



The Sizewell C Project

9.10.12 Initial Statement of Common Ground - East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council

Revision: 1.0
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

June 2021

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION AND CAVEATS	1
1.1	Status of the SOCG	1
1.2	Purpose of this document.....	1
1.3	Structure of this Statement of Common Ground	2
2	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT	3
3	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – AIR QUALITY	12
4	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – AMENITY AND RECREATION.....	19
5	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY AND ORNITHOLOGY	27
6	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – SHADOW HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT	46
7	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – HEALTH.....	52
8	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	58
9	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL.....	69
10	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – MARINE AND COASTAL.....	78
11	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – NOISE AND VIBRATION.....	82
12	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – SOCIO-ECONOMICS	128
13	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – TRANSPORT	149
14	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – WATER.....	221
15	POSITION OF THE PARTIES – OTHER	234

TABLES

Table 2.1 Position of the Parties – Principle of the Development.....	1
Table 3.1 Position of the Parties – Air Quality	14
Table 4.1 Position of the Parties – Amenity and Recreation	21
Table 5.1 Position of the Parties – Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology	29
Table 6.1 Position of the Parties – shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment.....	47
Table 7.1 Position of the Parties – Health	53
Table 8.1 Position of the Parties – Historic Environment.....	60
Table 9.1 Position of the Parties – Landscape and Visual	71
Table 10.1 Position of the Parties – Marine and Coastal.....	79
Table 11.1 Position of the Parties – Noise and Vibration	84
Table 12.1 Position of the Parties – Socio-economics	129
Table 13.1 Position of the Parties – Transport	151
Table 14.1 Position of the Parties – Water	223
Table 15.1 Position of the Parties – Other.....	236

1 INTRODUCTION AND CAVEATS

1.1 Status of the SOCG

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of the application for development consent under the Planning Act 2008 ('the Application') for the proposed Sizewell C Project. This version (01), dated 1 June 2021, has been prepared through a programme of engagement between NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') as the Applicant and East Suffolk District Council ('ESC') and Suffolk County Council ('SCC'), referred to as '*the parties*'. It is intended that an updated version of the SoCG will be submitted to the Examining Authority at Deadline 4 to provide an update on the status of the discussions between the parties in advance of the Issue Specific Hearings.

1.1.2 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

1.2 Purpose of this document

1.2.1 The purpose of this SoCG is to set out the position of the parties arising from the application for development consent for the construction and operation of the Sizewell C nuclear power station and together with the proposed associated development (hereafter referred to as 'the Sizewell C Project'). This SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the 'Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent' published in March 2015 by the Department of Communities and Local Government (hereafter referred to as 'DCLG guidance').

1.2.2 The aim of this SoCG is to inform the Examining Authority and provide a clear position on the state and extent of discussions and agreement between the parties on matters relating to the proposed Sizewell C Project.

1.2.3 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the DCO application documents, or within the Councils' Local Impact Report [REP1-044 to REP1-101]. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate's website.

1.3 Structure of this Statement of Common Ground

1.3.1 The SoCG has been structured to reflect the topics of the Application that are of interest to the Councils as follows:

- Principle of the development (including associated developments) (**Section 2**)
- Air quality (**Section 3**)
- Amenity and recreation (**Section 4**)
- Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology (**Section 5**)
- Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (**Section 6**)
- Health (**Section 7**)
- Historic Environment (**Section 8**)
- Landscape and Visual (including matters relating to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) (**Section 9**)
- Marine and coastal (**Section 10**)
- Noise and vibration (**Section 11**)
- Socio-economics (**Section 12**)
- Transport (**Section 13**)
- Water (Section 14)
- Other (Section 15)

1.3.2 The tables in the subsequent sections (**Sections 2-15**) provide fuller details, identifying for each topic where matters are 'agreed', 'not agreed' and or where there are 'discussions ongoing' (with the related actions identified).

- 1.3.3 In all cases, the positions of the Councils are subject to the detail of any necessary mitigation/obligations being secured in the DCO or elsewhere.
- 1.3.4 Where the Councils' position is stated as 'agreed', this means agreement in the context of the Statement of Common Ground statements, but further actions are considered necessary on most of the items, including provision of further design detail, timetabling, as well as resolving outstanding issues, and notwithstanding the caveat in paragraph 1.1.2. Some of these actions are referenced in the 'Status' column.

2 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – PRINCIPLE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1.1 **Table 2.1** provides an overview of the position of the parties and any further actions planned.
- 2.1.2 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

Table 2.1 Position of the Parties – Principle of the Development

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Overall Development				
SZC01	Principle - The principle of the need for new nuclear power stations is firmly established in NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6. The UK Government has concluded that Sizewell C is potentially suitable for the deployment of a new nuclear power station. This is further supported by the Government's Energy White Paper: Powering our Net Zero Future (2020).	Agreed	Accept that the Applicant quotes relevant national policy here	Agreed – no further action
Main Development Site				
MDS1	Outage Car Parking – There is an operational and security need for SZC Co. to have outage car parking located close to the SZC power station operational platform.	Agreed	Depends on definition of "close"	SCC to provide further details on its position in its Written Representation at Deadline 2
MDS2	SZC-specific Outage Car Parking – The outage car park for SZC needs to be separate from the SZB outage car park.	Agreed	Not Agreed	SCC to provide further details on its position in its Written Representation at Deadline 2
MDS3	Outage Car Park at Goose Hill – The appropriate site for the SZC outage car park is at Goose Hill.	Agreed	Not Agreed	SCC to provide further details on its position in its Written Representation at Deadline 2
MDS4	Operational Car Park at Goose Hill – The SZC operational car park is appropriately sized and located at Goose Hill.	Agreed	Not Agreed	SCC to provide further details on its position in its Written Representation at Deadline 2
MDS5	Layout of the main platform buildings - The proposed layout of the main platform buildings, including its broad symmetry in plan form, is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
MDS6	Nuclear island building design - The scale and appearance of buildings within the nuclear island set within the Generic Design Assessment (GDA) cannot be changed due to the need for compliance with the GDA.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MDS7	Turbine Hall, Operational Service Centre and Skybridge design - The proposed scale and appearance of the Turbine Halls, Operational Service Centre and skybridge is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
MDS8	The Accommodation Campus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is appropriate in principle (i.e. single, on-site campus) to provide mitigation for potential effects on the Housing Market and Transport; - Is of an appropriate scale (2,400 bedspaces); and Is proposed in a location that sufficiently balances the needs of the Project and environmental and community effects, with no better location having been identified.	Agreed	Acceptable	No further action
MDS9	The LEEIE Caravan Site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is appropriate in principle and design to provide mitigation for potential effects on the Housing Market and Transport - Is of an appropriate scale (400 caravan capacity); and Is proposed in a location that sufficiently balances the needs of the Project and environmental and community effects, with no better location having been identified.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
MDS10	Leiston off-site sports facilities - The need, scale and location of the Leiston off-site sports facilities are justified and have been adequately demonstrated.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
MDS11	Electrical connection to the National Grid substation – overhead power lines - The use of overhead power lines to export electricity to the National Grid substation within the Sizewell complex is justified and has been adequately demonstrated.	Agreed	Disagreed	SCC to detail its position in its Written Representation at Deadline 2
MDS12	Electrical connection to the National Grid substation – alternative technology - There is no feasible route for Gas Insulated Line (GIL) technology due to environmental, operational and security constraints.	Agreed	Disagreed	SCC to details its position in its Written Representation at Deadline 2
MDS13	Water Supply - Discussions are ongoing with Essex & Suffolk Water on potable water supplies for the project. A water transfer scheme from Barsham river works near Beccles is the preferred option subject to completion of an ongoing study under the EA-led 'WINEP' programme to confirm that the supply would be sustainable. Technical studies to develop the detail for the proposed scheme and deliver the connection are ongoing, but the principle this approach is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – Further engagement following receipt and review of the study.
MDS14	Temporary and Permanent BLFs - The principle of increased delivery of bulk materials and AILs by sea, as set out in the January Change submission is acceptable - including the development of the new temporary BLF.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
MDS15	SSSI Crossing design - The single span bridge SSSI Crossing (accepted change) design is appropriate in the context of reasonable alternatives, including the causeway over culvert crossing proposed in the DCO and the three-span bridge option.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Update at DL 4.
MDS16	Soft Coastal Defence Feature – The design of the SCDF is progressing. SCDF will be recharged when it erodes to provide mitigation to maintain sediment transport pathways along the coast and prevent exposure of the HCDF.	Refer to Table 10.1 of the Marine and Coastal Section		
MDS16	Hard Coastal Defence Feature - The crest height of the HCDF has been set at a precautionary level to provide protection from coastal flooding and resilience to climate change over the full lifetime of Sizewell C based on the latest climate change projections. The HCDF's toe has moved eastwards (seaward) in the accepted change to maintain the necessary slope for the increased crest height. The toe has been set at a level that would not be exposed in a 1:10,000 year design basis storm. Recharging of the SCDF, as proposed, will maintain a protective beach over the full lifetime of the power station.	Refer to Table 10.1 of the Marine and Coastal Section		
MDS17	Sizewell B Relocated Facilities - Details of both schemes for the relocation of certain Sizewell B facilities are acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MDS19	Main Access Building - Design of the main access building should generally retain the lower tier character and finishes described in the Design and Access Statement and in line with Detailed Built Design Principles 58, 59 and 60 of that document.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - SZC recognise that ESC is seeking a more innovative design to provide a more engaging entrance. This is

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				being considered by SZC Co. and an update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
Offsite Associated Developments				
AD1	Park and rides: principle - Both the northern park and ride at Darsham and the southern park and ride at Wickham Market will play an important role in the overarching transport strategy for the Sizewell C project, managing the flow of the construction workforce and visitors to and from the main development site. The principle of both a northern and southern park and ride is accepted. The need for the park and rides is supported by NPS EN-1, which requires that mitigation of impacts on local roads is provided. Table 3.6 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (2020) acknowledges the need for new park and ride facilities to support major energy infrastructure proposals, and that the local roads are not well suited to carry the number or type of vehicle movements that will be necessary to enable construction.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD2	Park and rides: location - The location of the proposed northern park and ride at Darsham and the proposed southern park and ride at Wickham Market is acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD3	Park and rides: design - The scale and design of both sites is accepted in principle. The detailed design will be approved through Requirement 20 of the draft DCO [APP-143].	Agreed	Agreed	The scale and design of both sites is agreed. – Regarding the northern park and ride, on-going discussions are taking place regarding the safety

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				of the level crossing – refer to Table 13.1 of the Transport section.
AD4	Two village bypass: principle - The two village bypass will be a necessary part of SZC Co's delivery of the Sizewell C Project, and its role in minimising traffic impacts on Stratford St Andrew and Farnham is supported. The two village bypass is a proportionate response to the impacts of the construction of the Sizewell C Project.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD5	Two village bypass: location - The route selected for the Two Village Bypass is the most appropriate of the available options.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD6	Two village bypass: design – The principle of the design is accepted however the detailed design still needs to be agreed.	Agreed	Agreed.	Detailed design to be discussed further – refer to Table 13.1 of the Transport section.
AD7	Sizewell link road: principle - The need for a Sizewell link road in providing a suitable route for construction vehicles to access the Sizewell C main development site without using the B1122 through the peak construction years is accepted.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD8	Sizewell link road: principle - The Sizewell link road, as proposed, should be retained as a long term legacy, providing permanent relief to the B1122 communities and an appropriate principal highway route to Sizewell. The retention of the link road creates an opportunity to enhance the local role of the B1122.	Agreed	Not agreed.	Discussions are ongoing - SCC consider that due to routeing in parallel to the existing B1122, the SLR offers limited legacy value – see SCC WR and LIR. Discussions are being progressed with ESC and SCC in relation to the potential of B1122 public rights of way and cycle

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				enhancements, should the Sizewell link road be retained.
AD9	Sizewell link road: location - The Sizewell link road as proposed is acceptable mitigation for the impacts of construction traffic.	Agreed	Agreed	SCC agree however considers alternative routes offering legacy benefit would have been preferable.
AD10	Sizewell link road: design : The principle of the design is accepted however the detailed design still needs to be agreed.	Agreed	Agreed.	Detailed design to be discussed further – refer to Table 13.1 of the Transport section. Refer to Table 14.1 of the Water section for details relating to drainage design.
AD11	Yoxford Roundabout: principle - The need for the Yoxford roundabout to assist in accommodating the anticipated construction traffic associated with the main development site is agreed. The upgrade to the existing junction will provide improved and appropriate access between the A12 and the B1122. Detailed design is still to be agreed.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD12	Highway Improvement at A1094/B1069 junction south of Knodishall - Proposed local highway works in this location are considered necessary for highway safety reasons (detailed designs still to be agreed).	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD13	Highway Improvement at A12/A144 junction south of Bramfield - The proposed local highway works in this location are considered necessary for highway capacity reasons. (detailed designs still to be agreed).	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
AD14	Highway Improvement at A12/B1119 junction at Saxmundham - The proposed local highway works in this location are considered necessary for highway safety reasons. (detailed designs still to be agreed).	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD15	Highway Improvement at B1078/B1079 junction east of Easton and Otley College - The proposed local highway works in this location are considered necessary for highway safety reasons. (detailed designs still to be agreed).	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD16	A140/B1078 junction west of Coddensham - The proposed local highway works in this location are considered necessary for highway safety reasons. (detailed designs still to be agreed).	No comment	Agreed	Agreed. ESC's response of 'no comment' is because these highways works are located outside of ESC's administrative area.
AD17	Freight Management Facility – principle: A freight management facility is needed to mitigate the impacts of construction traffic on the local road network, allowing a controlled pattern of deliveries to the Sizewell C main development site with reduced movements during peak or sensitive hours on the local road network. The use of a freight management facility in this way accords with NPS EN-1 which sets out that where transport mitigation is needed, demand management measures must be considered, including the controlling and routing of HGV movements to and from the site.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AD18	Freight management facility: location - In principle, the freight management facility in the location proposed is acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed.	Agreed in principle but further discussion on design and

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				operational issues is required (see transport section of the SoCG for further details).
AD19	Freight management facility: design – The scale and design of the site is accepted in principle. The detailed design will be approved through Requirement 20 of the draft DCO [APP-143].	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed. For further detail on design refer to Table 13.1 of the Transport section.
AD20	Rail - The use of rail for the delivery of construction materials in order to alleviate the impacts on local roads caused by HGV movements is supported by national policy and in principle.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed. Refer to Table 11.1 for issues related to Noise and Vibration.
AD21	Rail - The development and use of a rail terminal for the early years at LEEIE is acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed. Refer to Table 11.1 for issues related to Noise and Vibration. Refer to Table 14.1 of the Water section for detail related to drainage design.
AD22	Rail - The development of the green rail route to bring train deliveries into the temporary construction area is acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed. Refer to Table 11.1 for issues related to Noise and Vibration. Refer to Table 14.1 of the Water section for detail related to drainage design.
AD23	Rail – the required rail improvements on the East Suffolk Line and Leiston Branchline, including required noise reducing infrastructure, can be delivered within the required timescale, and this has been sufficiently evidenced by the Applicant.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. Refer to Table 11.1 for issues related to Noise and Vibration.
AD24	Overnight rail - The running of up to 4 freight trains (up to 8 movements) at night up to 6 days a week brings impacts but using	Principle - Agreed.	Principle - Agreed	ESC and SCC: Principle is agreed subject to mitigation (although noting

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	<p>rail transport to limit HGV deliveries in this way is acceptable in principle, subject to acceptable, deliverable mitigation.</p>	<p>Mitigation - Discussions ongoing</p>	<p>Mitigation - Discussions ongoing</p>	<p>that day-time rail deliveries would have been preferable but the Application does not propose a passing loop that would have enabled this (as had been previously proposed in consultation)).</p> <p>Mitigation – Discussions are continuing over the detail of any necessary mitigation and to ensure the timely delivery of the rail infrastructure.</p> <p>Refer to Table 11.1 for issues related to Noise and Vibration.</p>
AD25	<p>Rail: legacy - Any improvements in signalling or level crossing safety measures or mitigation on the East Suffolk Line would remain in place after construction as a legacy benefit and would have a positive benefit for the use of the line by passenger trains. Any measures to reduce noise and vibration on the East Suffolk Line would also provide a positive impact post-construction, in so far as the adverse impacts of non-Sizewell C related rail movements would also be reduced.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed (although note ESC and SCC consider that a greater benefit could have been achieved with a passing loop).</p>
Other				
OTH1	<p>Lovers Lane Household Waste Recycling Centre – The existing facility can still operate safely and effectively in the form set out in</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>	<p>Not agreed based on the proposal put forward by the Applicant. SCC currently considers that the only</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	the Application as a result of the proposed highway improvements in and around the access/egress into the facility.			solution to maintain the same service levels in a safe way is relocation of the HWRC. Discussions are ongoing from a transport and land perspective. An update on the position between the parties will be provided in the next version of this document.
OTH2	Implementation Plan –the information provided in response to the Examining Authority's questions are of a sufficient level of detail and the approach taken is robust. An updated construction programme for the Sizewell C Project is provided within the Implementation Plan (Doc Ref. 8.4I(A)) submitted at Deadline 2.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing

3 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – AIR QUALITY

3.1.1 Air quality has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement (ES):

- Volume 2, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-212\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)
- Volume 3, Chapter 5 of the ES [\[APP-357\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-182\]](#)
- Volume 4, Chapter 5 of the ES [\[APP-387\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-183\]](#)
- Volume 5, Chapter 5 of the ES [\[APP-418\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 5 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-184\]](#)
- Volume 6, Chapter 5 of the ES [\[APP-454\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-185\]](#)
- Volume 7, Chapter 5 of the ES [\[APP-487\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-186\]](#)
- Volume 8, Chapter 5 of the ES [\[APP-517\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-187\]](#)
- Volume 9, Chapter 5 of the ES [\[APP-548\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-188\]](#)

3.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

3.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to air quality is detailed in **Table 3.1**.

3.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

Table 3.1 Position of the Parties – Air Quality

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement				
Main Development Site				
AQ1	Existing Environment – Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
AQ2	Assessment Methodology – The impact assessment methodologies used provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on receptors; and has been undertaken with consideration of the appropriate relevant guidance.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
AQ3	Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions are agreed, including the use and monitoring of the control measures proposed in the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Agreed pending incorporation of agreements on HGV and NRMM emissions, and mitigation of dust from construction activities into the CoCP.
AQ4	Assessment Conclusions – The potential effects of emissions from freight trains have been adequately assessed.	Agreed	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. SCC - The inclusion is requested of an aspiration that rail locomotives will use the highest emission standards available, and to minimise idling while stationary.
AQ5	Assessment Conclusions – The potential effects of emissions impacts within the Stratford St Andrew Air Quality	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Agreed – subject to confirmation of agreement on

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	Management Area have been adequately assessed.			Euro class of construction vehicles accessing the development.
AQ6	Assessment Conclusions – The potential effects of non-traffic dust emissions (principally relating to the proposed stockpiles and haul road surfaces) has been adequately assessed.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	The assessment conclusions are agreed.
AQ7	Mitigation – The mitigation measures identified in the Code of Construction Practice (specifically at Part B page 30 and Part C page 24) are sufficient, including the recent commitment to a proportion of the construction vehicles to be to Euro VI standards and non-road mobile machinery to meet Stage V standards, or Stage IV if Stage V is unavailable (and Stage V for plant larger than 560 kW).	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing around the monitoring and mitigation measures to be applied and how they will be secured through the CoCP/Dust Management Plan.
AQ8	Mitigation of construction generator emissions – SZC Co. has made a commitment to the use of electrically powered plant (where possible) and abatement measures for any diesel generators used on site.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Consideration is being given by the Applicant as to the wording of the commitment to be applied. ESC will send a document highlighting its proposed approach to mitigating generator, NRMM and HGV emissions for consideration

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				and further discussion with SZC.
AQ8A	It is agreed that temporary mobile plant will be regulated by the Environment Agency under an Environmental Permit if above the permitting threshold - as is the case at HPC.	Noted	Noted	-
AQ9	Mitigation – The inclusion of additional supporting detail within the Code of Construction Practice on mitigation that has been agreed in principle, namely proposed dust measurement locations, and how monitoring data will be shared with the Councils and used through the Environment Review Group	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions are ongoing as to how additional control measures should be included in the CoCP/Dust Management Plan. ESC will provide a response to the draft Mitigation Routemap provided by SZC to inform these discussions.
AQ10	Cumulative Impacts - The assessment conclusions are agreed.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	ESC considers that not all cumulative impacts due to the proposed development have been fully assessed due to uncertainties in the construction programme. This will be addressed through the

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				mitigation and monitoring programme set out in the CoCP and CEMPs.
AQx	Emissions minimisation measures – to be agreed between SZC/ ESC. E.g. electric charging points for construction and operation phase vehicles	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Wording to be agreed
Offsite Associated Developments				
AQ11	Existing Environment – Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
AQ12	Assessment Methodology – The impact assessment methodologies used provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on receptors; and has been undertaken with consideration of the appropriate relevant guidance.	Agreed – no further action	Agreed – no further action	Agreed – no further action
AQ13	Assessment Conclusions - The assessment conclusions are agreed.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	See points AQ3, AQ5, AQ6, AQx
AQ14	Mitigation – The position is the same as that of the Main Development Site in relation to the matter.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	See points AQ7, AQ8, AQ9
AQ15	Cumulative Impacts - The position is the same as that of the Main Development Site in relation to the matter.	Agreed – no further action	Agreed – no further action	Agreed – no further action
Development Consent Order				
AQ16	Wording of requirement(s) – Draft Requirement 2 requires 'works to be carried out in general accordance with the Code of Construction Practice, unless otherwise agreed', and subsequently the Outline Dust Management Plan [APP-213] .	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – The wording of control and mitigation measures is being agreed through the Mitigation and Monitoring Plan and will be included in

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				the revised CoCP.
Section 106 Agreement				
AQ17	<p>Obligations within the Section 106 Agreement – Discussions are ongoing as to what, if any provision is required within the Section 106 Agreement.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – It is expected that agreement will be reached as to what provision is required and this will be included in the draft submitted at Deadline 3, if necessary.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

4 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – AMENITY AND RECREATION

4.1.1 Amenity and recreation has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [\[APP-267\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)
- Volume 3, Chapter 8 of the ES [\[APP-366\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-182\]](#)
- Volume 4, Chapter 8 of the ES [\[APP-397\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-183\]](#)
- Volume 5, Chapter 8 of the ES [\[APP-429\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 5 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-184\]](#)
- Volume 6, Chapter 8 of the ES [\[APP-464\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-185\]](#)
- Volume 7, Chapter 8 of the ES [\[APP-497\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-186\]](#)
- Volume 8, Chapter 8 of the ES [\[APP-526\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-187\]](#)
- Volume 9, Chapter 8 of the ES [\[APP-558\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-188\]](#)

4.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

4.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to amenity and recreation is detailed in **Table 4.1**.

4.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

Table 4.1 Position of the Parties – Amenity and Recreation

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement					
Main Development Site					
AR1	Baseline – The baseline environment for the main development site as detailed in section 15.4 of Volume 2 Chapter 15 and Appendices 15F of the ES, and in Appendix 15J for the off-site development areas (including off-site sports facilities at Leiston, fen meadow compensation sites south of Benhall and east of Halesworth and, if required, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area (Westleton)) is acceptable		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AR2	Methodology – The methodology for the assessment of impacts on amenity and recreation including tranquillity, as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6K of the ES is robust and appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AR3	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are robust and appropriate, with the exception of the matters identified at AR4 – AR7 .		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AR4	Assessment – The effects of additional traffic on roads including the A12, A145 and B1119, based on assessment of effects on severance, pedestrian delay, amenity, and fear and intimidation in Volume 2 Chapter 10 of the ES (APP-198) and in Volume 1 Chapter 2 of the Additional Submission (AS-181) have been assessed in Volume 2 Chapter 15 of the ES, and the assessment is robust and appropriate.		Not agreed	Not agreed	Discussions ongoing Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
AR5	Assessment – Long distance paths - Footpath 21 (E-363/021/0), footpath E-363/021/0 (Suffolk Coast Path) and Proposed England Coast Path and Sandlings Walk are assessed to have effects below significant during operation. The siting of the footpath is considered appropriate.		Not agreed	Not agreed	Discussions ongoing Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
AR6	Assessment – The assessment of impacts on amenity and recreation, including tranquillity, acknowledges the nature and significance of effects on the SCHAONB.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
AR7	Mitigation – The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 15.5 and 15.7 of Volume 2 Chapter 15 (APP-267) for the main development site and Appendix 15J (APP-270) for the off-site developments are robust and appropriate with the exception of AR8 – AR13 .		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
AR8	Mitigation – SZC Co. consider that a perimeter footpath around the accommodation campus would have regular use by campus based construction workers, and would help to reduce workers using off site recreational resources. This is part of measures to minimise use of off-site recreational resources (i.e. PRow etc.) by construction workers described at paragraphs 15.5.35 to 15.5.39 of Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES (APP-267).		Agreed	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
AR8A	Mitigation – SZC Co. do not consider that a wholly off-road inland route is required to the north of the campus site alongside Eastbridge Road.		Disagreed	Disagreed	Discussions ongoing – relating to the detail of the rights of way fund to be secured in the Section 106 Agreement.
AR9	Mitigation for construction workers – The impact from construction workers on recreational resources is appropriately mitigated with a proportionate payment into the ESC RAMS fund (see Section 106 Agreement for details).		Principle - Agreed Scale – Agreed in principle	Principle - Agreed Scale – Agreed in principle	Agreed – The scale of the payment is being discussed between SZC Co. and ESC and will be included in the Section 106 Agreement.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
AR10	Displacement mitigation – Displacement of recreational visitors may arise from the infrequent and short term closure of the coastal footpath and the closure throughout the construction phase of the permissive path /route of the Sandlings Walk connecting Kenton Hills with the coast, and the closure of Bridleway 19 for the full construction period, and from the proximity of the construction site to recreational resources, use of the BLFs and the noise and infrastructure associated with the SZC project. Visitor surveys undertaken in 2014 recorded that 29% of visitors would stop using the area because of noise, disruption and traffic impact, although applying those results directly and assuming that those visitors would be displaced to more sensitive locations would be a highly precautionary approach. The measures proposed to provide new recreational space at Aldhurst Farm, to limit beach closures, to provide new off-road replacement rights of way, to invest further into the rights of way network, and to propose measures to monitor and fund the management of any impacts at European sites represent an acceptable and appropriate response.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – Discussions are ongoing relating to the detail of the rights of way fund to be secured in the Section 106 Agreement.
AR11	Beach access – Proposals to manage beach access in order to maximise its availability and limit beach closures are appropriate.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
AR12	Mitigation – The Sandlings Walk within the Sizewell Estate is a permissive path which will be closed throughout the construction phase, but its status and benefit would be enhanced by the application proposals post construction and reopened at an appropriate time.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
AR13	Mitigation – An appropriate method for communicating closures of the coast path is proposed.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing Further update will be provided at Deadline 4.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
AR14	Mitigation – The Rights of Way and Access strategy is and robust and will be extended to cover all PRow and not just those on the Main Development Site.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing -	Updated Rights of Way and Access strategy to be submitted at Deadline 2.
AR15	Cumulative Impacts – The assessment conclusions are robust and appropriate.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
Offsite Associated Developments					
AR16	Baseline – Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment and is robust and appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AR17	Methodology – The methodology for the assessment of impacts on amenity and recreation including tranquillity, as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6K of the ES and is robust and appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
AR18	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are robust and appropriate as detailed in Volumes 3 – 9, Chapter 8 are robust and appropriate.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further update will be provided at Deadline 4.
AR19	Mitigation – The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in Volumes 3 – 9, Chapter 8 for the associated development sites are appropriate.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further update will be provided at Deadline 4.
AR20	Mitigation – 2VBP/SLR – Discussions are ongoing as to what, if any provision is reequiured within the Section 106 Agreement.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – It is expected that agreement will be reached as to what, if any, provision is required

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
					and this will be included in the draft submitted at Deadline 3, if necessary.
AR21	Cumulative Impacts – The assessment conclusions are robust and appropriate.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further update will be provided at Deadline 4.
Development Consent Order					
AR22	Footpath implementation plan disputes - Disputes will be considered and resolved through the transport review group (TRG), if required.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – It is expected that agreement will be reached as to what, if any, amendments are required to the governance arrangements of the TRG and this will be included in the draft submitted at Deadline 3, if necessary.
AR23	Rights of Way and access strategy – This is considered robust and appropriate.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further update will be provided at Deadline 4.
AR24	The PRoW plans for approval and DCO Schedules 10 – 13 are agreed.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further update will be provided at Deadline 4.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Section 106 Agreement					
AR25	Applicable area – The parameters for the PRow fund are acceptable.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – Any amendments required to Section 106 Agreement will be included in the draft submitted at Deadline 3, if necessary.
AR26	Flexibility –a degree of flexibility is to be retained within the PRow fund to accommodate impacts on PRow or open access sites where the impact is not yet known.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – Any amendments required to Section 106 Agreement will be included in the draft submitted at Deadline 3, if necessary.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

5 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY AND ORNITHOLOGY

5.1.1 Terrestrial ecology and ornithology has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 14 of the ES [\[AS-033\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)
- Volume 3, Chapter 7 of the ES [\[APP-363\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-182\]](#)
- Volume 4, Chapter 7 of the ES [\[APP-394\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-183\]](#)
- Volume 5, Chapter 7 of the ES [\[APP-425\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 5 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-184\]](#)
- Volume 6, Chapter 7 of the ES [\[APP-461\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-185\]](#)
- Volume 7, Chapter 7 of the ES [\[APP-494\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-186\]](#)
- Volume 8, Chapter 7 of the ES [\[APP-523\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-187\]](#)
- Volume 9, Chapter 7 of the ES [\[APP-555\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-188\]](#)

5.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

5.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to terrestrial ecology and ornithology is detailed in **Table 5.1**.

5.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

Table 5.1 Position of the Parties – Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement				
Main Development Site				
TEO1	Existing Environment – Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment, with the <u>exception</u> of points made in respect of TEO2 and TEO40 listed below.	Agreed	Agreed	Subject to identified exceptions.
TEO2	Bat surveys - Based on the deployment of static detectors used for the baseline and pre-construction monitoring surveys undertaken in 2020-2021, these are an appropriate and robust method to monitor bat usage of commuting routes during construction.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June. Discussions continuing regarding the adequacy / type of the bat surveys / monitoring approach and an update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO3	Assessment Methodology – The impact assessment methodologies used provide an acceptable approach to assessing potential impacts on receptors; and the impact assessments have been undertaken with consideration of the appropriate relevant guidance and using the 'Important Ecological Features' approach, as recommended by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
TEO5	Assessment conclusions in relation to the permanent land take of part of the Sizewell Marshes SSSI - The assessment conclusions are agreed, with the exception of those matters listed in rows TE06-TE07 below and	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	those matters listed under compensatory habitat measures are listed at TEO38 to TEO41 below].			
TEO6	SSSI land take - The land take of the SSSI associated with the SSSI Crossing as defined in January 2021 application has been minimised to an acceptable degree given that the <i>operational</i> SSSI Crossing bridge will be reduced in width to approximately 15m and this revision to the design will be provided to Examination at Deadline 2. This reduces permanent landtake and will be a substantial improvement on the January 2021 design. This point should be read alongside TEO7 below.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing Councils to review additional information once received. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG
TEO7	SSSI land take and fragmentation – The SSSI Crossing, based on a single span bridge and embankments, as defined in January 2021 application, is acceptable without caveat and ecologically no worse than the alternative of a triple span bridge in this location.	Disagree	Disagree	Discussions ongoing. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG
TEO8	SSSI Hydrology - Sheet piling and the cut-off wall will not result in impacts on the hydrological function of the SSSI or statutory designated nature conservation sites downstream of the development.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Councils await confirmation from Natural England and the Environment Agency that they are satisfied with the assessment and mitigation measures proposed.
TEO9	Assessment conclusions in relation to the fragmentation effects associated with the SSSI Crossing over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI – It is noted that the <i>operational</i> SSSI Crossing bridge will be reduced in width to approximately 15m and this revision to the design will be provided to	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. The councils have not yet seen the details of the revised operational

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	Examination at Deadline 2. This reduces fragmentation and will be a substantial improvement on the January 2021 design. The assessment conclusions in relation to fragmentation effects on the SSSI, at ES Addendum [AS-181], paragraphs 2.9.59 -2.9.62; 2.9.66-2.9.71 are agreed, with the exception of the matters listed in rows TEO10, TEO11 and TEO12. ***			design for the SSSI Crossing proposed for submission by the applicant at Deadline 2. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG
TEO10	Fragmentation effects associated with the SSSI Crossing over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI – Invertebrates – The SSSI crossing will not result in significant adverse impacts on invertebrates.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG
TEO11	Fragmentation effects associated with the SSSI Crossing over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI – Bats – The SSSI Crossing will not significantly fragment the important bat foraging and commuting corridor through this part of the SSSI, particularly as a result of lighting and noise disturbance impacts (see also TEOXX to TEOYY below).	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG
TEO12	Fragmentation effects associated with the SSSI Crossing over the Sizewell Marshes SSSI – Otters and Water Vole – The SSSI Crossing will not significantly fragment the important otter and water vole habitat corridor through this part of the SSSI.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG
TEO13	Temporary Landtake of SSSI - The approach in TEMMP, paragraphs 3.1.8-3.1.10 which provides for approval of method statements in areas subject to temporary landtake to protect or restore habitats in these areas, is acceptable and the TEMMP is secured by requirement 4	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
TEO14	Sizewell Levels County Wildlife Site Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions in [APP-224] paragraphs 14.7.162- 14.7.181, which conclude a Moderate Adverse, Significant impact on the CWS, -are agreed in relation to the Sizewell Levels County Wildlife Site.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
TEO15	Habitat creation within the order limits - The principle of the habitat creation proposals within the Main Development Site oLEMP are secured to an acceptable degree.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
TEO16	Wider estate wide habitat creation (outwith the order limits) The existing habitats and future habitat enhancements for the wider EDF Energy estate (outwith the order limits), contained within existing management plans, such as the Aldhurst Farm Management Plan, are acceptable and secured to an acceptable degree.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing on how these measures are secured/controlled. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG
TEO17	Suffolk Shingle Beaches County Wildlife Site Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions in [APP-224] paragraphs 14.7.182-193, which conclude a Moderate Adverse, Significant impact on the CWS, are agreed in relation to the Suffolk Shingle Beaches County Wildlife Site.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
TEO18	Re-establishment, mitigation, monitoring and management in relation to the beach habitats – The approach defined in the Main Development Site oLEMP and the TEMMP is acceptable in relation to initial habitat creation and monitoring.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
TEO18a	Re-establishment, mitigation, monitoring and management in relation to the beach habitats – The proposals for medium/long term retention of replacement habitats which may be affected by coastal processes and sea	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	level rise, impacts on which are exacerbated by the hard coastal defence feature, are acceptable.			An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO19	Bat Assessments – The assessments are agreed in relation to bats, as provided in the updated ES addendum updated bat appendix, Appendix 2.9.B [AS-208], with the exception of those matters in rows xx, all of which relate to the construction phase.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - A map of the new bat corridor will be shared in advance of a meeting in June to clarify the differences between the positions on assessments of bats. Updated roost survey reports will be submitted at Deadline 2; and an update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO20	Bats: The estate wide roost resource – The loss of a small number of roosts associated with tree removal, including from the Goose Hill plantation would not lead to a significant adverse effect on any of the relevant bat IEFs.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO21	Bats: The estate wide foraging habitats – The habitats, including proposed improvements, are sufficiently extensive such that the predicted loss of foraging habitats would result in no significant effects on foraging bats.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO22	Bats: The habitat connectivity for bats –Through and around the temporary construction area, including the proposed new corridor linking Kenton Hills with Ash Cottages, the protections afforded to the retained 'dark corridors' are such that there would be no significant adverse effects on bats arising from fragmentation, other potentially than in respect of barbastelle for which a significant effect is identified in the ES.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO23	Bats: Lighting - The lighting impacts on bats, reduced via way of the Lighting Management Plan, measures in the CoCP and in the TEMMP are such that there would be no significant adverse effects on bats, arising from these impacts	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO24	Bats: Noise - The noise impacts on bats, reduced via way of measures in the CoCP and in the TEMMP are such that there would be no significant adverse effects on bats, arising from this impact	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO25	Bats: The cumulative impacts – Impacts on bats, arising from the MDS and the SLR to the west are limited such that there would be no significant adverse cumulative effects on bats.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO26	Natterjack Toads Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions provided in the ES [APP-224] paragraphs 14.10.16-14.10.39	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	are accepted in relation to natterjack toads, other than the matters listed in TEO27 below.			
TEO27	Natterjack Toads Assessment Conclusions - The layout of WMZ within Retsoms Field is acceptable and avoids both the natterjack breeding ponds and the rabbit warrens which are used by the toads for hibernating.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further details of the WMZ1 to be shared by SZC Co which avoid the hibernation habitats. for consideration by the Councils. An update will be provide in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO28	Otters Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions provided in the ES [APP-224], paragraphs 14.14.22-41 and as supplemented by the ES addendum are appropriate, subject to the exception in TEO12 and details of the creation of a mammal culvert under Lovers Lane being provided.	Agreed. Subject to the specifications for the new mammal culvert under Lovers Lane being agreed.	Agreed. Subject to the specifications for the new mammal culvert under Lovers Lane being agreed	Agreed It is noted that the CoCP requires an update in relation to otters and this will be addressed in a future update to the CoCP.
TEO29	Water Voles Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions are appropriate in relation to water voles, provided in the ES [APP-224], paragraphs 14.14.42-65 and as supplemented by the ES addendum. This includes the creation of a mammal culvert under Lovers Lane, to link the Aldhurst Farm wetlands with the Sizewell Marshes SSSI.	Agreed. Subject to the specifications for the new mammal culvert under Lovers Lane being	Agreed. Subject to the specifications for the new mammal culvert under Lovers Lane being	Agreed but full confirmation to be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
		agreed and final mitigation measures being informed by pre-commencement surveys.	agreed and final mitigation measures being informed by pre-commencement surveys.	
TEO30	Reptiles Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions are appropriate in relation to reptiles provided in the ES [APP-224], paragraphs 14.14.42-65.	Agreed. Subject to final mitigation measures being informed by pre-commencement surveys.	Agreed. Subject to final mitigation measures being informed by pre-commencement surveys.	Agreed. Subject to final mitigation measures being informed by pre-commencement surveys.
TEO31	Assessment Conclusions: Residual effects - The residual adverse effects of the proposed development will not be significant, other than those defined in the ES, either individually or in aggregation and do not represent a considerable erosion of the biodiversity of east Suffolk.	Disagree	Disagree	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO32	Monitoring and Mitigation – The monitoring and mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Statement and its Addendum, the Habitat Regulations Assessment, the Main Development Site Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan and the TEMMP (as pertain to the Main Development Site) are appropriate, other than if listed separately in the following rows	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
TEO33	Mitigation measures for bats – The mitigation measures identified in the following document are appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The bat mitigation strategy appended to the Environmental Statement and its Addendum 	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO34	Mitigation measures for bats – The mitigation measures identified in the following document are appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Lighting Management Plan 	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO35	Mitigation measures for bats – The mitigation measures identified in the following document are appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft licences (in prep) for roost loss 	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC awaits Councils' review of draft licenses when available Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO36	Mitigation measures for bats – The mitigation measures identified in the following document are appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The TEMMP This includes the lighting and noise controls available to ensure no significant adverse effects arise on bats, from these two impacts are appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co awaits Councils' review of TEMMP. Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update provided

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO37	Monitoring and Habitat Compensation – The monitoring and habitat compensation already delivered at the Aldhurst Farm wetlands to compensate for the open water, reedbed and ditch loss from the Sizewell Marshes SSSI is sufficient.	Councils defer to Natural England in relation to this point	Councils defer to Natural England in relation to this point	Councils defer to Natural England in relation to this point.
TEO38	Monitoring and Habitat Compensation: Fen Meadow – The monitoring and habitat compensation measures identified, in relation to the permanent 0.46ha fen meadow loss from the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, in the the Fen Meadow Strategy (FMS) including the named sites (Benhall, Halesworth and Pakenham), are appropriate, as is the <u>principle</u> of a contingency fund. The position in relation to investigative surveys is excluded and covered in TEO40 below.	Agreed, subject to confirmation of the measures being satisfactory to Natural England.	Agreed, subject to confirmation of the measures being satisfactory to Natural England.	Agreed, subject to confirmation of the measures being satisfactory to Natural England.
TEO39	Monitoring and Habitat Compensation: Fen Meadow – The Fen Meadow Contingency Fund as defined in the Fen Meadow Strategy (FMS) is appropriate in <u>scale, parameters</u> (refer to the Section 106 Agreement for details) and funding triggers	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Further discussion required regarding scale, triggers and parameters of the contingency fund. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO40	Monitoring and Habitat Compensation: Fen Meadow - The investigative surveys undertaken in respect of hydrology at the three fen meadow	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing The baseline survey reports for all three sites

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	compensation sites will enable the approach to Fen Meadow creation at each site to be defined in the Fen Meadow Plan.			and a draft Fen Meadow Plan will be shared with stakeholders and the examination.
TEO41	Monitoring and Habitat Compensation: Wet Woodland – The monitoring and habitat compensation measures in relation to the permanent land take of 3.06ha of wet woodland loss from the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, defined in the Wet Woodland Strategy is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – The Wet Woodland Strategy was shared at Deadline 1 and SZC Co. awaits feedback from the Councils. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
Offsite Associated Developments				
TEO42	Existing Environment – Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Additional survey reports (bat roosts, wintering birds) submitted at Deadline 2; SZC Co. awaits feedback from the Councils. An update will be provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO43	Assessment Methodology – The impact assessment methodologies used provide an acceptable approach to assessing potential impacts on receptors; and the impact assessments been undertaken with consideration of the appropriate relevant guidance and using the Important Ecological	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	Features approach, recommended by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management.			
TEO44	Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions are appropriate other than as listed in the following rows – TEO44; TEO45 and TEO46.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – Awaiting details of survey results as at TEO42. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO45	Assessment Conclusions (Bats Crossings, Two village bypass) - The assessment conclusions are appropriate	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO46	Assessment Conclusions (Floodplain Grassland), Two Village bypass - The assessment conclusions are appropriate	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO47	Assessment Conclusions (Veteran trees), Two Village bypass - The assessment conclusions are appropriate	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG
TEO48	Mitigation – The mitigation measures identified in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) for the Sizewell Link Road are appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. An update will be provided in the next version of this

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				SoCG. How LEMP is secured in the DCO to be resolved.
TEO49	Mitigation – The mitigation measures identified in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) for the Two Village Bypass are appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG. How LEMP is secured in the DCO to be resolved.
TEO50	Mitigation – The mitigation measures identified in the Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (as pertaining to the Associated Developments) are appropriate	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO51	Mitigation – The mitigation measures identified in the mitigation strategies, draft licenses and method statements, in relation to protected species, appended to the Environmental Statement and its Addendum (as pertaining to the Associated Developments) are appropriate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> relevant sections of the Environmental Statement and its Addendum (as pertaining to the Associated Developments) 	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
Project-wide Impacts				
TEO52	Conclusions – The assessment conclusions in the ES in [APP-577] paragraphs 3.5.1-3.5.22 relating to project-wide ecological impacts are appropriate (excluding those covered separately in subsequent rows – TEO53.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
TEO53	Conclusions - The various impacts and effects on bats, including those arising between the MDS and the SLR, do not add together to cause a further 'project-wide' significant adverse effect on bat populations.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - A map of the new bat corridor will be shared in advance of a meeting in June to clarify the differences between the positions on assessments of bats. Updated roost survey reports will be submitted at Deadline 2; Further technical discussions to be held in a workshop on 3 rd June and an update will be provided in the next version of the SoCG.
Cumulative Impacts				
TEO54	Conclusions - The assessment conclusions in the ES in [APP-578] paragraphs 4.8.1-54 relating to cumulative ecological impacts are appropriate (excluding those covered separately in any subsequent rows – TEO55)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
TEO55	Conclusions - A moderate adverse cumulative effect on farmland birds is identified during the early phase of construction (this depends on construction programmes of various projects) but there are no clearly deployable mitigation measures, within the applicant's control which would mitigate this effect.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Biodiversity Net Gain Assessments				
TEO56	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - The assessment conclusions of the Biodiversity Net gain reports, as updated at Deadline 1, are appropriate, including an overall BNG on 19% across the Project and 18% across the main development site , other than where listed below.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Updated BNG reports were submitted at Deadline 1 and SZC Co. awaits feedback from the Councils. An update will be provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO57	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) - BNG is achievable when there is landtake to a SSSI.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	The Councils defer to Natural England in relation to this technical point. An update will be provided in the next version of the SoCG.
TEO58	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) – The BNG assessment methodology is limited to the operational phase.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	The Councils defer to Natural England in relation to this technical point. An update will be provided in the next version of the SoCG.
Development Consent Order				
TEO59	Wording of requirement(s) – Draft Requirement 4: Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	This Draft Requirement is to be updated at D2 to better align with the TEMMP. SZC Co.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				awaits the councils' review of the TEMMP and the amended requirement. Discussions ongoing. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO60	Wording of requirement(s) – Draft Requirement 14A: Fen Meadow is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	This Draft Requirement is to be updated at D2 to alter the reference to WSC. SZC Co. awaits the councils' review of the amended requirement. Discussions ongoing. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO61	Wording of requirement(s) – Draft Requirement 14B: Wet woodland is acceptable	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	This Draft Requirement is to be updated at D2 to alter the reference to WSC. SZC Co awaits the councils' review of the amended requirement. Discussions ongoing. An update will be provided

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				in the next version of this SoCG.
TEO62	No further requirements sought	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – particularly on need for Requirement to secure LEMPs for Two Village Bypass and SLR. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
Section 106 Agreement				
TEO63	Section 106 Agreement –Schedule 11 is finalised	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - principles agreed but sums still to be agreed.

6 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – SHADOW HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT

6.1.1 The shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment is provided in the following parts:

- Part 1 of 5 [\[APP-145\]](#)
- Part 2 of 5 [\[APP-146\]](#)
- Part 3 of 5 [\[APP-147\]](#)
- Part 4 of 5 [\[APP-148\]](#)
- Part 5 of 5 [\[APP-149\]](#)
- Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment Addendum [\[AS-173\]](#)

6.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)
- Other management plans

6.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to the shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment is detailed in **Table 6.1**.

6.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

Table 6.1 Position of the Parties – shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment				
HRA1	<p>SZC Co understands that the council's position is deferred to Natural England, other than in respect of certain matters in relation to recreational displacement.</p> <p>For example, the inclusion of the Marsh Harrier Habitat Improvement Area on the EDF Energy estate is understood and the Councils defer to Natural England as the statutory nature conservation body on Habitat Regulation Assessment.</p>	The Councils defer to Natural England as the statutory nature conservation body on this matter with the exception of certain matters in relation to recreational displacement		
HRA2	The assessment conclusions in relation to recreational displacement and the conclusions in the sHRA Report ¹ resultant from that displacement are appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. The submitted sHRA Report does not recognise the need for a contribution to the Suffolk Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy, however this is under discussion with the applicant to be secured as part of the S106. As the need for a Suffolk Coast RAMS contribution is discounted in the submitted sHRA this point cannot be agreed

¹ sHRA R4 report as comprising the sHRA Report (May 2020) and the sHRA Addendum (January 2021)

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				at this time. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA3	The assessment of the relevant sources of displacement is adequately presented in the sHRA Report.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HRA4	The monitoring of and required mitigation at the Minsmere - Walberswick European ² Sites and Sandlings (North) European Site are defined in a plan as follows and are appropriate: Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Minsmere - Walberswick European Sites and Sandlings (North) European Site. Note that the funds and the s106 commitments relating to this plan is covered below.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – This updated plan was shared with councils in mid May and will be submitted to Examination at deadline 2 An update will be provided in the next version of the SoCG
HRA5	The monitoring of and any required mitigation at the Sandlings (Central) and Alde, Ore and Butley Estuaries European Sites are defined in a plan as follows and are appropriate: Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Sandlings (Central) and Alde, Ore and Butley Estuaries European Sites. Note that the funds and the s106 commitments relating to this plan is covered below.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – This new plan will be shared with councils shortly and will be submitted to Examination at a suitable deadline. An update will be provided in the next version of the SoCG.

² In all cases and throughout, 'European Sites' are now regarded as 'Habitat Sites' or 'National Sites'

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
HRA6	In the sHRA context, the mitigation measures for the recreational impacts of campus workers and caravan site workers are agreed as being delivered through a S106 contribution, calculated in accordance with the Suffolk Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. Whilst the councils agree that a contribution to the Suffolk Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy, as secured in the S106 is required to mitigate this impact, discussion is ongoing with the applicant and Natural England over the need to secure SANG provision. An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
Development Consent Order				
HRA7	Not relevant	-	-	-
Section 106 Agreement				
HRA8	Schedule 11 - European Sites Access Contingency Fund - the maximum sum of £[●] is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
HRA9	Schedule 11 - European Sites Mitigation Measures - measures identified through the European Sites Recreational Monitoring Plan as required at Sandlings SPA (Tunstall Forest and Rendlesham Forest sections (but excluding Aldringham Common section), Alde-Ore Estuary SPA to reduce the impacts of additional recreational disturbance associated with Sizewell C, such measures to include (as required) additional signage and information boards, fencing, and training and support for wardens.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA10	Schedule 11 - European Sites Recreational Monitoring Plan - the plan which defines monitoring, using surveyors, mechanical counters and other techniques, at Sandlings SPA (Tunstall Forest and Rendlesham Forest sections (but excluding Aldringham Common section), Alde-Ore Estuary SPA to determine the impacts of additional recreational disturbance, associated with Sizewell C.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA11	Schedule 11 - Recreational Avoidance Mitigation Contribution - the sum of £[●] to be used by East Suffolk Council towards mitigating the in-combination recreational disturbance impacts of the Project on the Suffolk Coast RAMS Zone of Influence Zone B in accordance with the Recreational Avoidance Mitigation Strategy.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA12	Schedule 11 - Recreational Avoidance Mitigation Strategy - the Recreation and Mitigation Strategy partnership between East Suffolk Council, Ipswich Borough Council and Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils to reduce the impact of increased levels of recreational use on European wildlife sites is acceptable in principle.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA13	Schedule 11 - Minsmere and Sandlings (north) Contingency Contribution - the sum of £[●] is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
HRA14	Schedule 11 - Minsmere and Sandlings (north) Recreational Monitoring Plan - the plan which defines monitoring, using surveyors, mechanical counters and other techniques and mitigation measures at Sandlings SPA (Aldringham Common section), the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and the Minsmere-Walberswick Heath and Marshes SAC to determine and mitigate the impacts of additional recreational disturbance associated with the Project.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA15	Schedule 11 - Minsmere and Sandlings (north) Mitigation Measures - the measures identified through the Minsmere and Sandlings (north) Recreational Monitoring Plan as required at Sandlings SPA (Aldringham Common section), the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and the Minsmere-Walberswick Heath and Marshes SAC to reduce the impacts of additional recreational disturbance, associated with Sizewell C, such measures to include (as required) additional signage and information boards, fencing, and training and support for wardens.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA16	Schedule 13 - National Trust Dunwich Heath and Coastguard Cottages Resilience Fund and RSPB Resilience Fund - The sums of £[●] for the purposes of mitigating the impacts of the Project on these areas are acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HRA17	Schedule 11 - Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan – The monitoring proposals included within the plan are appropriate for the European sites, habitats and species which are relevant in the HRA context	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing An update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

7 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – HEALTH

7.1.1 Health has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [\[APP-346\]](#)

7.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

7.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to health is detailed in **Table 7.1**.

7.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table 7.1 Position of the Parties – Health

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement				
Main Development Site - Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 28				
HEA1	Methodology - The methodology is appropriate for the assessment of significance of health and wellbeing effects as set out in section 28.3 , with additional detail in Volume 1, Appendix 6Y of the ES .	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HEA2	Baseline - The baseline environment as set out in section 28.4 , with additional detail in Appendix 28C (Health Baseline) is appropriate. This baseline is provided for context only but not used to confer spare healthcare capacity.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HEA3	Effects: air quality (construction) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from changes in emissions to air, construction dust and PM ₁₀ as set out in section 28.6 b) i (for construction phase of Sizewell C) including updates in the ES Addendum is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Notwithstanding the “negligible adverse” impacts identified in the main development site ES Volume 2, Chapter 28 , ESC is aware that exposure to air pollution can have effects on health even at levels which comply with the current air quality standards. ESC is addressing this by seeking to ensure the highest standards of control and monitoring of air pollution, having regard to the specific features of the development, including the setting,

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				scale and nature of construction activities.
HEA4A	Effects: transport (construction) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from additional HGV transport movements as set out in section 28.6 b) ii (for construction phase of Sizewell C) including updates in the ES Addendum is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA4B	Effects: transport (construction) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from additional rail transport movements as set out in section 28.6 b) ii (for construction phase of Sizewell C) including updates in the ES Addendum is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA4C	Effects: transport (construction) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from additional sea-based transport movements as set out in section 28.6 b) ii (for construction phase of Sizewell C) including updates in the ES Addendum is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA5	Effects: noise (construction) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from changes in noise exposure as set out in section 28.6 b) iii (for construction phase of Sizewell C), including updates to the above in the ES Addendum is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing, including on the Noise Mitigation Scheme scope and thresholds.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
HEA6	Effects: construction workforce (construction) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects associated with the introduction of a temporary non-home-based construction workforce as set out in section 28.6 b) iv (for construction phase of Sizewell C) s appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA7	Effects: socio-economics (construction) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects associated with the socio-economic factors as set out in section 28.6 b) v (for construction phase of Sizewell C) is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA8	Effects: quality of life (construction) - The assessment of general stress and anxiety impacting upon quality of life as set out in section 28.6 b) vi (for construction phase of Sizewell C) is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA9	Effects: radiological - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from changes in radiological exposure during operation of the proposed development, as set out in section 28.6 c) i is appropriate.	No comment	No comment	Note both ESC / SCC do not have the technical expertise to comment further on this matter.
HEA10	Effects: electromagnetic field exposure - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from changes in in electromagnetic field exposure during operation of the proposed development, as set out in section 28.6 c) ii. is appropriate.	No comment	No comment	Note both ESC / SCC do not have the technical expertise to comment further on this matter.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
HEA11	Effects: air quality (operation) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from changes in emissions to air during operation of the proposed development is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HEA12	Effects: transport (operation) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from additional transport movements during operation of the proposed development, as set out in section 28.6 c) iv is acceptable.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA13	Effects: noise (operation) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects from changes in noise exposure during operation of the proposed development, as set out in section 28.6 c) v is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HEA14	Effects: socio-economics (operation) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects associated with socio-economic factors during operation of the proposed development, as set out in section 28.6 c) vi is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA15	Effects: quality of life (operation) - The assessment of potential health and wellbeing effects associated with general stress and anxiety impacting upon quality of life during operation of the proposed development, as set out in section 28.6 c) vii is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
HEA16	Mitigation - The approach to mitigation set out in section 28.5 a) primary mitigation i) public health is appropriate. (This includes embedded mitigation in relevant technical sections - socio-economics, transport, air quality, noise and vibration, and radiological considerations).	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HEA17	Mitigation – occupational health - The approach to mitigation set out in section 28.5 a) primary mitigation ii) occupational health provision , with further detail provided in Appendix 28A (Health Technical Note 1: Sizewell Occupational Health Care Service Description) is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing, including on scope and scale of the Public Services Resilience Fund and on how the occupational health service will contract for sexual health services (via SCC's provision).
HEA18	Mitigation - The approach to mitigation set out in section 28.5 b) tertiary mitigation is appropriate. (This includes tertiary mitigation in relevant technical sections - socio-economics, transport, air quality, noise and vibration, and radiological considerations).	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
Development Consent Order				
HEA19	Not directly relevant	-	-	-
Deed of Obligation				
HEA20	Deed of Obligation – In terms of Schedule 6 discussions are ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - principles agreed but sums still to be agreed

8 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

8.1.1 Historic Environment has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 16 of the ES [\[APP-272\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)
- Volume 3, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-368\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-182\]](#)
- Volume 4, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-399\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-183\]](#)
- Volume 5, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-432\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 5 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-184\]](#)
- Volume 6, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-467\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-185\]](#)
- Volume 7, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-499\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-186\]](#)
- Volume 8, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-528\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-187\]](#)
- Volume 9, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-560\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-188\]](#)

8.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

8.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to historic environment is detailed in **Table 8.1**.

8.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table 8.1 Position of the Parties – Historic Environment

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement				
Overarching				
HE1	Methodology - The methodology for the assessment of impacts on the terrestrial historic environment as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6L of the ES is comprehensive and appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
HE2	Methodology - The list of assets to be scoped in or out of the settings assessment in the EIA, as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6L Annex 6L.1 "Historic Environment Settings Scoping Update" which also includes the 2015 "Settings Assessment Scoping Recommendations" is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
HE3	Methodology - The methodology for the assessment of impacts on the marine historic environment as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6S of the ES is comprehensive and appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed – no further action
HE4	Overarching WSI - The Overarching WSI provided in Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 16, Appendix 16H is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – SZC Co. to submit updated OWSI at Deadline 3 to address SCC's outstanding comments and an update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Main development site				
HE5	Baseline - The baseline environment is sufficient for the DCO submission. It is noted that there are some gaps in trial trenching which SZC Co. will need to fill e.g. in wooded areas and where there are ecological constraints and also off-site areas including the Leiston sports pitch and ecological mitigation sites. An approach to addressing these has been agreed.	Agreed (Subject to comments in status)	Agreed (Subject to comments in status)	Agreed subject to the submission of an updated OWSI (Deadline 3) which addresses SCC comments, and to the agreement of detailed and appropriate requirement wording in order to secure outstanding archaeological assessment work.
HE6A	Impacts (terrestrial) -The assessment of impacts on the terrestrial historic environment for the construction, operation and - where relevant - removal and reinstatement for the main development site and Appendix 16F for the off-site developments is sufficient for the DCO submission. The scope for the outstanding assessment work required to support detailed mitigation design in other areas is agreed. ARCHAEOLOGY	Ageed subject to further assessment	Ageed subject to further assessment	Agreed that there has been sufficient archaeological assessment to inform the EIA but further assessment (trial trenching) will be required to inform the mitigation strategy. The approach for further assessment required to support detailed mitigation design is set out in the OWSI and is

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				agreed (subject to the submission of an updated OWSI (Deadline 3) which addresses SCC comments and to the agreement of detailed and appropriate requirement wording in order to secure outstanding archaeological assessment work).
HE6B	Impacts (terrestrial) -The assessment of impacts on the terrestrial historic environment for the construction,operation and removal and reinstatement for the main development site and Appendix 16F for the off-site developments is sufficient for the DCO submission. SETTINGS	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HE7	Impacts (marine) – The assessment of impacts on the marine environment is comprehensive.	No comment	No comment	Outside the Councils areas of responsibility.
HE8A	Mitigation - The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts for the main development site and off-site developments is appropriate; further discussions are required in terms of the securing mechanisms (dDCO and Deed of Obligation). ARCHAEOLOGY	Approach agreed but discussions ongoing on securing mechanisms (archaeology).	Approach agreed but discussions ongoing on securing mechanisms (archaeology).	Discussions ongoing - still require submission of an updated OWSI (Deadline 3) which addresses SCC comments and the

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				<p>agreement of detailed and appropriate requirement wording in order to secure archaeological mitigation (following the completion of assessment work), as well as post excavation analysis, reporting, publication and archive deposition.</p> <p>Site Specific WSIs (which are in line with the OWSI) will be required for each phase of assessment and mitigation work for every site within the DCO red line boundary, alongside detailed method statements for each site and phase of work to be produced by the appointed archaeological contractor(s).</p> <p>Discussions ongoing in relation to the Draft Deed of Obligation (formerly</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				the Section 106 Agreement) - principles agreed but sums still to be agreed; an update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
HE8B	Mitigation - The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts for the main development site and off-site developments is appropriate; further discussions are required in terms of the securing mechanisms (dDCO and Deed of Obligation). SETTINGS	Discussions ongoing.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HE9	Peat Strategy – The assessment of residual effects, conclusions and next steps are appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	This is agreed – subject to the agreement of robust, detailed DCO requirements in order to secure archaeological mitigation for the Main Platform of the main development site.
Off-site Associated Developments				
HE10	The baseline environment as detailed in Book 6, Volumes 3-9, Chapter 9 - section 9.4 and Appendices 9A-9D (9A-9C for freight) is sufficient for the DCO submission. It is noted that there are some gaps in trial trenching which SZC Co. will need to fill e.g. along the Two Village Bypass	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed. subject to the submission of an updated OWSI (Deadline 3) which addresses SCC comments and to the agreement of robust,

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	and Sizewell Link Road. An approach to addressing these has been agreed. The ES Addendum addressed the ESC concern that Yoxford Conservation Area was not included in the Sizewell link road baseline.			detailed DCO requirements in order to secure outstanding archaeological assessment work.
HE11A	The assessment of impacts on the terrestrial historic environment for the construction, operation and - where relevant - removal and reinstatement of the off-site associated developments is sufficient for the DCO submission. The scope for the outstanding assessment work required to support detailed mitigation design in other areas is agreed. ARCHAEOLOGY	Agreed subject to comments in Status column	Agreed subject to comments in Status column	Agreed - subject to further assessment (trial trenching) will be required to inform the mitigation strategy, and subject to the submission of an updated OWSI (Deadline 3) which addresses SCC comments and to the agreement of robust, detailed DCO requirements in order to secure outstanding archaeological assessment work.
HE11B	The assessment of impacts on terrestrial historic environment for the construction, operation and - where relevant - removal and reinstatement of the off-site	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	associated developments is sufficient for the DCO submission. SETTINGS			
HE12	<p>The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts for the off-site associated developments is acceptable; further discussions are required in terms of the securing mechanisms (dDCO and Draft Deed of Obligation).</p> <p>Approach agreed for archaeology - site specific WSIs will be discharged by requirement.</p> <p>Specific mitigation areas now agreed for northern and southern park rides, freight, Yoxford, green rail route and part of the two village bypass, but agreed site specific WSIs are not yet in place.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	<p>Discussions ongoing on settings. For archaeology, still require submission of an updated OWSI (Deadline 3) which addresses SCC comments and the agreement of detailed and appropriate requirement wording in order to secure archaeological mitigation (following the completion of assessment work), as well as post excavation analysis, reporting, publication and archive deposition.</p> <p>Site Specific WSIs (which are in line with the OWSI) will be required for each phase of assessment and mitigation work for every site within the DCO red</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				line boundary, alongside detailed method statements for each site and phase of work to be produced by the appointed archaeological contractor(s). Discussions ongoing in relation to the Deed of Obligation - principles agreed but sums still to be agreed; an update will be provided in the next version of this SoCG.
Development Consent Order				
HE13	<p>The historic environment specific DCO requirements to control impacts on the historic environment as set out in the Draft Development Consent Order are appropriate and necessary.</p> <p>Approach on archaeology agreed but some tweaks to wording required for clarity and to provide confidence that post-excavation assessment (PXA) and updated project design (UPD) will be delivered in a timely manner.</p> <p>Approach on Upper Abbey Farm agreed but some tweaks to wording may be required to ensure ESC is happy with what is proposed.</p>	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing:	Discussions ongoing – see comments with regards to requirement wording in the ESC and SCC LIR Annex J. SCC consider the present requirement does not make a clear distinction between the OWSI and Site-Specific WSIs. It also does not make clear that multiple phases of archaeological

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				investigation, followed by mitigation, will be required for all areas within the DCO order limits and all elements of the proposed scheme. The present requirement also does not secure post-investigation analysis, reporting, publication and archiving work within an appropriate timeframe.
HE14	The historic environment specific deemed marine licence condition to control impacts on the marine historic environment as set out in the draft deemed marine licence is appropriate.	Outside of the Councils' areas of responsibility		
Section 106 Agreement / Deed of Obligation				
HE15	Deed of Obligation – In terms of Schedule 8 discussions are ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - principles agreed but sums still to be agreed.

9 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

9.1.1 Landscape and visual has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 13 of the ES [\[APP-216\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)
- Volume 3, Chapter 6 of the ES [\[APP-360\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-182\]](#)
- Volume 4, Chapter 6 of the ES [\[APP-390\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-183\]](#)
- Volume 5, Chapter 6 of the ES [\[APP-421\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 5 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-184\]](#)
- Volume 6, Chapter 6 of the ES [\[APP-457\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-185\]](#)
- Volume 7, Chapter 6 of the ES [\[APP-490\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-186\]](#)
- Volume 8, Chapter 6 of the ES [\[APP-520\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-187\]](#)
- Volume 9, Chapter 6 of the ES [\[APP-551\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-188\]](#)

9.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

9.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to landscape and visual is detailed in **Table 9.1**.

- 9.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

Table 9.1 Position of the Parties – Landscape and Visual

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement					
Main Development Site					
LV1	Baseline – The baseline environment for the main development site as detailed in Volume 2 Chapter 13 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV2	Methodology – The methodology for the assessment of impacts on landscape and visual, as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6I of the ES is appropriate. Full details of the methodology consultation undertaken and agreement reached with LVIA consultees, including ESC and SCC is provided in Volume 2, Appendix 13H of the ES (Doc Ref 6.3). This includes: -the overarching methodology to be used, including assessment terminology regarding sensitivity of receptors, magnitude of effect and significance of effect; -LVIA references, including legislation and policy and landscape and seascape character baseline; -use of receptor groups in the assessment of visual effects; -the location of representative and illustrative viewpoints; and -the selection of viewpoints for the preparation of visualisations and the type of visualisations to be prepared for each of the agreed viewpoints.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV3	Assessment – The assessment conclusion is appropriate and agreed with the exception of LV5 -LV8.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
LV4	Assessment – Interpretation of provided photographs and montages is appropriate and robust. A summary of the representative viewpoints is contained in Table 13.11 of the LVIA (Doc. Ref. 6.3) and their locations are shown on Figures 13.6A and Figure 13.6B. The representative viewpoint photography is contained in Figures 13.9.01 – 13.9.32. The photographs are annotated and include a description of the existing view and the visual effects during construction and operation. Illustrative viewpoints – which do not contain a description of visual effects – are included within Appendix 13A of the LVIA (Doc. Ref 6.3).	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV5	Assessment – The assessment as set out in APP-216 and in summary paragraphs 13.6.139 - 13.6.144 and 13.6.145 - 13.6.150 for the construction phase and 13.6.311 - 13.6.315 and 13.6.316 - 13.6.32 for the operation phases and acknowledges the nature and significance of effects during on the AONB informed by a full appreciation of the AONB's natural beauty and special qualities as recorded in the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Natural Beauty and Special Qualities Indicators document provided as an appendix to the MDS LVIA (Volume 2, Chapter 13, Appendix C) [Doc Ref 6.3].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV6	Assessment – Impacts on visual receptors and the character of coastal and coastal hinterland areas have been recorded in the LVIA and inform the assessment of the effects on the AONB and Heritage Coast presented in the LVIA at paragraphs 13.6.139 - 13.6.144 and 13.6.145 - 13.6.150 (construction phase) and 13.6.311 - 13.6.315 and 13.6.316 - 13.6.321 (operation Phase).	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV7	Assessment - The LVIA acknowledges the nature and significance of effects on the SCHAONB. Matters related to wider perception of the whole AONB as a designation and as destination, is to be discussed further.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
					information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV8	Assessment – seascape impact assessment on Nearshore Waters SCT are represented accurately.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV9	Mitigation - The mitigation measures are appropriate, with the exception of the matters identified at LV10 – LV14.		Agreed	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV10	Mitigation – the lighting mitigation measures are as set out in the Lighting Management Plan are appropriate. Appendix 2B of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref 6.3) includes a lighting management plan and makes provision for construction and operation lighting.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV11	Mitigation – The chosen pylon option is appropriate and the feasibility of undergrounding the overhead transmission lines has been explored following early consultation proposals and is recorded in Chapter 6 Alternatives and Design Evolution [Doc Ref 6.3], in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy.		Refer to MDS11		

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
LV12	Mitigation – outage car park location has been explored fully and its location is appropriate and in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy.		Refer to MDS1		
LV13	Mitigation – design within the AONB – The landscape and visual effects identified cannot be fully mitigated in all cases. The scheme design includes significant embodied mitigation, which is described in the DAS, but residual impacts would need to be mitigated		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV14	Mitigation – DCO requirement – the proposals provide a clear indication of the extent of detailed and parameter based information for approval with significant detail provided for the main power station elements in particular. A set of design principles has been submitted for approval and was agreed with stakeholders to inform any subsequent requirements discharge or scheme alteration that may be necessary in future.		Agreed	Discussions ongoing. See also SCC response to ExQ LI.1.12	Discussions ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
LV15	Cumulative Impacts Assessment – The assessment conclusions reached in the cumulative assessment has been carried out in accordance with best practice. The SZC project provides a proportionate response to the effects it generates including the delivery of good design where it is practicable to bring this forward and as recorded in the DAS [Doc Ref 6.3], mitigation to reduce effects and the mitigation of residual effects through the Deed of Obligation (LV38).		Agreed	Discussion ongoing can only be finalised subject to resolution of LV38	Discussion ongoing - Further information to be submitted at Deadline 4.
Offsite Associated Developments					
LV16	Baseline – The baseline environment for the northern park and ride site as detailed in Volume 3, Chapter 6 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
LV17	Baseline – The baseline environment for the southern park and ride site as detailed in Volume 4, Chapter 6 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV18	Baseline – The baseline environment for the two village bypass as detailed in Volume 5, Chapter 6 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV19	Baseline – The baseline environment for the Sizewell link road as detailed in Volume 6, Chapter 6 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV20	Baseline – The baseline environment for the Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements as detailed in Volume 7, Chapter 6 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV21	Baseline – The baseline environment for the Freight Management Facility as detailed in Volume 8, Chapter 6 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV22	Baseline – The baseline environment for the rail chapter as detailed in Volume 9 Chapter 6 of the ES is appropriate.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV23	Methodology – The methodology for the assessment of impacts on landscape and visual, as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6I of the ES is robust and appropriate for all associated development sites		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV24	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the northern park and ride as set out in Volume 3, Chapter 6.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV25	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the southern park and ride as set out in Volume 4 Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV26	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the two village bypass as detailed in Volume 5, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV27	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the Sizewell link road as detailed in Volume 6, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
LV28	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements as detailed in Volume 7, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV29	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the Freight Management Facility as detailed in Volume 8, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV30	Assessment – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the rail chapter as detailed in Volume 9 Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV31	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are appropriate for the northern park and ride as set out in Volume 3, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV32	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are appropriate for the southern park and ride as set out in Volume 4, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LV33	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are appropriate for the two village bypass as detailed in Volume 5, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing including review of relevant AD design principles.
LV34	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are appropriate for the Sizewell link road as detailed in Volume 6, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing including review of relevant AD design principles.
LV35	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are appropriate for the Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements as detailed in Volume 7, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - although this

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
					should be inscope for review of AD design principles.
LV36	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are appropriate for the Freight Management Facility as detailed in Volume 8, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – confirmation required that control/mitigation of lighting is entirely consistent with LV31 & 32 SCC Response to LI 1.76.
LV37	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are appropriate for the rail chapter as detailed in Volume 9, Chapter 6 of the ES.		Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
Deed of Obligation					
LV38	Deed of Obligation – In terms of Schedule 11 discussions are ongoing.		Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - principles agreed but sums still to be agreed

10 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – MARINE AND COASTAL

10.1.1 Marine and coastal has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics: Volume 2, Chapter 20 of the ES [\[APP-311\]](#)
- Marine Water Quality and Sediments: Volume 2, Chapter 21 of the ES [\[AS-034\]](#)
- Marine Ecology and Fisheries: Volume 2, Chapter 22 of the ES [\[AS-035\]](#)
- Marine Historic Environment: Volume 2, Chapter 23 of the ES [\[APP-334\]](#)
- Marine Navigation: Volume 2, Chapter 24 of the ES [\[APP-338\]](#)
- Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)

10.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

10.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to marine and coastal is detailed in **Table 10.1**.

10.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table 10.1 Position of the Parties – Marine and Coastal

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
1.Environmental Statement				
MC1	Existing Environment – Sufficient survey data has been collected to inform the assessment	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MC2	Assessment Methodology – The impact assessment methodologies used provide an appropriate approach to assessing potential impacts on receptors; and has been undertaken with consideration of the appropriate relevant guidance (except for item MC2A – E)	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MC2A	To build the HCDF as proposed is in line with SMP policy.	Not agreed	Not agreed	Not agreed
MC2B	The seaward location / advance of HCDF is consistent with a precautionary approach.	Not agreed	Not agreed	Not agreed
MC2C	The primary Impact Assessment process did not need to include the HCDF.	Not agreed	Not agreed	Not agreed
MC2D	The schematic design of the HCDF was adequate for Impact Assessment.	Not agreed	Not agreed	Not agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
MC2E	The process takes adequate account of risk and uncertainty associated with a 120/140-year asset life.	Not agreed	Not agreed	Not agreed
MC3	Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions are agreed	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - The assessment conclusion status for the HCDF is substantially agreed but cannot be signed off until ESC has reviewed and commented on information in the pending HCDF Design Report. Resolution on this is expected by end August. The outstanding actions regarding BLF impact assessments are expected to be concluded by end July.
MC4	Mitigation – The mitigation measures are agreed, notably secured through the Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CPMMP)	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing: ESC anticipates reaching agreement with SZC Co. (and other MTF members) on the technical CPMMP content but not until after the DCO decision
MC5	Cumulative Impacts – The assessment conclusions from a coastal geomorphology during construction and operation are agreed	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
2. Development Consent Order				
MC7	Schedule 2: Draft Requirement 7A: Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - ESC will be writing to SZC Co. on this matter.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
MC8	Schedule 2: Draft Requirement 12B: Main Development Site – Coastal Defences	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - ESC will be writing to SZC Co. on this matter.
MC9	Part 6: Harbour Powers	Defer to MMO	Defer to MMO	Discussions ongoing - ESC will be writing to SZC Co. on this matter.
MC10	Schedule 2: Draft Requirements: Other Requirements proposed pending agreement on jurisdiction between mean low water and mean high water spring tidal marks (see Other Matters)	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - ESC will be writing to SZC Co. on this matter.
MC11	Part 6A: Deemed Marine Licence and Conditions	Defer to MMO	Defer to MMO	Discussions ongoing - ESC will be writing to SZC Co. on this matter.
MC12	CPMMP	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - ESC will be writing to SZC Co. on this matter.
3. Section 106 Agreement				
MC13	Marine Technical Forum – role and terms of reference	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - MTF ToR to be reviewed by all members prior to signing the deed of obligation.
MC14	Coastal contribution to support ESC analysis of monitoring data Thorpeness – Sizewell	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Need to discuss how this is linked into the CPMMP and potential contingency funding.

11 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – NOISE AND VIBRATION

11.1.1 Noise and vibration has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [\[APP-202\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)
- Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [\[APP-354\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-182\]](#)
- Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [\[APP-384\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-183\]](#)
- Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [\[APP-415\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 5 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-184\]](#)
- Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [\[APP-451\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-185\]](#)
- Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [\[APP-484\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-186\]](#)
- Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [\[APP-515\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-187\]](#)
- Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [\[APP-545\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-188\]](#)

11.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

11.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to noise and vibration is detailed in **Table 11.1**. This section is supported by SZC Co.'s responses to the questions raised by ESC contained in **Appendix 11A** and an updated **Noise Mitigation Scheme**, which is provided in Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A).

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- 11.1.4 East Suffolk Council's (ESC) and Suffolk County Council's (SCC) current positions on noise and vibration matters are set out in **Table 11.1** as either "agreed" or "under discussion".
- 11.1.5 Explanatory notes explaining the Councils' current positions and how they were reached are contained in the "notes" column.
- 11.1.6 As the Local Planning Authority, ESC has provided comments on the matters relating to noise and vibration from construction and operation of the proposed developments, including rail noise associated with construction activity. As the Highways Authority, SCC is the formal consultee in relation to traffic noise and vibration matters associated with the proposed development(s).
- 11.1.7 However, ESC has so far issued comments in relation to traffic noise in support of SCC where relevant matters have arisen. These comments were based on an initial review of road traffic noise and vibration, which was not undertaken in as much detail as other parts of the scheme.
- 11.1.8 SCC has recently formally appointed Adrian James Acoustics (AJA) to provide technical guidance on road traffic noise and vibration, extending AJA's existing appointment with ESC. AJA is currently conducting a more in-depth review of the road traffic noise and vibration assessments submitted by SZC Co. Ltd. SCC has therefore provided initial comments on matters related to traffic noise in advance of the full review of traffic noise assessments being completed.

Table 11.1 Position of the Parties – Noise and Vibration

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
Environmental Statement				
Main Development Site				
NV1	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The prediction methodology for MDS construction/ reinstatement noise is appropriate. The noise prediction method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 2, Appendix 11B of the ES [APP-204], updated in Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181].</p> <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to Rfls 1, 2 and 4 in Appendix 11A.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	<p>(i) ESC queried if/how the BLF had been modelled (RFI 1). The Applicant clarified this, and ESC are satisfied.</p> <p>(ii) ESC queried how night-time construction noise events (L_{AFmax}) were modelled (RFI 2). The Applicant clarified this, and ESC are satisfied.</p> <p>(iii) ESC queried if experiences at HPC were used to validate noise modelling for SZC (RFI 4). The applicant stated this was not possible due to the format that noise monitoring data at HPC was recorded. ESC notes this.</p>
NV2	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The assessment criteria for MDS construction/ reinstatement noise are appropriate. The criteria are described in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], with further information in SZC Co.'s response to Rfl 9 in Appendix 11A.</p> <p>As set out in SZC Co.'s response to Rfl 9 in Appendix 11A, and in Appendix E to that document, the separation of SOAEL from EIA significance is considered to be the appropriate implementation and interpretation of planning policy and the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>The tests against LOAEL and SOAEL form one</p>	Under discussion	Under discussion	<p>(i) ESC accept that it is sometimes appropriate and justified to define EIA significance separately from SOAEL, but also believe that where this happens the thresholds for each must reflect the most applicable guidance, and that the relationship between the two adequately protects residents from adverse noise effects, whilst also achieving the policy aims of NPS EN-1.</p> <p>(ii) The thresholds for SOAEL and EIA significance are not consistent with those discussed during pre-application consultations between The Applicant and ESC. ESC believe that lower thresholds would be appropriate. ESC requested clarification of this (RFI 9).</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	element of the noise and vibration assessment presented in the DCO, together with a second set of assessments identifying significant adverse effects in the context of the EIA Regulations. This is best practice and consistent with up-to-date guidance. It recognises that impacts can arise from a change in noise but that it is only when noise reaches a defined level that policy requires that level of exposure to be avoided.			
NV3	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The assessment methodology for MDS construction/ reinstatement noise is appropriate. The noise assessment method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 2, Appendix 11B of the ES [APP-204], updated in Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181].</p> <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 3 in Appendix 11A.</p> <p>The assessment considers both the policy tests in the form of LOAEL and SOAEL and the identification of significant adverse effects in the context of the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>The adoption of the SOAEL as a distinct threshold above the threshold of EIA significance does not have a material effect on the noise assessment in terms of the requirements of the EIA Regulations, relative to the assessment that had been</p>	Under discussion	Under discussion	<p>(i) ESC questioned the classification of impacts for different receptor types (RFI 3). The Applicant clarified this, and ESC are satisfied.</p> <p>(ii) The Councils cannot agree this specific matter until all disagreements regarding assessment criteria are resolved.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	previously discussed with the local planning authorities.			
NV4	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: The proposed mitigation for MDS construction/reinstatement is appropriate. The noise mitigation measures are described in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 2, Appendix 11B of the ES [APP-204], updated in Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181].</p> <p>The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation, and the provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.</p>	Under discussion	Under discussion	(i) The Councils cannot agree this specific matter until all disagreements regarding assessment criteria are resolved.
NV5	<p>Noise – Operation – Predictions: The prediction methodology for operational noise is appropriate. The operational noise prediction method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 2, Appendix 11C of the ES [APP-205] with further information in SZC Co.'s response to RfI X2 in Appendix 11A.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	(i) ESC queried whether the source data was likely to be representative. The Applicant provided additional information regarding the reference power station(s) (RfI X2), and ESC are satisfied with this.
NV6	<p>Noise – Operation – Criteria: The operational noise assessment criteria for the MDS are appropriate. The operational noise criteria are described in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], with further information in SZC Co.'s responses to RfIs 5, 6 and 10 in Appendix 11A.</p>	Under discussion	Under discussion	<p>(i) ESC queried the derivation of the magnitude of impacts (RfI 5). The Applicant provided additional information, and ESC are satisfied this is appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) The derivation of the LOAEL and SOAEL thresholds for night-time operational noise (RfI 6, RfI 10) remains under discussion.</p> <p>(iii) ESC agrees that British Standard 4142: 2014+A1: 2019 provides the most appropriate methodology for</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>The criteria adopted for operational noise from the MDS follows British Standard 4142: 2014+A1: 2019 including full consideration of relevant contextual matters, as required by the standard.</p> <p>Section 11 of BS4142: 2014+A1: 2019, which relates to the assessment of impacts, is not definitive or prescriptive; the three contextual considerations it suggests are examples of matters that may be relevant, and other factors may also be relevant (hence use of 'including the following' in the text of the standard), and the examples cited in the standard are not definitive or prescriptive in their application (hence the use of 'might be').</p> <p>An external noise threshold of 40dB L_{night} is considered by the World Health Organisation to provide sufficient protection to the most vulnerable groups in society, and it follows that there is negligible prospect of an adverse effect below this level, i.e. it is equivalent to the LOAEL.</p> <p>SZC Co. considers the 40dB L_{night} threshold to be a relevant contextual consideration in the context of a BS4142 assessment. Where operational noise from the MDS is lower than this level, no significant adverse effect is likely.</p>			<p>assessing noise produced by the operational power station, and that this requires consideration of context.</p> <p>One such contextual consideration is that where background <u>and</u> rating levels are low, an absolute noise threshold might be appropriate (Section 11 of BS 4142). This indicates that this would apply where both background and rating levels are low. The Applicant seems to have applied this guidance based only on low background sound levels, which ESC consider might not be appropriate.</p> <p>Furthermore, ESC does not believe the threshold of 40 dB L_{night} is appropriate for this situation. The WHO Night Noise Guidelines provide guidance for assessing noise effects on sleep but are mostly based on research into the effects of transportation noise, which tends to differ in character to operational power station noise.</p> <p>Instead, ESC believes that a rating level limit (in accordance with BS 4142) of 35 dB L_{Ar} should be adopted where it is appropriate to consider absolute noise levels as part of the context. A rating level limit means that the characteristics of the sound must be considered and also reflects guidance from the Association of Noise Consultants contained in their technical note on BS 4142 (March 2020) which suggests 35 dB $L_{Ar, Tr}$ as the threshold for 'low' rating levels.</p> <p>The Applicant has already adopted the preferred threshold of 35 dB L_{Ar} for the MDS substation and for plant</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	A lower threshold of 35dB L _{Ar,15mins} was adopted as a design target for items of mechanical and electrical plant other than the power station itself, as it was considered prudent to target best practice, quieter equipment, where it was reasonably practical to do so.			<p>equipment serving the Park and Ride sites. ESC sees no reason why this limit should not also be adopted instead of 40 dB L_{night} for operational power station noise.</p> <p>The Applicant has indicated during discussions (RFI 6) that it might not be possible to target a lower threshold of 35 dB L_{Ar} because of other health and safety constraints. If this is part of the justification for the 40 dB L_{night} threshold then it is important that this is clearly stated so the assessment results can be considered in context.</p>
NV7	Noise – Operation – Assessment: The operational noise assessment methodology is appropriate. The operational noise assessment method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 2, Appendix 11C of the ES [APP-205]. Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to RfIs 7 and X1 in Appendix 11A.	Under discussion	Under discussion	<p>(i) ESC queried how low frequency noise from the electrical substation was assessed (RFI 7). The applicant provided clarification and ESC have accepted this.</p> <p>(ii) ESC queried whether the assessment appropriately considers the acoustic characteristics of operational noise. The Applicant has provided additional information (RFI X1) and ESC are satisfied with this.</p> <p>(iii) The Councils cannot agree this specific matter until all disagreements regarding criteria are resolved.</p>
NV8	Noise – Operation – Mitigation: The proposed operational noise mitigation is appropriate. The noise mitigation measures are described in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 2, Appendix 11C of the ES [APP-205]. The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply. Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 6 in Appendix 11A.	Under discussion	Under discussion	<p>(i) ESC queried why different operational absolute noise criteria were adopted for the power station and electrical substation (RFI 6). The Applicant stated in response that it is generally less straightforward to control operational power station noise than it is substation noise, due to the necessary balance with health and safety considerations. This indicates that the current power station design already includes the best practicable noise control mitigation, although this is not clearly stated. If this the case, then a definitive statement would help ESC understand the position.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
NV9	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement - Predictions: The prediction methodology for MDS construction/ reinstatement vibration is appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration prediction method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] with further information in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 21 in Appendix 11A.	Agreed	Agreed	(i) ESC queried parts of the vibration prediction methodology (RFI 21). The Applicant clarified these points and ESC are satisfied.
NV10	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement - Criteria: The assessment criteria for MDS construction/ reinstatement vibration are appropriate. The criteria are described in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171] .	Agreed	Agreed	(i) The construction vibration thresholds in the ES are higher than those previously discussed during pre-application consultations between The Applicant and ESC. However, these are consistent with standardised methodology and are therefore accepted.
NV11	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The assessment methodology for MDS construction/ reinstatement vibration is appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration assessment method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] with further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 22a in Appendix 11A.	Agreed	Agreed	(i) ESC queried the duration of construction activities included in the vibration assessment (RFI 22a). The Applicant has provided some information regarding this, which is noted by ESC.
NV12	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement - Mitigation: The mitigation measures proposed to address MDS construction vibration are appropriate. The vibration mitigation measures are described in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and the CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation. Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 22b in Appendix 11A.	Agreed	Agreed	(i) ESC questioned which mitigation measures had been considered where predicted vibration levels would fall between LOAEL and SOAEL (RFI 22b). The Applicant referred ESC to Table 3.1 of the Code of Construction Practice which sets out general good practice measures but no measures specific to vibration. This is noted by ESC.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
NV13	Vibration – Operation: There is no potential for significant operational vibration effects and therefore no detailed assessment has been undertaken.	Agreed	Agreed	(i) ESC understands that operational vibration was scoped out of the assessment and are satisfied with this approach as it is agreed that adverse operational vibration effects are very unlikely.
NV14	Tranquillity – Construction/Reinstatement - Predictions: The construction/reinstatement noise prediction methodology for A&R receptors is appropriate. The tranquillity prediction method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270].	Agreed	Agreed	(i) The prediction methodology for A&R receptors is the same as for human receptors and is agreed.
NV15	Tranquillity – Construction/Reinstatement - Criteria: The construction/reinstatement criteria for A&R receptors are appropriate. The tranquillity criteria are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270].	Agreed	Agreed	(i) MDS construction noise impact on A&R receptors was assessed against the criteria in the Natural Tranquillity method. This is a relatively new method which has not been validated by ESC, but ESC agrees with the principal of assessing impacts on tranquillity in terms of the balance between natural and man-made sound, and in the absence of alternative, specialist assessment criteria consider this approach appropriate.
NV16	Tranquillity – Construction/Reinstatement - Assessment: The construction/reinstatement noise assessment methodology for A&R receptors is appropriate. The tranquillity assessment method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270].	Agreed	Agreed	(i) MDS construction noise impact on A&R receptors was assessed against the criteria in the Natural Tranquillity method. This is a relatively new method which has not been validated by ESC, but the assessment outputs reflect what ESC would typically expect in this scenario and in the absence of alternative, specialist assessment methodology consider this approach appropriate.
NV17	Tranquillity – Construction/Reinstatement - Mitigation: The mitigation measures proposed to protect A&R receptors from MDS construction/reinstatement noise are appropriate. Mitigation for tranquillity is set out in Volume 2,	Agreed	Agreed	(i) ESC queried what specific mitigation is proposed to protect A&R receptors from MDS construction noise (RFI 23). The Applicant referred ESC to Table 3.1 of the Code of Construction Practice which sets out general good practice measures for construction noise but there are no

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270] with further information provided in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 23 in Appendix 11A. The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation.			specific mitigation measures or mechanisms identified. This is noted by ESC.
NV18	Tranquillity – Operation - Predictions: The operational noise prediction methodology for A&R receptors is appropriate. The tranquillity prediction method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270] .	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) The prediction methodology for A&R receptors is the same as for human receptors and is agreed.
NV19	Tranquillity – Operation - Criteria: The operational noise assessment criteria for A&R receptors are appropriate. The tranquillity criteria are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270] .	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) MDS operational phase noise impact on A&R receptors was assessed against the criteria in the Natural Tranquillity method. This is a relatively new method which has not been validated by ESC, but ESC agrees with the principal of assessing impacts on tranquillity in terms of the balance between natural and man-made sound, and in the absence of alternative, specialist assessment criteria consider this approach appropriate.
NV20	Tranquillity – Operation - Assessment: The operational noise assessment methodology for A&R receptors is appropriate. The tranquillity assessment method is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270] .	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) MDS operational phase noise impact on A&R receptors was assessed against the criteria in the Natural Tranquillity method. This is a relatively new method which has not been validated by ESC, but the assessment outputs reflect what ESC would typically expect in this scenario and in the absence of alternative, specialist assessment methodology consider this approach appropriate.
NV21	Tranquillity – Operation - Mitigation: The mitigation measures proposed to protect A&R receptors from operational noise are appropriate. Mitigation for operational tranquillity is considered	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) ESC queried what specific mitigation is proposed to protect A&R receptors from MDS construction noise (RFI 23), but the same question applies to the operational phase (RFI 24).

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	in Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267] and Volume 2, Appendix 15E of the ES [APP-270].			
NV22	<p>Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Construction - Predictions: The prediction methodology for road traffic noise on existing roads during construction is appropriate. The noise prediction method for construction traffic on existing roads is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11F of the ES [APP-208]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11G of the ES [APP-209]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. • Volume 3, Appendices 2.6.A to 2.6.C of the ES Addendum [AS-204]. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to Rfls 15 and 16 in Appendix 11A.</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) ESC queried how The Applicant had decided which potential effects to report in the ES (RFI 15). The Applicant has provided further explanation on this, and SCC are satisfied.</p> <p>(i) ESC queried why The Applicant had adopted different noise prediction methodologies for daytime and night-time road traffic noise (RFI 16). The Applicant provided an explanation, and SCC are satisfied.</p> <p>(ii) SCC note the policy aim in NPS EN-1 to mitigate adverse effects above LOAEL and to avoid significant adverse effects above SOAEL. This means mitigating noise at source through the implementation of quiet road surfacing, road noise barriers and landscaping as a first option before noise insulation is offered to residents.</p> <p>(iii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>
NV23	<p>Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Construction - Criteria: The criteria for assessing potential increases in road traffic on existing roads during MDS construction are appropriate. The criteria for construction traffic are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171].</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) The assessment criteria for changes in road traffic noise are derived from DMRB. Absolute LOAEL and SOAEL values were also adopted from DMRB. SCC considers the criteria appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
NV24	Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Construction - Assessment: The assessment methodology for assessing potential increases in road traffic on existing roads during MDS construction are appropriate. The noise prediction method for construction traffic on existing roads is set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11F of the ES [APP-208]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11G of the ES [APP-209]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. • Volume 3, Appendices 2.6.A to 2.6.C of the ES Addendum [AS-204]. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) The methodology for assessing changes in road traffic noise is primarily based on DMRB. SCC considers this appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>
NV25	Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Construction - Mitigation: The current mitigation proposals for increases in road traffic on existing roads during construction are appropriate. Mitigation for construction traffic noise is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181] . The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) SCC understands that eligibility for the Noise Mitigation Scheme would be triggered where absolute noise levels on existing roads exceed the SOAEL, provided development-related traffic is a substantial cause of the increase. SCC considers this appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>
NV26	Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Operation - Predictions: The prediction	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) ESC queried how The Applicant had decided which potential effects to report in the ES (RFI 15). The</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>methodology for road traffic noise on existing roads during the operational phase is appropriate. The noise prediction method for operational traffic on existing roads is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11F of the ES [APP-208]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11G of the ES [APP-209]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. • Volume 3, Appendices 2.6.A to 2.6.C of the ES Addendum [AS-204]. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to Rfls 15 and 16 in Appendix 11A.</p>			<p>Applicant has provided further explanation on this, and SCC are satisfied.</p> <p>(ii) ESC queried why The Applicant had adopted different noise prediction methodologies for daytime and night-time road traffic noise (RFI 16). The Applicant provided an explanation, and SCC are satisfied.</p> <p>(ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>
NV27	<p>Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Operation - Criteria: The criteria for assessing potential increases in road traffic noise on existing roads during the operational phase are appropriate. The criteria for operational traffic on existing roads are set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171].</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.
NV28	<p>Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Operation - Assessment: The assessment methodology for assessing potential increases in road traffic noise on existing roads during the operational phase is appropriate. The assessment method for operational traffic noise on existing roads is set out in:</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11F of the ES [APP-208]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11G of the ES [APP-209]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. • Volume 3, Appendices 2.6.A to 2.6.C of the ES Addendum [AS-204]. <p>Changes to road traffic noise levels along existing roads as a result of construction traffic were assessed in line with the guidance in paragraphs 3.15 to 3.17, including Table 3.17, in DMRB LA111. This considers the change in the 'basic noise level', a value defined in the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise.</p> <p>The daytime and night-time traffic noise levels are quantified as $L_{A10,18hrs}$ values and L_{night} values, respectively.</p>			
NV29	<p>Road traffic noise on existing roads - Noise – Operation - Mitigation: The current mitigation proposals for increases in road traffic noise on existing roads during the operational phase are appropriate. The mitigation for operational traffic noise on existing roads is set out in Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202] and Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181].</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) The assessment criteria for changes in road traffic noise are derived from DMRB. Absolute LOAEL and SOAEL values were also adopted from DMRB. SCC considers the criteria appropriate.</p> <p>(i) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p> <p>However, SCC note the policy aim in NPS EN-1 to mitigate adverse effects above LOAEL and to avoid significant adverse effects above SOAEL. This means</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.			mitigating noise at source through the implementation of quiet road surfacing, road noise barriers and landscaping as a first option before noise insulation is offered to residents
NV30	AD Sites - Noise – Construction - Predictions: The prediction methodology for construction noise for the AD Sites is appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The noise prediction method for AD sites is set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Following discussions with The Applicant, ESC considers the construction noise prediction methodology for AD sites appropriate.
NV31	AD Sites - Noise – Construction - Criteria: The assessment criteria for construction noise for AD sites are appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The construction noise criteria for AD sites are set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. • Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171]. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) The thresholds for SOAEL and EIA significance are not consistent with those discussed during pre-application consultations between The Applicant and ESC. ESC believe that lower thresholds would be appropriate. ESC requested clarification of this (RFI 9).

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 9 in Appendix 11A.			
NV32	AD Sites - Noise – Construction - Assessment: The assessment methodology for construction noise for AD Sites are appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The construction noise assessment method for AD sites is set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) ESC cannot agree this specific matter until all disagreements regarding criteria are resolved.
NV33	AD Sites - Noise – Construction - Mitigation: The proposed mitigation for construction for AD Sites is appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The mitigation measures for construction noise for the AD Sites are described in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) ESC is currently in discussion with The Applicant regarding several matters relating to construction noise, and as a result the construction noise mitigation proposals cannot currently be agreed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation, and provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.			
NV34	AD Sites - Noise – Operation - Predictions: The operational noise prediction methodology for AD sites is appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The predictions for operational noise from the AD Sites are described in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Operational noise predictions for the sports facility were based on source data from Sport England guidance relating to AGP pitches. Noise level predictions at human receptors were based on a simple noise propagation calculation. ESC considers this approach appropriate.
NV35	AD Sites - Noise – Operation - Criteria: The operational noise assessment criteria for AD sites are appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The operational noise criteria for AD sites are set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Operational noise criteria for the sports facility are derived from Sport England guidance relating to AGP pitches. ESC considers this to be appropriate.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171]. 			
NV36	<p>AD Sites - Noise – Operation - Assessment: The operational noise assessment methodology for AD sites is appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The operational noise assessment method for AD sites is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. • Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 8 in Appendix 11A.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) ESC queried whether The Applicant had assessed operational noise at the sports facility using the time descriptors referred to in the applicable guidance (RFI 8). The Applicant provided clarification on this, which is noted by ESC.
NV37	<p>AD Sites - Noise – Operation - Mitigation: The mitigation measures proposed to address operational noise at AD sites are appropriate. AD Sites in this context refer to the fen meadow compensation areas and the Alde Valley School sports facilities. The mitigation measures for operational noise for the AD Sites are described in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206]. • Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) The assessment concludes that a 2m noise barrier will be required on the east site boundary to reduce noise impact on human receptors to the east, and that the noise barrier should be lined to reduce impact noise. ESC considers this proportionate, and the mitigation proposals will be appropriate provided this recommendation is secured through Requirement 12A.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Chapter 2.6 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. <p>The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.</p> <p>The specific mitigation recommended for Leiston Leisure Centre is a 2m high acoustic fence, as described in Volume 2, Appendix 11E of the ES [APP-207]. This will be secured by Requirement 12A of the DCO.</p>			
Park and Ride Sites				
NV38	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The construction/reinstatement noise prediction methodology for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The noise prediction method for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. Volume 1, Chapter 4.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-183] for the southern park and ride. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	
NV39	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The construction/reinstatement noise criteria for the park and ride sites are appropriate. The noise criteria for construction/reinstatement noise are set out in:</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) The thresholds for SOAEL and EIA significance are not consistent with those discussed during pre-application consultations between The Applicant and ESC. ESC believe that lower thresholds would be appropriate. ESC requested clarification of this (RFI 9).

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171]. Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. 			
NV40	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The construction/reinstatement noise assessment method for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The noise assessment method for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. Volume 1, Chapter 4.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-183] for the southern park and ride. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) ESC cannot agree this specific matter until all disagreements regarding criteria are resolved.
NV41	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: The mitigation for construction/reinstatement noise for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The mitigation for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] for the northern park and ride. Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] for the southern park and ride. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) ESC is currently in discussion with The Applicant regarding several matters relating to construction noise, and as a result the construction noise mitigation proposals cannot currently be agreed.</p> <p>(ii) ESC query whether Saturday afternoon construction (1300-1900) is essential at the northern P&R site, considering that significant adverse effects are predicted at most receptors during most phases (RFI 25).</p> <p>(iii) The NMS excludes eligibility where exceedance of the threshold does not occur on a consistent basis. ESC</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation, and the provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.			therefore query (RFI 26) how the provisions of the NMS would be used to avoid exceedances of SOAEL on Saturday afternoons, considering that the SOAEL would be exceeded during every phase at most receptors between 1300-1900 on Saturdays.
NV42	Noise – Operations – Predictions: The operational noise prediction methodology for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The prediction method for operational noise is set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. • Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. • Volume 1, Chapter 4.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-183] for the southern park and ride. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	
NV43	Noise – Operations – Criteria: The operational noise criteria for the park and ride sites are appropriate. The criteria for operational noise are set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171]. • Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. • Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) ESC consider that 35 dB L _{Ar} is an appropriate noise limit for night-time operational plant noise from P&R sites, considering local context and the noise sources in this case. However, it is not clear how this would be secured, and ESC have requested clarification of this from The Applicant (RFI 27).
NV44	Noise – Operations – Assessment: The operational noise assessment methodology for	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) ESC cannot agree on the assessment outcomes while there is outstanding disagreement regarding criteria.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>the park and ride sites is appropriate. The operational noise assessment method is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. • Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. • Volume 1, Chapter 4.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-183] for the southern park and ride. 			<p>(ii) ESC has outstanding queries regarding the baseline survey measurement positions (RFI 28), and this is under discussion.</p> <p>(iii) ESC does not consider Receptor C at the Southern Park and Ride site to be representative of the nearest property in the settlement of Marlesford to the east and have requested clarification on this matter (RFI 29). There is a closer property on Ford Road in Marlesford, which is further from the A12 and is therefore likely to be more at risk of adverse noise effects.</p>
NV45	<p>Noise – Operations – Mitigation: The mitigation for operational noise for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The mitigation for operational noise is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] for the northern park and ride. • Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] for the southern park and ride. <p>The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) Exceedance of LOAEL is identified at one receptor and in response The Applicant states that “this will be mitigated and minimised through the measures described in section 4.5 of this chapter”. However, Section 4.5 does not prescribe any operational noise mitigation other than the earth bunds, which it is understood are included in the predictions. ESC has requested that The Applicant clarify what mitigation would be applied (RFI 30).</p>
NV46	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The construction/reinstatement vibration prediction methodology for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration prediction method is set out in:</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. • Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. • Volume 1, Chapter 4.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-183] for the southern park and ride. <p>Further information is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 21 in Appendix 11A.</p>			
NV47	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The construction/reinstatement vibration assessment criteria for the park and ride sites are appropriate. The criteria are described in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171]. • Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. • Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.
NV48	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The construction/reinstatement vibration assessment method for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The noise assessment method for construction/reinstatement vibration is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] and Volume 3, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-355] for the northern park and ride. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] and Volume 4, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-385] for the southern park and ride. Volume 1, Chapter 4.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-183] for the southern park and ride. 			
NV49	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: The mitigation for construction/reinstatement vibration for the park and ride sites is appropriate. The mitigation for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 3, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-354] for the northern park and ride. Volume 4, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-384] for the southern park and ride. <p>The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.
NV50	<p>Vibration – Operation: There is no potential for significant operational vibration effects and therefore no detailed assessment has been undertaken.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.
New Roads and Highways Improvements				
NV51	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The construction noise prediction methodology for new roads and highway improvements is appropriate. The prediction method for construction/reinstatement noise for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Construction noise predictions for new roads and highway improvements were completed in accordance with BS 5228 Part 1. ESC considers this appropriate methodology.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] and Volume 5, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-416] for the two village bypass. • Volume 1, Chapter 5.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-184] and Volume 3, Appendices 5.3.A to 5.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-245] for the two village bypass. • Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] and Volume 6, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-452] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 1, Chapter 6.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-185] and Volume 3, Appendices 6.3.A to 6.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-249] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] and Volume 7, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-485] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. • Volume 1, Chapter 7.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-186] and Volume 3, Appendices 7.3.A to 7.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-251] for the Sizewell link road. 			
NV52	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The construction/reinstatement noise criteria for new roads and highway improvements are appropriate. The construction/reinstatement noise criteria for new roads and highway improvements are set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Construction noise from new roads and highway improvements are assessed against criteria derived from BS 5228 Part 1. ESC notes that alternative, more stringent criteria now exist in DMRB LA111, but the ES was submitted before this guidance was published.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. • Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. <p>The approach to LOAEL and SOAEL for construction/reinstatement noise for the new roads and highway improvements are consistent with the rest of the SZC project.</p>			
NV53	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The construction/reinstatement noise assessment methodology for new roads and highway improvements is appropriate. The assessment method for construction/reinstatement noise for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] and Volume 5, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-416] for the two village bypass. • Volume 1, Chapter 5.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-184] and Volume 3, Appendices 5.3.A to 5.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-245] for the two village bypass. • Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] and Volume 6, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-452] for the Sizewell link road. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Construction noise from new roads and highway improvements are assessed in accordance with the methodology in BS 5228 Part 1.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1, Chapter 6.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-185] and Volume 3, Appendices 6.3.A to 6.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-249] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] and Volume 7, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-485] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. • Volume 1, Chapter 7.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-186] and Volume 3, Appendices 7.3.A to 7.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-251] for the Sizewell link road. 			
NV54	<p>Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: The proposed mitigation measures during construction of new roads and highway improvements are appropriate. The mitigation for construction/reinstatement noise for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. • Volume 1, Chapter 5.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-184] for the two village bypass. • Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 1, Chapter 6.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-185] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) The mitigation strategy for construction of new roads and highway improvements includes good practice mitigation recommendations from BS 5228 Part 1 (for noise). Eligibility for the Noise Mitigation Scheme would be triggered at the defined thresholds, which are in line with the SOAEL.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Chapter 7.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-186] for the Sizewell link road. <p>The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation, and the provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.</p>			
NV55	<p>Noise – Operation – Predictions: The operational noise prediction methodology for new roads and highway improvements is appropriate. The prediction method for operational noise for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] and Volume 5, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-416] for the two village bypass. Volume 1, Chapter 5.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-184] and Volume 3, Appendices 5.3.A to 5.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-245] for the two village bypass. Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] and Volume 6, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-452] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 1, Chapter 6.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-185] and Volume 3, Appendices 6.3.A to 6.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-249] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] and Volume 7, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-485] for the Sizewell link road. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) ESC raised two queries with The Applicant regarding the road traffic noise prediction methodology (RFI 15, RFI 16). The Applicant provided clarification and ESC are now satisfied that the prediction methodology is appropriate.</p> <p>(iii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>485] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Chapter 7.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-186] and Volume 3, Appendices 7.3.A to 7.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-251] for the Sizewell link road. 			
NV56	<p>Noise – Operation – Criteria: The criteria for assessing operational road traffic noise from new roads and highway improvements are appropriate. The criteria for operational noise for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) The assessment criteria for changes in road traffic noise are derived from DMRB. Absolute LOAEL and SOAEL values were also adopted from DMRB. SCC considers the criteria appropriate.</p> <p>(ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>
NV57	<p>Noise – Operation – Assessment: The operational noise assessment methodology for new roads and highway improvements is appropriate. The assessment method for operational noise for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] and Volume 5, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-416] for the two village bypass. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) Exceedances of SOAEL are predicted during “peak construction” although effects are described as “short-term”. ESC queried the duration of these effects (RFI 18, RFI 19). The Applicant has confirmed that this period would be approximately seven months. The applicant also confirmed that daily peaks would not occur every day during this period but the number of typical days per week could not currently be confirmed.</p> <p>SCC consider that this would trigger the policy requirement to “mitigate and minimise” adverse effects</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Chapter 5.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-184] and Volume 3, Appendices 5.3.A to 5.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-245] for the two village bypass. Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] and Volume 6, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-452] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 1, Chapter 6.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-185] and Volume 3, Appendices 6.3.A to 6.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-249] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] and Volume 7, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-485] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. Volume 1, Chapter 7.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-186] and Volume 3, Appendices 7.3.A to 7.3.C of the ES Addendum [AS-251] for the Sizewell link road. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to Rfls 18 and 19 in Appendix 11A.</p>			<p>and “avoid” significant adverse effects and expect that eligibility for the Noise Mitigation Scheme would be triggered if avoidance of the SOAEL cannot be achieved through engineering solutions.</p> <p>(ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>
NV58	<p>Noise – Operation – Mitigation: The current mitigation proposals for new roads and highway improvements are appropriate. The mitigation for operational noise for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) ESC queried how the NPS EN-1 policy requirement to exhaust all forms of mitigation before considering noise insulation had been met in relation to operational noise from new roads and highway infrastructure (RFI 17). The Applicant clarified that engineering mitigation had been considered where necessary, but that the design of new roads would be refined during the detailed road design.</p> <p>However, SCC note the policy aim in NPS EN-1 to mitigate adverse effects above LOAEL and to avoid</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1, Chapter 5.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-184] for the two village bypass. • Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 1, Chapter 6.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-185] for the Sizewell link road. • Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. • Volume 1, Chapter 7.3 of the ES Addendum [AS-186] for the Sizewell link road. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to Rfl 17 in Appendix 11A.</p> <p>The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.</p>			<p>significant adverse effects above SOAEL. This means mitigating noise at source through the implementation of quiet road surfacing, road noise barriers and landscaping as a first option before noise insulation is offered to residents.</p> <p>SCC requires that The Applicant makes a commitment to mitigate noise through engineering as a primary stage in its Draft Noise Mitigation Strategy, as well as clarify the process for monitoring and mitigating road noise.</p> <p>(ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.</p>
NV59	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The vibration prediction methodology for new roads and highway improvements is appropriate. The prediction method for construction/reinstatement vibration for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. • Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	<p>(i) ESC queried parts of the vibration prediction methodology (RFI 21). The Applicant clarified these points and ESC are satisfied.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 21 in Appendix 11A.</p>			
NV60	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The vibration assessment criteria for new roads and highway improvements are appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration criteria for new roads and highway improvements are set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) The construction vibration thresholds in the ES are higher than those previously discussed during pre-application consultations between The Applicant and ESC. However, these are consistent with standardised methodology and are therefore accepted.
NV61	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The vibration assessment methodology for new roads and highway improvements are appropriate. The assessment method for construction/reinstatement vibration for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) ESC queried the duration of construction activities included in the vibration assessment (RFI 22a). The Applicant has provided some information regarding this, which is noted by ESC.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 22a in Appendix 11A.</p>			
NV62	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: The mitigation measures proposed to address construction vibration relating to new roads and highway improvements are appropriate. The mitigation for construction/reinstatement vibration for new roads and highway improvements is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 5, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-415] for the two village bypass. Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451] for the Sizewell link road. Volume 7, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-484] for Yoxford roundabout and other highways improvements. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 22b in Appendix 11A.</p> <p>The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation.</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) ESC questioned which mitigation measures had been considered where predicted vibration levels would fall between LOAEL and SOAEL (RFI 22b). The Applicant referred ESC to Table 3.1 of the Code of Construction Practice which sets out general good practice measures but no measures specific to vibration. This is noted by ESC.
NV63	<p>Vibration – Operation: There is no potential for significant operational vibration effects and therefore no detailed assessment has been</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) SCC understands that operational vibration was scoped out of the assessment and are satisfied with this approach

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	undertaken. This is noted in paragraph 4.55 in Volume 1, Appendix 6G, Annex 6G.1 of the ES [APP-171].			as it is agreed at this stage that adverse operational vibration effects are relatively unlikely. (ii) Road traffic noise and vibration assessments are currently under review, as per the introductory note.
Freight Management Facility				
NV64	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The construction/reinstatement noise prediction methodology for the freight management facility is appropriate. The noise prediction method for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515].	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.
NV65	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The construction/reinstatement noise criteria for the freight management facility are appropriate. The noise criteria for construction/reinstatement noise are set out in Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], and Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515].	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) The thresholds for SOAEL and EIA significance are not consistent with those discussed during pre-application consultations between The Applicant and ESC. ESC believe that lower thresholds would be appropriate. ESC requested clarification of this (RFI 9).
NV66	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The construction/reinstatement noise assessment methodology for the freight management facility is appropriate. The noise assessment method for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515].	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) Paragraph 4.3.31 of Vol 8 Ch 4 states that “no baseline monitoring was undertaken as part of the assessment since the existing noise climate would not influence the outcome of the assessment” because noise and vibration are considered against absolute values. However, ESC notes that both the BS 5228-1 ABC Method (Table 4.2) and the adopted LOAEL threshold (paragraph 4.3.28) are set according to baseline ambient noise levels. ESC has requested that The Applicant explains the reasoning for this (RFI 31).
NV67	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: No specific noise mitigation measures	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(ii) Paragraph of 4.6.10 of Vol 8 Ch 4 states that “the LOAEL, which for construction noise is taken to be equal

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>are considered necessary during the construction/reinstatement of the freight management facility, as set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515].</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation, if required, and the provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.</p>			<p>to the existing baseline sound levels, may be exceeded at the closest receptor locations for at least some of the time during the construction works” and that this would be mitigated and minimised through implementing the CoCP. However, ESC notes that the adopted LOAEL threshold (paragraph 4.3.28) is set according to baseline ambient noise levels, which have not been measured. ESC has requested that The Applicant provides clarification of the specific mitigation that would be used (RFI 32)</p>
NV68	<p>Noise – Operations – Predictions: The operational noise prediction methodology for the freight management facility is appropriate. The operational noise prediction method is set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515].</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) There are no predictions of noise from mechanical plant serving the operational FMF. ESC has requested that The Applicant clarifies why this is (RFI 33), considering that the site would contain amenity and office buildings which would normally be served by some mechanical plant.</p> <p>(ii) The operational noise assessment does not include predictions of potential increases in road traffic noise on Felixstowe Road, which would be the only access route for vehicles attending the FMF. SCC have requested clarification of why this was not assessed (RFI 34).</p>
NV69	<p>Noise – Operations – Criteria: The operational noise criteria for the freight management facility are appropriate. The operational noise criteria are set out in Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], and Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515].</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) There are no criteria for noise from mechanical plant serving the operational FMF. ESC have requested that The Applicant clarifies why this is (RFI 33), considering that the site would contain amenity and office buildings which would normally be served by some mechanical plant.</p> <p>(ii) The operational noise assessment does not propose criteria for assessing the impact of potential increases in road traffic noise on Felixstowe Road, which would be the only access route for vehicles attending the FMF. SCC</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
				have requested clarification of why this was not assessed (RFI 34).
NV70	Noise – Operations – Assessment: The operational noise assessment methodology for the freight management facility is appropriate. The operational noise assessment method is set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515] .	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) Noise from mechanical plant serving the operational FMF is not assessed. ESC have requested that The Applicant clarifies why this is (RFI 33), considering that the site would contain amenity and office buildings which would normally be served by some mechanical plant.</p> <p>(ii) The operational noise assessment does not include potential increases in road traffic noise on Felixstowe Road, which would be the only access route for vehicles attending the FMF. SCC have requested clarification of why this was not assessed (RFI 34).</p>
NV71	Noise – Operations – Mitigation: No specific mitigation measures are considered necessary for operational noise from the freight management facility, as set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515] .	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) Mitigation for noise from mechanical plant serving the operational FMF is not addressed. ESC request that The Applicant clarifies why this is (RFI 33), considering that the site would contain amenity and office buildings.</p> <p>(ii) The operational noise assessment does not consider what mitigation might be required due to potential increases in road traffic noise on Felixstowe Road, which would be the only access route for vehicles. SCC have requested clarification of why this was not assessed (RFI 34).</p>
NV72	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The construction/reinstatement vibration prediction methodology for the freight management facility is appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration prediction method is set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515] .	Agreed.	Agreed.	
NV73	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The construction/reinstatement vibration	Agreed.	Agreed.	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	criteria for the freight management facility are appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration criteria are set out in Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171] , and Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515] .			
NV74	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The construction/reinstatement vibration assessment methodology for the freight management facility is appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration assessment method is set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515] .	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.
NV75	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: No specific vibration mitigation measures are considered necessary during the construction/reinstatement of the freight management facility, as set out in Volume 8, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-515] . Notwithstanding this, the CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation, if required.	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.
NV76	Vibration – Operation – Predictions: There is no potential for significant operational vibration effects and therefore no detailed assessment has been undertaken.	Agreed.	Agreed.	Agreed.
Rail				
NV77	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The noise prediction methodology for rail construction/reinstatement is appropriate. The prediction method for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Noise from rail construction activity was predicted using SoundPLAN modelling software. ESC considers this and the underlying assumptions appropriate.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] and in Volume 9, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-546].			
NV78	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The rail construction/reinstatement noise criteria are appropriate. The criteria for construction/reinstatement noise are set out in Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], and Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545].	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Rail construction noise is assessed against criteria derived from BS 5228 Part 1. ESC considers this appropriate.
NV79	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The rail construction/reinstatement noise assessment methodology is appropriate. The assessment method for construction/reinstatement noise is set out in Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] and Volume 9, Appendix 4A of the ES [APP-546].	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Rail construction noise is assessed in accordance with the methodology in BS 5228 Part 1. ESC considers this appropriate.
NV80	Noise – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: The rail construction/reinstatement noise mitigation measures proposed are appropriate. The mitigation for construction/reinstatement noise for rail is set out in Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545]. The CoCP [AS-273] provides the mechanism to apply mitigation, and the provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) The mitigation strategy for rail construction noise includes good practice mitigation recommendations as set out in the Code of Construction Practice. Eligibility for the Noise Mitigation Scheme would be triggered at the defined thresholds, which are in line with the SOAEL.
NV81	Noise – Operation – Predictions: The prediction methodology for operational rail noise is appropriate. The prediction method for operational rail noise is set out in:	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) The most recent rail noise predictions are based on extensive survey work carried out by The Applicant to refine their earlier predictions. ESC welcomes the comprehensiveness of this approach.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] Volume 9, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-546] Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188] Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A to 9.3.E [AS-257] and [AS-258]. 			
NV82	<p>Noise – Operation – Criteria: The criteria for assessing operational rail noise are appropriate. The criteria for operational rail noise are set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171] Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] Volume 9, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-546] Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188] Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A to 9.3.E [AS-257] and [AS-258]. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Average and maximum operational rail noise criteria were derived from WHO guidance, and ESC considers the adopted LOAEL and SOAEL values to be appropriate.
NV83	<p>Noise – Operation – Assessment: The assessment methodology for operational rail noise is appropriate. The assessment methodology for operational rail noise is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] Volume 9, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-546] Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188] Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A to 9.3.E [AS-257] and [AS-258]. 	Agreed.	Agreed.	<p>(i) ESC queried whether DMRB LA111 and the Noise Insulation Regulations are an appropriate basis for rail noise assessment (RFI 12). The Applicant has explained how this has informed the assessment methodology, and ESC are satisfied with this.</p> <p>(ii) ESC queried whether The Applicant had provided reasonable justification for separating LOAEL and SOAEL thresholds from the EIA significance threshold (RFI 13). The Applicant has provided further explanation and ESC are satisfied that separating significance in this way is justifiable in some cases, but only if the overarching approach to assessment and mitigation meets the policy</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to Rfls 12 and 13 in Appendix 11A.			aims of NPS EN-1 and provides adequate protection to receptors.
NV84	<p>Noise – Operation – Mitigation: The mitigation proposals to address operational rail noise are appropriate.</p> <p>The mitigation proposals for operational rail noise are set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] • Volume 9, Appendix 4B of the ES [APP-546] • Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188] • Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A to 9.3.E [AS-257] and [AS-258]. <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to Rfls 11 and 14 in Appendix 11A.</p> <p>Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.E [AS-258] is the draft Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply.</p> <p>The updates to the Noise Mitigation Scheme are described in NV94 in this document.</p> <p>The combination of the draft Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy and the Noise Mitigation Scheme provide</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	<p>(i) ESC has queried whether the current mitigation proposals for operational rail noise meet the policy aims of NPS EN-1 (RFI 11). The applicant has prepared an updated draft Noise Mitigation Scheme with lower thresholds for eligibility in relation to operational rail noise.</p> <p>(ii) ESC has queried whether the current mitigation proposals meet the policy aim of NPS EN-1 to exhaust all other forms of mitigation before noise insulation is considered and requested that The Applicant carry out further work to consider the potential for additional mitigation measures to reduce rail noise levels at receptors (RFI 14). The Applicant has agreed to undertake this exercise and ESC are currently waiting to receive the final outcome. We understand that The Applicant intends to confirm this in the SOCG which is being prepared with Network Rail.</p> <p>(iii) ESC also has significant concerns that the full package of engineering mitigation that is proposed (as part of the Rail Noise Mitigation Scheme) and assumed in the assessment could actually be delivered in collaboration with Network Rail and consider that there will need to be a commitment to all of these mitigation measures in order for the conclusions of the assessment to be representative.</p> <p>(iv) SCC fully supports ESCs position and concerns on this.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>for mitigation for all elements of the noise propagation path:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At source by seeking to use the quietest trains, run at the lowest practical speeds, on the most appropriate track, with infrastructure that avoids the need to stop the trains. Between source and receptor through the use of track support systems that reduce ground-borne vibration levels, and with acoustic barriers that remain under discussion with Network Rail. <p>At receptor through the provision of a scheme to improve the sound insulation at the worst-affected properties.</p>			
NV85	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Predictions: The vibration prediction methodology for rail construction/reinstatement is appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration prediction methodology for rail is set out in Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545]. Information on ground-borne noise is also found in Volume 1, Appendix 6G, Annex 6G.2 of the ES [APP-171].</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) ESC queried parts of the vibration prediction methodology (RFI 21). The Applicant clarified these points and ESC are satisfied.
NV86	<p>Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Criteria: The vibration assessment criteria for rail construction/reinstatement are appropriate. The criteria for construction/reinstatement vibration are set out in Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171], and Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545].</p>	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) The construction vibration thresholds in the ES are higher than those previously discussed during pre-application consultations between The Applicant and ESC. However, these are consistent with standardised methodology and are therefore accepted.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
NV87	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Assessment: The vibration assessment methodology for rail construction/reinstatement is appropriate. The construction/reinstatement vibration prediction methodology for rail is set out in Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] .	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) Some moderate and major adverse effects were predicted during “relatively short periods” of vibratory compaction and were classified as not significant due to the short duration. ESC considers this reasonable, though if the effects would occur for longer once construction proposals are fully developed then The Applicant should revisit this assessment of effects.
NV88	Vibration – Construction/Reinstatement – Mitigation: The mitigation proposals to address rail construction vibration are appropriate. The mitigation for construction/reinstatement vibration for rail is set out in Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545] with further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s response to RfI 20 in Appendix 11A.	Agreed.	Agreed.	(i) A high magnitude vibration impact is expected to occur where receptors are within 5m of road construction. The Applicant stated that the provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme would be applied to avoid such exceedances. ESC queried whether this was correct (RFI 20), and The Applicant confirmed that the reference should have been to the Code of Construction Practice. ESC notes that the CoCP sets out general good practice measures but no measures specific to vibration.
NV89	Vibration – Operation – Predictions: The vibration prediction methodology for operational rail, including ground-borne noise, is appropriate. The vibration prediction methodology for operational rail is set out in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545]. • Volume 1, Appendix 6G, Annex 6G.2 of the ES [APP-171] on ground-borne noise. • Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188]. • Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A [AS-257]. • Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.E [AS-258]. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) The operational rail vibration assessment is currently under review by ESC.
NV90	Vibration – Operation – Criteria: The vibration criteria for operational rail, including ground-borne	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) The operational rail vibration assessment is currently under review by ESC.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>noise, are appropriate. The vibration criteria for operational rail are set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 1, Appendix 6G of the ES [APP-171] including Volume 1, Appendix 6G, Annex 6G.2 of the ES [APP-171] on ground-borne noise. • Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545]. • Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188] • Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A [AS-257] • Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.E [AS-258]. 			
NV91	<p>Vibration – Operation – Assessment: The vibration assessment methodology for operational rail, including ground-borne noise, is appropriate. The vibration assessment methodology for operational rail is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545]. • Volume 1, Appendix 6G, Annex 6G.2 of the ES [APP-171] on ground-borne noise. • Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188] • Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A [AS-257] • Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.E [AS-258]. 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) The operational rail vibration assessment is currently under review by ESC.
NV92	<p>Vibration – Operation – Mitigation: The mitigation proposed for operational rail vibration, including ground-borne noise, is appropriate. The operational rail vibration mitigation is set out in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545]. • Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [AS-188] 	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) The operational rail vibration assessment is currently under review by ESC.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.A [AS-257] Volume 3, Appendices 9.3.E [AS-258]. <p>Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.E [AS-258] is the draft Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy.</p> <p>The provisions of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (originally in [APP-210] with a revised version provided as Doc Ref. 6.3 11H(A)) will apply where ground-borne noise is considered in conjunction with airborne noise.</p>			
Overarching Policy				
NV93	<p>Policy – Noise and Vibration:</p> <p>It is SZC Co.'s position that the aims of the national policy, as set out in NPS EN-1 and the NPSE are consistent, setting broadly the same tests.</p> <p>SZC Co. consider that the noise and vibration assessments appropriately treat significant adverse effects, as identified in the EIA Regulations, and significant observed adverse effect on health and quality of life (SOAL), as defined in NPS EN-1 and the NPSE, as different thresholds.</p> <p>This is considered consistent with both planning policy and the EIA Regulations, and accords with the most recent authoritative advice from a national overseeing organisation in the form of</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) ESC queried whether The Applicant had provided reasonable justification for separating LOAEL and SOAEL thresholds from the EIA significance threshold (RFI 13). The Applicant has provided further explanation and ESC are satisfied that separating significance in this way is justifiable in some cases, but only if the overarching approach to assessment and mitigation meets the policy aims of NPS EN-1 and provides adequate protection to receptors.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>DMRB (LA111).</p> <p>LA111 does not treat significant adverse effects as the same as SOAEL, and it allows for outcomes below SOAEL to be significant, in terms of the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>Further clarification is contained in SZC Co.'s responses to Rfls 11, 12 and 13 in Appendix 11A.</p>			
S106				
NV94	<p>Noise Mitigation Scheme</p> <p>The original Noise Mitigation Scheme, which was contained in Volume 2, Appendix 11H of the ES [APP-210], provided a mechanism for improving the sound insulation of the properties worst-affected by noise from the SZC project.</p> <p>While statutory Noise Insulation Regulations for road and rail strictly only apply in relation to “new or altered” roads, the Noise Mitigation Scheme extends the principles of such provision to effects caused by SZC on either new or existing infrastructure, where the qualifying criteria are met.</p> <p>Eligibility under the Noise Mitigation Scheme will be established through refreshed noise assessments, informed by updated construction and design information.</p>	Under discussion.	Under discussion.	(i) This is still under consideration by both Councils.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's Position	SCC's Position	Notes
	<p>As a result of concerns expressed by ESC, the following amendments have been made to the Noise Mitigation Scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the L_{AFmax} threshold to trigger eligibility for sound insulation as a result of rail movements reduced to a façade level of 73dB L_{AFmax} from the previous façade level of 80dB L_{AFmax}; inclusion of a review mechanism to reconsider potentially eligible properties after the works have commenced; provision for specific consideration of listed or historic buildings so that any offered insulation is appropriate for the particular circumstances. inclusion of a more detailed description of the anticipated process for the implementation of the Noise Mitigation Scheme. 			

12 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – SOCIO-ECONOMICS

12.1.1 Socio-economics has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES [\[APP-195\]](#)

12.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

12.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to socio-economics is detailed in **Table 12.1**.

12.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

Table 12.1 Position of the Parties – Socio-economics

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Main Development Site - Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 9				
Baseline and Methodology				
SE1	<p>The baseline environment for Project-wide socio-economic effects as detailed in Section 9.5 of Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES are sufficient for the DCO submission.</p> <p>Project assumptions and limitations related to the baseline have been set out in Appendix 6E of Volume 1 of the ES (paragraph 1.3.72 to 1.3.75) and include limitations related to datasets (representing a 'snapshot' in time) and the approach to dynamism of the baseline.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SE2	<p>The methodology for the assessment of socio-economic effects as set out in Volume 1 Appendix 6E of the ES and Section 9.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES is agreed unless specified elsewhere in this table.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
Assumptions, Definitions and Background to the Socio-economic Assessment				
SE3	<p>The Sizewell C Project's approach to estimating the size, scale and skill breakdown of the workforce over the construction phase and at peak (for the purposes of EIA assessment) as set out in Book 6.2, Chapter 9, Appendix 9A is sufficient for assessment purposes.</p> <p>The approach sets a sufficient assessment case based on best available information at the time of submission, and it is acknowledged that any modelled approach such as this</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	has limitations which means where significant effects are considered likely, a 'plan-monitor-manage' approach is adopted through implementation of mitigation.			
SE4	<p>The approach to definition and estimation of the scale of HB and NHB workforce at the peak of the construction workforce profile as set out in Book 6.2, Chapter 9, Appendix 9A is sufficient for assessment purposes.</p> <p>The approach sets a sufficient assessment case based on best available information at the time of submission, and it is acknowledged that any modelled approach such as this has limitations which means where significant effects are considered likely, a 'plan-monitor-manage' approach is adopted through implementation of mitigation.</p>	Under discussion	Under discussion	SZC Co to clarify definitions – particularly of 'worker' and 'home-based worker' including definition of both construction and operational workers in order to reach agreement. See also SE11.
SE5	<p>Linked to SE4, the fact that the 'uplift' in workforce between Stage 2 Consultation (5,600 peak) and DCO submission (7,900 peak) is assessed as entirely NHB makes this a conservative assessment case in relation to its impacts on accommodation and public services. This does not preclude the HB workforce exceeding it's predicted level (for assessment purposes).</p> <p>The approach sets a sufficient assessment case based on best available information at the time of submission, and it is acknowledged that any modelled approach such as this has limitations which means where significant effects are</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	considered likely, a 'plan-monitor-manage' approach is adopted through implementation of mitigation.			
SE6	<p>The approach to estimating the likely demographic profile and characteristics of the construction workforce for the Sizewell C Project as set out in Book 6.2, Chapter 9, Appendix 9B is sufficient for assessment purposes.</p> <p>The approach sets a sufficient assessment case based on best available information at the time of submission, and it is acknowledged that any modelled approach such as this has limitations which means where significant effects are considered likely, a 'plan-monitor-manage' approach is adopted through implementation of mitigation.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SE7	<p>The approach to estimating the likely spatial distribution of the Sizewell C workforce using the Gravity Model as set out in Book 6.2, Chapter 9, Appendix 9C is acceptable for assessment purposes.</p> <p>The approach sets a sufficient assessment case based on best available information at the time of submission, and it is acknowledged that any modelled approach such as this has limitations which means where significant effects are considered likely, a 'plan-monitor-manage' approach is adopted through implementation of mitigation.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SE8	The approach to estimating the likely demand for different types of accommodation from the Sizewell C workforce as set out in Book 6.2, Chapter 9, Appendix 9D is	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	<p>appropriate for assessment purposes (subject to agreement of SE9).</p> <p>The approach sets a sufficient assessment case based on best available information at the time of submission, and it is acknowledged that any modelled approach such as this has limitations which means where significant effects are considered likely, a 'plan-monitor-manage' approach is adopted through implementation of mitigation.</p>			
SE9	Assumptions about the uptake of accommodation in the Accommodation Campus and LEEIE Caravan Park (including sharing rates for the Caravan Park) are appropriate for assessment purposes.	Under discussion	Under discussion	Agreement will be subject to further discussions on the ability of the Housing Fund to mitigate adverse effects
SE10	<p>Notwithstanding the above – other assumptions and limitations of the assessment, as set out in Book 6.1, Appendix 6E and summarised at Book 6.3, Chapter 9, Section 9.4(h) and (h)(i) (Paragraphs 9.4.49 to 9.4.55) are considered appropriate for assessment purposes.</p> <p>The approach sets a sufficient assessment case based on best available information at the time of submission, and it is acknowledged that any modelled approach such as this has limitations which means where significant effects are considered likely, a 'plan-monitor-manage' approach is adopted through implementation of mitigation.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SE11	Definitions of Workers, Visitors, Associated Development Workers, Employment Years, Non-home-based (NHB) and	Under discussion	Under discussion	As per SE4, SZC Co to provide clarification on definitions particularly

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	Home-based (HB) workers for assessment purposes, as set out in Book 6.2, Chapter 9, Section 9.4(h)(ii) (Paragraph 9.4.56)			relating to workers, HB and NHB workers, and visitors in order to reach agreement
Environmental Design and Mitigation				
SE12	The Accommodation Campus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is appropriate in principle (i.e. single, on-site campus) to provide mitigation for potential effects on the Housing Market and Transport; - Is of an appropriate scale (2,400 bedspaces); and - Is proposed in a location that sufficiently balances the needs of the Project and environmental and community effects, with no better location having been identified. 	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SE13	The Accommodation Campus is appropriately secured through the Implementation Plan in order to be relied upon to deliver its aim to mitigate effects of the peak NHB workforce. Please refer to the Implementation Plan (Doc Ref. 8.4(A), and the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)), Schedule 3, 3.1.1.	Under discussion	Under discussion	SZC Co and ESC/SCC to work to agree the Implementation Plan.
SE14	The LEEIE Caravan Site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is appropriate in principle and design to provide mitigation for potential effects on the Housing Market and Transport - Is of an appropriate scale (400 caravan capacity); and - Is proposed in a location that sufficiently balances the needs of the Project and environmental and community effects, with no better location having been identified. 	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
SE15	The LEEIE Caravan Site is appropriately secured in order to be relied upon to deliver its aim to mitigate effects of the peak NHB workforce and provide appropriate supply for demand from early years civills workforce. Please refer to the Implementation Plan (Doc Ref. 8.4I(A), and the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)), Schedule 3, 3.2.1.	Under discussion	Under discussion	SZC Co and ESC/SCC to progress work towards agreeing the Implementation Plan / Securing mechanism for the Caravan Site; and SZC Co to set out position on why pre-commencement implementation isn't possible (and why implementation at end Y1 is appropriate).
SE16	Off-site Permanent Sports Facilities are appropriate to mitigate for increased demand for formal sports provision by NHB workers and will also provide benefits to the local community.	Agreed – Subject to specific points on environmental effects raised in LIR	Agreed – Subject to specific points on environmental effects raised in LIR	SZC Co, ESC and SCC to undertake further discussions on the environmental effects and contracting.
SE17	Visitor centre: - Will contribute to education and inspiration; and - Will generate a positive effect on tourism	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SE18	Notwithstanding the development of details to be secured within the S. 106 Agreement, the principles for tertiary mitigation set out in section 9.6 for the construction phase of Sizewell C is considered appropriate in relation to the Project's Employment, Skills and Education Strategy (Appendix A to the Economic Statement)	Under discussion	Under discussion	Principle of activities agreed for ESE – subject to development of detail and funding. SZC Co and SCC/ESC to meet to further discuss specific S. 106 measures

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
SE19	<p>Notwithstanding the development of details to be secured within the S. 106 Agreement, the principles for tertiary mitigation set out in section 9.6 for the construction phase of Sizewell C is considered appropriate in relation to the Project's Supply Chain Strategy (Appendix B to the Economic Statement).</p> <p>SZC Co note that this (mitigation etc) does not preclude collaboration for inward investment and business support outside of the DCO and Section 106 Agreement.</p>	under discussion	under discussion)	SZC Co to provide further representations (building on response to ExA First Written Question SE.1.27) and continue discussions.
SE20	Notwithstanding the development of details to be secured within the S. 106 Agreement, the principles for tertiary mitigation set out in section 9.6 for the construction phase of Sizewell C is considered appropriate in relation to the Project's Worker Code of Conduct and implementation of drug and alcohol testing.	Under discussion	Under discussion	It is noted that the Worker Code of Conduct and implementation of drug and alcohol testing is not subject to the same level of agreement as other tertiary measures. The Applicant proposed for these measures not be secured through obligation or Requirement, but to be adopted as internal workforce management measures, in order to meet the standards required by the Nuclear Site Licence.
SE21	Notwithstanding the development of details to be secured within the S. 106 Agreement, the approach to monitoring and governance set out in Section 9.8(c) is considered appropriate.	Under discussion	Under discussion	In development - Additional detail to the EIA will be included and agreed through the S. 106 Agreement.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				Subject to detail particularly relating to monitoring of employment, skills and education, supply chain and public services / community safety
Assessment of Construction Effects - Economics				
SE22	The assessment of economic effects as set out in Section 9.7 and Section 9.9 (residual effects) for the construction phase of Sizewell C is sufficient notwithstanding the specific issues raised in the following lines (SE23 to SE26)	Agreed (subject to SE23 to SE26)	Agreed (subject to SE23 to SE26)	Agreed (subject to SE23 to SE26)
SE23	<p>Labour Market effects – Impacts on the dynamic labour market (from Paragraph 9.7.16 to Paragraph 9.7.42 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9) and Labour market churn and 'hard to fill' vacancies are appropriate and realistic.</p> <p>SZC Co position is that the effects on the labour market are overwhelmingly positive and that the labour market is sufficiently dynamic to respond to the Project, through acknowledges risk of labour market churn making vacancies harder to fill and has set appropriate measures to be secured through the Seciton 106 Agreement e.g. Jobs Brokerage, Supply Chain Strategy (Appendix B to the Economic Statement).</p>	Under Discussion – Refer to LIR (24.11; 25.14-16)	Under Discussion – Refer to LIR (24.11; 25.14-16)	Discussions ongoing – particularly with regard to assumptions of labour force.
SE24	Business and supply chain effects (from Paragraph 9.7.43 to Paragraph 9.7.53 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9) are appropriately considered.	Not Agreed (Under discussion) –	Not Agreed (Under discussion) –	SZC Co to provide further representations (building on response to ExA First Written

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	SZC Co position is that supply chain effects are overwhelmingly positive, and the Supply Chain Strategy (Appendix B to the Economic Statement) will be enacted to support businesses within the Project's supply chain.	See LIR (24.12)	See LIR (24.12)	Question SE.1.27) and continue discussions
SE25	<p>Effects on the tourism economy (from Paragraph 9.7.63 to Paragraph 9.7.96 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9) are appropriately considered.</p> <p>SZC Co's conclusion is that (Paragraph 9.7.95 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9):</p> <p><i>in some locations, times and for some visitors, there is the risk of a minor to moderate adverse effect to arise on factors that contribute to tourist visitor sensitivity (including but not limited to traffic) that has the potential to be significant at the local level, without mitigation in the early years of construction.</i></p> <p>The quantum to this effect cannot be predicted with any confidence in economic terms, there is inherent uncertainty about the extent to which this may occur, and there is an opportunity to tackle perceived changes to certain sensitivities that existing and potential visitors to the area may be concerned about.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Principle of impact and mitigation agreed – scale of mitigation will determine if significant effects can be mitigated - to be agreed through further discussions on the scope and scale of the Tourism Fund (see SE38).
SE26	Effects of transport on business (from Paragraph 9.7.104 to Paragraph 9.7.108 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9).	Not Agreed	Not Agreed	See LIR 24.14

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	SZC Co's position, drawing on transport modelling, is that there is no evidence for significant adverse effects on businesses as a result in changes to traffic/transport.			
Assessment of Construction Effects - Accommodation				
SE27	The assessment of accommodation / housing effects as set out in Section 9.7 and Section 9.9 (residual effects) for the construction phase of Sizewell C is agreed notwithstanding the specific issues raised (subject to SE28 and SE29)	Agreed	Agreed	<p>Agreed (subject to SE28 and SE29)</p> <p>SZC Co, SCC and ESC to discuss measures that SCC consider relate to housing but that are without the scope of the Housing Fund and could be accommodated in the Public Services Resilience Fund (LIR 29.43):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Safeguarding issues associated with renting out rooms (awareness raising programme may be required);</i> - <i>Economic incentives for care providers to change use of premises from specialist housing to general market housing, which could increase costs of delivering care and cause shortages of suitable accommodation</i>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
SE28	<p>The effects of NHB workers using tourist sector accommodation as set out at Section 9.7 from paragraph 9.7.140 to paragraph 9.7.148; and Section 9.9 (Table 9.52 – Residual Effects).</p> <p>SZC Co recognise localised effects may occur, but note that wider effects on the tourist accommodation sector are not significant.</p> <p>A Housing Fund with a specific element ring-fenced for tourist-sector accommodation would mitigate effects.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	SZC Co, ESC and SCC to finalise approach to Housing Fund, particularly with regard to the proposed Tourist Accommodation Market Supply element (Draft Deed of Obligation, Schedule 3, Paragraph 2.7)
SE29	<p>The following potential effects on vulnerable people – considered likely significant effects or risks by ESC and SCC in the Local Impact Report (29.43) would be mitigated within the scope of the Housing Fund, as set out within the Draft Deed of Obligation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Potential effects on vulnerable young people and care leavers, some of whom are in housing need or vulnerable to homelessness;</i> - <i>Potential increase in rents in the Private Rented Sector and impact on families and vulnerable households, potentially resulting in financial difficulty and homelessness; and</i> - <i>Potential effects on housing for key workers as a result of increase in rents, which may impact on availability of key workers in the local area.</i> 	Agreed	Agreed	SZC Co, ESC and SCC to finalise approach to Housing Fund and nature of Public Services Resilience Fund (where it may be relevant to housing vulnerability).

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Assessment of Construction Effects – Community Safety, Community Cohesion				
SE30	Effects on Crime, Anti-social Behaviour and Policing set out at Section 9.7(vi) (Paragraphs 9.7.211 to 9.7.230 and Section 9.8 (Paragraphs 9.8.50 to 9.8.53). SZC Co recognise potential for localised temporary significant adverse effect as a result of concentrated NHB workforce.	Under discussion	Under discussion	Subject to SoCG with Suffolk Constabulary
SE31	Effects on Fire and Rescue Service set out at Section 9.7(vii) (Paragraphs 9.7.231 to 9.7.239) and Section 9.8 (Paragraphs 9.8.54 to 9.8.57). SZC Co recognise under certain conditions a minor adverse effect may arise before mitigation, and therefore SZC Co. will seek to develop a responsive mitigation strategy and relevant financial contributions in this regard.	No comment	Subject to SoCG with SCC Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service	Subject to separate SoCG with SCC Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service. ESC have no remit with regards to Fire and Rescue Service.
SE32	Effects on Community Cohesion and Integration set out at Section 9.7(ix) (Paragraph 9.7.240 to 9.7.246) and Section 9.8 (Paragraphs 9.8.58 to 9.8.69). SZC consider effects to be negligible following implementation of primary, tertiary and secondary mitigation	Under Discussion	Under Discussion	Subject to agreement on scope and scale of measures within Draft Deed of Obligation (Schedule 5 – Public Services and Community Safety)
Assessment of Construction Effects – Public Services				
SE33	Effects on Pre-school and Education [capacity] set out at Section 9.7 (v) (Paragraphs 9.7.170 to 9.7.188) and Section 9.8(v) Paragraphs 9.8.32 to 9.8.36	Agreed)	Agreed	Scale of mitigation to be agreed, but technical work has progressed to

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	Recognition that there may be localised effects / uncertainty that warrants appropriate mitigation which will be secured through S. 106 Agreement.			understand the likely locations and types of investment needed.
SE34	<p>Effects on Social Services – set out at Section 9.7 between Paragraphs 9.7.189 and 9.7.195.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that the Sizewell C Project has the potential to increase risks, and has identified mitigation measures in order to avoid or reduce the risks through direct interventions. Risks identified through engagement with SCC relate to those listed in bullets under paragraph 9.7.192 and workforce effects sets out at paragraph 9.7.193.</p>	Under discussion	Under discussion .	<p>Discussion ongoing - subject to scope, scale and governance of mitigation – see SE39</p> <p>SZC Co, ESC and SCC to consider scope of PSRF in light of SE27, as well as LIR Annex 4 and additional LIR risks raised by SCC (LIR 26c):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Increase in demand for under 5s and family services, particularly Health Visitor Services</i> • <i>Risk of loss of residential based care provision; increased delays in delivery of care and costs for home care and community health; and increased shortage of social care and community health workforce</i>
SE35	Effects on Other County Level Services (libraries, arts and other cultural services) set out at Section 9.7 at Paragraph 9.7.196 are considered to be negligible	Under discussion	Under discussion	Discussion ongoing
SE36	Effects on Formal Sport and Leisure set out at Section 9.7 at Paragraphs 9.7.197 to 9.7.205 and within Appendix 9E	Agreed	Agreed	Subject to deed of obligation detail re: implementation

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	are considered to be major beneficial and significant subject to the implementation of the proposed Leiston Sports Facilities			
SE37	Effects on Regulatory and Environmental Services as set out at Section 9.7 from Paragraph 9.7.206 to 9.7.210 are considered to be negligible .	Under discussion	Under discussion	Discussion ongoing
Assessment of Operational Effects				
SE38	The assessment of impacts as set out in Section 9.7(c) for the operational phase of Sizewell C are sufficient for the DCO application.	Under discussion	Under discussion	SZC Co, ESC and SCC to discuss the potential for post-construction supply chain strategy and scope / implementation of Operational Workforce Delivery Strategy.
Assessment of Cumulative Effects				
SE39	The conclusions of the cumulative socio-economic effects assessed at Volume 10, Chapter 4 of the ES .	Under discussion	Under discussion	SZC Co has prepared a paper in response to ExA FWQs to consider the areas of disagreement raised and will undertake further discussions with ESC and SCC in this regard. (LIR 32.44 to 32.50)
Deed of Obligation				
SE40	Schedule 3 – Accommodation and Housing (with the exception of Accommodation Campus and LEEIE Caravan Site which are covered elsewhere in this table): - Housing Fund - Accommodation Management System / Accommodation Co-ordinator - Governance and Monitoring	Principle of Housing Fund is broadly agreed	Principle of Housing Fund is broadly agreed Scale of Housing Fund	SZC Co, ESC and SCC to continue discussion on scale of Housing Fund (including for individual measures) and finalise scope of individual elements

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
			Scale of Housing Fund under discussion, including scale for indicative measures Governance and monitoring under discussion	under discussion, including scale for indicative measures Governance and monitoring under discussion	Parties agree that the Housing Fund should focus on pre-peak delivery of bedspaces.
SE41	Schedule 15 - Tourism - Tourism Fund - Governance and Implementation - Tourism Programme Manager		Principle is broadly agreed Appropriate scale of Tourism Fund under discussion Timing not agreed – both pre-	Principle is broadly agreed Appropriate scale of Tourism Fund under discussion Timing not agreed – both pre-consent	Agreed on the (broad) scope, governance and implementation of Tourism Fund and relationship to complementary funds SZC Co, ESC and SCC to continue to discuss appropriate scale of Tourism Fund.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
		consent and post-construction	and post-construction	
SE42	Schedule 5 - Public Services and Community Safety - Public Services Resilience Fund – under discussion (agreed on principles)	Agreed on the principle of a PSRF and the largely autonomous role of the Local Authorities in directing the Fund appropriately. Appropriate scale of funds under discussion..	Agreed on the principle of a PSRF and the largely autonomous role of the Local Authorities in directing the Fund appropriately. Appropriate scale of funds under discussion..	SZC Co developed position on scope of the PSRF set out in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES to address Councils' request for multi-agency funding, specific community safety funding, and delineation of funds for County and District Councils, and to align with existing governance mechanisms in the area (e.g. Community Partnerships; Safer Stronger Communities Board). Further discussions between SZC Co, ESC and SCC on scope of PSRF in relation to partner organisations following receipt of LIR Annex N.
SE43	Schedule 5 – Public Services and Community Safety - School and Early Years Capacity Contributions	Scope is broadly agreed – subject to	Scope is broadly agreed – subject to finalisation of scale	SCC has set out position in the LIR that is broadly agreed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
			finalisation of scale		SZC Co and SCC to finalise scale and implementation of financial contributions.
SE44	Schedule 4 – Emergency Services: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community Liaison Service - On-site Emergency Response - Emergency Services Contribution and Contingency - Community Safety Working Group 		Agreement would be largely with Emergency Services bilaterally. Refer to Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service Role of ESC within Community Safety Working Group	Agreement would be largely with Emergency Services bilaterally. Refer to Statement of Common Ground with Suffolk Constabulary and SCC Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service. Role of SCC within Community Safety Working Group to be finalised.	Agreement would be largely with Emergency Services bilaterally.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
		Group to be finalised.		
SE45	Schedule 10 – Leisure, Public Rights of Way and Amenity - insofar as it relates to Leiston Sports Facilities only	Agreed subject to detailed design and contract	Agreed subject to detailed design and contract	Scope of approach is well-developed. SZC Co and ESC to develop and agree position on design and build, environmental effects.
SE46	<p>Schedule 7 - Employment, Skills, Education and Supply Chain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funded initiatives e.g. Outreach Fund, ASEC Fund, SZC Bursary, RSCF contribution - SZC Commitments e.g. Jobs Service, YSZC, Apprenticeships, Skills Prospectus - Governance and Implementation – WDS (including Operational) and AIPs 	<p>Principles Agreed – however agreement is subject to understanding detail on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - STEMC / Education initiatives - Jobs Service Implementation - Timely release of funds - Apprenticeship targets 	<p>Principles Agreed – however agreement is subject to understanding detail on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - STEMC / Education initiatives - Jobs Service Implementation - Timely release of funds - Apprenticeship targets 	ESE Scope and governance developed at a high level - discussions on quantum will be held between SZC Co, ESC and SCC to provide confidence to Councils on efficacy of measures; and detailed delivery mechanisms for individual elements to be developed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supply chain skills programme - Governance - Funding - monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supply chain skills programme - Governance - Funding - monitoring 	
SE47	Schedule 7 – Employment, Skills, Education and Supply Chain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supply Chain Strategy, Monitoring and Working Group 		Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	SZC Co to provide further representations (building on response to ExA First Written Question SE.1.27) and continue discussions.
SE48	Community Fund: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scope, governance/implementation - Scale and ring-fencing for local communities 		The principal of the proposed Community Fund is supported, however further discussions are required as to its	The principal of the proposed Community Fund is supported, however further discussions are required as to its scale,	Discussions on governance and implementation are progressing. Scale of Community Fund yet to be defined / agreed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position		ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
			scale, scope and governance arrangements.	scope and governance arrangements.	

13 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – TRANSPORT

13.1.1 Transport has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES [\[APP-198\]](#)
- Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)

13.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Draft Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) [\[APP-607\]](#)
- Draft Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [\[APP-608\]](#)
- Draft Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) [\[APP-609\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

13.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to transport is detailed in **Table 13.1**.

13.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

13.1.5 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to transport is detailed in Table 13.1. The table is divided into six themes:

- Transport strategy;
- Transport modelling;

- Technical highway design;
- Environmental transport effects;
- Management plans; and
- Transport mitigation.

13.1.6 This section sets out the position of the parties on detailed transport matters (i.e. transport strategy, transport modelling, technical highway design, environmental transport effects, management plans, transport mitigation), but does not encompass the project-wide strategy aspects such as the principle of the associated developments, and chosen routes. Other strategic transport matters are set out in Chapter 1 (Principle of the Development) of this Statement of Common Ground.

13.1.7 The validity of the transport impact assessment is to some extent dependent upon the robustness of the transport models used, which by their very nature are close approximations to the real world. The ability of transport practitioners (and the parties to this SoCG) to accurately predict future impacts is reliant on the validity of the underlying input data, key assumptions, modelling processes and correctly interpreting results. Sizewell C transport models have been developed using the best available information and knowledge at the time, and in accordance with national technical guidance. They therefore represent the most reliable basis for assessment available at this time based on current assumptions. It is acknowledged however that should there be any fundamental change to key underlying assumptions, then it may be necessary to review the validity of modelling results presented to date. It is also noted that the transport models assume the effect of controls, monitoring and management proposed within the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7(A)), Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8(A)) and the Traffic Incident Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.6(A)) is embedded mitigation. These management plans and the extent of the controls are yet to be agreed. Model results are therefore reliant upon those plans being enacted during construction phase. The CTMP, CWTP and TIMP are secured via the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)).

Table 13.1 Position of the Parties – Transport

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
Transport Strategy – The purpose of this theme is to set out the position of the parties in relation to the proposed Sizewell C project transport strategy.				
TS01	Freight Management Strategy – In principle, a strategy which seeks to maximise the use of rail and sea for the transport of bulk construction materials is an appropriate response to policy and a preferred strategy for the construction of Sizewell C.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed only so far as a principle - but the specifics of strategy currently proposed is not agreed and has a number of outstanding matters, as set out in the LIR and WR.
TS02	The use of HGVs - HGV transport should be limited where practical, but HGVs are necessary for the transport of approximately 40% of construction material.	Agreed	Disagreed	Disagreed with regard to the necessity to transport 40% by HGV (see LIR).
Traffic Modelling – The purpose of this theme is to set out the position of the parties in relation to the technical validity of the transport models used for the assessment of Sizewell C Project impacts. It does not deal with any transport mitigation aspects which may arise from the use of these models. Transport mitigation is covered more comprehensively within a dedicated “Transport Mitigation” theme.				
TM01	Highway traffic modelling approach including software, software versions, assessment years, time-periods, scenarios, calibration and validation approach – The transport modelling approach used to assess the proposed development is described in Chapter 6 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)), and shown diagrammatically in Plate 6.2 and 6.3 of that document. Changes to the modelling methodology in the January	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	2021 DCO submission are described in Chapter 6 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The proposed development was assessed through a consistent hierarchy of transport models including the gravity model, strategic highway assignment model (VISUM), detailed stand-alone junction models (Junctions9 and LinSig) and microscopic traffic simulation (VISSIM). The transport modelling approach follows industry guidelines (e.g. WebTAG), uses proven software and is proportionate to the scale and context of the development. The modelling methodology was developed in consultation with Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council over many years and is considered to be acceptable, subject to no further issues being identified in this work.			
TM02	Gravity Model development, underlying assumptions and derived results – model developed to assess the current labour supply and predict the residential distribution and mode split of the construction workforce. The Gravity Model has been run to produce workforce 24-hour home-to-work trips for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) scenarios, and to serve as the basis for the Sizewell C construction workforce travel demand in the strategic highway (VISUM) model. The development and application of the Gravity Model is described in Appendix 7A of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). The Gravity Model is considered to be an acceptable basis for assessment of the proposed development.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
TM03	Extent of the strategic highway model network for assessment – The extent of the highway network modelled in the VISUM strategic model is shown in Plate 6.1 in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). The strategic highway network scope is centred on the proposed Sizewell C main site, and extends to Lowestoft in the north, Ipswich in the south and the A140 to the west; including the A12 and A14 strategic routes. The strategic model (VISUM) extents are considered to be acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
TM04	Baseline traffic survey data – A comprehensive traffic data collection exercise was conducted in May 2015 in accordance with DfT TAG guidance. Traffic data was collected using Automatic Traffic Counters (ATC), Manual Classified Turning Counts (MCTC), and supplemented by additional data provided by Suffolk County Council (additional ATCs and bus timetables), Highways England ('TRADS' link counts on the A12 and A14) and the Department for Transport ('TrafficMaster' journey times). The data collection exercise is summarised in the VISUM Base Model Local Model Validation Report (LMVR), in Appendix 8A of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). The observed baseline 2015 traffic flows are shown in Table F.2 (08:00-09:00), Table F.4 (15:00-16:00), Table F.6 (17:00-18:00), broken down by direction of travel and vehicle type. The observed baseline 2015 traffic flows for the additional hours modelled in VISUM are shown in Table D.2 (06:00-07:00), Table D.4 (07:00-08:00), Table D.6 (16:00-17:00), Table D.8 (18:00-19:00) of the LMVR Addendum (Appendix 8A of	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A))). The observed baseline data is considered to be an acceptable basis for use in the assessment of the project's transport effects.			
TM05	Strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Base Year (2015) Calibration and Validation – The development, calibration and validation of the Base Year (2015) strategic traffic model (VISUM) is described in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)) and Appendix 8A of that document. Further refinement of the Base Year VISUM model, which improved the validation of the Base Year model around Woodbridge, is described in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad), and Appendix 8A of that addendum. The Base Year VISUM model is considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
TM06	Strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Reference Case assumptions, models and forecast traffic flows for 2023, 2028 and 2034 – The Reference Case models for 2023, 2028 and 2034 forecast years are described in a series of technical notes provided in Appendix 8B to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). Reference Case model traffic flow forecasts (AAWT) are shown in Table 8.4 (2023), Table 8.6 (2028), Table 8.8 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The Reference Case model traffic flow forecast (network peak hours) are shown in Table 8.5 (2023), Table 8.7 (2028) and Table 8.9 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref.	Agreed	agreed,	Subject to controls as set out in management plans being implemented.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	8.5(A)Ad). The strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) Reference Case models, underlying assumptions and traffic flow forecast are considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development.			
TM07	Sizewell C trip generation, distribution and mode share assumptions for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) scenarios – The traffic generation, distribution and mode share assumptions used in the strategic highway modelling assessment are described in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)). In response to consultation with Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council and Highways England additional supporting evidence was prepared, and in some cases, assumptions were refined. The refinements are described in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad), and further evidence provided in Appendix 7A, 7B, 7C and 7D of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The assumptions and evidence underlying the trip generation, distribution and mode share of Sizewell C traffic are considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development with agreed management plan in place.	Agreed	Agreed	This is agreed in principle, the remaining issue is to implement acceptable controls within the management plans so that the assumptions made in the modelling remain valid and correct.
TM08	Sizewell C distribution assumptions for 100% HGVs from the south sensitivity test. Traffic flow forecasts derived from this sensitivity test – The geographical distribution of Sizewell C construction HGVs in the DCO application is assumed to be 85%	Agreed	Agreed	This is agreed in principle, the remaining issue is to implement acceptable controls within the

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	from the south (Felixstowe, Ipswich and London/South of England), and 15% from the north (including Lowestoft and Norwich). Further work has been undertaken by SZC Co. and their supply chain partners on the likely sources of bulk materials (see the Freight Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.18), and Material Management Strategy in Appendix 2.2.C of the Environmental Statement Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14)) and the assumed HGV distribution is unchanged from that presented in the DCO. Notwithstanding this, a sensitivity test was undertaken assuming 100% of construction HGVs would arrive from the south via the A12. The HGV flows, trip distribution and timing of HGV movements is described in Appendix 8E of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The approach to this sensitivity test, and the derived traffic flows (Table 1 and Table 2 of Appendix 8E), are considered to be acceptable for the assessment of the Sizewell C project transport effects subject to agreed management plans being in place.			management plans so that the assumptions made in the modelling remain valid and correct.
TM09	Sizewell C trip generation, distribution and mode share assumptions for increased rail and marine capacity resulting from proposed Changes 1 and 2 to the DCO application. Traffic flow forecasts derived from this scenario – The Change submission in January 2021 included two changes to the transport strategy, which would increase bulk material transported by rail and marine and reduce the number of HGVs on the highway network. The changes are described in Chapter 2 of the	Agreed	Agreed	This is agreed in principle, the remaining issue is to implement acceptable controls within the management plans so that the assumptions made in the modelling remain valid and correct.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14) and the updated Freight Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.18). The underlying strategic highway modelling assumptions for this scenario are described in Chapter 7 (Section 7.4) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The resultant change to Peak Construction (2028) highway flows in this scenario is described in Chapter 8 (Section 8.3) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Updated traffic flow forecasts are shown in Table 8.16 (AAWT) and Table 8.17 (peak hours). The derived traffic flow forecasts for the reduced HGV movements associated with proposed Changes 1 and 2 are considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development transport effects subject to agreed management plans being in place.			
TM10	Strategic highway traffic model (VISUM) for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Sizewell C scenario. Traffic flow and journey time forecasts derived from these models, including cumulative traffic flows – The development of the strategic traffic model (VISUM) forecast year models is described in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)) and updated by Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Forecast Sizewell C traffic flows (AAWT) are shown in Table 8.4 (2023), Table 8.6 (2028), Table 8.8 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Table 8.4 (2023) and 8.6 (2028) also show cumulative flows (including Scottish Power traffic).	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	Forecast Sizewell C traffic flows (peak hours) are shown in Table 8.5 (2023), Table 8.7 (2028) and Table 8.9 (2034) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Strategic highway model network peak hour journey time forecasts are shown in Table 8.10-8.11 (2023 Early Years), Table 8.12-8.13 (2028 Peak Construction) and Table 8.14-8.15 (2034 Operational) of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The strategic highway traffic models (VISUM) for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Sizewell C scenarios, as well as the traffic flow and journey time forecasts derived from these models, are considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development transport effects.			
TM11	<p>Highway mitigation embedded in the strategic highway traffic models (VISUM) for the Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) scenarios – The VISUM strategic highway traffic models for the Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) scenarios include the following proposed highway improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A12 / B1122 roundabout at Yoxford, replacing the priority T junction; • Single-carriageway two village bypass on the A12 to the south of Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham; and 	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-carriageway Sizewell link road joining the A12 south of Yoxford with the B1122 east of Theberton. <p>There are a number of minor highway improvements within SZC Co. proposals, primarily intended to improve road safety. These schemes are not of a significant enough scale to influence the strategic highway modelling results or traffic flow forecasts. Minor highway schemes are assessed in detail using Junction models, described later in this table.</p> <p>The strategic transport modelling also assumes the full package of embedded transport mitigations, although these mitigations are not explicitly coded within the VISUM highway model. Other non-coded transport mitigation elements include the two Park and Ride sites, Freight Management Facility, rail infrastructure and freight movements. Transport modelling also assumes that the controls, monitoring and management proposals set out in the CTMP, CWTP and TIMP are implemented as embedded mitigation.</p> <p>The modelling of the embedded highway infrastructure, assumed within the Peak Construction and Operational VISUM models, is considered to be coded within the models in an acceptable way to assess the proposed development transport effects.</p>			
TM12	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic model of Yoxford for Validated Base (2015) – The development of a micro-simulation traffic model (VISSIM) of the A12 between A1120 at Yoxford and	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	the A144 junction Yoxford is described in Appendix 9B of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The report sets out the data collection, development, calibration and validation of a 2015 Base Year VISSIM model against Department for Transport guidelines set out in TAG Unit M3.1. The base model was calibrated for the AM, PM and interpeaks against observed traffic counts and validated against junction queue lengths and journey times along the A12. The Yoxford Base Year VISSIM model (model files) was provided to Suffolk County Council for their audit, and their comments addressed in the final version of the models reported in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The Yoxford Base Year VISSIM model is considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development within the extent of this model.			
TM13	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic models of A12 between A1120 at Yoxford and the A144 for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Reference Case and Sizewell C scenarios. Journey time, delay and queue length forecasts derived from these models – Using the validated Yoxford VISSIM Base Year (2015) model, SZC Co. created Reference Case and Sizewell C scenario models for 2023, 2028 and 2034. The core assumptions for these scenarios (e.g. highway infrastructure, traffic growth, worker profiles, bus services) are described in Appendix 9B of the Transport	Agreed	Agreed	This is agreed in principle, the remaining issue is to implement acceptable controls within the management plans so that the assumptions made in the modelling remain valid and correct.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Reference Case and Sizewell C scenario model results including queue lengths, journey times, delays and area-wide network performance are reported in Appendix 9B. The Yoxford VISSIM models were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit, and their comments incorporated into final model runs. The Yoxford VISSIM Reference Case and Sizewell C models, underlying assumptions, and derived results reported Chapter 9 and Appendix 9B of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad), are considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development transport effects within the extent of this model subject to agreed management plans being in place.			
TM14	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic model of the A12 corridor from the A14 interchange at Seven Hills to the A1152 at Melton. Validated Base Year (2019) model – Suffolk County Council and Highways England requested a micro-simulation traffic model (VISSIM) of the A12 corridor between the A14 interchange at Seven Hills and the A1152 at Melton, principally to assess the impact of the proposed development on A12 journey times, as well as junction operations. SZC Co. developed a Base Year (2019) VISSIM model of the AM and PM peak periods and calibrated and validated the model in accordance with Department for Transport and relevant industry guidelines (e.g. Transport for London's VISSIM template). The development of the A12 corridor Base Year VISSIM model is described in Appendix 9C of the	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The model files were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit, and comments addressed in the final runs. The A12 corridor VISSIM 2019 Base Year model is considered an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development transport effects within the extent of this model.			
TM15	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic model of the A12 corridor for Early Years (2023), Peak Construction (2028) and Operational (2034) Reference Case and Sizewell C scenarios. Journey time, delay and queue length results derived from these models – Using the validated A12 corridor Base Year micro-simulation model as a basis, SZC Co. prepared forecast year models for a Reference Case and Sizewell C scenario for the Early Years (2023) and peak construction (2028) and undertook a modelling assessment of the traffic effects of Sizewell C. The model development and assumptions are described in Appendix 9C of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). Model predicted journey times and queue lengths are also reported in that appendix for all scenarios. The model files were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit, and comments addressed in the final runs. The A12 corridor VISSIM 2023 and 2028 Reference Case and Reference Case + Sizewell C models, and derived results, are considered as an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development transport effects within this	Agreed	Agreed	This is agreed in principle, the remaining issue is to implement acceptable controls within the management plans so that the assumptions made in the modelling remain valid and correct.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	model's extents subject to agreed management plans being in place.			
TM16	Micro-simulation (VISSIM) traffic model of the A12 corridor for Peak Construction (2028) Sizewell C scenario with additional rail and marine capacity (changes 1 and 2), and journey time and queue length forecasts derived from these models – The A12 corridor VISSIM models were used to assess a scenario with additional rail and marine capacity (proposed changes 1 and 2), and corresponding reduction in HGV traffic. The preferred freight management strategy is set out in the Freight Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 8.18). The core assumptions underlying this scenario, and derived journey time and queue length results are described in Chapter 9 (Section 9.6) and Appendix 9C of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad). The model files were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit, and comments addressed in the final runs. The A12 corridor VISSIM Sizewell C models with additional rail and marine capacity and corresponding reduction in HGV movements, and derived results, are considered to be an acceptable basis for assessing the proposed development transport effects within the extent of the model subject to agreed management plans being in place.	Agreed	Agreed	This is agreed in principle, the remaining issue is to implement acceptable controls within the management plans so that the assumptions made in the modeling remain valid and correct.
TM17	Junction models development, calibration, validation and reliability of RFC, delay and queue length results – SZC Co. consulted Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council to	On-going discussion	On-going discussion	On-going discussion – awaiting additional models

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>ensure that junctions of interest to them were considered and assessed appropriately. An extensive scoping exercise was undertaken to exclude junctions that were forecast to operate with significant spare capacity in all scenarios. The list of 'scoped-out' junctions was agreed with both authorities. The remaining junctions were included in the assessment of impacts of the proposed development. Table 9.2 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad) tabulates the full list of junctions considered. Junction model results (RFC and delay) are reported in Chapter 9, and Appendix 9A of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad), and detailed model outputs are provided in Appendix 9D. All of these junction models (raw model files) were provided to Suffolk County Council for audit. The final model results reported in the addendum reflects their comments. Suffolk County Council are awaiting a number of additional local junction models (e.g. 2034 Operational scenario 4-5pm), so agreement is subject to acceptance of those models.</p>			(e.g. 4-5pm 2034 Op. phase).
<p>Technical Highway Design – The purpose of this theme is to set out the position of the parties in relation to the technical aspects of the highway design. It seeks to summarise key agreements and on-discussions, with the aim of establishing a set of highway design proposals which give sufficient confidence that they can be delivered within the order limits proposed within the DCO. Preliminary highway design discussions continue between SZC Co. and SCC on highway design issues, with the aim of reaching an agreeable position on all technical matters. In some cases SZC Co. have provided SCC with supplementary drawings as part of those discussions, though design alterations remain within the DCO constraints (e.g. limits of deviation). This theme does not cover the principles of the highway infrastructure proposed, or high-level design aspects such as route alignments. These aspects are covered in Chapter 1 (Principles of the Development).</p>				

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
HWY01	General – Part 1 land compensation event – Entitlement to compensation will be determined under Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1961, as set out in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HWY02	General – Risk register – SZC Co. maintain design decision logs and risk registers in line with CDM procedures as part of on-going design development. Risk registers will be submitted to SCC with preliminary design report for Technical Approval.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HWY03	<p>General – Road Safety Audit Stage 1 – A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit (RSA) was carried out for each of the proposed highway works submitted with the May 2020 DCO application. RSA reports and Designer's Responses are provided in Appendix 10A of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) [APP-602].</p> <p>Further road safety audits will be required as the design and implementation of the road progresses.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the Stage 1 RSA and designer's response are considered acceptable by SCC and ESC, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - While RSA1 were provided the design is in iterative on going process and may be subject to re-auditing if substantial changes are made. Nor have the designer's responses been fully analysed and agreed.
HWY04	General – Signing strategy (destinations, load categories) – Highway signage design for the proposed highway improvements	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	in terms of destinations and load categories will be developed and agreed with SCC as part of the technical approval process.			
HWY05	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Plan showing order limits – The Order Limits for the proposed development at the A12 / B1122 junction (i.e. Yoxford Roundabout) are shown on the Proposed General Arrangement (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100019) in Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132]. Those plans include the minor amendment to the Order Limits described in the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14), Volume 1, Chapter 7.</p> <p>SZC Co. continue to consult SCC on the preliminary design of Yoxford Roundabout, but highway scheme design is within the Order Limits referenced above.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the order limits as proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	<p>SZC Co. continues to consult with SCC on the preliminary design of Yoxford Roundabout through a programme of regular design meetings.</p> <p>Draingage technical note to be provided to SCC to provide certainty on the order limits.</p> <p>Departures from standard forms to be submitted to SCC to provide certainty on the order limits.</p>
HWY06	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Plan showing proposed highway boundary – The proposed highway boundary is shown on the General Arrangement (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100019) in Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132].</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions on-going. Drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100019 shows the red line is the developer site boundary not the areas that will become highway maintainable at public

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	SZC Co. will continue to engage with SCC on highways design matters, including discussions in relation to the land which is proposed to become highway maintainable at public expense.			expense. Note that the location of drainage at the north end of the A12 remains to be agreed.
HWY07	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Plan showing vertical and horizontal alignment with limits of deviation – The horizontal alignment of the proposed Yoxford Roundabout is shown on the Proposed General Arrangement (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100019) in Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132]. The vertical alignment of junction approaches is shown in Proposed Longsections (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100020) in Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the horizontal and vertical alignments and limits of deviation as proposed are considered acceptable.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - no further action
HWY08	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Plan showing typical cross sections, including drainage – Yoxford roundabout typical cross-sections for approach roads and circulatory carriageway are shown on Yoxford Roundabout Proposed Cross Sections (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100021) in Yoxford Roundabout and</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Not Agreed: Discussions on-going. Drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100021 does not show sufficient detail to show that the highway system is viable i.e. no controls or drainage invert levels.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>Other Highway Improvement Plans – Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-134].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the cross-sections as proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>			However, this is under discussion.
HWY09	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Design codes (DMRB, design speed, departures from standards) – Yoxford Roundabout is being design in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), to a 30mph design speed. There is one departure from standard: the B1122 approach horizontal radii. SZC Co. have presented the development of the preliminary design, approach and design parameters to SCC through a series of design meetings in early 2021. SZC Co will submit a departure from standard form to SCC, which will include information on the design standards and design speed as well as the departure from standard.</p> <p>SZC Co. believe that based on the departure form, SCC will be able to agree that the Yoxford roundabout design is acceptable and able to be constructed within the Order Limits.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	<p>SZC Co. to submit departures from standard form to SCC for approval.</p> <p>SCC are reviewing the preliminary design.</p>
HWY10	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Junction modelling – Detailed traffic modelling has been undertaken for the Yoxford roundabout proposals using industry standard modelling software</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>Junctions 9 and VISSIM (traffic micro-simulation). The latest Yoxford roundabout traffic modelling is described in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad) [AS-266].</p> <p>Traffic models were provided to SCC for technical review and have are considered to be an acceptable basis for the assessment of the Sizewell C project transport effects within the extent of the Yoxford VISSIM model (see Traffic Modelling section in this SoCG).</p>			
HWY11	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Drainage strategy including any wayleaves or easement on private land – The high-level landscaping and drainage strategy for Yoxford Roundabout is described in the ES Volume 7, Chapter 2 Description of Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements (Doc Ref. 6.8) [APP-480] and Appendix 2A Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3) [APP-181]. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the Yoxford Roundabout is provided in (Doc Ref. 5.7).</p> <p>SZC Co. are preparing a site-specific drainage strategy for Yoxford Roundabout which will provide further detail and evidence to demonstrate that effective drainage will be achievable within the Order Limits and that it follows the Hierarchy for the Disposal of Surface Water. The Drainage Strategy will summarise the proposed preliminary design and reference the areas of</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to issue site-specific Drainage Strategy for Yoxford Roundabout.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	agreement with SCC as recorded in Design Review Meetings and joint Site Inspections. It will include both the highway drainage and impact on watercourses.			
HWY12	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Plans showing proposed land use (highway, footway, drainage, landscaping) – Proposed arrangements for highway, footways, drainage and landscaping are shown on Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132] and Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-134].</p> <p>Post DCO and as part of the technical approval process, SZC Co. will prepare highway adoption plans which will indicate the extent of highways, footways, drainage and landscaping, based on the for approval drawings submitted with the DCO application.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Not agreed, Awaiting plans showing limits of adoption and land use.
HWY13	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Limits of streetlights – Drawings showing extent of proposed street lighting at Yoxford Roundabout are provided on Yoxford Roundabout Proposed General Arrangement (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100019) in Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132].</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed -note that further detailed design will be required at a later stage

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	SZC Co. believe that the preliminary street lighting proposals are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.			
HWY14	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Site clearance specifically trees, hedges, structures – Yoxford Roundabout Site Clearance Plans are provided as drawing SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100178 in Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the site clearance proposals are considered acceptable.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - no further action
HWY15	<p>Yoxford Roundabout highways design – Limits of permanent traffic regulation orders – Proposed permanent traffic regulation measures are set out in article 22 and Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). There are 2no. permanent traffic regulation measures and 4no. temporary traffic regulation measures as part of the Yoxford Roundabout proposals; all in relation to speed limit changes. Speed limit signs are shown on Yoxford Roundabout Proposed General Arrangement (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100019) in Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9) [AS-132].</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. SCC reviewing Schedule 14 in consultation with Suffolk Constabulary.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	SZC Co. understand that the traffic regulation measures proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.			
HWY16	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Plan showing order limits – The Order Limits for the proposed Sizewell Link Road are shown on the Proposed General Arrangement and Profiles Sheet 1 to 5 (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100056, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100057, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100058, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100059, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100060) in Sizewell Link Road Plans Part 1 of 3 For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10). Those plans include the amendment to the Order Limits described in the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14), Volume 1, Chapter 6 Sizewell Link Road.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the order limits as proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	<p>Draingage technical note to be provided to SCC to provide certainty on the order limits.</p> <p>Departures from standard forms to be submitted to SCC to provide certainty on the order limits.</p>
HWY17	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Plan showing proposed highway boundary – The highway fencing location for the proposed Sizewell Link Road is shown on the Proposed General Arrangement and Profiles Sheet 1 to 5 (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100056, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100057, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100058, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	No plan showing the highway boundary has been provided to SCC. Ongoing discussions.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>100059, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100060) in Sizewell Link Road Plans Part 1 of 3 For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10).</p> <p>SZC Co. welcome discussions with SCC to reach agreement on location of highway boundary.</p>			
HWY18	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Plan showing vertical and horizontal alignment with limits of deviation – The horizontal and vertical alignments for the proposed Sizewell Link Road are shown on the Proposed General Arrangement and Profiles Sheet 1 to 5 (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100056, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100057, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100058, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100059, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100060) in Sizewell Link Road Part 1 of 3 – Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-136], part of the additional submission in January 2021.</p> <p>SZC Co. welcome ongoing discussions to close-out matters of concern in relation to highway alignments.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Following technical meetings between EDF, WSP and SCC there are a small number of areas where the alignment requires change to remove or reduce departures. These are mostly on the side roads and at Middleton Moor.
HWY19	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Plan showing typical cross sections, including drainage – Sizewell link road typical cross-sections are shown on Sizewell Link Road Proposed Cross Sections (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100285) in Sizewell Link Road Part 1 of 2 – Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-139], part of the additional submission in January 2021.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Not Agreed. Highway drainage design is ongoing, specifically at the western end.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>Pretty Road Footbridge Proposed Cross Sections (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100442) in Sizewell Link Road Part 1 of 2 – Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-139], part of the additional submission in January 2021, show the proposed cross sections for that footbridge.</p> <p>East Suffolk Line Bridge Proposed Cross Sections (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100298) in Sizewell Link Road Part 1 of 2 – Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-139], part of the additional submission in January 2021, show the proposed cross sections for that bridge.</p>			Discussions regarding Pretty Road Bridge and Rail Bridge AIP ongoing
HWY20	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Design codes (DMRB, design speed, departures from standards) – The Sizewell link road is being designed in accordance with DMRB, to a 60mph design speed. There are 23no. departures from standard which have been discussed with SCC. SZC Co. have presented the development of the preliminary design, approach and design parameters to SCC through a series of design meetings in early 2021. Meetings have been collaborative in taking the design forward. SZC Co will submit a departure from standard form to SCC for each departure, which will include information on the design standards and design speed as well as the departure from standard.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Departures from standard forms to be submitted to SCC. The majority have been accepted or resolved but a few remain.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	SZC Co. continue to engage with SCC in relation to departures from standard.			
HWY21	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Junction modelling – Traffic modelling of the A12 / Sizewell link road junction was undertaken as part of the DCO application and reported in the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad) [AS-266]. The models were prepared using industry standard Junctions9 software. That modelling was accepted by SCC following their technical review.</p> <p>SCC requested traffic modelling of four proposed junctions as part of the information required for technical approval of the Sizewell link road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sizewell link road / B1125 (proposed priority T-junction) • Sizewell link road / Middleton Link Road (proposed priority T-junction) • Middleton Link Road / B1122 (proposed roundabout) • Sizewell link road / A12 (proposed roundabout) <p>Preliminary results from the models shows that these junctions have significant spare capacity. The four additional junction</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Submit three additional junction models for the SLR to SCC for technical review.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	models are being finalised and will be provided to SCC and ESC for their review.			
HWY22	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Drainage strategy including any wayleaves or easement on private land – The high-level landscaping and drainage strategy for Sizewell link road is described in Appendix 2A Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3) [APP-181] of Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the Sizewell link road is provided in Sizewell Link Road Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.6) [APP-136]. These documents were submitted to PINS in May 2020 with the DCO application.</p> <p>After the May 2020 DCO application submission further ground investigations were carried out to confirm the proposed drainage strategy for the Sizewell link road. A technical note was prepared to document the findings from that work: Sizewell link road – DCO Design Validation – Drainage in Volume 3, Appendix 6.2.B of the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14). The review led to a change to the drainage strategy.</p> <p>SZC Co. is preparing an updated site-specific drainage strategy for Sizewell link road which will provide further detail on the proposed site drainage, taking account of consultation with SCC.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Issue drainage strategy technical note for Sizewell link road to SCC for review and acceptance.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
HWY23	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Plans showing proposed land use (highway, footway, drainage, landscaping) – Proposed arrangements for highway, footways, drainage and landscaping are shown on a series of plans within Sizewell Link Road Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) Part 1 to 3.</p> <p>Post DCO and as part of the technical approval process, SZC Co. will prepare highway adoption plans which will indicate the extent of highways, footways, drainage and landscaping, based on the for approval drawings submitted with the DCO application.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Proposed process agreed. Further discussion on content of plans still continuing.
HWY24	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Limits of streetlights – The proposed Sizewell link road route would be mostly unlit, however to improve road safety lighting would be provided at the A12 roundabout and the roundabout connecting the Middleton Moor link to the B1122. The proposed location of lighting poles is shown on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sizewell Link Road Middleton Moor Roundabout Proposed Street Lighting Plan (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100437); and • Sizewell Link Road Western Roundabout Proposed Street Lighting Plan (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100438). 	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - no further action

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>Both drawings are provided in Sizewell Link Road Part 2 – Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-140].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the preliminary street lighting proposals are considered acceptable.</p>			
HWY25	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Site clearance specifically trees, hedges, structures – Sizewell Link Road Site Clearance Plans (4no.) are provided as drawing SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100174, SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100175, SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100176, SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100177 in Sizewell Link Road Part 3 – Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-136].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the site clearance proposals are considered acceptable, but welcome continued engagement on outstanding matters.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Subject to detailed design and validation of the actual site conditions. Note site clearance does not yet include highway infrastructure such as gullies, drains chambers, streetlights VRS and the like.
HWY26	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Feasibility design of highway structures (nominal spans, heights, clearance and construction materials) – There are two highway structures within the Sizewell link road proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a single span railway bridge, approximately 50m in length, to enable the route of the proposed Sizewell link road to cross over the East Suffolk railway line. The structural design proposals for this bridge are shown on SZC-SZ0701- 	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - the principles are agreed and a preminiary AIP nearing completion. Subject to detailed design.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>XX-000-DRW-100297 and SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100298 in Sizewell Link Road Part 1 of 2 – Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-139] and SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100296 in Sizewell Link Road Part 2 of 3 – Plans for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-137].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a new overbridge, single span, up to 44m long to carry non-motorised users only (pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians) over the Sizewell link road and connect to Pretty Road on either side. The structural design proposals for this bridge are shown on SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100439 and SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100442 in Sizewell Link Road Part 1 of 2 – Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-139] and SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100299 in Sizewell Link Road Part 2 of 3 – Plans for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.10) [AS-137]. <p>SZC Co. understand that the feasibility design of highway structures is considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>			
HWY27	<p>Sizewell link road highways design – Limits of permanent traffic regulation orders – Proposed permanent traffic regulation measures are set out in article 22 and Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). There are no permanent traffic regulation measures and 10 no. temporary traffic regulation measures identified in the</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	The details in Schedule 14 require checking against SCC policy and existing TRO orders. It is understood that EDF have not yet engaged in formal

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	Draft DCO for the Sizewell link road; all in relation to speed limit changes.			consultation with the police on this matter.
HWY28	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Plan showing order limits – The Order Limits for the proposed Two village bypass are shown on the Proposed General Arrangement and Profiles Sheet 1 and 2 (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100038, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100522) in Two Village Bypass Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-128]. Those plans include the amendment to the Order Limits described in the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14), Volume 1, Chapter 5 Two Village Bypass.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the order limits as proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
HWY29	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Plan showing proposed highway boundary – The highway fence location for the proposed Two village bypass is shown on the Proposed General Arrangement and Profiles Sheets 1 and 2 (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100038, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100522) in Two Village Bypass Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-128].</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Ongoing discussion. No highway boundary plans have been provided for SCC to review. The drawings show a fence line (an accommodation fence), which is not the same as the highway boundary nor

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	SZC Co. welcome discussions with SCC to reach agreement on location of highway boundary..			has this been discussed with SCC.
HWY30	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Plan showing vertical and horizontal alignment with limits of deviation – The horizontal and vertical alignments for the proposed Two village bypass are shown on the Proposed General Arrangement and Profiles Sheets 1 and 2 (drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100038, SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100522) in Two Village Bypass Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-128], part of the additional submission in January 2021.</p> <p>Vertical alignment details for the eastern roundabout (A12 / A1094) are shown on SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100450 and for the western roundabout (A12) on SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100451.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the horizontal and vertical alignments and limits of deviation as proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed subject to future detailed design
HWY31	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Plan showing typical cross sections, including drainage – Two village bypass typical cross-sections are shown on Two Village Bypass Cross Sections (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100443) in Two Village Bypass Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-129], part of the additional submission in January 2021.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foxburrow Wood Footbridge Cross Sections (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100292) in Two Village Bypass Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-129], part of the additional submission in January 2021, show the proposed cross sections for that footbridge. River Alde Overbridge Cross Sections (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100295) in Two Village Bypass Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-129], part of the additional submission in January 2021, show the proposed cross sections for that bridge. <p>SZC Co. understand that the cross-sections as proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>			
HWY32	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Design codes (DMRB, design speed, departures from standards) – The Two village bypass is being design in accordance with DMRB, to a 60mph design speed. There are 3no. departures from standard. SZC Co. have presented the development of the preliminary design, approach and design parameters to SCC through a series of design meetings in early 2021. Meetings have been collaborative in taking the design forward. SZC Co will submit a departure from standard form to SCC for each departure, which will include</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. complete and submit departure from standard forms for each departure. Most departures or relaxations have either been resolved or agreement reached.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	information on the design standards and design speed as well as the departure from standard.			
HWY33	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Junction modelling – There are two junctions within the Two village bypass scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A12 / Tinker Brook / Two village bypass (western roundabout); and • A12 / A1094 / Two village bypass (eastern roundabout). <p>Detailed traffic modelling for these junctions was reported in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad) [AS-266]. These traffic models were developed in consultation with SCC and ESC. The model files and results were provided to SCC for their review as part of technical approval to the highway designs.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SCC are undertaking review of traffic models submitted.
HWY34	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Drainage strategy including any wayleaves or easement on private land – The high-level drainage strategy for Two village bypass is described in Appendix 2A Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3) [APP-181] of Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES. The drainage strategy assumes that all highway run off is removed and disposed by infiltration to ground. The subsequent infiltration testing results have</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Submit drainage strategy technical note for two village bypass to SCC for review and acceptance.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>been shared with SCC and there is joint agreement that infiltration will work.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the Two village bypass is provided in Two Village Bypass Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.5) [APP-119]. These documents were submitted to PINS in May 2020 with the DCO application. The Two Village Bypass Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 5.5) [AS-171] was submitted to PINS in January 2021 to provide further information to support the Two village bypass FRA. The FRA Addendum confirmed the conclusions of the FRA.</p> <p>SZC Co. are preparing an updated site-specific drainage strategy for Two village bypass which will provide further detail on the proposed site drainage, taking account of recent site walkovers and consultation with SCC.</p>			
HWY35	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Plans showing proposed land use (highway, footway, drainage, landscaping) – Proposed arrangements for highway, footways, drainage and landscaping are shown on a series of plans within Two Village Bypass Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-128].</p> <p>Post DCO and as part of the technical approval process, SZC Co. will prepare highway adoption plans which will indicate the extent</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. Plans have been provided but not to the level of detail to allow SCC accept them. This is specifically the case for areas of landscaping that may or may not be within the future public highway.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	of highways, footways, drainage and landscaping, based on the for approval drawings submitted with the DCO application.			It is noted that some drawings are not consistent
HWY36	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Limits of streetlights – The proposed Two village bypass route would be mostly unlit, however, to improve road safety, lighting would be provided at the A12 / Tinker Brook junction and the A12 / A1094 junction. The proposed location of lighting poles is shown on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two Village Bypass A12/A1094 Western Roundabout Proposed Street Lighting Plan (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100447); and Two Village Bypass A12/A1094 Eastern Roundabout Proposed Street Lighting Plan (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100446). <p>Both drawings are provided in Two Village Bypass Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-129].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the preliminary street lighting proposals are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - no further action
HWY37	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Site clearance specifically trees, hedges, structures – Two Village Bypass Site Clearance Plans (2no.) are provided as drawing SZC-SZ0701-XX-</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Agreed - in principle subject to detailed design and validation of the actual

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>000-DRW-100168, SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100169 in Two Village Bypass Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-128].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the site clearance proposals are considered acceptable by SCC and ESC, but welcome comment within this table if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>			site conditions. Note site clearance does not yet include highway infrastructure such as gullies, drains chambers, streetlights VRS and the like.
HWY38	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Feasibility design of highway structures (nominal spans, heights, clearance and construction materials) – There are two highway structures within the Two village bypass proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A crossing of the River Alde via an overbridge. The overbridge would be 60m in length and have two concrete intermediary piers. The structural design proposals for this bridge are shown on SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100294 and SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100295 in Two Village Bypass Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-129] and SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100293 in Two Village Bypass Plans for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-128]. A footbridge across the route of the proposed two village bypass approximately 150m east of Farnham Hall, referred to as the 'Foxburrow Wood footbridge'. The structural design proposals for this bridge are shown on SZC-SZ0701- 	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed in principle. Structures AIP close to finalisation.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>XX-000-DRW-100291 and SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100292 in Two Village Bypass Plans Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-129] and SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100290 in Two Village Bypass Plans for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.8) [AS-128].</p> <p>AIP's for these structures have been issued to SCC and comments received addressed in a second AIP issued to SCC.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the approval in principle of highway structures is nearing finalisation.</p>			
HWY39	<p>Two village bypass highways design – Limits of permanent traffic regulation orders – Proposed permanent traffic regulation measures are set out in article 22 and Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). There are 3no. permanent traffic regulation measures and 5no. temporary traffic regulation measures identified in the Draft DCO; all in relation to speed limit changes.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - The details in Schedule 14 require checking against SCC policy and existing TRO orders. It is understood that EDF have not yet engaged in formal consultation with the police on this matter.
HWY40	<p>MDS highways design – Plan showing order limits – The Order Limits for the proposed highway works around the main development site are shown on the Main Development Site Highway Works Proposed General Arrangement – Sheets 1 to 9 in Main Development Site Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - no further action

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>119]. Those plans include the amendment to the Order Limits described in the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14), Volume 1, Chapter 2 Main Development Site.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the order limits as proposed are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>			
HWY41	<p>MDS highways design – Plan showing proposed highway boundary – The highway boundary for the proposed highway works around the main development site is not shown on the Main Development Site Highway Works Proposed General Arrangement plans. The location of highway boundary fencing will be added to subsequent plans, and shared with SCC and ESC, as part of the preliminary design development.</p> <p>SZC Co. welcome discussions with SCC to reach agreement on location of highway boundary.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Plans showing the proposed highway boundary have not been provided to SCC.
HWY42	<p>MDS highways design – Plan showing vertical and horizontal alignment with limits of deviation – The horizontal alignments for the proposed highway works around the main development site are shown on the Proposed General Arrangement Sheets 1 and 9 in Main Development Site Highway Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-119], part of the additional submission in January 2021.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Many areas are agreed in terms of alignment but design is continuing on some, specifically the structure for the bridleway over Leiston Drain. The details of the bridleway along Abbey Road and how

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>The vertical alignment details are shown on a series of drawings, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lover's Lane re-alignment on Main Development Site Highways Proposed General Arrangement – Sheet 5 of 9 (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100110) in Main Development Site Highway Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-119]; Lover's Lane secondary site access on Main Development Site Highways Proposed General Arrangement – Sheet 6 of 9 (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100111) in Main Development Site Highway Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-119]; and Main site access roundabout on Main Site Access Roundabout Proposed Vertical Profiles – Sheet 5 of 22 in Main Development Site Highway Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-116]. <p>There are no vertical limits of deviation (LoD) defined for the highway works in the vicinity of the main development site. See article 4 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) for reference.</p> <p>Discussions are continuing with SCC and ESC on this matter.</p>			this interacts with drainage is being checked.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
HWY43	<p>MDS highways design – Plan showing typical cross sections, including drainage – Typical cross-sections for the proposed highway works along Lover's Lane are shown on the following drawings in Main Development Site Highway Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-116]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lover's Lane Highway Works Proposed Cross Sections – Sheet 13 of 22 (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100171); • Lover's Lane Highway Works Proposed Cross Sections – Sheet 14 of 22 (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100172); and • Lover's Lane Highway Works Proposed Cross Sections – Sheet 15 of 22 (SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100173). 	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	
HWY44	<p>MDS highways design – Design codes (DMRB, design speed, departures from standards) – The main development site highway schemes are being design in accordance with DMRB. There are 8no. departures from standard. SZC Co. have presented the development of the preliminary design, approach and design parameters to SCC through a series of design meetings in early 2021. Meetings have been collaborative in taking the design forward. SZC Co will submit a departure from standard form to SCC for each departure, which will include</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co to submit departure from standard forms for each departure to SCC. The majority of departures or relaxations have been agreed or resolved but a few remain to be agreed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	information on the design standards and design speed as well as the departure from standard.			
HWY45	<p>MDS highways design – Junction modelling – There are three junctions near the main development site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1122 / main site access roundabout; • B1122 / Lover's Lane (priority T-junction); and • Lover's Lane / LEEIE access (priority T-junction). <p>Detailed traffic modelling for the two B1122 junctions was reported in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad) [AS-266]. These traffic models were developed in consultation with SCC and ESC. The model files and results were provided to SCC for their technical review, and are now considered by SCC to be acceptable.</p> <p>The Lover's Lane / LEEIE access traffic model was requested by SCC as part of the technical approval process. A model has been developed for this junction, and preliminary results indicate significant spare capacity at this junction. Model files and results will be shared with SCC and ESC for technical review.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Submit Lover's Lane / LEEIE access junction traffic model to SCC and ESC for review as part of technical approval.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
HWY46	<p>MDS highways design – Drainage strategy including any wayleaves or easement on private land – The high-level drainage strategy for the highways works around the main development site is described in Appendix 2A Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3) [APP-181] of Volume 2, Chapter 2 of the ES.</p> <p>The proposed drainage is infiltration to ground, or discharge to watercourse at controlled attenuation flow rate (i.e. main site access roundabout) if infiltration is not achievable.</p> <p>SZC Co. are preparing an updated site-specific drainage strategy for the highway works around the main development site which will provide further detail and evidence to demonstrate that effective site drainage will be provided and that it follows the Hierarchy for the Disposal of Surface Water. The Drainage Strategy will summarise the proposed preliminary design and reference the areas of agreement with SCC as recorded in Design Review Meetings and joint Site Inspections. It will include both the highway drainage and impact on watercourses.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to issue site-specific Drainage Strategy for highway works in the vicinity of the main development site.
HWY47	<p>MDS highways design – Plans showing proposed land use (highway, footway, drainage, landscaping) – Proposed arrangements for highway, footways and drainage are shown on a series of plans within Main Development Site Highway Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-119]. Landscape proposals are shown</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing. Plans have been provided but not to the level of detail to allow SCC and ESC accept them. This is specifically the case for areas of landscaping

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>in Main Development Site Landscape Plans – For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-120].</p> <p>Post DCO and as part of the technical approval process, SZC Co. will prepare highway adoption plans which will indicate the extent of highways, footways, drainage and landscaping, based on the for approval drawings submitted with the DCO application.</p>			that may or may not be within the future public highway.
HWY48	<p>MDS highways design – Limits of streetlights – To improve road safety lighting would be provided at the main development site roundabout, the Abbey Road / Lover's Lane junction, new railway level crossing, Lover's Lane / Sandy Lane / Valley Road, and King George's Avenue. The proposed location of lighting poles is shown on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Development Site Main Site Access Roundabout Proposed Lighting Plan - Sheet 3 of 22 in Main Development Site Highway Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-116]; • Main Development Site Lover's Lane Proposed Lighting Plan - Sheet 8 of 22 in Main Development Site Highway Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-116]; • Main Development Site King George's Avenue Proposed Site Access Proposed Lighting Plan - Sheet 21 of 22 in Main 	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>Development Site Highway Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-116];</p> <p>The proposed extent of streetlights has been presented to SCC as part of preliminary design workshops.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the preliminary street lighting proposals are considered acceptable, but welcome comment if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>			
HWY49	<p>MDS highways design – Site clearance specifically trees, hedges, structures – Main development site clearance plans (4no.) are provided as drawing SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100152, SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100153, SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100154, SZC-SZ0701-XX-000-DRW-100155 in Main Development Site Landscape Plans – Plans for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.5) [AS-120].</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the site clearance proposals are considered acceptable by SCC and ESC, but welcome comment within this table if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed - in principle subject to detailed design and validation of the actual site conditions. Note site clearance does not yet include highway infrastructure such as gullies, drains chambers, streetlights VRS and the like.
HWY50	<p>MDS highways design – Feasibility design of highway structures (nominal spans, heights, clearance and construction materials) – There are three proposed minor structures within the main development site highway works scope:</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Continue engagement with SCC and ESC on feasibility design of highways structures.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Abbey Road and green rail route crossing culvert; Bridleway crossing over Leiston Drain near Lover's Lane; Lover's Lane mammal crossing. <p>Detailed drawings of these structures were not provided in the DCO application plans, but proposals have been presented to SCC and ESC through design workshops.</p> <p>SZC Co. propose to continue engagement with both authorities to agree the feasibility designs.</p>			Lovers Lane Mammal culvert agreed in principle.
HWY51	<p>MDS highways design – Limits of permanent traffic regulation orders – Proposed permanent traffic regulation measures are set out in article 22 and Schedule 14 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). There are 7no. permanent traffic regulation measures and 27no. temporary traffic regulation measures identified in the Draft DCO; all in relation to speed limit changes.</p> <p>SZC Co. understand that the traffic regulation measures proposed are considered acceptable by SCC and ESC, but welcome comment within this table if there are still outstanding matters of concern.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - The details in Schedule 14 require checking against SCC policy and existing TRO orders. It is understood that EDF have not yet engaged in formal consultation with the police on this matter.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
HWY52	Northern Park & Ride access highway design – Highway design plans for the Northern Park & Ride are provided in the Northern Park and Ride Plans For Approval and Northern Park and Ride Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.6). Discussions are ongoing in relation to highway design matters.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HWY53	Southern Park & Ride access highway design – Highway design plans for the Southern Park & Ride are provided in the Southern Park and Ride Plans For Approval and Southern Park and Ride Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.7). Discussions are ongoing in relation to highway design matters.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HWY54	Freight Management Facility access highway design – Highway design plans for the Freight Management Facility are provided in the Freight Management Facility Plans For Approval and Freight Management Facility Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.11). Discussions are ongoing in relation to highway design matters.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HWY55	A12 / A144 junction highway design – Highway design plans for the A12/A144 junction are provided in the Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – A12/A144 Junction South of Bramfield Plan for Approval and Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvement Plans – A12/A144 Junction South of Bramfield Plan Not for Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9). Discussions are ongoing in relation to highway design matters.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
HWY56	A12 / B1119 junction highway design – Highway design plans for the A12/B1119 junction are provided in the Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements Plans - A12/B1119 Junction at Saxmundham Plans For Approval and Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements Plans - A12/B1119 Junction at Saxmundham Plans Not For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9). Discussions are ongoing in relation to highway design matters.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HWY57	A1094 / B1069 junction highway design – Highway design plans for the A1094/B1069 junction are provided in the Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements Plans - A1094/B1069 Junction South of Knodishall Plans Not For Approval and Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements Plans - A1094/B1069 Junction South of Knodishall Plans For Approval (Doc Ref. 2.9). Discussions are ongoing in relation to highway design matters.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
HWY58	Draft DCO schedules and Streets clauses. Part 3 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1), in conjunction with Schedules 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 sets out the powers in respect of streets.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
Environmental Transport Effects – The purpose of this theme is to set out the position of the parties in relation to the outcomes of the assessment of environmental transport effects described in Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3) and Chapter 2 of the Environmental Statement Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14). This section does not cover any potential mitigation that may arise				

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
from the assessment of environmental transport effects. Transport mitigation is covered under a dedicated “Transport mitigation” theme later in this table.				
ET01	Methodology for the ES transport assessment – The methodology for the ES transport chapter is set out in Volume 1, Appendix 6F of the Environmental Statement and is based on the Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic published by the Institute of Environmental Assessment in 1993 (now Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment). The methodology is considered a sound basis from which to assess the environmental transport effects of the project.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET02	Traffic flows used for the ES transport assessment – 24 hour, 18 hour and representative hour traffic flows derived from the VISUM strategic traffic model have been used for the ES transport assessment included in the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-181]. The traffic flows are considered an acceptable basis from which to assess the environmental transport effects of the project.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. has provided further information with regards to comments raised on the traffic flows used for the ES Transport chapter. SZC Co. to confirm to SCC/ESC there would be no impact on traffic link screening as a result of the SCC/ESC comments to enable SCC/ESC to accept the traffic flows

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
ET03	Sensitivity of receptors – The sensitivity of road links is summarised in Appendix 10A of Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES (Doc Ref 6.3) [APP-199].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET04	Screening process in accordance with IEMA Rules 1 and 2 – The screening of road links has been undertaken in accordance with Rule 1 and 2 of the IEMA guidance and is set out in Appendices 2.5A and 2.5D of the ES Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-203].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET05	Assessment of the effects of the SZC project on severance – The assessment of the effects of the SZC project on severance is summarised in the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-181].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET06	Assessment of the effects of the SZC project on pedestrian delay – The assessment of the effects of the SZC project on pedestrian delay is summarised in the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-181].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET07	Assessment of the effects of the SZC project on amenity – The assessment of the effects of the SZC project on amenity is summarised in the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-181].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
ET08	Assessment of the effects of the SZC project on fear and intimidation – The assessment of the effects of the SZC project on fear and intimidation is summarised in the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-181].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET09	Assessment of the effects of the SZC project on road safety – The assessment of the effects of the SZC project on road safety is summarised in the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-181].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET10	Assessment of the effects of the SZC project on driver delay – The assessment of the effects of the SZC project on driver delay is summarised in the Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [AS-181].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET11	Assessment of the effects of the SZC project on hazardous loads – The assessment of the effects of the SZC project on hazardous loads is summarised in Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES (Doc Ref 6.3) [APP-198].	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter
ET12	Cumulative impact assessment – Committed developments were agreed with Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council and are included in the Reference Case traffic flows. The cumulative impact assessment therefore assesses the potential cumulative effects of Sizewell C with Scottish Power (EN-1 and	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide SCC and ESC with a response to comments raised on the ES Transport chapter

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	EN-2) and is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 10 of the ES Addendum (Doc Ref 6.14) [APP-189].			
Transport management plans – The purpose of this theme is to set out the position of the parties in relation to the controls, monitoring and impact management proposals set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.7(A)), Construction Worker Travel Plan (Doc Ref. 8.8(A)) and Traffic Incident Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.6(A)). This theme also covers the scope and procedures proposed in relation to the Transport Review Group (TRG).				
MP01	General – Transport Review Group (TRG) – The scope of the Transport Review Group (TRG) is set out in Section 2 of the Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) and duplicated in Section 2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). An updated CWTP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP and CWTP to SCC and ESC
MP02	General – relationship between TRG and other groups – The relationship between the TRG and other groups is summarised in Section 2 of the CWTP and duplicated in Section 2 of the CTMP. An updated CWTP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP and CWTP to SCC and ESC
MP03	General – Transport Co-ordinator and Delivery Co-ordinator – The role of the Transport Co-ordinator is set out in Section 2 of the CWTP and duplicated in Section 2 of the CTMP. The role of the Delivery Co-ordinator is set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP and CWTP to SCC and ESC

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
MP04	Construction Worker Travel Plan – objectives and targets – The objectives and mode share for construction worker travel to work are set out in Section 3 of the CWTP. An updated CWTP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP with updated targets based on the TA Addendum modelling.
MP05	Construction Worker Travel Plan – measures – The package of travel plan measures are set out in Section 4 of the CWTP. An updated CWTP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP to SCC and ESC
MP06	Construction Worker Travel Plan – monitoring and review – The mechanism for monitoring and review of the CWTP is set out in Section 5 of the CWTP. An updated CWTP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP to SCC and ESC
MP07	Construction Worker Travel Plan – enforcement – The mechanisms for enforcement of the CWTP is set out in Section 6 of the CWTP. An updated CWTP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CWTP to SCC and ESC
MP08	Construction Traffic Management Plan - objectives – The objectives of the CTMP are set out in Section 1 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
MP09	Construction Traffic Management Plan – HGV and AIL routes – The proposed HGV and Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) routes are summarised in Section 3 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC
MP10	Construction Traffic Management Plan – HGV management measures – The measures to manage HGV movements associated with the construction phase of the project are set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC
MP11	Construction Traffic Management Plan – LGV management measures – The measures to manage light goods vehicle (LGV) movements associated with the construction phase of the project are set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC
MP12	Construction Traffic Management Plan – AIL management measures – The measures to manage AIL movements associated with the construction phase of the project are set out in Section 4 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC
MP13	Construction Traffic Management Plan – monitoring and review – The mechanism for monitoring and review of the CTMP	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	is set out in Section 5 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.			
MP14	Construction Traffic Management Plan – enforcement – The mechanisms for enforcement of the CTMP is set out in Section 6 of the CTMP. An updated CTMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC
MP15	Traffic Incident Management Plan – scope and traffic incident management area – The scope of the Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) is set out in Section 1 of the TIMP as well as the Incident Management Area (IMA), within which the TIMP protocols will apply. An updated TIMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated CTMP to SCC and ESC.
MP16	Traffic Incident Management Plan – roles and responsibilities – The roles and responsibilities of SZC Co. Suffolk County Council, Highways England and the emergency services with regards to the TIMP are summarised in Section 2. An updated TIMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to SCC and ESC
MP17	Traffic Incident Management Plan – measures – Measures to be implemented by SZC Co. to manage SZC HGVs and buses in the event of an incident are summarised in Section 4 of the TIMP. An updated TIMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to SCC and ESC

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
MP18	Traffic Incident Management Plan – protocols for planned and unplanned incidents – Protocols to manage SZC HGVs and buses in the event of specific planned and unplanned incidents are summarised in Section 5 of the TIMP. An updated TIMP will be issued to SCC and ESC for discussion.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	SZC Co. to provide an updated TIMP to SCC and ESC
Transport Mitigation – The purpose of this theme is to set out the position of the parties in relation to transport mitigation matters.				
MI01	<p>Mitigation for transport related community impacts – In addition to the implementation of the associated development and other primary transport mitigation, SZC Co. has committed to mitigating residual transport related community effects through measures to be secured via the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)) SZC Co. has committed to monitoring the transport effects of the project throughout the construction phase and to report the monitoring to the Transport Review Group (TRG), to ensure that the transport effects of the project are appropriately managed and controlled in accordance with the management plans: CTMP (Doc Ref 8.7(A)), CWTP (Doc Ref. 8.8(A)) and the TIMP (Doc Ref. 8.6(A)). A contingency fund is proposed to be secured through the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)), to be used by the TRG if necessary for any further mitigation and remedial actions arising from the transport monitoring.</p> <p>The principle of mitigating residual impacts is agreed, but discussions are ongoing with SCC and ESC to agree the procedures, governance, etc. that will be in place through the TRG</p>	Discussions ongoing	Ongoing discussions	The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via the Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	to ensure that residual transport related community impacts are mitigated. Further details will be provided within the CTMP, CWTP and TIMP when revised versions are released to SCC and ESC for discussion.			
MI02	<p>With regards to the economic cost of congestion, the Transport Assessment Addendum (Doc Ref. 8.5(A)Ad) concludes that no significant mitigation is required, beyond the principal mitigation proposed in the form of the associated development submitted with the Application.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with SCC and ESC to reach agreement with respect to the economic cost of congestion.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
MI03	<p>Mitigation for impacts on the Leiston Household Waste Recycling Centre at Lover's Lane – SZC Co. have responded to this through a minor extension of the site boundary to allow for a proposed right turn lane into the Leiston Household Waste Recycling centre. The proposed amendments to the highway design mitigate impacts on the LHWRC at Lover's Lane.</p> <p>Discussions are continuing with SCC to reach agreement on this matter.</p>	No comment	Ongoing discussions.	<p>SZC Co. will continue to discuss the design of the LHWRC access junction to word towards agreement with Council.</p> <p>SCC continues to hold the position that it will be a challenge to accommodate the HWRC at the existing site, with the same service levels, and wwith the required road safety</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
				improvements, and continues to advocate relocation of the facility
MI04	<p>Transport contingency fund – A transport contingency fund is proposed to be made available to the Transport Review Group (TRG) to be used if necessary to implement any further mitigation measures and remedial actions. The contingency fund is included within the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)).</p> <p>The principle of a transport contingency fund is agreed, but discussions are ongoing in relation to the scope, scale and governance around the deployment of that fund.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI05	<p>Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – This is a matter of ongoing discussion between SZC Co. and the County Council. Considerable progress has been made with the development of scheme for Leiston, Wickham Market, Marlesford and Little Glemham and the B1078 to be funded via the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)). A transport contingency fund is proposed to be made available to the Transport Review Group to be used if necessary to implement any further mitigation measures and remedial actions. The following</p>	Discussions ongoing	Ongoing discussions.	The Council expects that the construction of the project will be, in a number of locations, detrimental to highway safety, highway capacity and will increase environmental impacts of road traffic such as severance, delay and fear and intimidation in a number of communities.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	response is provided with regards to the areas identified by Council requiring further mitigation.			Such impacts are expected along the A12, the B1122 prior to the delivery of mitigation, the B1078, B1069, B1125, A1120 specific rural roads, roads in Leiston and Wickham Market, and to a lesser extent the A14. Locations that the Council considers are likely to require additional improvements are listed in this table below. The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI06	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – i) A1094/B1069 - SZC Co. propose to monitor through the TRG and use contingency fund if required	Discussions ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Further mitigation required –) Mitigation fund for impacts on the highway network to the east of the A12; most notably the two

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	to address issues. Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.			<p>A1094 / B1069 junctions, but inclusive of other unforeseen impacts.</p> <p>The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.</p>
MI07	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – ii) B1125 through Westleton and Middleton – Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.	<p>Further mitigation required – ii) Mitigation for the B1125 through Westleton and Middleton because of environmental and community impacts – including local pedestrian and cycle improvements.</p> <p>The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
MI08	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – iii) Leiston – good progress has been made to develop an improvement scheme for Leiston. SZC Co. is seeking to work with local authorities to progress these plans through local public consultation early in 2021, and to develop costed designs which would be appended to the Section 106 Agreement. Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.	Discussions ongoing	Discussion ongoing.	Further mitigation required – iii) Mitigation for impacts of construction and operational traffic in Leiston. SZC Co. continues to work with Leiston Town Council, as well as Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council to agree a package of measures for each location. The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI09	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – Wickham Market – good progress has been made to develop an improvement scheme for Wickham Market. SZC Co. is seeking to work with local authorities to progress these plans through local public consultation early in 2021, and to develop costed designs which would be appended to the Section 106 Agreement. Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.	For Wickham Market, the Council expects an agreed and costed formal mitigation package that is acceptable to the Council as well as the local parish / town council. SZC Co. continues to work with Wickham Market

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
				Parish Council, as well as Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council to agree a package of measures for each location. The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI10	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – iv) A1120, Yoxford – the ES Assessment did not identify significant adverse effects on the A1120 in Yoxford. SZC Co. do not consider further mitigation is required beyond the management of construction traffic via the transport management plans. Notwithstanding this, discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.	Discussions ongoing	Discussion ongoing.	Further mitigation required – iv) Mitigation for the A1120 through Yoxford and Peasenhall because of environmental and community impacts – including local pedestrian and cycle improvements. The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
				continuing discussions with SCC.
MI11	<p>Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – v) B1122 walk and cycle improvements prior to the Sizewell link road – a maintenance fund is proposed for the B1122 prior to the Sizewell link road being operational, which will ensure that the road is maintained for cyclists. The delivery and retention of the Sizewell link road would enable the down grading of the B1122 with enhanced potential for cycling and recreation.</p> <p>Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this corridor.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussion ongoing.	<p>Further mitigation required – v) Mitigation for the B1122 prior to delivery of the Sizewell Link Road – including local pedestrian and cycle improvements / infrastructure.</p> <p>The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.</p>
MI12	<p>Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – vi) A12 between A14 and A1152 – Based on the A12 VISSIM modelling, no material impact is predicted on journey times and therefore no mitigation in the form of highway improvements is considered to be required for the A12 corridor between A14 and A1152. Traffic will be managed and monitored through the transport management plans.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussion ongoing.	<p>Further mitigation required – vi) Highway capacity improvements for the A12 corridor between the A1152 and A14 as identified in the Councils' LIR.</p> <p>The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	Notwithstanding this, discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to the A12 corridor.			secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI13	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – vii) A12/Woodbridge Road, Bredfield – SZC Co. proposes that the Bredfield junction performance is monitored during the construction of Sizewell C via the Transport Review Group (TRG). The transport contingency fund would be available to the TRG to address any significant issues, should they arise. Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI14	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – viii) Little Glemham and Marlesford – further liaison with the County Council is required on this matter. This is a matter of ongoing discussion between SZC Co. and the County Council. Considerable progress has been made with the development of scheme for Little Glemham and Marlesford to be funded via the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)). A transport contingency fund is proposed to be made available to the	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.	Further mitigation required – viii) Mitigation for the A12 at Little Glemham and Marlesford because of environmental and community impacts - including local pedestrian and cycle improvements.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	Transport Review Group to be used if necessary to implement any further mitigation measures and remedial actions. The following response is provided with regards to the areas identified by Council requiring further mitigation.			The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI15	<p>Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – ix) B1078 corridor – progress has been made with the County Council to develop a package of road safety improvements along this corridor.</p> <p>This is a matter of ongoing discussion between SZC Co. and the County Council. Considerable progress has been made with the development of scheme for the B1078 corridor to be funded via the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)). A transport contingency fund is proposed to be made available to the Transport Review Group to be used if necessary to implement any further mitigation measures and remedial actions. The following response is provided with regards to the areas identified by Council requiring further mitigation.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.	<p>Further mitigation required – ix) Mitigation for the significant impacts at the B1078 / B1079 - sufficient funding needs to be in place for this corridor.</p> <p>The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.</p>
MI16	<p>Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – x) Blythburgh – SZC Co. <u>do not propose additional mitigation at this location</u> on the A12 at Blythburgh beyond the management of construction traffic through</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.	<p>Further mitigation required – x) Mitigation for the A12 at Blythburgh - including local</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	the transport management plans, Transport Review Group and contingency funds. Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing to reach an agreed position.			pedestrian and cycle improvements. The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI17	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – x) Knodishall Common / Coldfair Green Discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.	Further mitigation required – Mitigation for the B1069 including local pedestrian and cycle improvements.
MI18	Need for road improvements, in addition to those proposed in the Transport Assessment – xi) Saxmundham – It is proposed to provide a road safety improvement to the A12/B1119 junction. Traffic is proposed to be managed through the transport management plans. HGVs would be routed via the A12 and would not route through Saxmundham. The majority of the workers would travel to site via the sustainable modes and no park and ride buses would route through Saxmundham. Parking is proposed to be limited at the main development site and managed	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing.	Further mitigation required – xi) Mitigation of impacts in Saxmundham and adjacent junctions on the A12 and the B1119 towards Leiston. The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via S106

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	<p>with parking permits. A direct bus is proposed from Saxmundham to site to reduce car trips from the town to the main development site. SZC Co. do not consider that further mitigation is required in Saxmundham beyond what is already proposed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, discussions with SCC and ESC are continuing in relation to this location.</p>			Obligations is part of continuing discussions with SCC.
MI19	<p>Maintenance contribution to highways – SZC Co. has committed to undertake a highway condition survey of the B1122 prior to commencement of construction. SZC Co. also proposes to provide a maintenance fund via the S106 Agreement for the maintenance of the B1122 prior to the completion of the Sizewell Link Road to mitigate the impacts of Sizewell traffic during the early years construction phase. [revise wording, not closing it down.]</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with SCC in relation to highways maintenance contributions on the B1122.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions on-going.	<p>The Council expects appropriate levels of maintenance contribution for all affected highways; this has not been confirmed yet by the applicant. Maintenance may have to occur at night-time as the construction traffic will make it disruptive to program maintenance works on the A12 and B1122 / SLR in daytime off peak hours. The Council also considers that the volume of HGV traffic will result in significant structural damage to local roads with resultant delays for essential maintenance</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
				<p>and additional costs for the authority which needs to be covered by the applicant.</p> <p>The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via the Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.</p>
MI20	<p>Maintenance contribution to highways – HGVs will route via the A12 and B1122 / Sizewell Link Road during the construction phase. Highway improvements are proposed on the A12 to mitigate the transport effects of the Sizewell C traffic. The A12 is a strategic lorry route, as defined in the Suffolk Lorry Route Network Map, and is regularly used by HGV traffic. SZC Co. does not consider that the increase in HGV traffic on the A12 generated by the project requires highway maintenance funding.</p> <p>Discussions are ongoing with SCC in relation to highways maintenance contributions on the A12.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions on-going.	<p>The Council expects appropriate levels of maintenance contribution for all affected highways; this has not been confirmed yet by the applicant. Maintenance may have to occur at night-time as the construction traffic will make it disruptive to program maintenance works on the A12 and B1122 / SLR in daytime off peak hours. The Council also considers that the volume of HGV traffic will result in significant</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
				<p>structural damage to local roads with resultant delays for essential maintenance and additional costs for the authority which needs to be covered by the applicant.</p> <p>The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via the Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.</p>
MI21	<p>Cumulative transport impacts with Scottish Power Renewables EA1N and EA2 schemes – SZC Co. proposes to manage Sizewell C construction traffic through the implementation of a CTMP and CWTP, which would be monitored on a quarterly basis throughout the construction phase and reviewed through a Transport Review Group (TRG). The TRG would include representatives from SZC Co., the local authorities and Highways England. A Transport Contingency Fund is to be established by SZC Co. through the S106 Agreement and made available to the TRG in the event that further mitigation or corrective actions are required. SZC Co. proposes to monitor the cumulative effects of Sizewell C with Scottish Power Renewables of East Anglia 1 North (EA1N) and East Anglia 2 (EA2) during the construction</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions on-going.	<p>Relevant controls need to be put in place to ensure that the impacts of the development do not exceed those assessed; this is pertinent in the case of cumulative impacts where combined impacts are not proposed to be mitigated by the applicant due to the length of time they are occurring for and their deemed likelihood of the</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
	phase and, if any significant effects arise, could utilise the Transport Contingency Fund to implement additional measures to manage/reduce Sizewell C effects. SZC Co. would support a proportionate approach to funding of any mitigation measures in the event that significant cumulative transport effects arise through the monitoring process.			<p>impacts occurring. Therefore, it is reasonable to consider that additional funding and appropriate monitoring, as set out above, needs to be put in place to ensure those cumulative impacts can be identified and then mitigated should they occur.</p> <p>SZC Co. continue to work with SCC, Highways England and the emergency services to progress the suite of transport management plans. The extent and scope of the mitigation package to be secured via the Deed of Obligation is part of continuing discussions with SCC.</p>
MI22	Protective provisions – Protective provisions are set out in Schedule 18 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	The highway authority will need to protect its position with respect to its duties

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s Position on Matters	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status – Next Steps and Timescales
				under the Highways Act to maintain the public highway. Measures are also necessary to recover reasonable costs relating to technical approval and supervision of management plan, etc.

14 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – WATER

14.1.1 Groundwater, surface water and flood risk has been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Volume 2, Chapter 19 of the ES [\[APP-297\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-181\]](#)
- Volume 3, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-376\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 3 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-182\]](#)
- Volume 4, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-407\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 4 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-183\]](#)
- Volume 5, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-441\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 5 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-184\]](#)
- Volume 6, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-476\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 6 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-185\]](#)
- Volume 7, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-507\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-186\]](#)
- Volume 8, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-536\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 8 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-187\]](#)
- Volume 9, Chapter 12 of the ES [\[APP-570\]](#) and Volume 1, Chapter 9 of the ES Addendum [\[AS-188\]](#)

14.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

14.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation to groundwater, surface water and flood risk is detailed in **Table 14.1**.

14.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table 14.1 Position of the Parties – Water

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement				
Main Development Site				
W1	Existing Environment – Sufficient data have been collected to inform the assessment for the main development site with the exception of topographic survey and infiltration testing.	Agreed	Agreed	Results of infiltration testing must be provided to inform the choice and design of relevant mitigation options. Likewise topographic surveys should be used to inform outfall levels from basins, which ultimately dictates the total depth and volumes of the basins.
W2	Methodology - The methodology for the assessment of impacts on groundwater and surface water as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 60 of the ES and section 19.3 of Volume 2 Chapter 19 for the main development site assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
W3	Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions are appropriate for the main development site.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Assessment conclusions are reliant on the delivery of primary and tertiary mitigation. Until it has been demonstrated that sufficient and appropriate mitigation can be delivered within the Order Limits SCC are not able to agree that the

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				assessment conclusions are appropriate.
W4	Monitoring and Mitigation - The mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Parts A, B and C of the Code of Construction Practice are appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Largely reliant on information contained in Outline Drainage Strategy, which is not yet agreed.
Offsite Associated Developments				
W5	Existing Environment – Sufficient data have been collected to inform the assessment for the offsite associated development sites with the exception of topographic survey and infiltration testing.	Agreed	Agreed	Results of infiltration testing must be provided to inform the choice and design of relevant mitigation options. Likewise topographic surveys should be used to inform outfall levels from basins, which ultimately dictates the total depth and volumes of the basins.
W6	Methodology - The methodology for the assessment of impacts on groundwater and surface water for each of the offsite associated developments, as well as the project-wide cumulative and transboundary effects is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
W7	Assessment Conclusions – The assessment conclusions for the assessment of impacts on groundwater and surface water for each of the offsite associated developments, as well as the project-wide cumulative and transboundary effects is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Assessment conclusions are reliant on the delivery of primary and tertiary mitigation. Until it has been demonstrated that sufficient and appropriate mitigation can be delivered within the Order Limits SCC are not able to agree that the

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				assessment conclusions are appropriate.
W8	Monitoring and Mitigation - The mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Parts A, B and C of the Code of Construction Practice are appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Largely reliant on information contained in Outline Drainage Strategy, which is not yet agreed.
Development Consent Order				
W9	The securing mechanisms to control impacts on groundwater and surface water on the main development site as detailed in the Mitigation Route Map are appropriate including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Deemed Marine Licence Conditions - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Requirement 5 (PW: Surface and foul water drainage) - Requirement 7 (MDS: Water Monitoring and Response Strategy)) - Requirement 8 (MDS: Temporary construction-related development) - Requirement 11 (MDS: Approved buildings, structures and plant) - Requirement 14 (MDS: Landscape works) - Requirement 16 (MDS: Removal and reinstatement) 	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing in relation to Requirement 5.
W10	The securing mechanisms to control impacts on groundwater and surface water on the associated development sites as, relevant and detailed in the Mitigation Route Map are appropriate including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) 	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing in relation to Requirement 5.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requirement 4 (PW: Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring Plan) - Requirement 5 (PW: Surface and foul water drainage) - Requirement 18 (Rail works) - Requirement 20 (AD: Buildings and structures) - Requirement 24 (AD: Removal and reinstatement) 			
Flood Risk Assessment				
W11	Main Development Site - The assessment for the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment, as updated by the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment Addendum is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
W12	Northern Park and Ride - The assessment for the Northern Park and Ride Flood Risk Assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
W13	Southern Park and Ride - The assessment for the Southern Park and Ride Flood Risk Assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
W14	Two Village Bypass - The assessment for the Two Village Bypass Flood Risk Assessment, as updated by the Two Village Bypass Flood Risk Assessment Addendum, is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
W15	Sizewell Link Road - The assessment for the Sizewell Link Road Flood Risk Assessment, as updated by the Sizewell Link Road Flood Risk Assessment Addendum, is appropriate.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
W16	Yoxford and Other Highway Improvements - The assessment for the Yoxford and Other Highways Improvements Flood Risk Assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
W17	Freight Management Facility - The assessment for the Freight Management Facility Flood Risk Assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
W18	Green Rail Route - The assessment for the Rail Flood Risk Assessment is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
W19	Flood Risk Emergency Plan – This is appropriate for the main development site.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
W20	Flood Risk Emergency Plan – This is appropriate for the two village bypass.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing
W21	Flood Risk Emergency Plan – This is appropriate for the Sizewell link road.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – The Sizewell Link Road Flood Risk Assessment Addendum was shared with the Councils in advance of its inclusion at Deadline 2 and SZC Co. had regard to their feedback.
Drainage Strategy – General				
W22	Outline Drainage Strategy – The strategy sets out appropriate proposals that prioritise the use of SuDS, through alignment with policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - SZC Co has committed to provide updated technical drainage notes to provide additional information.
W23	Outline Drainage Strategy – The strategy sets out appropriate proposals that do not increase existing surface water flood risk, through alignment with policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W24	Outline Drainage Strategy – The strategy sets out appropriate proposals that enable the assessment and management of pollution, through alignment with policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - refer to W22
W25	Outline Drainage Strategy – The strategy sets out appropriate proposals for the management of foul water that do not result in an increase to existing foul water flooding.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Drainage Strategy – Main development site (construction phase)				
W26	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the main development site, through alignment with policy policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W27	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the main development site can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W28	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the main development site.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W29	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the main development site.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W30	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the LEEIE site, through alignment with policy policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W31	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the LEEIE site can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W32	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the LEEIE site.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W33	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the LEEIE site.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Drainage Strategy – Main development site (operation phase)				
W34	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the main development site, through alignment with policy policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W35	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the main development site can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W36	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the main development site.	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W37	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the main development site.	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W38	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the off-site sports facilities.	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
Drainage Strategy – Associated development (Sizewell link road)				
W39	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the Sizewell link road, through alignment with policy policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W40	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the Sizewell link road can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W41	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the Sizewell link road.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
W42	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the Sizewell link road.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
Drainage Strategy – Associated development (two village bypass)				
W43	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the two village bypass, through alignment with policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W44	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the two village bypass can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W45	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the two village bypass.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W46	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the two village bypass.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
Drainage Strategy – Associated development (Yoxford roundabout)				
W47	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the Yoxford roundabout, through alignment with policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W48	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the Yoxford roundabout can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W49	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the Yoxford roundabout.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
W50	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the Yoxford roundabout.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
Drainage Strategy – Associated development (green rail route)				
W51	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the green rail route , through alignment with policy policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W52	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the green rail route can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W53	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the green rail route .	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W54	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the green rail route .	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
Drainage Strategy – Associated development (freight management facility)				
W55	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the freight management facility , through alignment with policy policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W56	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the freight management facility can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W57	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the freight management facility .	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
W58	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the freight management facility .	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
Drainage Strategy – Associated development (northern park and ride)				
W59	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the northern park and ride, through alignment with policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W60	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the northern park and ride can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W61	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the northern park and ride.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W62	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the northern park and ride.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
Drainage Strategy – Associated development (southern park and ride)				
W63	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the use of SuDS has been prioritised for the southern park and ride, through alignment with policy, prevailing guidance and good practice.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W64	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the southern park and ride can be facilitated within the proposed redline boundary to an appropriate standard.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22
W65	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed surface water drainage approach would not increase existing surface water flood risk at the southern park and ride.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC Co.'s position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
W66	Appropriate evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed approach would enable the assessment and management of pollution at the southern park and ride.	Discussion ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – refer to W22

15 POSITION OF THE PARTIES – OTHER

15.1.1 The matters listed in **Table 15.1** have been assessed in the following chapters of the Environmental Statement:

- Project-wide, inter-relationship, cumulative and transboundary impact assessments - [\[APP-575\]](#) [\[APP-577\]](#) [\[APP-578\]](#) [\[APP-580\]](#) [\[AS-189\]](#)
- Geology and land quality assessments - [\[APP-280\]](#) [\[APP-374\]](#) [\[APP-405\]](#) [\[APP-438\]](#) [\[APP-473\]](#) [\[APP-505\]](#) [\[APP-534\]](#) [\[APP-566\]](#) [\[AS-181\]](#) [\[AS-182\]](#) [\[AS-183\]](#) [\[AS-184\]](#) [\[AS-185\]](#) [\[AS-186\]](#) [\[AS-187\]](#) [\[AS-188\]](#)
- Soils and agriculture assessments – [\[APP-277\]](#) [\[APP-371\]](#) [\[APP-402\]](#) [\[APP-435\]](#) [\[APP-470\]](#) [\[APP-502\]](#) [\[APP-531\]](#) [\[APP-563\]](#) [\[AS-181\]](#) [\[AS-182\]](#) [\[AS-183\]](#) [\[AS-184\]](#) [\[AS-185\]](#) [\[AS-186\]](#) [\[AS-187\]](#) [\[AS-188\]](#)
- Major accident and disasters assessment – [\[APP-344\]](#)
- Materials and waste assessments – [\[APP-192\]](#) [\[APP-193\]](#) [\[APP-340\]](#)
- Climate change [\[APP-342\]](#)
- Sustainability statement [\[APP-617\]](#) [\[AS-019\]](#)

15.1.2 The relevant mitigation measures are secured in the following documents:

- Mitigation Route Map [\[APP-616\]](#)
- Mitigation Route Map Addendum [\[AS-276\]](#)
- Code of Construction Practice [\[AS-273\]](#)

15.1.3 The position of the parties, including any further actions planned, in relation other matters is detailed in **Table 15.1**.

15.1.4 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. The SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. The document was written in the context of the Councils' recently finalised Local Impact Report, so due to the timescales involved, all the parties have not been able to be as thorough as they will be in the next iterations. Therefore, the future iterations will evolve from this point and all parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as we progress the discussions to ensure it is comprehensive. There are many items within it that although not currently agreed have the potential to be resolved. We will continue to work

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

together, seeking resolution where appropriate to ensure it is a reliable and up to date document which can inform the examination.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table 15.1 Position of the Parties – Other

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Draft Development Consent Order				
DCO1	<p>Draft Development Consent Order - Discussions are ongoing between the parties who are working towards submission of a final version into the examination at Deadline 9.</p> <p>This will include further detail on Schedule 23 (procedure for approvals, consents) as sought by the ExA's first round of written questions. Refer to the Applicant and ESC's responses to question DCO.1.122.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - The parties continue to engage on this. The version submitted by SZC Co. at Deadline 2 will have regard to the Councils' latest comments.
Section 106 Agreement				
S106-1	<p>Draft Section 106 Agreement - Discussions are ongoing between the parties who are working towards submission of a final version into the examination at Deadline 9.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - The parties continue to engage on this, using the version submitted into the examination at Deadline 1 as the basis of current discussions.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Environmental Statement				
Project-wide, inter-relationship, cumulative and transboundary effects				
CIA1	Assessment Methodology – The assessment methodologies for project-wide, inter-relationship, cumulative and transboundary impacts are appropriate and the assessments undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
CIA2	Assessment Methodology – the list of cumulative schemes considered within the ES has been agreed.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
CIA3	Assessment Conclusions – the assessment conclusions for the transboundary effects assessment are agreed.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
CIA4	Assessment Conclusions – the project-wide, inter-relationship and cumulative effects assessment conclusions for each topic assessment are dependent on the agreement of the relevant environmental topic effects presented within this SoCG.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing - Discussions are ongoing an an update on the status will be provided at Deadline 3.
Geology and Land Quality				
LQ1	Assessment Baseline – The baseline presented for geology and land quality is appropriate and accurate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
LQ2	Assessment Methodology – The assessment methodology for geology and land quality is appropriate and the assessment undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance and legislation.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LQ3	Assessment Conclusions – The conclusions are agreed with respect to the geology and land Quality assessments.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LQ4	Mitigation - The measures to control impacts on geology and land quality on the main development site and off-site associated development sites, as relevant, detailed in the Code of Construction Practice and Mitigation Route Map are appropriate, and sufficiently controlled through the dDCO.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
LQ5	Mitigation – The appropriate contamination measures will be carried out in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice.	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing	Discussions ongoing – ESC request a Land Contamination Management Plan and discussions are ongoing.
Soils and Agriculture				
SA1	Assessment Methodology – The baseline presented for soils and agriculture is appropriate and accurate.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SA2	Assessment Methodology – The assessment methodology for soils and agriculture is appropriate and the assessment has been undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance and legislation; noting the	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
	approach to agricultural land classification (ALC) surveys has been agreed with Natural England.			
SA3	Assessment Conclusions – The conclusions are agreed with respect to the soils and agriculture assessments, including in relation to those sites that will ultimately be restored after use.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SA4	Mitigation - The measures to control impacts on soils and agriculture on the main development site and off-site associated development sites, as relevant, detailed in the Code of Construction Practice and Mitigation Route Map are appropriate and sufficiently controlled through the dDCO. It is recognised that in some instances the Project will have a long-term benefit, such as the replacement of predominately arable land with a heathland mosaic once the restoration plans have been implemented. Mitigation for lost agricultural land as a result of permanent road schemes?	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
SA5	Outline Soil Management Plan – This Plan is an appropriate framework for the detailed soil management plans use as a framework.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
Major Accidents and Disasters				
MAD1	Assessment Methodology – The assessment methodology for major accidents and disasters is appropriate and the assessment has been undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance and legislation.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
MAD2	Assessment Conclusions – The description of baseline, assessment and mitigation presented within Volume 2, Chapter 27 of the ES satisfies the requirements of the EIA Regulations with respect to the major accidents and disasters assessment.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MAD3	Assessment Conclusions – It is within the remit of the nuclear site licensing process to assess, consent and regulate matters in relation to nuclear safety.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MAD4	Assessment Conclusions – Emergency preparedness measures will be agreed pursuant to the requirements of the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019 and the Nuclear Site Licence. SZC Co. have included a requirement within the dDCO submitted for Deadline 2 for emergency planning, as suggested by ESC within the Local Impact Report.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MAD5	Mitigation - The measures to control impacts associated with major accidents and disasters on the main development site and off-site associated development sites, as summarised in the Mitigation Route Map, are appropriate and would be sufficiently controlled through the dDCO, Nuclear Site Licence and other legislative requirements.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
Materials and Waste				
MW1	Assessment Methodology - The assessment methodology for materials and conventional waste is appropriate and the assessment has been undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MW2	Assessment Conclusions - The assessment conclusions for the materials and conventional waste assessment are agreed.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
MW3	Mitigation - The measures to control impacts associated with materials and waste on the main development site and off-site associated development sites, as summarised in the Mitigation Route Map, are appropriate, and sufficiently controlled through the dDCO.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
Climate Change				
CC1	Assessment Methodology - The assessment methodology for climate change resilience is appropriate and the assessment has been undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance.	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed
CC2	Assessment Methodology - The assessment methodology for in-combination climate impacts is appropriate and the assessment has been undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance.	Agreed	Accepted on face value	Agreed
CC3	Assessment Methodology - The assessment methodology for greenhouse gas impacts is appropriate and the assessment has been undertaken with due regard to relevant guidance.	Agreed	Accepted on face value	Agreed

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
CC4	<p>Assessment Conclusions – The overall conclusion for climate change resilience assessment is that with appropriate mitigation in place, there are no significant effects on the Sizewell C Project as a result of climate change.</p> <p>Any specific points of agreement and disagreement on related technical assessments and required mitigation are addressed within the relevant topic sections of this SoCG (e.g. Section 5 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology, Section 10 Marine and Coastal and Section 14 Water).</p>	Agreed	Accepted on face value	Agreed
CC5	<p>Assessment Conclusions – The overall in-combination climate impacts assessment conclusion is that with appropriate mitigation in place there are no additional significant effects as a result of in-combination climate impacts with the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Any specific points of agreement and disagreement on related technical assessments and required mitigation are addressed within the relevant topic sections of this SoCG (e.g. Section 5 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology, Section 10 Marine and Coastal and Section 14 Water).</p>	Agreed	Accepted on face value	Agreed
CC6	<p>Assessment Conclusions – The overall conclusion of the greenhouse gas impact assessment is that the Sizewell C Project will provide substantial carbon benefits from its operation and contribute to the UK Government's net zero emissions strategy.</p>	Discussions ongoing	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing – ESC to consider the information provided by SZC Co. in response to the Examining Authority's questions to inform a discussion on whether this

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				matter can be agreed or whether further discussions are necessary.
Sustainability				
SUS1	<p>Principle - The information presented within the sustainability statement provides an accurate overview of the measures listed within the DCO application that will promote and drive sustainability.</p> <p>It is recognised that specific elements falling into the wider umbrella of sustainability are covered elsewhere, where relevant, in the thematic sections of this report (e.g. transport, socio-economics and climate change).</p>	Agreed	Discussion ongoing	Discussions ongoing - thematic matters dealt with elsewhere. LIR refers to the carbon footprint of traffic generated by Sizewell C and the construction activity, and the use of resources and generation of waste during construction (particularly materials) remaining substantial, with the Councils encouraging the Applicant to consider ways to off-set the carbon footprint of the development. This

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Ref.	SZC's Position	ESC's position	SCC's position	Status
				needs to be further discussed.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED