Stop Sizewell C and Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council (T&EPC) ExA Questions pt 4

Ref	Also for	Question	Stop Sizewell C and T&EPC Responses. These answers should in no way be considered as an endorsement of the project, to which we remain totally opposed.
LI.1.1	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Historic England, Natural England, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Partnership, Parish and Town Councils, Together Against Sizewell C, Stop Sizewell C	**Design Approach** It is imperative that the proposal represents a good quality sustainable design which can be effectively integrated into the landscape. As such, please comment on whether the following measures would ensure this would be achieved in the detailed design, construction and operation phases: i) A 'design champion'. Such a role would advise on the quality of sustainable design and the spatial integration of the both the Main Development Site and Associated Development Sites ii) A 'design review panel' to provide a 'critical friend' role. Such a role would provide comment on the development of sustainable design proposals iii) The production of an approved 'design code' or 'design approach document' which would establish the approach to delivering the detailed design specifications to ensure good quality sustainable design (as approved in the Hinkley	i) We consider that if a 'design champion' is employed to advise on the quality of design and spatial integration that the advice should consider the location of the proposed Main Development Site development being in a nationally designated landscape and not simply functional design. Given the purpose of the AONB the primary concern should be to minimise the inevitable negative impacts on the AONB. ii) We consider the role for a design review panel should include an overriding purpose of minimising any negative environmental impact, including landscape impacts. The defined qualities of the AONB such as landscape quality, scenic quality and tranquillity should be maintained as a result of their deliberations and recommendations. iii) We note the design code at Hinkley Point C Connector project but given the fact that Sizewell sits in the national landscape of the AONB and on the Suffolk Heritage Coast, with the highest level of protection from inappropriate development in planning policy, comparisons to Hinkley Point cannot be regarded as remotely similar. We endorse the recommendations of the Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Partnership in establishing a review structure and panel to ensure that any resultant design meets the obligations as required for such a designated landscape. It is regrettable that matters of design critical to minimising impacts on the AONB have not formed part of the proposed Development Consent Order and instead have been left as a requirement within the draft DCO. The AONB Partnership and other stakeholders should be given a role in the agreement of such a requirement.

		Point C Connector Project (EN020001)). Please advise on how such measures could be secured. In addition, please comment as to whether any other measures or approaches are considered necessary?	
LI.1.2	ESC, SCC, Historic England, Natural England, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Partnership, Parish and Town Councils, Together Against Sizewell C, Stop Sizewell C	**AONB – Adverse Effects** Has sufficient weight has been given to the statutory purpose and need for protection of the landscape, character and special qualities of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB both within and outside its boundary, in accordance with paragraphs 5.9.9 and 5.9.12 of NPS EN-1? Please qualify your answer. If not, please identify what additional measures are required?	Paragraph 5.9.9 of the NPS EN-1 requires the former IPC (now Examining Authority (ExA)) to give substantial weight to the impacts on the AONB when deciding on applications. The paragraph is reproduced below: *National Parks, the Broads and AONBs have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Each of these designated areas has specific statutory purposes which help ensure their continued protection and which the IPC should have regard to in its decisions126. The conservation of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should be given substantial weight by the IPC in deciding on applications for development consent in these areas.* Throughout the pre-application consultation and even within the DCO application, we do not consider that the applicant has given sufficient weight to the statutory purpose of the AONB and its environs. Whilst suggestions have been made regarding changes in cladding and other relatively simple changes have been made by the applicant, the fact of the matter is that both the cumulative size of all the buildings plus the unforgiving nature of the concrete reactor shell cannot really be adapted in a sympathetic way. Paragraph 5.9.12 recognises that development outside nationally designated areas can compromise the purposes of adjacent designations and that such projects should be sensitively designed. We agree with the AONB Partnership that the accommodation campus and temporary beach landing facility/jetty, but would add that the increased height of the Hard Coastal Defence and the lengthened and more substantial design of the permanent beach landing facility, which will be on the coast for close to a century, in the setting of the AONB will compromise the purpose of the AONB designation as the defined characteristics of the AONB, including landscape quality, scenic quality, relative wildness and tranquillity, will be significantly negatively impacted.

			We agree with the AONB Partnership and consider that the applicant should further review these elements of the application and seek to redesign those aspects that have a significant negative impact on the AONB.