



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

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

Issued on 21 April 2021

Responses are due by Deadline 2: Wednesday 2 June 2021

ExQ1 PART 3 OF 6

- CC.1 [Climate change and resilience](#)
- CG.1 [Coastal Geomorphology](#)
- CA.1 [Compulsory Acquisition](#)
- CI.1 [Community Issues](#)
- Cu.1 [Cumulative impact and transboundary effects](#)

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CC.1	Climate change and resilience	
CC.1.0	The Applicant	<p>General climate change and policy issues</p> <p>NPS EN-1, section 4.8, states that the ES should take into account how the proposal will take account of the projected impacts of climate change. This should include climate change adaptation. The Planning Statement [APP-590], Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.63, indicates that SZC Co. has complied with those requirements and ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342] sets out the Climate Change Resilience (CCR) assessment:</p> <p>(i) Please specify in summary all appropriate mitigation or adaptation measures that have been identified for the scheme highlighting any relevant changes to the embedded mitigation since the preparation of the ES;</p> <p>(ii) Please clarify the period that they are intended to cover?</p> <p>(iii) Please summarise how the Applicant seeks to demonstrate that EN-1 paragraphs 4.8.6 - 4.8.7 would be satisfied.</p>
CC.1.1	The Applicant	<p>General climate change and policy issues</p> <p>In relation to EN-1, paragraph 4.8.8: Please explain how the ES demonstrates that there would be no critical features of the scheme which might be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond that projected in the latest set of UK climate projections?</p>
CC.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES VII Chapter 26 [APP-342] indicates that decommissioning cc 3029f the Sizewell C power station has been scoped out of the detailed Green House Gas (GHG) assessment and a high level summary of the impacts of decommissioning has been provided in Chapter 5. The matter was scoped out of the ES on the basis that an ES for decommissioning of the main site would be secured through the DCO or other suitable mechanism. Please explain how that would be achieved?</p>
CC.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES VII Chapter 26 26.4.15 [APP-342] acknowledges that as a result of the amended 2050 carbon reduction target to net zero carbon, the Committee on Climate Change (CCC) would be reviewing the current carbon budgets and to achieve the revised 2050 target, the emissions reduction trajectory set out in the budgets through to 2050 will need to</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		steepen. What are the implications of the CCC's 6th carbon budget for the assessment presented?
CC.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES VII Chapter 26 [APP-342] explains that IEMA guidance recommends comparing a project's carbon footprint against available carbon budgets. In the absence of any defined industry guidance for assessing the magnitude of GHG impacts for EIA, IEMA recommend the use of professional judgement. Please explain further and specifically identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) those aspects of the GHG assessment for which professional judgment has been used; (ii) the outcome of those judgements; and (iii) the justification for the assumptions made in the exercise of that professional judgement.
CC.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) [RR-1231] complain that there is a lack of information for independent verification of EDF's carbon emission claims. Please explain further how the calculation has been made setting out the assumptions which underline the carbon calculations and support the conclusion reached.</p>
CC.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342] sets out key measures embedded within the design principles of the Sizewell C Project for the reduction of GHG emissions within Table 26.7: GHG emissions: Primary (embedded) mitigation measures. Please explain how those measures including the Design Principles Document and those intended to achieve design Principles 1, 2, and 3 would be adequately secured by the draft DCO?</p>
CC.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342], paragraph 26.4.69, indicates that in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) appointed contractor(s) will develop and implement a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to measure, monitor and report energy and water consumption and GHG emissions during construction. Please explain how this aspect of the CEMP would operate in practice including how the reports would be utilised and actions instigated where necessary?</p>
CC.1.8	The Applicant	Green House Gas emissions

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342], paragraph 26.4.49, in relation to the assessment of GHG emissions during operation explains that by 2034 it is anticipated that Defra and other industry published GHG emissions factors will have considerably declined as the UK transitions towards meeting a net zero carbon emissions target by 2050. To account for the influence of decarbonisation activities across multiple sectors as the UK moves towards the 2050 target, a second step to apply a conservative reduction factor has been undertaken. Please explain and justify the application of a 15% reduction to the calculation compared to 2019 emission factors and why this is likely to represent the highest operational emissions which will be experienced in 2034?</p>
CC.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES concludes that the construction emissions for Sizewell C will not exceed 1% of the total five year UK carbon budget period in which they arise, and the construction of Sizewell C will not have a significant impact on the UK meeting its five carbon budgets through to 2032. Chapter 26 [APP-342], paragraph 26.4.61, states that as carbon budgets had only been set by Government through to 2032, it was not possible to assess the operational impact of the Sizewell C Project in the context of the UK meeting its carbon budget targets. However, it is estimated that GHG emissions from the construction would be offset within the first 6 years of operation by GHG emissions displaced. (i) What are the implications of the CCC 6th Carbon budget December 2020 for that assessment? (ii) Does that assessment and the overall conclusion that Sizewell C provides a significantly beneficial impact, when the GHG impact of electricity generated at Sizewell C is compared against the impact of generating the equivalent energy from the anticipated future mix of alternative generation, need to be revised in the light of more recent reports and information on climate change?</p>
CC.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council [RR-1214] submits that the operational waste heat vented to the environment has not been assessed against Paris Agreement, 2050 net zero commitments or UK Committee for Climate Change reports. Please comment specifically on the points raised by the Parish Council and explain the position in relation to the climate change impact of the operational waste heat that would be generated.</p>
CC.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Environmental Statement Addendum – Non-Technical Summary [AS-179], Section 2.3 n) indicates that the proposed changes and Additional Information on materials management have been used to re-calculate the construction emissions and lifetime emissions from the Sizewell C Project. Please confirm that these are the only factors relevant to the calculations that would be different as a result of the change.</p>
CC.1.12	The Applicant	<p>The role of the Nuclear Regulators</p> <p>The Planning Statement, [APP-590] Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.59, refers to NPS EN-6 Vol I, section 2.7, which states that the decision maker should not duplicate matters that are within the remit of the Nuclear Regulator. Further details of the potential impacts of climate change that fall within the scope of the Nuclear Site License (NSL) are set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 26, paragraphs 26.5.34 to 26.5.38. Nevertheless, to provide clarity please identify with reasoned justification all those aspects of climate change adaption which the Applicant considers fall within the role of the Nuclear Regulators (whether as part of GDA, site licensing or environmental permitting) and those issues which remain within the remit of the decision-maker for the DCO application.</p>
CC.1.13	ONR	<p>The role of the Nuclear Regulators</p> <p>The ONR [RR-0992] 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 ONR is currently assessing this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Does the ONR have any concerns at this stage associated with the proposed development in relation to climate change impacts and the adaptation measures proposed in the light of experience gained since its assessment of the generic EPR design in 2012? (ii) In the light of EN-6, paragraph 2.7.5, are there any reasons at this stage for the ExA to be concerned that any necessary licence, permit or authorisation will not subsequently be granted? (iii) In the light of EN-6, paragraph 2.7.6, is the ONR aware of any regulatory requirements that are likely to be attached to the grant of a licence and the anticipated timing of the process?
CC.1.14	EA	<p>The role of the Nuclear Regulators</p> <p>The EA [RR-0373] highlights that it is currently unable to advise the ExA of its position on the environmental permits required for operation, or provide representations on any matters covered by those permits. Whilst the ExA appreciates that the EA may not be able</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		to publish the draft decisions on the environmental permits before the Sizewell C DCO Examination closes, does the EA have any specific concerns at this stage associated with the proposed development in relation to climate change impacts and the adaptation measures proposed?
CC.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Climate change adaptation</p> <p>In relation to NPS EN-1, paragraph 4.8.10: Please identify all the proposed adaptation measures that could themselves have the potential to give rise to consequential impacts.</p>
CC.1.16	The Applicant, EA	<p>Climate change adaptation</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.61 [APP-590] refers to the mitigation measures embedded in the design including the elevation of the main platform to take it out of the area of flood risk. The EA [RR-0373] expresses concern that the current Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) identifies increased flooding to properties without identifying appropriate mitigation and compensation measures:</p> <p>(i) Is it agreed that the embedded mitigation proposed including the design changes would overcome the flood risk for the main platform itself for the relevant period under consideration?</p> <p>(ii) In the light of EN-1, paragraph 5.7.16, please demonstrate that the project would be safe without increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. If that remains a point of disagreement, please identify the area of dispute and any further steps proposed to resolve the matter?</p>
CC.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Climate change adaptation</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.61 [APP-590], refers to the mitigation measures embedded in the design including the elevation of the main platform to take it out of the area of flood risk up to a level of 7.3m AOD and the creation of new coastal flood defences at the heights proposed by the changes up to 10.2m AOD with adaptive design to potentially raise the defence up to 14.2m AOD. These heights have now changed as part of the revised application. Please clarify that the proposed elevation of the main platform and sea defence design now reflect and provide a safe margin in the light of both UKCP18 and later reports and advice on the topic.</p>
CC.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Climate change adaptation</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Change 9 proposes a change to the sea defence to make the scheme more efficient and resilient to climate change. Notwithstanding the details provided in the FRA Addendum [AS-157]:</p> <p>(i) Please explain in further detail how the proposed height of the permanent sea defence would extend the period when future raising may be needed to beyond the operational lifetime of the power station?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain further how the proposed changes to the sea defence would increase resilience to climate change.</p>
CC.1.19	The Applicant	<p>In-combination climate change impact (ICCI) assessment</p> <p>The ES Chapter 26, paragraphs 26.6.7 to 26.6.9 [APP-342] explain that limitations associated with the approach taken for the ICCI assessment relate to uncertainties inherent within UKCP18 Projections. To overcome uncertainty issues, forecast climate change data from UKCP18 has been used coupled with the replication of proven effective approaches undertaken for similar project types. Assessments made in relation to 'consequence' and 'likelihood' rely on professional judgement and evidence gathered through other environmental disciplines:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further and specify the approaches which have been replicated and the project types to which they relate.</p> <p>(ii) Please identify the elements of professional judgement relied upon and the 'other environmental disciplines to which they relate.</p>
CG.1 Coastal Geomorphology		
CG.1.0	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The ES V II, Chapter 20 [APP-311], identifies potential impacts on coastal change. The Change Request provided additional information in relation to coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics including the draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan appended to the ES Addendum. In the light of EN-1, paragraphs 5.5.7 and 5.5.10 and EN-6 paragraph 3.8.5, please demonstrate how the decision-maker can be satisfied in relation to the changed application:</p> <p>(i) That the potential impacts would be minimised;</p> <p>(ii) That the proposed development will be resilient to coastal erosion and deposition, taking account of climate change, during the project's operational life and any decommissioning period.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>A number of IPs have expressed concern that the scheme could inhibit sediment flow or have an adverse impact on coastal processes at other locations. In the light of NPS EN-1, paragraph 5.5.11, please explain how the decision-maker could be satisfied that any impacts of the project on coastal processes would be managed to minimise adverse impacts on other parts of the coast.</p>
CG.1.2	The Applicant, EA, Natural England, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The EA [RR-0373] in relation to the residual uncertainty associated with predicting future changes to the geomorphology of the greater Sizewell Bay, as well as to key driving processes such as sea level rise and wave climate, considers this to be mitigated by SZC's commitment to continued engagement with the Marine Technical Forum of regulators as part of the Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (MMP):</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that the MMP and proposed means of enforcement would provide sufficient security in that respect, particularly in relation to the agreement and funding of specialists to closely monitor the evolution of the coastline and agree and implement the most appropriate measures to manage any unforeseen impacts.</p> <p>(ii) Please indicate when it is anticipated that the detailed design process for the Hard Coastal Defence Feature (HCDF) will take place and how that process would be appropriately appraised and approved?</p> <p>(iii) Are there any draft DCO changes that would be required to exercise sufficient control over that process?</p>
CG.1.3	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The East Suffolk Council [RR-0342] indicates that the draft MMP prepared by SZC Co. is currently under consultation with key stakeholders in parallel with the DCO process. There are several points of contention between ESC and SZC Co. In relation to the identified points of contention between ESC and SZC:</p> <p>(i) Is it agreed that a precautionary principle should be applied to assumptions on potential future critical requirements including Impact Assessments, incomplete designs, and the extent of the area to be monitored?</p> <p>(ii) If not, why not?</p> <p>(iii) If so, please suggest how this should be secured through the DCO, including any amended drafting for the draft DCO or other associated documentation?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(iv) Please comment further on the project plan and budget and the assumptions to be made as regards the period that the MMP will remain active explaining any points of difference.</p> <p>(v) Please specify the means, in the event of a transfer by SZC Co. of its interest in the site to a new owner, whereby it is suggested that the new owner would be bound by covenant or other legal mechanism to adopt responsibility including costs for maintaining the MMP process setting out any drafting changes to the DCO documentation that would be required to achieve that.</p> <p>(vi) Please comment further on the proposal for an independent body to monitor the MMP, and to direct SZC Co. mitigation and compensation requirements.</p> <p>(vii) Please provide an update on the Council's consultation with MMO as regards the delivery of the MMP.</p>
CG.1.4	The Applicant, SCC, EA	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] identifies as an area of key concern: "<i>xii) A comprehensive coastal change Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (MMP), with an allocated mitigation/compensation budget, that allows determining if and to what extent an observed coastal change in the Sizewell C zone of influence is attributable to the development, and appropriate and required mitigation measures; and xiii) Provision for the cost of full removal of the hard sea defence as part of the decommissioning process unless and until a future study changes this position</i>".</p> <p>(i) Please indicate the progress of agreeing the MMP; any associated funding for mitigation/compensation and the removal cost for the hard sea defence;</p> <p>(ii) Please identify any outstanding areas of dispute in relation to the MMP, funding and the removal of the hard sea defence;</p> <p>(iii) Has the means whereby the MMP, funding and other costs would be secured been agreed? If not, please identify any matters which remain in dispute?</p>
CG.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The Alde and Ore Association [RR-1206] also raise issues in relation to the MMP. Please respond to those specific matters of concern including the duration and level of monitoring and funding proposed to be available pursuant to that plan.</p>
CG.1.6	The Applicant, SCC, EA	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] notes that the draft DCO proposes not to remove the Sizewell C coastal defence after decommissioning, unless required by the Pre-Decommissioning Environmental Impact Assessment. The Council does not consider this acceptable, and expects the Funded Decommissioning Programme to make provision for the cost of full removal of the hard sea defence as part of the decommissioning process, when safe to do so, unless and until a future study, informed by monitoring and other data, changes this position. Why has the removal not been included in the Funded Decommissioning Programme if there is potential for this to be necessary?
CG.1.7	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The MMO [RR-0744] advises that any coastal monitoring plan should also be included as a requirement. This is because for any works landward of MHWS, East Suffolk Council will be the enforcement body; any monitoring that relates to the SCDF and HCDF will be of relevance to the Council. Please comment on this matter and, if agreed, set out any drafting changes required for the draft DCO to accommodate this.</p>
CG.1.8	The Applicant, MMO, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The MMO [RR-0744] advises that monitoring options to address the uncertainties in the scale of predicted impact and hence the level of monitoring should be included in the MMP in particular for the monitoring of the BLF. It also advises that more detailed monitoring plans must be agreed for each project element and method. The MMO makes a number of other detailed criticisms of the MMP. Please comment on the criticisms made and provide an update as to the progress of agreeing the draft MMP.</p>
CG.1.9	MMO, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237] provides information on the mitigation proposed. Please indicate whether that mitigation is considered to be satisfactory and, if not, suggest any changes considered to be necessary.</p>
CG.1.10	MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P, explains that the scope of the assessment has also been informed by ongoing consultation and engagement with statutory consultees throughout the design and assessment process. To facilitate engagement with statutory (and non-statutory) stakeholders on the marine assessments, the Sizewell Marine Technical Forum</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		has been established. The Marine Technical Forum has an independent chair, supported by a technical secretariat supplied by SZC Co. together with nominated technical representatives from Natural England, the EA, the MMO and the East Suffolk Council, and any consultants working on their behalf. The Zone of Influence (ZoI) for the coastal geomorphology assessment has been defined in agreement with the Marine Technical Forum as the Greater Sizewell Bay. Please explain further the role of the MMO as a nominated technical representative of the Marine Technical Forum and indicate whether the ZoI was agreed by the MMO at that stage?
CG.1.11	MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P [APP-171], Hard coastal defence feature 1.3.45 indicates that the final design and detailed construction plans for the HCDF were not known at the time of assessment. Though considered unlikely, it has been assumed as a worst case that heavy plant will be required to operate on the upper beach as part of the construction works. Please indicate whether it is agreed that the assumption of use of heavy plant in the assessment reasonably represents the worst case. In the absence of detailed design and detailed construction plans explain how the worst case scenario for the HCDF be fairly assessed?</p>
CG.1.12	MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P [APP-171], Beach landing facility, paragraph 1.3.46, explains that use of a jack-up barge is considered the worst case for construction of the BLF as the cantilever method (installation from each previously assembled deck section) would have no separate impact apart from the piles themselves.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether it is agreed that the assumptions made in the assessment reasonably represent the worst case scenario for the construction of the BLF?</p> <p>(ii) Are there any other factors which should have been taken into account?</p> <p>(iii) Please provide an update in the light of Change 2 to the original application.</p>
CG.1.13	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P [APP-171], paragraph 1.3.49, indicates that dredging would only be needed when the BLF approach is too shallow or the requirements for the barge grounding pocket are not met and when the BLF is in use. The dredging requirement (clearance) for vessel (barge and tugboats) access to the BLF is not currently known but is considered to be small (substantially less than 1m). The dredging requirement for the</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>docked (grounded) barge has also not been finalised. Please confirm that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the assumptions set out in Appendix 20A of Volume 2 of the ES [APP-312] made in relation to dredging are agreed; (ii) that these assumptions would over-represent the required barge traffic over the construction period; and (iii) the assessments conservatively assume maintenance of the approach channel and grounding pocket throughout the construction period of the proposed development. (iv) Please provide an update in the light of Change 2 to the original application.
CG.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The MMO [RR-0744] states that the risk that the wave climate at Sizewell reverts to the pre-1925 case could significantly alter the sediment supply and coastline behaviour and the lack of assessment of changes to the offshore wave climate to a north east domination is a gap in the analysis. In addition, for the nearshore climate, the Applicant assumes that the bank system is stable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Please comment on the criticisms made and provide further justification for the assumptions set out in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 20 [APP-311], including the extent of the study area for coastal geomorphology set out in paragraph 20.3.9 and the assumptions and limitations referred to in paragraphs 20.3.21 and 20.3.29. (ii) In relation to paragraph 20.4.6, as pointed out by the MMO, why has the impact of the "19th Century" wave climate resuming not been assessed? (iii) Please provide further justification for the assumption that the present wave regime and hence little costal change and impact will continue.
CG.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The MMO [RR-0744] states that in general, despite the littoral drift to the south, the mitigation ignores potential impacts to the south of SZC. While the MMO recognises that the assessment concentrates on the stretch of the coast to the north of the site because that is a particularly sensitive area, the less sensitive parts to the south should be further considered. Please explain why this has been omitted to date and whether it is agreed that further consideration should be given to the parts of the coast to the south of the site.</p>
CG.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The Alde and Ore Association [RR-1206] expresses concern that the ES fails to justify the assertion that the Great Sizewell Bay is a self-contained unit and changes there will have</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		no impact on the longshore coastal evolution which has resulting in the uniquely long shingle spit of Orfordness, which itself created the Alde and Ore Estuary. Likewise, Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257] submits that EDF have not justified the assertion that coastal effects to the south will not extend beyond the coralline crag to the north of Thorpeness. Given the scope of the ES assessment how can the ExA be satisfied that the proposed change at Sizewell would not adversely these natural processes further to the south?
CG.1.17	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257] questions the acceptance of the EDF predictions of when the HCDF will be exposed in the absence of a finalised design. Please provide further justification for the reliability of the ES conclusions on this topic prior to the assessment of the final design of the HCDF.
CG.1.18	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board [RR-0345] expresses concern that the identified changes to long-term sediment flow off the Coast because of the HCDF would be likely to lead to accretion to the north of the development. (i) Please comment as regards the potential impact that this could cause to future discharge to the sea from the gravitational drainage system at Minsmere; (ii) Please summarise the mitigation proposed and comment on whether this matter has been sufficiently considered.
CG.1.19	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes National Trust [RR-0877] in relation to coastal geomorphology and long-term change, expresses concern that there are potential/possible impacts of the proposal on their site during the lifetime of the development that have not been fully explored as part of a holistic and integrated assessment. The Trust submits that the Applicant should be required to define and monitor this change for the lifetime of the development and to include the north of the application site, specifically Dunwich Heath and Beach. (i) Please respond to the specific concerns of National Trust on this topic; (ii) Please explain further and set out the proposals for mitigation/compensation for adverse impacts resulting from the project upon Dunwich Heath and Beach that might arise through coastal change.
CG.1.20	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Stop Sizewell C (Theberton & Eastbridge Action Group) [RR-1162] sets out its various concerns in relation to the effect of the Sizewell C Project on coastal processes and flood risk. Please respond specifically to the concerns raised including the current absence of a submitted plan for the HCDF structure; the MMP; and the assertion that coastal effects to the south will not extend beyond the coralline crag to the north of Thorpeness.</p>
CG.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>Suffolk Coast Acting for Resilience [RR-1171] raise the issue of coastal erosion outside the narrow Sizewell Bay and the assumption that nothing will change south of the Great Sizewell Bay. Please respond specifically to the concerns raised in respect of:</p> <p>(i) the availability of long-term funds for coastal defence works, including for Aldeburgh to at least Shingle Street.</p> <p>(ii) Whether the latest information on climate change, sea level rise and coastal evolution has been taken into account and, if not, why not and how that affects the soundness of any assessments.</p>
CG.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>A number of IPs express concern that the scheme would exacerbate existing levels of coastal erosion along this coast. For example, Dr Kay Laskey [RR-0329] draws attention to existing rapid coastal erosion especially either side of the site, at both Thorpeness and Cove Hithe. Please comment upon such concerns and whether the proposed new defences would be likely to cause flanking erosion in other locations and identify any proposed mitigation for this issue?</p>
CG.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>NE [RR-0478] makes specific comments on the Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics report within the application, and sets out additional information or evidence that it requires or which needs clarification including how the various beach measures would avoid an adverse effect and maintain condition of SAC foreshore annuals vegetation communities; the extent to which the measures would also reduce the risk to SAC/SPA habitats in Minsmere Valley behind the barrier beach; the impact of the coastal defence measures on the dune County Wildlife Site and how the loss of most of the site would be mitigated or offset within the footprint of the HCDF and SCDF; how the coast protection of the development site would enhance the wider coastal natural environment, including its form, function, and ability of coastal habitats to contribute to climate change</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		resilience and nature recovery, as part of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan. Please comment on the points raised by NE and provide the additional information/clarity sought.
CG.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Addendum – Non-Technical Summary [AS-179], Section 2.3 k) considers coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics explains that the updated assessment considered the effects associated with the construction and operation of the enhanced permanent breach landing facility, the new temporary beach landing facility, the temporary discharge outfall and the change to the sea defence design and concludes that with mitigation in place all effects on coastal processes associated with the changes are assessed as not significant.</p> <p>(i) Please identify any specific mitigation and/or changes to the Coastal Processes and Monitoring and Mitigation Plan that have been required as a result of these changes.</p> <p>(ii) In relation to the assessed new significant benefit associated with the changes, please explain in detail the basis for that conclusion.</p>
CG.1.25	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237] Table 1, summarises the SZC components that are considered to require coastal geomorphology monitoring, along with the proposed method and rationale.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any other components should be monitored?</p> <p>(ii) Please provide further justification for an explanation of the frequency and spatial extent of the monitoring proposed in this table for the relevant components.</p>
CG.1.26	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 2, provides the suite of monitoring methods which would be used to track changes in coastal geomorphic receptors and annual vegetation, including impacts arising from SZC pressures and activities. The methods combine the use of continuous remote sensing techniques for early warning of any impacts with targeted, high-accuracy, field surveys.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any other methods should be utilised?</p> <p>(ii) Please confirm that the suite of methods proposed represents an appropriate balance between remote and on-site techniques.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.27	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 5.2, indicates that all Beach Landing Facilities (BLF) effects have been classified as not significant, although some were minor and some negligible. Minor effects were predicted to arise from the reprofiled navigation channel leading to the permanent BLF jetty and propeller wash from tugboats on the longshore bars. It confirms that seabed reprofiling (dredging) would be required in order to gain safe navigational access to the enhanced permanent BLF jetty. Please explain in further detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) why the altered bed shear stress over this area would have low impact duration and probability;(ii) why the occurrence of a storm could be relied upon to result in rapid shrinkage of the effect;(iii) the reliability of the conclusion reached that higher than natural quiescent levels of suspended sediment concentration arising from propeller wash from tugboats would be directed to the south.
CG.1.28	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 5.2, indicates that as the BLF is close to the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC, precautionary monitoring associated with BLF-use is proposed in order to confirm the predicted no significant effect of bed reprofiling and tugboat propeller wash. However, it is proposed that this aspect of the beach and longshore bar monitoring would be cease once shown that these activities have no significant effect on the designated sites. Given the designation of these particular sites, does the proposed continuation of background monitoring provide sufficient safeguards for the longer term?</p>
CG.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], in relation to scour around BLF piles, acknowledges that with sea level rise and shoreline retreat (landward translation of the beach profile), terrestrial piles could become exposed by the receding intertidal beach and intertidal profiles could become subtidal. Please explain further why the proposed background monitoring would be sufficient to document any changes arising from beach profile translation?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 6, acknowledges that the likely timeframe of 2053 – 2087 for HCDF exposure is sufficiently far into the future that the details of which part of the shingle beach might become vulnerable, and its extent, cannot be known and neither can an individual mitigation plan be specified years or more in advance. Since the precise beach conditions and matching mitigation actions cannot be known at this stage, how can it be ensured that beach conditions would not threaten HCDF exposure and could be satisfactorily mitigated at that time?</p>
CG.1.31	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 6.2 and 6.3, set out the proposed beach management framework and the mitigation trigger (beach volume). Please confirm that these sections of the draft plan have been agreed and, if not, why not and highlight any changes sought.</p>
CG.1.32	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 6.5.4, states that the proposed beach maintenance/sediment management approaches would not have an adverse effect on designated supra-tidal shingle habitats.</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that this section of the draft plan has been agreed. If not, please explain why that is the case and highlight any changes sought.</p> <p>(ii) Is it agreed that the Leiston - Aldeburgh SSSI is too distant to be affected by beach management activity at SZC?</p>
CA.1.	Compulsory acquisition	
CA.1.0	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-062], paragraphs 6.1.4 and 6.1.5, indicates that in addition to developing the power station itself, SZC Co. is applying for consent for associated development and assesses the consistency of the proposed development with the principles set out in the associated development guidance. Please provide further justification for the conclusions reached in paragraph 6.1.5 bullet points 1, 2 and 4 with particular regard to the provision of the Two Village Bypass (TVP) and the Sizewell Link Road (SLR)?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.1	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], section 5, considers the source and scope of the powers set out in the draft DCO. Paragraph 5.3.3, states that any land within the Order Limits will be subject to a statutory authority to override easements and other rights, and to extinguish private rights of way upon the appropriation of the land for the purposes of the DCO. Please explain in further detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) The need to seek such a wide-ranging power and why all such rights and easements cannot be specifically identified;(ii) Why it is necessary to include powers of compulsory acquisition as a means of overriding existing rights and interests in or over land, as well as creating new rights over land, and granting the right to take temporary possession of land?(iii) The nature and extent of any delay to the project that might otherwise result?(iv) What alternatives to this approach have been explored?
CA.1.2	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.3.9, explains that Article 30 would allow SZC Co. to compulsorily acquire existing and new rights, as well as impose restrictive covenants over land, for example where flood mitigation works need to be retained. Where SZC Co. only needs to acquire rights over land, it is not required to acquire a greater interest in the land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Please provide an indication of the anticipated content and/or an initial draft of any restrictive covenants intended to be imposed;(ii) Should a requirement for consultation with relevant owners/occupiers as regards the drafting of any such restrictive covenants be imposed?
CA.1.3	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.5.8, states that Article 25 would authorise SZC Co. to enter onto any land within the Order Limits or which may be affected by the authorised development (whether or not that land is within the Order Limits) to undertake various survey and investigative works, including trial holes. Article 25(2) provides for a 14 day notice period to be given to the owner/occupier of the land. Please provide justification for a 14 day notice period and consider whether this is unreasonably short and should be extended to 28 days?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.4	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>To assist with the consideration of whether the extent of the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development to which the development consent will relate:</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.3.4, states that the Order Limits have been defined to allow sufficient flexibility to enable the final detailed design of the Sizewell C Project to be optimal. In addition, paragraph 7.3.6, indicates that limits within which the highway works may be constructed have been defined to incorporate sufficient land to allow for the final detailed design to be determined. The land included in the Order Land includes the full extent of the area where works may be undertaken. However, in practice only the land needed for the highway works would be acquired.</p> <p>(i) For the avoidance of doubt, please set out and justify the extent of the flexibility that the submitted scheme would allow in terms of Limits of Deviation (LoD) and parameters providing dimensions where relevant;</p> <p>(ii) How would it be ensured that powers of Compulsory Acquisition would not be exercised in respect of land not ultimately required as a result of the detailed design process?</p>
CA.1.5	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.4.3, in relation to Article 18, states that this article would allow SZC Co. to use temporarily any private road within the Order Limits for the passage of persons or vehicles for the purposes of, or in connection with, the construction of Sizewell C without the need to obtain an interest (i.e. right of way) over that land. Please explain why it is necessary to seek this power and identify the private roads to which it is intended to apply?</p>
CA.1.6	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.4.5, explains that Article 38 would provide that SZC Co. must exercise its power to temporarily use land or interests within five years of the Order being granted. However, this leaves the period of temporary possession open-ended from the date the power is exercised. Should there not also be a time limit after which the temporary possession of the land or interests must cease?</p>
CA.1.7	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		For the avoidance of doubt, please confirm the total number of plots falling within each of the six classes listed in the SoR [APP-062], Table 1.1. for the application as amended.
CA.1.8	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], section 2.2, sets out the amendments to the Order Land that are required as a result of the proposed changes. For the avoidance of doubt, please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the extent of the new land to be included within the Order Limits in respect of which compulsory acquisition powers are sought; (ii) the total area of land over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought; (iii) the extent of the new land to be included within the Order Limits in respect of which temporary possession powers are sought; (iv) the total area of land over which temporary possession powers are sought; (v) the extent of the new land over which the compulsory acquisition of rights only are sought; (vi) the total area of land over which the compulsory acquisition of rights only are sought.
CA.1.9	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>In relation to the SoR Addendum [AS-149], Tables 2.1-2.4, please identify and include the number of the relevant change request applicable to each section.</p>
CA.1.10	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], Tables 2.1 and 2.4, and the Draft DCO Addendum [AS-145] provide reasons for the additions/changes to the powers sought. However, please provide further details of the necessity for these additions/changes and the assessment of the extent of the Additional Land/Powers sought in each case including in relation to draft DCO, Schedule 17A [AS-143].</p>
CA.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], section 7.4, sets out the Applicant's compelling case in the public interest for the proposed compulsory acquisition. Paragraph 7.4.1 asserts that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the adverse impacts on the interests of those who would be affected by the proposed use of compulsory acquisition powers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) What assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual Affected Persons

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and their private loss that would result from the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers in each case;</p> <p>(ii) What is the clear evidence that the public benefit would outweigh the private loss and how has that balancing exercise between public benefit and private loss been carried out?</p>
CA.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.4.3, sets out the expected public benefits of the project. Please indicate whether the public benefits claimed within the five bullet points set out in that paragraph require any update?</p>
CA.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.4.7, states that the Applicant has taken pro-active steps to engage with these persons through formal consultation and informal engagement to understand the direct and indirect impacts on them. Paragraph, 9.2.2, explains that the Applicant has engaged directly with individual landowners and those with an interest in the affected land. As a result of this engagement SZC Co. has had a better understanding of the direct and indirect impacts on individual landowners. Please provide further details, with examples where available:</p> <p>(i) How such engagement has helped to shape the proposals and enabled the Applicant to make changes to designs to minimise the private loss;</p> <p>(ii) How has the direct engagement with individual landowners given the Applicant a better understanding of the direct and indirect impacts on them;</p> <p>(iii) Please provide detail, where available, of the direct and indirect impacts thereby identified.</p>
CA.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>What weight has the Applicant attached to the compensation that would be available to those entitled to claim it under the relevant provisions of the national Compensation Code in its assessment of private loss?</p>
CA.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The relevant representation of NFU [RR-0885] raises various issues including the justification for the powers sought, extent and location of the land sought to be compulsorily acquired; the powers sought to create new public rights of way; and that no meaningful negotiations have taken place with those it represents. It submits that a compelling case cannot be made. Please respond to the points raised by the NFU on these matters including the adequacy of the negotiations conducted on the Applicant's behalf and the lack of detail within the heads of terms.
CA.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>The Procedural Deadline A submission made by Gregory Jones QC on behalf of clients [PDA-020] asserts that there has been a failure to justify size and location of balance ponds and, in relation to the proposed new public rights of way, the Applicant should not be authorised to acquire more land than is needed for the scheme itself. Please provide justification for the extent of and need for the land sought to be acquired for these purposes.</p>
CA.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>In the light of the DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (CA Guidance), paragraph 8:</p> <p>(i) How can the Panel be assured that all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored;</p> <p>(ii) Set out in summary form, with document references where appropriate, what assessment/comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests therein in each case.</p>
CA.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.5.20, refers to the four stages of statutory pre-application consultation, between 2012 and 2019, and the targeted statutory consultation, informal consultation and engagement that has also taken place outside of these consultation stages and the consideration given to that in the selection of the most appropriate options.</p> <p>(i) Please explain what, if any, account has been taken of responses to pre-application consultation (both in relation to statutory and non-statutory consultation) in the location and design of the elements of the scheme that were the subject of such consultation in</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		considering whether there are reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition; (ii) Please provide any examples of location/route changes and changes to design development options within the application scheme in response to public consultation.
CA.1.19	The Applicant	Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored The ES 6.7 Volume 6 [APP-450] Sizewell Link Road Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution 3.3.20 states that as part of design refinement and EIA process, there were a number of updates to the design following Stage 4 consultation. (i) Please provide further justification for the extent of the land take that would permanently be required for the new road; the consideration given to the potential severance of holdings and division of existing field patterns and the ability to access and utilise that land following completion of construction. (ii) Please explain in further detail the consideration given to accommodation access tracks and private means of access and how these have been refined or added to reduce severance impacts following Stage 4 consultation.
CA.1.20	The Applicant	Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.5.52, asserts that all reasonable alternatives have been considered prior to the making of the Application and such consideration has included reasonable factors at relevant stages, including the minimisation of environmental and visual impacts and land take. Please explain further, by reference to the documentation submitted, the consideration given to the minimisation of land take and the assessment of alternatives to the extent of the land sought to be compulsorily acquired, and the nature of the powers sought for each plot.
CA.1.21	The Applicant	Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored The CA Guidance, paragraph 25, state that applicants should seek to acquire land by negotiation wherever practicable. As a general rule, authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought as part of an order granting development consent if attempts to acquire by agreement fail. (i) Please demonstrate the Applicant's compliance with this aspect of the CA Guidance. (ii) Has the Applicant offered full access to alternative dispute resolution techniques for those with concerns about the compulsory acquisition of their land or considered other means of involving those affected?

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 1.3.3, refers to discussions having taken place with relevant landowners of the Additional Land. Please include details of the negotiations within the update to be submitted to the next Deadline, identifying separately those which relate to the Additional Land.</p>
CA.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 3.3, refers to the summary of main alternatives that have been considered for the Project in the Statement of Reasons [APP-062]. Nonetheless, please expand and explain the consideration of all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) of these additional plots in accordance with paragraph 8 of the CA Guidance.</p>
CA.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The CA Guidance, paragraph 17, considers the resource implication of the proposed scheme. In the light of that guidance, please set out the degree to which other bodies (public or private sector) have agreed to make financial contributions or to underwrite the scheme, and the basis upon which any such contributions or underwriting is to be made.</p>
CA.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>In the light of the CA Guidance, paragraph 18, what evidence is there to demonstrate that adequate funding is likely to be available to enable the compulsory acquisition within the statutory period following any DCO being made?</p>
CA.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-590], paragraphs 7.3.3-7.3.10, considers financial and technical viability and makes reference to ENS-1 paragraph 4.1, and concludes that based on the Funding Statement the decision maker can be satisfied of the projects viability and that there is a reasonable prospect of the requisite funds for the acquisition becoming available. Please confirm that it is agreed that:</p> <p>(i) This presupposes that the decision-maker is satisfied based on the information provided in the application, that the financial viability and technical feasibility of the proposal has been properly assessed by the applicant?</p> <p>(ii) If the decision-maker is not satisfied from the information provided that the applicant</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		has properly assessed the financial viability of the project, then remains a matter of relevance for the decision-maker?
CA.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>Please summarise the evidence relied upon to support the conclusion that there is a reasonable prospect that the scheme, if granted consent, would actually be taken forward and in what time period?</p>
CA.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-066], paragraph 3.2.1, indicates that the current cost estimate for the project is circa £20 billion. That figure includes design, land acquisition, and physical construction. The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.6, indicates that the overall estimated cost of the project remains the same as presented in the Funding Statement [APP-066]. Please explain, in the event that the changes to the application are accepted, how that has been calculated to have no impact upon the overall cost estimate?</p>
CA.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-066], paragraph 3.2.2, states that the cost estimate has primarily been informed by learning from Sizewell C's sister project, Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details of the other sources which have informed the costs estimate and evidence to support the accuracy of the estimated cost?</p> <p>(ii) Given the differences between the two sites including their different locations, please explain why the Hinkley Point C experience can reasonably be relied upon in estimating costs for this project?</p> <p>(iii) What contingencies does the figure of £20 billion include? (iv) Please set out the differences between the initial cost estimate for Hinkley Point C prior to the grant of approval and the actual figure that is likely to be expended.</p>
CA.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Energy White Paper in relation to nuclear (page 48) expects a 30% reduction in the cost of nuclear new build projects by 2030. Whilst noting that timeline, how does that correspond with the Applicant's own anticipation of costs for the Sizewell C project compared to Hinkley Point C?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-066], paragraph 4.1.1, states that an estimate of the amounts necessary to cover the payment of compensation associated with the exercise of any compulsory acquisition powers granted has been taken into account in the overall project cost. Please provide a separate estimate of the cost of land acquisition. Please explain further the nature of the expert advice taken in that respect and the basis for and reliability of this estimate?</p>
CA.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.6, indicates that the Applicant continues to have positive engagement with potential third party investors:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further what is meant by 'positive engagement';</p> <p>(ii) whether any formal agreement or commitment to invest from third parties, subject to the necessary approvals being obtained, has been achieved;</p> <p>(iii) Why the development of the RAB funding model would be supportive of the project securing its financing requirements?</p>
CA.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Funding Statement Addendum [AS-011], paragraph 3.1.4, states that the replication strategy allows the cost of energy produced at Sizewell C to be substantially less than that produced at Hinkley Point C:</p> <p>(i) Please provide an indication of the anticipated energy cost reduction that it is anticipated would be achieved in comparison to Hinkley Point C;</p> <p>(ii) Please explain further what is meant by "substantially less" and how that would be achieved through the replication strategy?</p>
CA.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.5, refers to the publication of a summary of the responses to the Government's RAB consultation which indicate that a RAB model remains credible for funding large-scale nuclear projects. The Energy White Paper reiterates that position and indicates that it will continue to explore this, alongside a range of financing options with developers. Whilst examining the potential role of Government finance during construction, that is subject to there being</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		clear value for money for consumers and taxpayers. Given that hurdle, explain why the Applicant remains confident that the required funding will be achieved?
CA.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraphs 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 refer to the publication of the Government 'Ten Point Plan' and the Energy White Paper. The Energy White Paper in relation to power, sets out a key commitment to provide up to £385 million in an Advanced Nuclear Fund for the next generation of nuclear technology aiming, by the early 2030's, to develop a SMR design and to build an AMR demonstrator. Does that financial support for Small Modular Reactors indicate a limited window of opportunity for large scale nuclear projects that will be expected to pass the 'value for money' test?</p>
CA.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.8, notes a number of factors which increase the Applicant's confidence that it will be able to raise the funding required for the project and for compulsory acquisition to take place within the timescales set by the draft DCO. In relation to the factors listed:</p> <p>(i) The Energy White Paper indicates that the Government's aim to bring at least one large-scale nuclear project to financial close this Parliament is subject to clear value for money, and all relevant approvals. Please explain how the project is anticipated to meet that caveat?</p> <p>(ii) If the Applicant fails to demonstrate that the project represents 'clear value for money' and the negotiations with the Government do not reach a satisfactory conclusion, what are the prospects of obtaining the necessary funds from other sources? In short, is the achievement of the project reliant upon those negotiations reaching a successful conclusion?</p>
CA.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The relevant representations of Interested Persons including Against Sizewell C (TASC) [RR-1231], Louise Gooch (East Suffolk Council Cllr) [RR-701], NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867], Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] and NFU [RR-0885] raise concerns as regards the funding of the project, the proposed compulsory acquisition and decommissioning. Please respond to those concerns.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>What degree of importance has been attributed to the existing uses of the land proposed to be acquired in assessing whether any interference would be justified, and why?</p>
CA.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.9.1, acknowledges that the powers of compulsory acquisition sought through the draft DCO would engage Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) to the extent that homes are to be compulsorily acquired.</p> <p>(i) Please identify all those homes which are proposed to be compulsorily acquired and indicate whether any agreement has been reached with those owners/occupiers affected in this way?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain separately for each home the necessity and justification for seeking their acquisition and how that acquisition would comply with Article 8(2)?</p>
CA.1.40	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.9.4, states that in pursuing the DCO, SZC Co. has carefully considered the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest. Explain more precisely the factors which have been placed in the balance (including references to any paragraphs of the relevant NPS and Government Guidance), the weight attributed to those factors and how this exercise has actually been undertaken?</p>
CA.1.41	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.9.4, states that to the extent that the DCO would affect individuals' rights, the proposed interference with those rights would be in accordance with law, proportionate and justified in the public interest.</p> <p>(i) How has the proportionality test been undertaken?</p> <p>(ii) Explain further the proportionate approach which has been taken in relation to each plot?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.42	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>In relation to the Applicant's duties under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010: (i) Please explain how the Applicant has had regard to its public sector equality duty in relation to the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought and where this can be identified in the Equalities Impact Statement [APP-158]; (ii) Have any Affected Persons been identified as having protected characteristics?</p>
CA.1.43	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 3.4, asserts that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the CA Additional land is for a legitimate purpose, necessary and proportionate. Please expand and provide full justification for reaching that conclusion specifically in relation to the Additional Land.</p>
CA.1.44	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 3.7.2, relies upon the original Statement of Reasons [APP-062] to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. Please indicate the specific consideration given to the human rights of those affected by the proposed CA of the Additional Land.</p>
CA.1.45	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>Please provide specific details of the need and justification for the powers of compulsory acquisition sought and the consideration given to the Human Rights of each owner/occupant in respect of the following residential garden areas and/or properties: (i) The Round House, Eastbridge Road, Leiston, (Plot Ref MMDS/01/05); (ii) 54 and 55 Stockhouse Cottages, Main Road, Benhall, Saxmundham, (Plot Ref: 2VB/18/02); (iii) Annison's Cottage, Annesons Corner, Middleton (Plot Ref SLR/21/16); (iv) Upper Abbey Cottage, (Plot Ref MDS/02/04).</p>
CA.1.46	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Relevant Representation of Susanne Nujeerallee [RR-1194], states that: <i>"If Sizewell C goes ahead my family and I will be made homeless"</i>.</p> <p>(i) Please respond to the concerns raised by the occupier of Upper Abbey Cottage (Plot ref MDS/02/04) and explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon this family and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned.</p>
CA.1.47	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The Procedural Deadline A submission made by Gregory Jones QC on behalf of clients [PDA-020] complains that in breach of guidance and case law (as well as Article 8 European Convention of Human Rights and the First Protocol to the Convention) no meaningful negotiations have taken place alongside the formal procedures for compulsory purchase. Therefore a compelling case cannot be made for the proposed compulsory acquisition. Please respond including details of any negotiations that have taken place and what, if any, consideration has been given to the prospect of achieving different locations and/or lesser rights in relation to those plots.</p>
CA.1.48	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Please confirm that the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151] together accurately set out the various plots and interests. Please identify any inaccuracies that have come to light since the submission of the application and any further updates that need to be made at this stage.</p>
CA.1.49	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons [APP-062], paragraph 9.1.2, states that diligent inquiry to identify relevant persons with an interest in land was undertaken by Land Referencers appointed by the Applicant and sets out the process that was followed to identify such persons:</p> <p>(i) Please comment on the reliability and accuracy of the BoR in the light of those inquiries.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide further details of the process for identifying Category 3 persons.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Explain why that process should be regarded as a conservative approach towards identifying Category 3 persons.
CA.1.50	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>What assurance and evidence can the Applicant provide of the accuracy of the land interests identified as submitted and indicate whether there are likely to be any changes to the land interests, including the identification of further owners/interests or monitoring and update of changes in interests?</p>
CA.1.51	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Explain how the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151] comply with the guidance published by the former Department for Communities and Local Government – Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition for land Annex D, paragraph 10?</p>
CA.1.52	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Where have the proposed new rights and restrictive covenants been identified and cross-referenced to the relevant development consent order articles? Please explain how this has been achieved by the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151]?</p>
CA.1.53	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Please confirm that the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151] comply with the advice contained in Annex D, paragraph 8, of the guidance. For example, are all those identified in Part 3 also recorded in Part 1?</p>
CA.1.54	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>The Consultation Report [APP-069], paragraph 2.4.18, indicates that previously unregistered areas of land were periodically checked to ensure the land remained unregistered. What reliability can be placed upon the process by which those with an</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		interest in unregistered land were initially identified and subsequently checked for accuracy?
CA.1.55	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Please provide an up to date list of those plots of land where ownership still remains unknown.</p>
CA.1.56	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Please indicate whether a cover letter accompanied the Land Referencing Questionnaire attached as Appendix G4 to the Consultation Report [APP-084] and/or how the need to complete the document accurately was conveyed to recipients? Was this sent at the same time as the Request for Information Form attached at Appendix G6?</p>
CA.1.57	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>The relevant representation of Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Magnox Limited [RR-0991] and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority [RR-0992], indicates that regardless of Article 26 in the draft DCO, the NDA and Magnox are of the opinion that land plots MDS/05/06 and MDS/05/07 should be excluded from the BoR [APP-067] altogether. Please respond to their concerns and indicate whether the BoR will be amended in that respect?</p>
CA.1.58	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 1.3.2, states that the Applicant has carried out diligent inquiry in the CA Additional Land and persons with a claim for compensation as a result of the proposed development of the CA Land. Please provide specific details of the inquiries that have been made and justification for the reliance placed upon the outcome of those inquiries.</p>
CA.1.59	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.9.5, refers to section 127 PA 2008. However, Article 40 would allow SZC Co. to acquire land or rights in land owned by statutory undertakers (such as telecommunications and electricity suppliers) or to interfere with their apparatus</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		by removing or repositioning the apparatus within the Order Limits. In addition, the relevant representation of Network Rail [RR-0006] makes reference to s138 PA 2008. (i) Please clarify whether or not s138 PA 2008 is engaged by the Sizewell C project. (ii) If s38 is so engaged, then please identify all statutory undertakers to which that applies and provide details of the relevant right or apparatus to be extinguished or removed and why the Applicant considers that to be necessary? (iii) Please explain and justify the extent of the land over which such powers are sought given the width of the corridors likely to be needed for the reaction and acquisition of new rights to accommodate the diversion of statutory undertakers' apparatus.
CA.1.60	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.9.7, states that adequate protection for the statutory undertakers will be included within protective provisions in the DCO. SZC Co. therefore considers that the statutory undertakers will not suffer serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking as a result of the compulsory acquisition of land or rights over land or powers of temporary possession. (i) Have any Protective Provisions and/or asset protective agreements between the various parties been agreed. If not, please identify any outstanding areas of disagreement? (ii) For those Statutory Undertakers' who have been sent the draft protective provisions but have not confirmed agreement, please explain for each one why these protective provisions are considered to provide adequate protection and why SZC Co. considers that the land and rights can be acquired without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking.</p>
CA.1.61	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of Network Rail [RR-0006] objects to the inclusion of the Plots in the Order and to all other compulsory powers in the Order that affect, and may be exercised in relation to, Network Rail's property and interests. Please provide an update on the matters required by Network Rail in order for it to be in a position to withdraw its objection, including whether appropriate protective provisions have been agreed?</p>
CA.1.62	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of Anglian Water Services Ltd [RR-073]:</p> <p>(i) Has the proposed amendment to Article 23 draft DCO been agreed? If not, why not?</p> <p>(ii) Have the specific protective provisions suggested by Anglian Water been agreed? If not, why not?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Please indicate whether agreement has been reached in relation to temporary possession of land in Anglian Water's ownership to provide access to a proposed construction compound for the proposed Yoxford Roundabout?
CA.1.63	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of Cadent Gas Limited [RR-0168] explains why adequate protective provisions for the protection of Cadent's statutory undertaking are required and in discussion between the parties but not yet agreed. Please provide an update on the progress of those discussions and indicate whether any agreement has yet been reached?</p>
CA.1.64	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of National Grid Electricity Transmission Ltd (NGET) [RR-0874] states that NGET's rights to retain its apparatus in situ and rights of access to inspect, maintain, renew and repair such apparatus located within or near the Order limits should always be maintained and access to inspect and maintain such apparatus must not be restricted. Please provide an update on the progress of discussions with NGET in relation to protective provisions highlighting any outstanding areas of disagreement?</p>
CA.1.65	The Applicant	<p>Adequacy of any Protective Provisions set out in the dDCO and the need for any other Protective Provisions to safeguard relevant interests</p> <p>The relevant representation of East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board [RR-0345] welcomes the consideration of the benefits of including a protective provision for drainage and flood risk authorities (including Internal Drainage Boards) within the draft DCO. Please provide an update on progress and indicate whether such protective provisions have been agreed. If not, please set out any areas of disagreement?</p>
CA.1.66	The Applicant	<p>Adequacy of any Protective Provisions set out in the dDCO and the need for any other Protective Provisions to safeguard relevant interests</p> <p>The relevant representation of Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Magnox Limited [RR-0991] and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority [RR-0992], states that Protective Provisions should be included in the draft DCO in order to preserve and protect their respective abilities to effectively carry out their statutory functions and regulatory responsibilities and to reflect agreement reached on the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers. Please provide an update on progress and indicate whether such protective provisions have been agreed. If not, please set out any areas of disagreement?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.67	The Applicant	<p>Adequacy of any Protective Provisions set out in the dDCO and the need for any other Protective Provisions to safeguard relevant interests</p> <p>The relevant representation of Suffolk County Council [RR-1174], seeks Protective Provisions for its role as the Local Highway Authority in order for it to continue to discharge its duties under the Highways Act (1980) within those parts of the public highway included within the Order Land. The Council also proposes that Protective Provisions should be considered for other topic areas, such as its Lead Local Flood Authority and statutory archaeological roles. Please respond and indicate whether any such protective provisions are being negotiated and/or have been agreed?</p>
CA.1.68	The Applicant	<p>Crown Land</p> <p>The CA Guidance, paragraphs 39 and 40, provides guidance in relation to Crown Land. It advises that discussions between applicants and the appropriate Crown authority should start as soon as it is clear that such land or interests will be required and that the aim should be to ensure that agreement is in place no later than the time that the application for the project is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. Please set out when those discussions began and explain why no agreements were in place when the application was submitted.</p>
CA.1.69	The Applicant	<p>Crown Land</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.9.4, states that the Applicant is in negotiation to acquire the necessary interests directly with the Crown Estate Commissioners and does not perceive any obvious impediment to acquiring these interests. In addition, the Applicant's response [AS-006] to the ExA's [PD-005] request for clarification in relation to Crown Land states that in accordance with Annex A of the CA Guidance, it will seek any necessary consents prior to the end of the examination. Please provide an update to the progress of any such negotiations and also those with the Department of Transport and the Department of Education with reference to relevant plots numbers and when it is anticipated that any such consents and/or voluntary agreements will be concluded?</p>
CA.1.70	The Applicant	<p>Other matters</p> <p>In the light of the CA Guidance, paragraph 19, please demonstrate:</p> <p>(i) How potential risks or impediments to implementation of the scheme have been properly managed;</p> <p>(ii) the account taken of any other physical and legal matters pertaining to the application,</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		including the programming of any necessary infrastructure accommodation works and the need to obtain any operational and other consents applicable to this type of development.
CA.1.71	The Applicant	<p>Other matters</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.5.2, states that the Sizewell Link Road has been proposed to avoid the adverse effects that would otherwise be associated with the addition of the construction traffic to the existing volume of traffic that would travel along the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton. Please therefore provide justification for the compulsory acquisition of this land on a permanent rather than a temporary basis for the duration of the construction works.</p>
CA.1.72	The Applicant	<p>Other matters</p> <p>The SoR section 10, refers to the Schedule of Other Consents, Licences and Agreements (Doc Ref. 5.11) [APP-153] which identifies the other consents, licenses and agreements that are required for the Sizewell C Project to be implemented. Please indicate whether there are any changes to the status and/or timeframe for each consent, licence and agreement listed within that schedule since the application was submitted.</p>
CA.1.73	The Applicant	<p>Other matters</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 3.3.7, states that the emerging local plan contains a number of site specific policies, including area specific strategies for Darsham, Leiston, Saxmundham and Woodbridge, which have relevance to some of the Sizewell C Project's associated development sites. Please provide further details of those policies, as adopted, and explain many implications they may have for the associated development sites?</p>
CA.1.74	The Applicant	<p>Other matters</p> <p>Please include in the next submission of the Updated Statement of Reasons Appendix B 'Status of Negotiations with Owners of the Order Land' the relevant parts of the BoR within which each affected person falls and further details of any engagement including dates of any letters sent and/or meetings.</p>
CA.1.75	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation made by Clarke and Simpson on behalf of Family Mellen [RR-0241] raises objection to the proposed powers sought in relation to a 9 acre field that came with their house and is integral to their future plans. Please explain further the</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		need for the powers sought in respect of this land; whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs and the consideration that has been given to impact upon and the implications for the human rights of this family in seeking these powers.
CA.1.76	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of LJ and EL Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] states that the EDF proposed land-take for roads/roundabouts etc and for borrow pits for the spoil from the site would make their arable business unviable. Please explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land; whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs and the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of those individuals comprising the farming partnership in seeking these powers.</p>
CA.1.77	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] refers to the Applicant's proposal, as a result of the proposed Sizewell Link Road (SLR), to compulsorily acquire some 12 acres of productive arable and vegetable land from them. The construction of the SLR would cut five fields into halves and quarters and reduce their farmed area. They indicate that it is highly unlikely that they could replace the high quality irrigable vegetable land that is being taken. In addition, the application plans do not provide enough detail for them to know that satisfactory access to areas farmed would be made available in the future:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs;</p> <p>(iii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned;</p> <p>(iv) Please provide specific details by including by reference to a plan of the proposed means of access to the reduced land area in the event that the powers sought are exercised?</p>
CA.1.78	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The relevant representation of Norton Rose Fulbright LLP on behalf of Hevingham Hall Estate (HHE) [RR-0908], explains that part of HHE is located south of the temporary Northern Park and Ride site and a proportion of HHE also falls within land to be compulsorily acquired to facilitate the roundabout at Yoxford (plot OHI/24/02):</p> <p>(i) Please explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs;</p> <p>(iii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned.</p>
CA.1.79	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of Oliver Holloway on behalf of Clarke and Simpson [RR-912] raises concerns amongst other things in relation to the justification for the need for the Sizewell Link Road, Fen Meadow mitigation, the consideration of alternative options and funding:</p> <p>(i) Please respond to the concerns raised and explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs;</p> <p>(iii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned?</p>
CA.1.80	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Magnox Limited [RR-0991] and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority [RR-0992], indicates that they oppose the acquisition of any land, or the extinguishment of any rights etc, in any land plots which are: (a) within the boundary of the nuclear site licence, held by Magnox, for the Sizewell A Nuclear Site, and (b) land which the NDA has responsibility for decommissioning and cleaning-up in accordance with the Energy Act 2004 and the Sizewell A Directions, being land plots MDS/05/06 and MDS/05/07. Please respond to the specific concerns raised including:</p> <p>(i) Why the Applicant may need to acquire the plots detailed in column (2) of Part 1 of Schedule 15 to the draft DCO;</p> <p>(ii) Why land plot MDS/02/28, in respect of which Magnox is a Category 1 person, is not</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>detailed in column (2) of Part 1 of Schedule 15 to the draft DCO;</p> <p>(iii) Why the protection afforded to the Sizewell B Nuclear Site in Article 26(2)(b) of the draft DCO should not be extended also to the Sizewell A Nuclear Site;</p> <p>(iv) Whether Article 30 should be made subject to Article 26?</p> <p>(v) the implications of these powers for those plots that abut the nuclear site licence area, being plots MDS/05/02 and MDS/05/13;</p> <p>(vi) Whether the Applicant has undertaken diligent enquiry as to why the relevant Class 4 powers are required, or how the compulsory acquisition of Class 4 powers may affect more widely the ability of the NDA and Magnox to carry out their respective statutory functions and regulatory responsibilities?</p> <p>(vii) Whether there is a need to for a Nuclear Site Licensees' Co-operation Agreement(s) to be entered into between the NDA, Magnox, the Applicant and EDF?</p>
CA.1.81	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Justin and Emma Dowley [RR-1099], Nat and India Bacon [RR-1100] and the Trustees of A W Bacon Will Trust [RR-1101], question why the 'Road D2' option was not taken forward. Please provide a response to those queries and justify the response to consultation in that respect.</p>
CA.1.82	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259], object to the proposed compulsory acquisition of some 12 acres of productive arable and vegetable land that the company farms. They indicate that the construction of the road would cut five fields into halves and, quarters and result in a reduction in farmed area of around 41 acres. Please respond to their complaints in relation to:</p> <p>(i) The failure of the Applicant's experts to meet as requested and to genuinely engage with them;</p> <p>(ii) the analysis, rigour and level of detail provided by the Aecom Report on the SLR route;</p> <p>(iii) the impact of the proposed reduction in land area.</p> <p>(iv) the provision of satisfactory means of access in the future; and (iv) the creation of new rights of way.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.83	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of the CLA Country Land and Business Association [RR-0229] raises concerns in relation to the fragmentation of farms and other rural businesses by new infrastructure and overall impact of the scheme. Please explain including by reference to the application documentation the impact upon such businesses in considering design and route alternatives to the application scheme and the associated powers of compulsory acquisition sought.</p>
CI.1 Community Issues		
CI.1.0	The Applicant ESC	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>Within the Accommodation Strategy [APP 613] para 5.4.10 – reference is made to the layout being shared with ESC.</p> <p>(i) Please provide a copy of the layout and indicate the facilities that are to be included.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide an update of the latest position on the delivery, operation and management of the site and how these components would be secured through the DCO</p>
CI.1.1	The Applicant Leiston Town Council ESC SCC	<p>Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE)</p> <p>Please provide an update on the strategy that has been developed for the movement of workers from the main development site to and from the LEEIE and between the LEEIE and Leiston Town.</p>
CI.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>The facilities to be provided at the accommodation (gym, restaurant, amenity area etc.) campus to assist in managing the needs of onsite staff and reducing the pressure on local facilities do not appear to be described in detail. There is no obvious indication of the scale of these facilities, the time period for their delivery/maintenance/availability.</p> <p>(i) Please explain in light of this how the assessment of the effectiveness of these proposed mitigations has been undertaken and explain where this information defining their scale, availability etc. is set out within the ES?</p> <p>(ii) How and when would the facilities be delivered through the DCO?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CI.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>(i) Please provide a timeline mapping the number of workers expected to be working on the main development site alongside the provision of the accommodation campus, camping/caravanning area and provision of gymnasium, restaurants and any other supporting facilities.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain how each element is linked to a delivery mechanism within the dDCO to ensure the mitigation anticipated would materialise at an appropriate time.</p>
CI.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>Several RRs express concerns that the scale of the accommodation campus did not change when the staffing numbers increased during the consultation process.</p> <p>Please explain the rationale for the quantity of accommodation relative to the quantity of workforce anticipated to be on site throughout the construction period.</p>
CI.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>In assessing the accommodation needs both during construction and subsequent operation:</p> <p>(i) Did the assessment include the additional 850 staff that may be on site at Sizewell B during planned outages?</p> <p>(ii) Please advise where this is set out within the ES.</p>
CI.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>(i) What confidence can the ExA have that the accommodation campus and proposed caravan site would be optimally occupied during construction?</p> <p>(ii) How would this be achieved?</p>
CI.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>(i) Please confirm whether or not the figures provided for bed spaces within the private rented sector include bed spaces that would come from holiday self-catering accommodation or second homes?</p> <p>(ii) Explain how have the figures been differentiated between private rented and holiday cottages/flats?</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Provide details of what safeguards are in place to ensure that double counting of holiday cottages/flats as both 'tourist accommodation', 'private rented sector' or 'second homes' has not occurred?
CI.1.8	ESC, SCC	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>Are there any concerns regarding the effect of demand for temporary worker accommodation and any effect this may have on the private rented sector and or holiday accommodation?</p>
CI.1.9	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>Licensing or planning restrictions may exist for caravanning and camping sites regarding occupancy.</p> <p>(i) Are there similar restrictions for example planning conditions for other property within the tourism stock such as holiday cottages?</p> <p>(ii) If there are, how would this effect the availability of such accommodation and has this been factored in?</p> <p>(iii) Would ESC support the temporary removal/suspension of such conditions or licence restrictions to enable this stock to be used for worker accommodation during the construction period?</p>
CI.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>There would appear to be the potential for significant pressure on local accommodation during the construction period. Please explain where the additional pressure from outages at Sizewell B has been considered and how this has been addressed?</p>
CI.1.11	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Leiston</p> <p>The Town Council express concern 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 largely male workers and what mitigation would be secured to address these community effects.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CI.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Effect of the proposed development on the local population</p> <p>In light of the concerns expressed by the CCG [RR-0500] and the Suffolk Constabulary [RR 1140] amongst others please comment on whether you still regard the assumptions of impacts on the local community as conservative and fully assess the likely impacts. In responding please address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Whether the increased workforce could be supported by existing GPs (ii) Whether the effect on housing availability has been underestimated; (iii) The potential for adverse effects on health workers capacity to do their work due to impacts on journey times; (iv) Whether the equalities assessment adequately assesses effects on vulnerable groups; (v) Whether the mitigation for noise, dust, and impact on travel times has fully addressed health impacts; and (vi) Whether there has been a full assessment of the impacts on care homes and their residents.
CI.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Access to Health Services</p> <p>The Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG and West Suffolk CCG [RR-0500] have expressed concern that the proposed development could have an adverse impact on health visitors and other professionals accessing residents in a timely manner.</p> <p>In light of the need to ensure there are not adverse indirect health impacts how do you respond to these concerns?</p>
CI.1.14	The Applicant, Suffolk Constabulary	<p>Community Safety</p> <p>The Suffolk Constabulary [RR-1140] express concern that important community safety and policing impacts raised during the pre-application consultation stage have yet to be addressed. Please advise what progress has been made between the parties in this regard.</p>
CI.1.15	The Applicant, Suffolk Constabulary	<p>Community Safety</p> <p>In light of the concerns raised by the Suffolk Constabulary in respect of what they describe as the narrowness of the assessment please advise what you have done to address this criticism, and what could be put in place to respond to these concerns.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please advise how you consider any appropriate mitigation could be delivered through the DCO in order to achieve a satisfactory level of community safety.
CI.1.16	The Applicant Suffolk Constabulary	<p>Community Safety</p> <p>(i) Please advise on the progress in developing the assessment of likely community safety impacts and policing impacts following the more detailed assessment of transport, staffing and demographic data.</p> <p>(ii) Is it intended to provide a copy of this assessment into the Examination?</p> <p>(iii) Is this assessment now agreed?</p>
<p>Cu.1 Cumulative impact</p>		
Cu.1.0	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative assessment in EIA and HRA 'in-combination' assessment</p> <p>Natural England (NE) [RR-0878] does not consider that a suitably robust assessment has been undertaken within the HRA of impacts from different aspects of the project, or of 'in combination' impacts between other projects which may impact on the same internationally designated sites and features. In particular, the cabling for East Anglia ONE North (EA1N) and East Anglia TWO (EA2) would come ashore and be routed through this part of the AONB close to the Sizewell C construction site. (i) Please provide an update on the latest position in relation to discussions with NE on this topic and indicate any outstanding points of disagreement for this element of the HRA process; (ii) Please provide an update on the part of the Sizewell project's nine to twelve years construction phase that would be likely to coincide with the EA1 North and EA2 cable route's construction?</p>
Cu.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>NE [RR-0878] does not consider that a suitably robust assessment has been undertaken on cumulative impacts from all project elements on nationally designated sites (SSSIs) and their notified features. Please provide an update on the latest position in relation to discussions with NE on this topic and indicate any outstanding points of disagreement on this aspect of the SSSI impact assessment process.</p>
Cu.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		NE [RR-0878] highlights the impact of the Sizewell C scheme on how Sizewell B currently relates visually to its immediate and wider landscape setting and submits that the potential mitigation benefits would not address a general cumulative effect of the power station with existing energy infrastructure on the landscape character of the AONB. Please comment on the criticisms made and indicate whether there is any additional mitigation, such as by way of updates to the LEMP or mitigation route maps which might alleviate the adverse cumulative impact of the scheme and avoid the visual clutter anticipated by NE?
Cu.1.3	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4, Table 4.16 [APP-578], identifies those effects that have been found to be greater in-combination with the non-Sizewell C schemes than for the proposed development alone. For transport, this includes the A12 at Little Glemham and Marlesford. (i) Please explain further how the proposed mitigation would operate in practice and how this would satisfactorily overcome the anticipated cumulative moderate adverse effect on fear and intimidation; (ii) Please indicate whether there are any other steps which could be taken in mitigation of this adverse effect?</p>
Cu.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, Table 4.16 in relation to landscape and visual impact, and amenity and recreation, identifies significant adverse cumulative effects for Visual Receptor Groups 18, 19 and 20 during the construction period.</p> <p>(i) Please explain further why there are considered to be no more practicable and proportionate mitigation steps available?</p> <p>(ii) For these receptors, please explain in detail how the combined effects of these cumulative impacts arising under these different topics have been assessed, including on the overall effect on health and well-being of those concerned?</p>
Cu.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, Table 4.16 in relation to health and wellbeing and effects associated with changes to noise and vibration, identifies significant adverse cumulative effects for the rail proposals (construction), and the two village bypass (construction and operation). Please explain</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		further why there are considered to be no more practicable and proportionate mitigation steps available?
Cu.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, paragraphs 4.21.35 to 4.21.38, in relation to cumulative quality of life and wellbeing effects associated with general stress and anxiety, recognises that due to their scale, larger projects may generate stress and anxiety. However, it concludes that on the basis that each individual development would inherently manage stress and anxiety associated with the planning application process, the cumulative health and wellbeing effects would remain minor adverse and not significant.</p> <p>(i) Please explain further how such stress and anxiety would be inherently managed rather than exacerbated by the planning process?</p> <p>(ii) Please provide further evidence and reasoning to support the conclusion reached that the cumulative effect would not be significant?</p>
Cu.1.7	The Applicant, EA1N	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>EA1N [RR-0340] indicates that its representatives have engaged proactively with Sizewell C representatives to better understand the scope and impact of the proposed Sizewell C Project and its potential cumulative and in-combination effects, in particular on transport related matters. Please confirm that such discussions are ongoing and indicate whether any further information is available at this stage in relation to potential cumulative and in-combination effects of the projects with particular regard to transport- related matters.</p>
Cu.1.8	The Applicant, EA1N, EA2	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>EA1N [RR-0340] and EA2 [RR-0341] explain that the Order limits for the EA1N Project and the Sizewell C Project overlap in three areas of the public highway, namely: Sizewell Gap (close to the Junction of Sizewell Gap/King George’s Avenue); the junction of A12/A1094 (Friday Street); and the junction of A1094/A1069 (Snape Road).</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any progress has been made in relation to opportunities for co-ordinating works in these areas and how this would be secured by the DCO(s).</p> <p>(ii) If not, what are the perceived obstacles to any such co-ordination?</p> <p>(iii) Explain the way in which the various works for these schemes in these locations could conflict?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iv) Explain how it is proposed that the necessary access for the EA1 North and EA TWO Projects would be maintained?
Cu.1.9	The Applicant, EA1N, EA2	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, paragraph 4.4.13, indicates that the construction of EA1N and EA2 could overlap with the construction of the Sizewell C Project. Paragraph 4.14, states that the 'concurrent build' traffic flows have been used, derived from the preliminary environmental information for the EA2 development.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any further information is available at this stage as to the likely timing and duration of the overlap should all these projects be approved. (ii) Please comment on the reliability of the ES assessment given that it has utilised preliminary environmental information and indicate whether this has now been superseded?</p>
Cu.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, paragraph 4.4.47, states that at peak construction all of the highway improvement schemes associated with the Sizewell C Project will be operational. (i) Please explain how that would be secured and enforced through the draft DCO or other means? (ii) Would there be any consequential effects on the assessment conclusions were this not to be met, even if it were for short periods?</p>
Cu.1.11	The Applicant, EA1N, EA2, SCC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects with Other Plans, Projects and Programmes [APP-578], paragraph 4.4.53, explains that the cumulative assessment for Sizewell C with EA1N and EA2 is based on certain worst case assumptions. Please indicate whether those assumptions are agreed between all parties and that they comprise a complete list of potential 'worst case' factors?</p>
Cu.1.12	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects with Other Plans, Projects and Programmes [APP-578], paragraph 4.4.54, indicates that it is possible that the significant adverse effect on fear and intimidation would not arise. The construction programmes for East Anglia ONE North and</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>East Anglia TWO and the Sizewell C Project will be monitored through the transport review group throughout the construction phase of the Sizewell C Project and should there be a potential for the worst case traffic flows to arise concurrently, additional mitigation measures would need to be secured through the transport contingency fund, which is to be secured via the Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>(i) Please explain further how the effect on fear and intimidation could be satisfactorily managed through the transport review group and transport contingency fund?</p> <p>(ii) Although the contingency fund is referred to in the Mitigation Route Map, Plate 1.1 [APP-616], it does not appear to be mentioned in the main mitigation route map tables. Please explain why not?</p> <p>(iii) Please outline the additional mitigation measures anticipated and explain how this would achieve the desired objective?</p>
Cu.1.13	The Applicant, EA1N	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>EA1N [RR-0340] in relation to offshore matters notes that whilst the Sizewell C Project's Work Nos. 2B, 2D and 2F fall outside the EA1N Order limits, there remains an overlap in the Order limits. The company expresses concern that it must not be hindered from undertaking the necessary works for the EA1N Project as a result of the Sizewell C Project works at these locations. Please indicate the form of assurance sought in this respect and whether this has been provided to the satisfaction of EA1N?</p>
Cu.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects with Other Plans, Projects and Programmes [APP-578], section 4.19 Climate Change, paragraph 4.19.1, states that presenting the impact of the proposed development in the context of the UK carbon budgets is an inherently cumulative assessment and as such it is concluded that further assessment of cumulative GHG emissions is not applicable. Please explain further the basis for this approach and why the cumulative impact of a number of different projects that each fall below the 1% threshold should not be a matter of concern?</p>
Cu.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>Beach View Holiday Park [RR-0126] propose that an independent 'cumulative impact study' should be undertaken to safeguard the AONB and wider area from the impact on multiple large-scale industrial projects including Sizewell C, EA1N and EA2 wind farms,</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Nautilus and Eurolink and SCD1 and SCD2 Interconnector. Please comment specifically on the need for and benefits of such an additional study?
Cu.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ESC [RR-0342], expresses concern that the potential in-combination effects on the labour market of Sizewell C with other major construction projects including ScottishPower Renewable projects, Bradwell B, other power stations in England and Wales and sizeable engineering projects such as Crossrail 2 has not been fully considered or reflected in the mitigation package. Please respond to this specific point and explain further the consideration of this factor and any mitigation proposed.</p>
Cu.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ESC [RR-0342] states that during the construction phase of Sizewell C, particularly the peak years, cumulative effects related to the labour market may arise in-combination with other NSIPs in the region. Please explain in detail the means of delivering, monitoring and enforcing the proposals for boosting skills and employment to minimise the cumulative effects arising from the in-combination construction of the various consented or under consideration NSIPs in the region.</p>
Cu.1.18	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ESC [RR-0342] accepts that the primary issues arising in the cumulative assessment are predominantly managed with the proposed transport strategy. However, one element that continues to raise concern is the A12 west of Woodbridge and the A12/A1094 junction to Aldeburgh pre: Two Village Bypass construction.</p> <p>(i) The Council is requested to explain further its stated intention to work with the Highway Authority to understand how capacity here can be increased and indicate the prospects of that objective being achieved?</p> <p>(ii) Please provide further explanation as to the anticipated timetable for the provision of the Two Village bypass and the scope for the Friday Street roundabout element of the Two Village Bypass to be brought online as soon as possible during the Sizewell C construction.</p>
Cu.1.19	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ESC [RR-0342] in relation to amenity and recreation notes that during the early years of construction there may be impacts in some areas should other NSIPs be under construction simultaneously. The majority of these impacts will be on receptor groups</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>using public footpaths. The majority are considered to be not significant, but receptors at Aldringham Common and The Walks are likely to experience significant effects.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether it is considered that any further mitigation other than that already proposed is necessary for receptors in these locations.</p> <p>(ii) If not, why not?</p> <p>(iii) If so, what additional mitigation is sought and how could that be secured through the draft DCO?</p>
Cu.1.20	The Applicant, National Grid (in relation to (i))	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>Norfolk County Council [RR-0906] raises cross-boundary electricity transmission issues in respect of the 400kV network which runs between Norfolk and Suffolk including the potential for reinforcement and new lines in both Norfolk and Suffolk.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether there is likely to be any requirement in the wider area for either: (a) reinforcement; of the existing 400 kV network; or (b) new overhead lines (400kV).</p> <p>(ii) Please explain how the cumulative impact on the 400 kV transmission network in the wider strategic area has been considered by the ES?</p> <p>(iii) Please comment on the need for further evidence and studies setting out the full implications of both Sizewell C and the planned/emerging offshore wind energy projects on the existing 400 kV network across the two Counties.</p>
Cu.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership [RR-1170] considers the cumulative impacts of proposed and existing infrastructure appear to have been underplayed when taken into combination in relation to the statutory purpose of the AONB. Please provide further explanation and justification for the ES conclusion in relation to cumulative impact upon the AONB having regard to the other proposed and existing Nationally Significant Infrastructure in the area that has been referred to in that representation.</p>
Cu.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>SCC [RR-1174] considers that the full cumulative impacts of the existing and potential future projects in the East Suffolk area have not been adequately assessed.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any further information has come to light on the schemes considered by the ES and other schemes coming forward since the time of the assessment</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>including offshore wind projects, inter-connector cables across the North Sea and the interconnector project to Kent;</p> <p>(ii) Please summarise the proposals for the delivery of traffic mitigation schemes and explain how that could be achieved in practice without disrupting traffic from other projects including use of the A12/B1122 and A12/A1094/B1069 transport corridors by East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO traffic;</p> <p>(iii) Please explain how cumulative impacts which are not currently proposed to be mitigated due to the length of time they are expected to occur and their deemed likelihood of occurring would be monitored, identified and then mitigated should they in fact occur?</p>
Cu.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>SCC [RR-1174] in respect of the cumulative ecological impact, submits that it is not clear why the construction of the EA1 North and EA2 have been scoped out of the assessment of cumulative impacts, particularly in respect of Natura 2000 sites, when the cable corridor passes relatively close to the Sizewell C project. Please provide further details and reasoning to justify the scoping out of that matter from the cumulative impact assessment.</p>
Cu.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>SCC [RR-1174] in relation to economic development and skills is critical of the ES consideration of the potential in-combination effects on the labour market of Sizewell C with other major construction projects. In addition, it indicates that the timelines for construction of East Anglia THREE (EA3) have changed and are significantly different to the timelines presented in the application.</p> <p>(i) What account has or will be taken of the other significant projects to be delivered in the same time period as the proposed construction of Sizewell C, as identified by the Technical Skills Legacy Study?</p> <p>(ii) How is it proposed that changes in the timelines for the construction of EA3 compared to those presented in the application will be reflected in the cumulative impact assessment?</p> <p>(iii) Please respond to the Council's criticism of the cumulative impact assessment methodology and whether this should have taken into account the different skill sets needed to deliver at particular phases of the project, rather than only concentrating on construction labour.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.25	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>SCC [RR-1174] considers that the cumulative pressure on the local housing stock may increase impacts in East Suffolk and may push workers to look further afield creating pressures on adjacent authorities such as Ipswich and Mid Suffolk. (i) Please respond to the criticism that appropriate monitoring and mitigation measures need to be put in place for all affected areas, to ensure housing impacts are managed and mitigated. (ii) Should anything else be included in the accommodation strategy and other measures related to housing in addition to those measures already set out in the Mitigation Route Map?</p>
Cu.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>NPS EN-1, paragraph 4.2.6, explains that consideration should be given to how the accumulation of, and interrelationship between, effects might affect the environment, economy or community as a whole, even though they may be acceptable when considered on an individual basis with mitigation measures in place. Please explain how the overall effects (cumulative, inter-related, intra-related and inter-related) on health and well-being for the various individual communities affected has been considered by the application?</p>
Cu.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ESC [RR-0342] on the topic of inter-relationship effects recognises that a summary of each element of the development and its potential impact is included in the ES and does not disagree with its findings. However, it considers that the mitigation proposed to address these potential effects lacks clarity. Please provide further details, by way of expansion of the Mitigation Route Map, of the mitigation proposed including what would be available, in particular for residential properties, to mitigate for the interrelationship effects of the proposal.</p>
Cu.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] assesses the potential for residential properties, commercial facilities and schools to experience effect interactions as a result of the Sizewell C Project. Paragraph 2.3.10 identifies that a number of receptors within close proximity to the main development site have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and views during construction. In addition, paragraph 2.3.13, identifies a number of receptors that are also likely to have high potential for combined</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>effects arising from impacts during operation. There are also areas where new and/or different environmental effects may be experienced including properties between Yoxford and Leiston, close to the B1122.</p> <p>(i) Please explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome these additional or new impacts.</p> <p>(ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?</p>
Cu.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Northern Park and Ride, paragraph 2.3.22, identifies receptors at residential properties on the western side of Main Road adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site that have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction, operation and removal and reinstatement. (i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors. (ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?</p>
Cu.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Two Village Bypass, identifies receptors at The Red House and Timbers, Main Road; Hall Cottages, Farnham Hall, Farnham Street Farm; Farnham Hall Farmhouse; and Rosehill Cottages that have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction. Paragraph 2.3.36, identifies a number of receptors are also likely to have high potential for combined effects arising from impacts during operation. (i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors. (ii) If no additional mitigation is proposed, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		of individual components, please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?
Cu.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Sizewell Link Road, paragraph 2.3.43, identifies receptors at Kelsale Lodge Cottages; Fir Tree Farm; The Red House Farm and Rosetta; Vale Cottage and Oakfield house; Valley Farm House; Annesons Cottage; Coronation Cottages; Forge Cottage and Walnut Cottage have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction. In addition, a number of receptors are also likely to have high potential for combined effects arising from impacts during operation. (i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors.</p> <p>(ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, then explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?</p>
Cu.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Freight Management Facility, paragraph 2.3.57, identifies residential properties at 1 and 2 Keepers Cottage have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction and removal and reinstatement.</p> <p>(i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors.</p> <p>(ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, then please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?</p>
Cu.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Green Rail Route, paragraph 2.3.65, identifies that during construction, noise generated from rail movements on the East</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Suffolk line have the potential to interact with air quality effects from road traffic and rail emissions and could result in new and or different environmental effect within a number of areas. It recognises that there is a potential for effect interaction to occur and result in a further significant effect at those receptors where noise effects from the rail movements would be significant (within 20 metres of the East Suffolk Line). The rail noise effects would be mitigated where possible through the implementation of speed restrictions along the East Suffolk Line.</p> <p>(i) Please identify the receptors where the effects would be significant? (ii) Please explain further mitigation proposed and the extent to which the proposed speed restrictions would assist in that respect; (iii) How could it be ensured that the proposed speed restrictions would be implemented and adhered to?</p>
Cu.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative impact of water supply strategy</p> <p>The ES Addendum Volume 1: Environmental Statement Addendum Chapter 10 Project Wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects - Revision 1.0 [AS- 189] paragraph 10.4.229 indicates that the proposals would require an upgrade to some existing water treatment plants and a new high capacity water main. Please provide further details and explanation to support the view set out in paragraph 10.4.232 that the preferred water supply strategy proposal would not change the conclusions of the waste and material resource cumulative assessment presented within Volume 10, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-578], based on expected waste arisings and material quantities required due to the scale and nature of the scheme.</p>
Cu.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative impact of water supply strategy</p> <p>The ES Addendum Volume 1: Environmental Statement Addendum Chapter 10 Project Wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects - Revision 1.0 [AS-189] paragraph 10.4.233 b)(iii) Transport – explains that works associated with the preferred water supply proposal are currently programmed to coincide with the Early Years construction of the Sizewell C Project. In addition, paragraph 10.4.235 b) (iv) noise and vibration, identifies that if the earthworks for the cut and fill, and the pipelaying task for the preferred water supply proposal works were to take place at a time when other construction works associated with the Sizewell C Project is occurring nearby, there is the potential for a cumulative effect. This could occur at receptors close to construction works for the Sizewell link road, the main development site and along the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Please explain further how it is proposed that routing and logistics associated with the water supply would be managed to ensure existing and Sizewell C traffic is not disrupted as a result.</p> <p>(ii) How would that be secured through the draft DCO?</p> <p>(iii) What further work is required to understand the programme and scope of works, and to determine the best measures to put in place?</p> <p>(iv) Please provide further details, for example, of anticipated trip generations and duration of works to support the view that the construction traffic generated by the preferred water supply strategy proposal would not change the conclusions of the transport cumulative assessment.</p> <p>(v) Please indicate if any updated information is available in relation to the temporary nature of the construction works and the extent of the works required for the installation of the water main.</p>
Cu.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative impact of water supply strategy</p> <p>The ES Addendum Volume 1: Environmental Statement Addendum Chapter 10 Project Wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects - Revision 1.0 [AS- 189] paragraph 10.4.258 states that overall the preferred water supply connection strategy would result in no new or different significant effects than those reported in Volume 10, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-578]. Please confirm that that remains the position in the light of any updated information on that topic.</p>
Cu.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 3 Assessment of Project-wide Effects [APP-577] Table 3.1, identifies receptors or receptor groups where there is potential overlap of noise impacts from different elements of the project, and where two or more of the project elements could be close enough to receptors such that combined noise levels may have a significant effect. This includes Receptor 13 (Leiston Abbey, including Pro Corda music school) combined effects are therefore considered significant.</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details and the timing of the proposed bespoke assessment of impacts from the Sizewell C Project on the Pro Corda Music School at Leiston Abbey;</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(ii) Please indicate whether there has been any progress in relation to the provision of any additional mitigation requirements?</p> <p>(iii) Please explain exactly how that mitigation would be secured through planning obligations.</p>
Cu.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 3 Assessment of Project-wide Effects [APP-577] Table 3.1 identifies Receptor 14 (Lovers Lane / Sandy Lane Junction) as a location where the combined effects of the construction and construction road traffic noise may result in a perceived worsening of effects during the day during some early phase construction work at LEEIE.</p> <p>(i) Please explain further the role of professional judgment in assessing the combined impact of these two noise sources.</p> <p>(ii) How in practice would an exceedance of the SOAEL be determined and how would that be avoided through the application of the Noise Mitigation Scheme?</p>
Cu.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>[APP-577] Para 3.5.6 In terms of habitat loss and fragmentation, it is said that (i) impacts are considered to be <i>“temporarily moderate adverse and significant during the construction phase”</i> and (ii) that <i>“avoidance measures have been incorporated into the scheme design in the “associated design principles”</i>.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant state where these are secured. Please will it also explain what is the effect with those principles in place.</p>
Cu.1.40	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>[APP-577] In section 3.5, there are a number of cases where the argument for no significant project-wide effect is that there is no significant effect at the relevant individual sites, therefore there is no significant project-wide effect. But cannot several non-significant effects add up to a significant effect? Examples of paragraphs where this approach is taken are: 3.5.10; 3.5.12; 3.5.14; 3.5.15; 3.5.19; 3.5.21; 3.5.22. The Applicant’s reply should not please be limited to those paragraphs but also address the issue generally across the ES.</p>

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.41	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.8.30 – peak construction, breeding birds. This does not have a conclusion on effects. Please could the Applicant explain.
Cu.1.42	The Applicant, ESC	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.8.33 – bats – this conclusion of no significant effect relies on an explicit assumption. How likely is that assumption to hold good?
Cu.1.43	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.15.67. Assessment of cumulative effects of noise on harbour porpoise appears to be limited to the winter period or area only. Please could the Applicant point the ExA to the summer (and other seasons) assessment or clarify why winter alone is the correct approach. Is the answer para 9.2.7 of [APP-145]? Please could the Applicant submit an amended version of Fig 22.15 of [APP-333] to demonstrate this and confirm separation distances to the summer area?
Cu.1.44	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.17.1 Assessment of cumulative navigational effects. This says schemes outside the 10 mile radius ZOI have been included if vessels may cross the route of AIL vessels for the Proposed Development, <i>that is</i> “if the transshipment base is at Harwich” (emphasis added). What happens if the transshipment base is not at Harwich? What other candidate locations are there?
Cu.1.45	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.17.14. Presumably the reference in the heading to “construction” is a misprint for “operation”. But please will the Applicant confirm this.
Cu.1.46	The Applicant	Transboundary effects ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 5 Transboundary Effects, Appendix 5A: Long Form Transboundary Screening Matrix sets out the Applicant’s response to a screening exercise using the matrix in Annex 1 of Advice Note Twelve. In relation to risk of accidents, reliance is placed upon the Nuclear Site Licence and the Euratom Treaty obligations. It indicates that the proposed UK EPR™ design of reactor has been the subject of a regulatory justification process.

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

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Please confirm that reliance is no longer placed upon the Euratom Treaty obligations; (ii) Please clarify the stage of construction by which the Nuclear Site Licence must be in place; and (iii) Please indicate whether any further review of the proposed UK EPR™ design of reactor is anticipated and whether that review takes into account the latest available information on risk of accidents?
Cu.1.47	The Applicant	Transboundary effects Ministry of Energy, Agriculture, the Environment and Nature – Germany and Digitalisation of the State of Schleswig-Holstein [RR-0801] expresses concern that the UK’s withdrawal from Euratom may have a negative impact on reactor safety and radiation protection in relation to both existing plants and planned projects. The ES Volume 2 Chapter 27 Major Accidents and Disasters [APP-344] footnote 2 provides details of the position during the transition period for the UK exiting the EU and the Euratom Treaty. Please provide an update and/or any relevant changes to that information post Brexit.
Cu.1.48	The Applicant	Transboundary effects ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 5 Transboundary Effects [APP-580], paragraph 5.4.43, in relation to Major Accidents and Disasters recognises that without mitigation, such hazards and threats could result in significant environmental effects and might result in transboundary effects. Please explain in further detail the conclusion reached that following the implementation of the identified mitigation, all risks including any potential transboundary effects are considered to be tolerable or tolerable if as low as reasonably practicable and not significant.
Cu.1.49	The Applicant	Transboundary effects There are a number of RR’s and other submissions made under EIA Reg 22 including Belgian State [RR-0127], Danish Emergency Management Agency [RR-0265], National Planning Agency [RR-0876], Nucléaire Stop Kernenergie [RR-0909], Stowarzyszenie 'Wspólna Ziemia' (Association Common Earth) [RR-1163], Swedish NGO Office for Nuclear Waste Review and member org [RR-1197], Ministry of Energy, Agriculture, the Environment and Nature – Germany and Digitalisation of the State of Schleswig-Holstein [RR-0801], The Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management [RR 802] for the Netherlands and Wiener Plattform Atomkraftfrei [RR-1267] that raise transboundary

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		issues. Please ensure that responses to the Reg 32 submissions are included as psrt of the comments on RRs.
Cu.1.50	The Applicant	Transboundary effects Brigitte Artmann [RR-0155] expresses concern that the proposal as carried out to date is in breach of the Aarhus convention. Please respond to the specific points raised in relation to the requirements of this convention.