



The Sizewell C Project

9.10.17 Initial Statement of Common Ground - Suffolk Constabulary

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	1
1.1	Status of the SOCG	1
1.2	Purpose of this document	1
1.3	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.4	Structure of this Statement of Common Ground	3
1.5	Position of the Parties	4
1.6	Summary of Commonality	5

TABLES

Table 2.1	Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Suffolk Constabulary	8
Table 2.2	SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and Suffolk Constabulary ..	16

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG	16
-------------	------------------------------	----

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Status of the SOCG

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of the application for a development consent order ('DCO') to the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') under the Planning Act 2008 ('the Application') for the proposed Sizewell C Project.

1.1.2 This SoCG (version 01) has been prepared by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') as the Applicant and Suffolk Constabulary and agreed on 2 June 2021.

1.1.3 This SoCG has evolved through a programme of engagement and series of versions as detailed in Section 2.

1.2 Purpose of this document

1.2.1 The purpose of this SoCG is to set out the position of the parties on policing and community safety issues, so far as they relate to the remit of Suffolk Constabulary, 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').

1.2.2 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').

1.2.3 Paragraph 58 of the DCLG Guidance states:

"A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence"

1.2.4 The aim of this SoCG is therefore to inform the Examining Authority and provide a clear position of the state and extent of discussions and agreement

between SZC Co. and Suffolk Constabulary on matters relating to the Sizewell C Project.

- 1.2.5 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the DCO application documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate website (<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/the-sizewell-c-project/>).

1.3 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.3.1 SZC Co. has submitted an application for development consent to build and operate a new nuclear power station, Sizewell C, along with the associated development required to enable construction and operation.

- 1.3.2 Suffolk Constabulary is the territorial police force responsible for the county of Suffolk and has a mission to make Suffolk a safer place to live, work, travel and invest. Under the leadership of the Chief Constable, Suffolk Constabulary uses its resources to protect its communities and prevent crime happening in the first place, with a particular focus on preventing harm and protecting the most vulnerable in its communities.

- 1.3.3 Collectively SZC Co. and Suffolk Constabulary are referred to as ‘the parties’.

- 1.3.4 Matters of interest to Suffolk Constabulary and which are detailed in Section 2 of this SoCG are as follows:

- The assessment of socio-economic effects in the Environment Statement (ES) (**Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 9**) and associated appendices, so far as they relate to crime, policing and community safety (**Doc Ref. 6.3**).
- The approach to community safety, including roles and responsibilities of the Sizewell C Project and other stakeholders, as set out in the Community Safety Management Plan (**Doc Ref. 8.16**).
- The assessment of transport effects in the ES (**Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 10**) and the Transport Assessment (**Doc Ref. 8.5**) plus measures set out within the transport management plans (**Doc Refs. 8.6-8.8**) (SC note that the primary roads policing impact from the Sizewell C Project relates to road based movement of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) on Suffolk’s roads).

- The major accidents and disasters assessment (**Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 27**), so far as it relates to matters within Suffolk Constabulary's remit (**Doc Ref. 6.3**).
- Updates to the above as set out in the January 2021 submission of additional information and proposed changes (**Doc Ref. 6.14**).

1.3.5 In addition, other DCO application documents of interest to Suffolk Constabulary may include:

- Draft DCO (including the Requirements) (**Book 3**);
- Community Impact Report (**Doc Ref. 5.13**);
- Equality Statement (**Doc Ref. 5.14**);
- Draft Section 106 heads of terms (**Doc Ref. 8.4**);
- Code of Construction Practice (**Doc Ref. 8.11**);
- Mitigation Route map (**Doc Ref. 8.12**);
- Traffic Incident Management Plan;
- Construction Traffic Management Plan;
- Construction Worker Travel Plan;
- Works Plans.

1.4 Structure of this Statement of Common Ground

1.4.1 Chapter 2 provides schedules which detail the matters of agreement and disagreement between the parties. It also identifies where discussions are continuing if applicable.

1.4.2 **Appendix A** provides a summary of engagement undertaken to establish this SoCG.

1.5 Position of the Parties

1.5.1 **Table 2.1** provides details on the areas of agreement and disagreement between the parties.

1.5.2 This SOCG focuses on the following areas:

- Crime and anti-social behaviour,
- Community safety, including prevention measures to protect the community from harm; and
- Roads policing.

1.5.3 Suffolk Constabulary holds no views as to the virtues of nuclear energy or the merits of the application for the Sizewell C Project. In responding to the SZC DCO application, the Constabulary is solely concerned with ensuring that all likely significant impacts relating to community safety and policing (including roads policing) arising from the Sizewell C Project are fully identified, assessed, and adequately mitigated. Policing is a complex and multi-faceted activity which plays a key role in responding to and managing many community safety risks, extending well beyond what may be perceived as deterring and investigating traditional crime types.

1.5.4 The Constabulary's objectives in relation to the Examination and determination of the Sizewell C DCO application are to:

1. Understand and address the full range of likely community safety and policing impacts from SZC, including impacts on local policing in the community and on roads policing. Acting as a Statutory Party, Suffolk Constabulary will be pleased to assist the Examination Authority in considering these matters fully; and, in doing so,
2. Secure appropriate mitigation, including adequate police resourcing, to avoid likely significant adverse community safety impacts and any other unacceptable community safety risks.

1.5.5 Other stakeholders, including Suffolk Fire and Rescue, East of England Ambulance, the Councils, Public Health Suffolk and the NHS have responsibility for other aspects of community safety. Suffolk Constabulary will not comment on these, save where there are overlaps or where a measure proposed for another stakeholder resolves a concern raised by Suffolk Constabulary.

1.5.6 Therefore, where the tables below refer to a specific document or part of a document, agreement or disagreement relates only to the parts of that document which consider the matters set out in **paragraph 2.1.2** above.

1.6 Summary of Commonality

1.6.1 The Parties broadly agree on:

- The need for adequate and appropriate policing involvement (i.e. by Suffolk Constabulary) to help mitigate community safety impacts during the construction period of SZC.
- The need for Suffolk Constabulary and the Sizewell C Project to work together over the construction phase to address community safety issues, including crime both by and against the workforce and non-crime incidents.
- The need for likely community safety impacts to be addressed through partnership working between SZC Co., Suffolk Constabulary and relevant partner agencies, supported by adequate resourcing. Adequate mitigation is required to ensure the existing levels of service afforded to Suffolk's communities are not adversely impacted upon during the build programme.
- The need for a Policing Impact Assessment, building upon relevant DCO application documents submitted by SZC Co., to identify the required level of additional police resourcing needed as mitigation to help address community safety impacts and thereby ensure the avoidance of likely significant adverse effects.
- At the start of discussions between the Parties it was therefore agreed the Constabulary, as the subject matter experts for policing, should undertake an assessment of likely community safety and associated policing resourcing impacts.
- Suffolk Constabulary has undertaken detailed modelling over 24 months of the likely demand on policing arising from the construction of the Sizewell C Project, with draft outputs shared with SZC Co. in August 2020 and November 2020.
- The level of support required to deal with non-crime incidents, although note that the methodology utilised to calculate this and wider resourcing differs between the Parties.

- That crime and associated policing demand is influenced by a range of factors, including demographic and socio-economic characteristics and the effective implementation of other community safety mitigation measures. This is relevant to the ongoing discussion on rates of crime incidents.

1.6.2 The Parties do not agree on:

- The scope and assessment findings regarding likely impacts on policing as stated within **Volume 2, Chapter 9** (Socio-economics) of the **ES** and **Section 2.4** (Socio-economics) of the **ES Addendum**.
- The extent to which employment status acts to reduce criminality (including risk of being a victim). SZC Co. believes employment is a key mitigating factor whereas Suffolk Constabulary considers that the relationship between employment status and criminality (including risk of being a victim) is not clear cut.
- Therefore whether it is appropriate to control for employment status within modelling of predicted crime impacts and if so how this should be achieved.
- The reliance upon the experience (perceived or actual) of the construction of Hinkley Point C (HPC) project within the Avon and Somerset Police (ASP) area to predict and mitigate community safety and policing impacts from the SZC project in Suffolk.
- The need to base additional local policing resources to help mitigate community safety impacts either on the SZC site (SZC Co. position) or within the existing community of Leiston (Suffolk Constabulary position).
- The use of policing data collated by the HPC Socio-economic Advisory Group (SEAG) as input data to model policing impacts from SZC. SZC Co. believes this approach appropriately accounts for the combination of workforce characteristics (employed status) and relevant mitigation which will be replicated for the Sizewell C Project (e.g. security vetting and Worker Code of Conduct). This position is not accepted by Suffolk Constabulary owing to known weaknesses with the HPC SEAG data and collation methodology (including under-reporting and inconsistencies), limitations of proposed mitigation and as the introduction of a population in one demographic, socio-economic and geographical situation cannot be assumed to generate the same

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

community safety impacts in an entirely different situation, even if the same workers were recruited.

- SZC Co. considers that the SEAG data being reported from Hinkley Point C is robust and there is no evidence in the wider crime data to suggest that incidents are being missed on a significant scale. SZC Co. notes also that the SEAG data includes home-based workers which would not represent additional demand, as well as incidents picked up by the security team on site which are investigated internally and - if not reported to 101 which is often the case - do not have to be addressed by the police. SZC Co. does not consider that Suffolk Constabulary has evidence to support the approximately 3.5 times crime rates associated with workers on Sizewell C versus Hinkley Point C, especially when some of the non-home based workforce is likely to be the same people and when the MSG data shows lower crime rates than in Somerset (suggesting workers are less likely to become victims of crime in Suffolk than Somerset).
- Suffolk Constabulary does not accept use of policing data collated by the HPC SEAG as input data to model policing impacts from SZC in Suffolk for the reasons outlined above and detailed further within the Constabulary's Written Representation to the ExA. In consequence, Suffolk Constabulary maintains that any assessment of likely policing impacts from SZC and the development of associated community safety mitigation measures must be based on observed and modelled data directly applicable to the geographical, socio-economic, policing, and demographic contexts of the SZC project in Suffolk. Suffolk Constabulary has also developed a risk-based approach to predict the volume of AIL movements likely to require police escort during the construction period, taking account of proposed traffic mitigation measures.
- Consequent to the above, the quantum and structure of additional resources required within Suffolk Constabulary to mitigate the adverse impacts of the Sizewell C Project.

Table 2.1 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Suffolk Constabulary

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
SOCIO-ECONOMICS						
Socio-economics ES Chapter – Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 9						
SC_SOC	The methodology for the assessment of significance of socio-economic effects on crime and policing as set out in Table 9.1 (significance criteria), with additional detail on methodology as set out in Volume 1 Appendix 6E of the ES.	6.2 / 6.3	The methodology employed to establish the significance of effects on crime and policing is deficient as it is based solely on a predicted percentage change in 'recorded' (i.e. Home Office notifiable) crimes over a limited period, which excludes non-notifiable crimes and other non-crime incidents that form significant elements of Suffolk Constabulary's workload. The methodology is also weak as it does not account for the demographic characteristics of the workforce and simply assumes community safety mitigation will be adequate and sufficient to address a predicted pre-mitigation significant adverse effect on community safety and policing, without demonstrating the effectiveness of mitigation including the required quantum of additional police resourcing. This approach is not aligned with the EIA methodology set out within Plate 6.1 and under paragraph 6.4.2 of the ES.	SZC Co. used available public domain datasets in the ES assessment. Since the DCO submission, Suffolk Constabulary have shared this data and it has been utilised to update the assessment in the ES Addendum Book 6, Chapter 2, (Doc Ref. 6.14). No change to the assessment conclusions or approach to mitigation is proposed as a result of this. Agreement has since been reached on the predicted levels of non-crime incidents and associated mitigation.	No further action	Not Agreed
SC_SOC	The baseline environment as detailed in section 9.5 xvi (crime and community safety).	6.3	As above. Whilst the provision of additional community safety baseline data within the ES Addendum is welcomed, as Suffolk Constabulary has advised to SZC Co., in the absence of revisions to the assessment of policing impacts and mitigation requirements this alone does not resolve the deficiency in the published impact assessment. Refer to Suffolk Constabulary's Written Representation for further details.	As above – not all data is available in the public domain, with recorded offences data (as a National Statistic) used in this instance. Other information was subsequently shared, has been submitted to the Examination and will be used to develop mitigation.	No further action	Not Agreed
SC-SOC	The environmental design and mitigation measures set out in section 9.6 . The	6.3	As above. Suffolk Constabulary has taken account of other proposed mitigation			Not Agreed

¹ This column does not need to be filled out in the initial stages, the principal purpose at this stage is to set out the position of the parties

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	principle for the approach to secondary mitigation set out in section 9.8 paras 9.8.50-9.8.53 for policing services and community safety ² .		including security vetting and the Worker Code of Conduct, including the value and limitations of this mitigation in a policing context.			
SC_SOC	The assessment of impacts on crime, anti-social behaviour and policing as set out in section 9.7b) vi (for construction phase of Sizewell C).	6.3	<p>The assessment of policing impacts (ES paragraphs 9.7.216 – 9.7.230) is deficient owing to limited consideration of demographic factors, the narrow scope of assessment (singular focus on changes in 'recorded' (i.e. Home Office notifiable) crimes and the application of mitigation to reach a conclusion of no likely significant effects without the required level or structure of police resourcing mitigation being confirmed.</p> <p>Whilst the provision of additional community safety baseline data within the ES Addendum is welcomed, as Suffolk Constabulary has advised to SZC Co., in the absence of revisions to the assessment of policing impacts and mitigation requirements this alone does not resolve the deficiency in the published impact assessment.</p> <p>Suffolk Constabulary considers that the demographic and population changes, resulting from the introduction of the SZC workforce, will have a significant impact in the Leiston and surrounding area and this in itself will lead to increased demands on policing. Suffolk Constabulary believes that the increased crime (both as perpetrators and as victims) will be higher than that for the existing population.</p> <p>Suffolk Constabulary considers that there is over reliance on the HPC data, as a predictor of demand from SZC, as there are inconsistencies and weaknesses in the data being used. The existing community</p>	<p>i) Response as above.</p> <p>ii) The ES assesses effects of the non-home-based workforce on crime and anti-social behaviour and consequent requirement for mitigation, including for SC.</p> <p>The ES makes specific reference to the observed impacts of Hinkley Point C which is assumed to have the same or very similar demographics to the Sizewell C workforce. Therefore the assessment does include consideration of demographics. The observed impacts also reflect other socio-economic characteristics of the non-home-based workforce and the mitigation in place at Hinkley Point, both of which are anticipated to be replicated at Sizewell C.</p>		Not Agreed

² Note also that the measures and mechanisms to avoid, manage and mitigate socio-economic impacts are set out the Mitigation Route Map ref MDS-S1-S25 (Socio-economics) (**Doc Ref. 8.12**).

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
			and existing policing provision are factors that are not comparable to HPC. Suffolk Constabulary's position is detailed further in their Written Representation.			
SC_SOC	The assessment of impacts on public services (so far as it relates to policing) set out in section 9.7c) iv (for operational phase of Sizewell C).	6.3	Suffolk Constabulary believes that the volume of traffic associated with SZC, even after full mitigation measures, will have more than 'only a small impact' across the road network.			
SC_SOC	The assessment of impacts on community cohesion and integration, where relevant to SC, as set out in section 9.7b) ix and 9.7c) v .	6.3	As above. Suffolk Constabulary believes that the potential effects on community cohesion will be greater than 'negligible and not significant'			
SC_SOC	The approach to secondary mitigation set out in section 9.8 b) v for public services and community facilities as a whole, where relevant to SC.	6.3				Agreed
SC_SOC	The approach to secondary mitigation set out in section 9.8 b) vi for community cohesion and integration and section 9.8 b) vii for inter-relationship effects, where relevant to SC.	6.3				Agreed
SC_SOC	The approach to monitoring of workforce and community safety and community cohesion effects set out in sections 9.8 c) i and ii , respectively.	6.3	Suffolk Constabulary agrees with SZC Co. position that there is some uncertainty as to the demand arising from the construction of SZC and that robust monitoring is required			Agreed
SC_SOC	The approach to governance set out in section 9.8 c) iii .	6.3	Suffolk Constabulary considers the CSWG as an important tool, and the importance of Suffolk Constabulary being a member of this.	SZC Co. has issued a note to the Councils providing additional detail on the governance of the Community Safety Working Group.	Discussions ongoing, including with other members of the CSWG.	In progress.
SC_SOC	The residual effects conclusions as detailed in Table 9.52 .	6.3				Agreed
Other documents						
SC_SOC	Section 4.3 of Book 6, Volume 10, Chapter 4 setting out the cumulative effects assessment for socio-economics.	6.11		No cumulative effects predicted for policing.	No action required	Agreed

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
SC_SOC	The Community Safety Management Plan (CSMP) (Doc Ref. 8.16) which considers the potential effect on community safety that the construction of the Sizewell C Project may have and sets the strategy for mitigating any negative impacts through monitoring and management, making use of the most appropriate resources.	8.16	It is welcomed that EDF has recognised the need to manage community safety impacts from SZC and proposed associated mitigation measures, which are broadly supported. Due to issues with the assessment (above) combined with a lack of specificity within the CSMP it is difficult to determine whether the mitigation proposals set out in the CSMP will be effective in avoiding significant adverse community safety impacts.	The mitigation measures for Sizewell C have proven effective at HPC - overall crime and non-crime rates at Hinkley Point C are lower than average, despite the workforce being overwhelmingly male. There are also other factors that may mitigate against increases in crime, such as the fact that many NHB workers would spend time at their permanent homes away from Suffolk (e.g. at the weekend when some crimes are typically higher) and that they are employed (employed people are less likely to both commit and be victims of crime).	Being addressed in overall discussions on the appropriate levels of mitigation required.	In progress
SC_SOC	The approach to Community Safety set out in the draft S106 Heads of Terms (Doc Ref. 8.4, Appendix J).	8.4	Suffolk Constabulary operates to capacity and will require additional resourcing to address the net additional impacts of SZC.	Principle of S106 contribution to Suffolk Constabulary is agreed. Scope and quantum are being defined through ongoing engagement, informed by the Suffolk Constabulary modelling which SZC Co. is funding and lessons learnt from HPC.	Being addressed in overall discussions on the appropriate levels of mitigation required.	In progress
SC_SOC	The proposed approach to Monitoring (Workforce and Socio-economic Impacts) set out in the draft S106 Heads of Terms (Doc Ref. 8.4, Appendix J).	8.4				Agreed
SC_SOC	The proposed approach to Communication, Community and Stakeholder Engagement set out in the Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 8.11), Part A section 3 .	8.11				Agreed

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
SC_SOC	The proposed approach to Incidents and Emergencies set out in the Code of Construction Practice, Part A section 4 .	8.11	Suffolk Constabulary is still in discussion with SZC Co. as to the need for a Strategic Relationship Protocol, as this would not affect the Constabulary's approach to addressing calls for service.			
SC_SOC	The Community Impact Report	5.13	See entries above. At this time Suffolk Constabulary and SZC Co. do not agree on the impact on policing arising from the construction of SZC.			
SC_SOC	The Equality Statement	5.14				
MAJOR ACCIDENTS AND DISASTERS (MA&D)						
MA&D ES Chapter – Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 27						
SC_MA&D	The methodology for the MA&D assessment set out on Volume 1 Appendix 6X of the ES.	6.2				Agreed
SC_MA&D	The baseline environment as detailed in section 27.4 and Appendix 27A .	6.3				Agreed
SC_MA&D	The environmental design and mitigation measures set out in section 27.5 . ³	6.3		Arrangements for emergency response and preparedness in relation to nuclear emergencies will be agreed as part of the multi-agency response plan under the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019.	No further action	Noted Agreed
SC_MA&D	The MAD assessment as detailed in section 27.6 .	6.3				Agreed
SC_MA&D	The secondary mitigation measures set out within section 27.7 .	6.3				Agreed
SC_MA&D	The residual effects conclusions as detailed in section 27.8 .	6.3				Agreed

³ Note also that the measures and mechanisms to avoid, manage and mitigate MAD impacts are set out the Mitigation Route Map ref MAD1-MAD26 (**Doc Ref. 8.12**).

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
SC_MA&D	Sections 4.20 of Book 6, Volume 10, Chapter 4 setting out the cumulative effects assessment for MA&D.	6.3				
ROAD POLICING						
ES ADDENDUM - TRANSPORT						
	The impact on emergency response times.	6.14	<p>Suffolk Constabulary has raised that the Transport Planning models are for the network peak periods and do not reflect the cumulative effects of the movement of Abnormal Indivisible Loads around the shoulders of the network peaks. It is SC's opinion that AIL movements prior to network peak periods could have residual effects on the road network.</p> <p>The impacts on route journey times and hence emergency response time s would therefore be greater than estimated within the Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>SZC Co. provided an assessment of the impact of journey delays for emergency services within Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14) [AS-181]. The assessment concluded that journey times during peak construction on the A12 northbound would be predicted to increase by up to 62 seconds between 08:00-09:00 and for all other hours the increase would be less than 36 seconds. In the southbound direction, the model predicts a journey time increase of 0-28 seconds. Over the 14 km route, this is considered to be imperceptible to drivers and would not materially impact on emergency response times.</p>		Not agreed
CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN						
	The proposed approach to governance of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	8.7	<p>It is SC's opinion that it should have direct representation on the Transport Review Group such that it will be engaged in the timely management and monitoring of the roads policing aspects of the construction period for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Suffolk Constabulary will be required to participate in many operations during the construction period and the mechanism of reporting through the infrequent and ad</p>	<p>SZC Co. proposes that Suffolk Constabulary would sit on the Community Safety Working Group and that the transport co-ordinator would attend the transport agenda item of the meetings. Any road policing concerns raised would be communicated to the Transport Review Group. In</p>		Not agreed

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
			<p>hoc forum of the Community Safety Working Group will be insufficient for Suffolk Constabulary to effectively influence the safe and efficient operations in which they will be involved or of which they should be aware – such as temporary street management and network changes, AIL movement planning; incident reviews; and planning for the effects of programme amendments.</p> <p>The mechanism for communication and engagement proposed by SZC Co. Is not sufficiently robust.</p>	<p>addition, the Delivery Co-ordinator would be in close contact with Suffolk Constabulary to communicate about abnormal indivisible load (AIL) movements.</p>		
	Management of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs)	8.7	<p>Suffolk Constabulary acknowledges SZC Co.'s engagement on the management of AIL movements to and from the Sizewell C project. It is intended to determine matrices that will guide as to the suggested level of assistance and escorting for AILs.</p> <p>Those matrices will inform the resources that Suffolk Constabulary would require to undertake the level of activity proposed by SZC Co. during the construction period – based on data provided by SZC Co. of AIL movements at HPC.</p> <p>Funding is sought for those additional resources to allow Suffolk Constabulary to undertake that extended function.</p>	<p>SZC Co. Is working closely with Suffolk Constabulary to agree a risk assessed guide for the movement of AILs to/from the Sizewell C Project during the construction phase, which will be included in the CTMP. The guide would be in the form of two matrices; one for the early years phase and one of the peak construction phase when the two village bypass and Sizewell link road are in use. All AIL movements are subject to review by Suffolk Constabulary's Abnormal Loads Officer.</p>	<p>Agree AIL escort matrix for early years and peak construction for inclusion in the CTMP</p>	Not agreed
	Transport contingency fund	8.7	<p>Suffolk Constabulary acknowledges SZC Co.'s proposal to provide a contingency fund. Without representation on the Transport Review Group, Suffolk Constabulary would have limited influence over the application of the fund.</p>	<p>SZC Co. Is to provide a transport contingency fund, which could be used by the Transport Review Group to mitigate potential unmitigated significant adverse transport effects, should they arise.</p>		
TRAFFIC INCIDENT MANAGEMENT PLAN						

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Suffolk Constabulary Position	SZC Co. Position	Further Action / Additional references.	Status - Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	Management of incidents on the highway network	8.6	Suffolk Constabulary has requested further detail on the Traffic Incident Management Plan and the need for scenario analysis to supplement that document and process. Responses to SC's review of the draft document have not been provided.	In the event of an incident within the Incident Management Area, Sizewell C vehicles will comply with the processes set out in the Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) (Doc Ref. 8.6) [APP-607].	Agree the TIMP with Suffolk Constabulary	Not Ageed

APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG

- A.1.1. The preparation of this SoCG has been informed by a programme of discussions between SZC Co. and Suffolk Constabulary and their consultants, Stantec. The relevant meetings are summarised in **Table 2.2**.

Table 2.2 SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and Suffolk Constabulary

Date	Details of the Meeting
16/07/20 05/08/20 (Roads) 27/08/20 23/09/20 (Roads) 26/11/20 (Soc-ec) 04/12/20 (14/5/21)	Post-DCO submission meetings ahead of first draft of SoCG plus discussions on police modelling. Discussion on review of DCO documents and first review of Comments' register Discussion on review of DCO documents and second review of Comments' register Reviews of draft Policing Impact Assessment – Socio-economic Matters (V1 – August 2020, V2 – November 2020)
18/5/21	Run through statement of common ground and discussion on areas of agreement and disagreement following various written exchanges of questions / information Jan-April 21
26/3/21	Meeting to discuss VISSIM model and the impact on journey times
19/5/21 28/5/21	Meetings to discuss AILs

INCOMPLETE: TO be updated in later draft