The Planning Inspectorate

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

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

Issued on 21 April 2021
Responses are due by Deadline 2: Wednesday 2 June 2021

ExQ1 Part 6 of 6

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SE.1	**Socio-economic**	
SE.1.0	All relevant local authorities	**Assessment of Socio-Economic Effects** The NPS at paragraph 5.12.3 sets out what an assessment of socio-economic affects should cover. Are there any shortcomings within the assessment that require further assessment or clarification?
	Response	
SE.1.1	The Applicant	**Accommodation Strategy** As there appears to be the potential for both Sizewell B and the Proposed Development to be operating simultaneously: (i) are you able to explain how the outages at the respective plants would operate, and whether they would be co-ordinated or operate independently? (ii) Please explain the basis for the ES assessment in this regard and the different implications of the different scenarios. (iii) In the event that they might be co-ordinated- how would this be achieved?
	Response	
SE.1.2	The Applicant	**Accommodation Strategy** In light of the concerns highlighted by Westleton Parish Council [RR-1264] please explain how the accommodation assessment has assessed the potential effects on both the rental and purchase prices of local housing.
	Response	
SE.1.3	The Applicant	**Accommodation Strategy** In light of the concerns highlighted by Westleton Parish Council [RR-1264] please explain how the socio economic assessment has assessed the potential effects on the supply and provision of local trades people.
	Response	
SE.1.4	The Applicant	**Workforce Skills Enhancement**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please explain what progress has been made on developing a programme of workforce skills enhancement and how any programme would be secured through the DCO.
	Response	
SE.1.5	The Applicant, relevant local authorities	**Economic Benefits** The Economic Statement suggests [APP-610] there would be substantial economic benefits arising from the development. Please explain whether the experiences that arose from the development of the current and former nuclear power stations resulted in positive benefits. A number of RRs indicate that there has not been a long term benefit to the local area (RR-002, RR-008) how do you anticipate that this scheme could ensure a positive legacy in economic terms for the local area?
	Response	
SE.1.6	The Applicant, relevant local authorities	**Sizewell Link Road** The link road as proposed would sever Petty Road which [RR-0014] considers an important link between Saxmundham and Theberton providing access for the village community to the services in Saxmundham. Please explain how these concerns have been addressed.
	Response	
SE.1.7	The Applicant	**Effect on Local Business** Several RRS make reference to adverse effects on their businesses. [RR-0131] - effect on family business due to effect on tourism [RR-0126] – lack of detail on tourism fund [RR-0123] - impact on retail sales reliant on tourism/visitors [RR-0050] - adverse effect on caravanning and camping due to development [RR-1023] – adverse effect on livery businesses in the local area Please respond to these concerns and set out how if justified mitigation would be provided for each of these businesses.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.8	The Applicant	**Fishing Industry** [RR–0140] suggests the failure to have an acoustic fish deterrent system would adversely affect the fishing industry. Please respond to this criticism and explain your position in this respect.
	Response	
SE.1.9	Mill Hill Farm Caravan and Campsite [RR-799], Sue Townsend [RR-1167], Sea Poppies Furnished Holiday Lets [RR- 1103], Sasha French [RR-1096], Anthony Philip Baskett [RR-105], Cipher Crystal [RR-0228], Steel Scupltures [RR-1141], Tom Lagdon [RR-1233],	**Effect on business operations** Please provide more detail in respect of your concern on the impact that the Proposed Development would have on your business.
	Response	
SE.1.10	Nacton Parish Council [RR-868]	**Effect on business operations** You indicate in your Relevant representation that the Freight Management Facility would adversely affect Nacton Home Farm, please provide details as to how you consider the business would be affected by the Proposed Development.
	Response	
SE.1.11	The Applicant	**Northern Park and Ride**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		[RR 799] Indicates that the Northern P&R would adversely affect the Mill Hill Farm Caravan and Camping site. Please respond to this concern and explain how the scheme would avoid or mitigate for adverse effects.
	Response	
SE.1.12	The Applicant	**Two Village Bypass** (TVB) [RR 812] Indicates the TVB would adversely affect the holiday business, water supply and drainage at Molletts Partnership. Please respond to these concerns and explain how the scheme would avoid or mitigate for adverse effects.
	Response	
SE.1.13	The Applicant	**Displacement of Visitors** The RSPB [RR-1059] express concern that the ES does not adequately assess the impacts on visitor numbers and consequently appropriate mitigation for such affects has yet to be provided and subsequently delivered by an appropriate mechanism through the DCO. Please respond to these concerns and advise on the latest position in respect of any ongoing discussions with the RSPB.
	Response	
SE.1.14	The Applicant	**Potential Effects on Tourism** Snape Parish Council [RR-1132] have expressed concern that the ES does not adequately assess the economic impacts of the Proposed Development on the tourism sector within the parish and the significant cultural events run in the locality. Please respond to these concerns.
	Response	
SE.1.15	The Applicant	**Pressure for skilled labour** Essex CC [AoC-003] express concern over cumulative effects on socio economics, tourism, the supply chain for materials and workforce, with ongoing effects on broader economic objectives/infrastructure projects. How have the in-combination effects of other major infrastructure projects been considered and sought to be addressed to avoid problems of shortages as expressed by Essex CC.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.16	The Applicant, relevant local authorities	**Potential Effects on Tourism** Essex CC [AoC-003]indicated a desire to see a broader assessment of the impacts on tourism and the relationship to Bradwell B, please respond to this particular concern and whether the assessment of effects on the tourism sector are considered robust and conservative.
	Response	
SE.1.17	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** [APP-611] identifies that through dedicated skills and employment interventions mitigation for and improvements to the local workforce would arise. (i) Please explain precisely what dedicated skills and employment interventions are proposed; (ii) How these interventions would be secured; (iii) What monitoring would be in place to assess their effectiveness, and In the event they were not proving successful, what further arrangements may be put in place and to what timetable.
	Response	
SE.1.18	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** In light of the recognised pressures on the provision of and availability of skilled labour both regionally and nationally, has anything been put in place already to commence preparedness for the project?
	Response	
SE.1.19	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** As part of the Guiding Principles set out in para 1.3 of [APP-611] you refer to maximising the fleet effect.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The final sentence of the 4th bullet point suggests this is intended to maximise regional benefits. Please explain how this works in respect of the intention to transfer skills, jobs and contracts from Hinkley.
	Response	
SE.1.20	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** (i) In light of the lessons learned from Hinkley is it your intention not to develop an Energy Skills Centre similar to the Bridgewater and Taunton College in Suffolk? (ii) It is recognised at para 1.5.8 [APP-611] that new entrants training would need to commence shortly after a financial investment decision had been made. What is in place to facilitate this?
	Response	
SE.1.21	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** Please advise what progress has been made in investigating the potential for a National College for Nuclear hub in the East of England?
	Response	
SE.1.22	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** (i) How do you envisage the conveyor principal referred to in para 1.6.8 of [APP-611] working in practice? (ii) Have a number of places been set aside for residents from the NALEP area (if so how many), or would the opportunities be offered nationally/internationally and be subject to open competition?
	Response	
SE.1.23	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** (i) Has the 'Going Early' initiative referred to in the third bullet point of para 1.6.12 [APP-611] commenced? (ii) If not please explain the reasoning behind this and when you now anticipate it would commence.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.24	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, NALEP	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** (i) The Asset Skills Enhancement and Capability Fund is proposed to be governed by a several stakeholders. Is there agreement as to who they should be? (ii) Who would make the final decision?
	Response	i) The Applicant has proposed governance arrangements which are subject to further consideration and engagement. ii) The final decision sits with the Applicant. It is vital that decisions enhance the local skills system, deliver inclusive growth in the LEP area, and carefully manage the fact that there are already skills shortages to ensure positive benefits. The LEP would welcome regular updates at the Skills Advisory Panel from the Applicant's representative. It is vital the Applicant works with local education providers across Suffolk and Norfolk to support the skills acquisitions of new entrants plus those needing to reskill/upskill either for Sizewell C itself or to counter any displacement of workers across Norfolk and Suffolk.
SE.1.25	The Applicant	**Employment Skills and Education Strategy** The skills initiatives as referred to under sub heading c) [APP-611] refers to the 'potential' delivery mechanism and 'could' be extended to deliver the National College for Nuclear curriculum. Has this moved any closer to being a part of the delivery mechanism for upskilling the local workforce or being offered as a commitment through the DCO/S106?
	Response	
SE.1.26	The Applicant	**Training and Assessment** Reference is made to Tier 1 Partners and training boards contributing towards investment to fill gaps in training (paragraph 1.6.19 [APP-611]). (i) Which organisations and Tier 1 Partners have committed to this? (ii) How is this to be secured?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.27	The Applicant, (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce ESC SCC NALEP (iii) only)	**Supply Chain Strategy** [APP-610] in paragraph 7.3.6 refers the reader to Appendix B [APP-611]. The section on Supply Chain (1.7) does not however explain how this strategy will be delivered. (i) Please provide precise details on this strategy and the delivery and monitoring mechanism. (ii) Please set out the details of governance arrangements and progress of the S106 so this strategy can be more fully understood. (iii) Do the respective parties agree that the S106 would deliver an appropriate supply chain strategy?
	Response	(iii) A complete supply chain strategy has not been shared with New Anglia LEP so we do not have sufficient detail to ascertain whether or not the S106 commitment would actually deliver what is required and derive the benefits and level of mitigation. The LEP is of a view that an effective supply chain strategy needs to encompass a much wider range of actions than those simply meeting S106 obligations. There are wider benefits and opportunities in the supply chain that need to be addressed and leveraged through effective partnership working across LEP, Chamber, Local Authorities, education, EDF and industry partners and industry groups. We are keen to support this activity and via the All Energy Industry Council can help progress supply chain transferability across our major energy infrastructure projects in the region and support enhanced local content.
SE.1.28	The Applicant, Relevant local authorities	**Labour Market** Considering the number of construction workers envisaged to be required please advise on the implications this may have for the labour market both locally and regionally.
	Response	
SE.1.29	Relevant local authorities	**Labour Market** (i) Following on from the previous question do you consider the assessment of effects on the local labour market has robustly assessed likely impacts? Are there any concerns that you would wish to identify in this respect?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) The effects on the labour market for the area would be different during operation from that experienced during construction. Are you content with the assessment in this regard and the potential mitigation offered?
	Response	
SE.1.30	The Applicant	**Labour Market** ESC in paragraph 1.149 [RR-0342] express concern that the *'dynamic labour market is not evidence based'* Please respond to this concern and explain what assumptions have been made concerning the dynamic nature of the labour market.
	Response	
SE.1.31	The Applicant, all relevant local authorities	**Labour Market** (i) What is being undertaken to maximise the number of local people that could aspire to and achieve higher paid skilled employment on the project? (ii) How could this be secured through the DCO?
	Response	
SE.1.32	The Applicant	**Home Based Workers** ESC [RR-0342] criticises the assessment of the proportion of homebased workers to be employed that are already in employment. (i) Please respond to this concern and support your response with evidence as to how you arrived at the range of 42% to 50%[APP-610 section 5.4] (ii) In the event the figure were inaccurate either higher or lower, what implications would this have for the conclusions reached within the ES? (iii) In undertaking such assessments, a number of assumptions are made. Would it be more reasonable to suggest that in the conclusions there would be a range of the proportion already in employment? (iv) If so, what percentage range would this be?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.33	The Applicant, all relevant local authorities	**Home Based Workers** ESC suggest they are seeking 36% of workers to be homebased[para 1.157 RR-0342]. (i) Please explain why this figure is being sought, and upon what evidence this is based. (ii) Should this figure be regarded as a minimum for the whole project, or particular phases? (iii) How should this be secured? (iv) In the event the figure were to be lower for either the whole project, or particular phases what would the implications be?
	Response	
SE.1.34	The Applicant, all relevant local authorities	**Operational Roles** Has a strategy been prepared to support local people becoming permanent members of staff during the operational phase of the development?
	Response	
SE.1.35	The Applicant	**Tourism Impacts** (i) Please explain how the tourism fund would be managed and how existing companies affected by the proposed development might access funding? (ii) What governance arrangements are proposed in order to ensure a transparent and robust management process would be in place?
	Response	
SE.1.36	The Applicant	**Tourism Impacts** A number of RRs including [RR-0131, 123, 160, 163, 228, 241, 263] consider the development would adversely affect tourism and impact not only existing businesses, but the much broader appeal of the area which is considered so important to the economic success of Suffolk. Please respond to these concerns and explain how you consider any significant adverse effects could be mitigated.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.37	The Applicant	**Displacement** Concern is expressed by ESC [RR-0342 para 1.165] over the definition of displacement and whether it would actually be significant. Please respond to this concern and support it with evidence in terms of the degree of effect on the local economy and what could be done and delivered through the DCO to ensure any adverse effect is minimised.
	Response	
SE.1.38	The Applicant	**Supply Chain** (i) Is there a commitment to a proportion of contracts to be provided through local suppliers? (ii) If so, how would this be secured, monitored and delivered?
	Response	
SE.1.39	The Applicant, SCC, ESC, New Anglia LEP	**Cumulative Effects** (i) Please explain how any effect on the labour market might be managed when considered in conjunction with other potential major construction projects. In providing a response please set out the list of projects that are being considered and whether this list has been agreed with the relevant local authorities. Suffolk CC [RR-1174] at paragraph 156 provides a list, but it not clear whether this is agreed. Please support the response with the most up to date position of the prospective delivery times of these projects where known. (ii) Please consider the different demands on the different phases of the project and how this might affect the labour market and supply chain.
	Response	This is critically important as any skills strategies need to be considered through a wider lens particularly with respect to expected demands on similarly skilled workers in the region for other local energy projects and other significant infrastructure projects. These include new river crossing developments in Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth as well as some of the planned offshore wind farm developments lead by SPR, Vattenfall and others. This approach should carefully manage skills shortages to ensure that this project and other

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		infrastructure projects deliver positive benefits for the region and the local workforce develop skillsets that have long-term applications in the local economy. The Pye Tait Consulting report 'Technical Skills Legacy for Norfolk and Suffolk' identifies the key skillsets that will have an enduring legacy regionally and ensure that Suffolk maximises local employment opportunities associated with the significant investment forecast in major infrastructure projects.
SE.1.40	The Applicant	**Beach Landing Facility (BLF)** With increased activity on the beach from the introduction of the changed BLF and increased number of deliveries and potentially extended season, please explain how these changes have been assessed in terms of the effects on the tourism industry.
	Response	
SE.1.41	The Applicant	**Freight Management Strategy** Please advise what modal split would be most beneficial in socio economic terms for the Suffolk area?
	Response	
SE.1.42	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	**Freight Management Strategy** A number of RRs including [RR-0040] expressed concern that the original application would cause economic harm by severing communities and reducing the quality of the environment which is an important contributory factor to the tourism sector. Would an increase in rail and seaborne freight provide an economic benefit by reducing such severance?
	Response	
SE.1.43	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Rail Passenger Services** (i) A number of RRs [Greater Anglia, Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council, Framlingham Town Council, Sudbourne Parish Council in response to proposed changes AS-307] express concern about the potential loss of passenger rail services in the event the freight paths are created as suggested, please explain what effect the proposed freight strategy would have on passenger rail services.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Has the alternative of dualling the Lowestoft to Ipswich line which could give significant legacy benefits including providing the opportunity to significantly increase passenger train services been considered as an option? (iii) Was any other form of expanding the network considered?
	Response	
SE.1.44	The Applicant	**Inshore Fisheries** The Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority [RR-0348] have expressed concern that the proposed development has not fully explored or explained the degree of effects on both recreational and commercial fishing. This concern is further expanded in the response to the consultation to the proposed changes [AS-307]. Please respond to these concerns.
	Response	
SE.1.45	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Rail Freight** (i) In light of the comments from Associated British Ports (ABP) in response to the consultation on the proposed changes [AS-307] would rail paths be available from either Lowestoft or Ipswich ports? (ii) Have these alternatives been considered?
	Response	
SE.1.46	The Applicant	**Visitor Centre** (i) Are their figures available which indicate the number of visitors who come to the current visitor centre at Sizewell B and any indication of the economic benefits this provides? (ii) Has the economic assessment included an assessment of the closure/reduced availability of the current visitor centre? (iii) Would there be an opportunity to have a visitor centre open during construction?
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SE.1.47	The Applicant	**Accommodation Campus** (i) Is the ExA understanding correct that the accommodation campus would provide ensuite bedrooms, but these rooms would not have kitchens, sitting areas etc? (ii) If this is incorrect, please explain what the accommodation consists of and what would be made available for the on-site workforce.
	Response	
TT.1	**Traffic and Transport**	
TT.1.0	The Applicant	**Freight Management Strategy - Concrete Materials** Table 2.1 [AS-280]. The updated assumption of concrete materials is stated as 4.8 million tonnes but the following paragraphs 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 set out in more detail the amounts of aggregate, sand and cement. The total of which does not equate to 4.8 million tonnes. Explain this discrepancy.
	Response	
TT.1.1	The Applicant	**Freight Movement Modal Split by Rail** Table 2.2 [AS-280]. Explain why the lower limit in the Rail column of this table is lower than the original application amount of 38% by rail?
	Response	
TT.1.2	The Applicant	**Marine Freight Quantities** Table 2.1 [AS-280]. Indicate where the following are accounted for: (i) All Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) arriving at the BLF and by road; and (ii) The permanent Hard Coastal Defence Feature (HCDF) rock armour said to be directly deposited by barges on the beach in paragraph 3.4.103 [AS-202]
	Response	
TT.1.3	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Provision of Additional Rail Capacity**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Explain whether the current additional rail proposals are based on ongoing development of the Network Rail Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) 2 report prepared when a Rail Led strategy was being considered at Stage 3 Consultation and if so: (i) Explain what GRIP stage proposals are currently at; and (ii) Set out the delivery timescale for the necessary improvement works.
	Response	
TT.1.4	The Applicant	**Provision of Additional Rail Capacity** Surrey County Council [RR-1174] Paragraph 24 provided a link to a consultant's report concerning the deliverability of rail improvements. Provide a response to the issues set out in that report
	Response	
TT.1.5	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Deliverability of Rail Capacity (Reference Table 4.1 [AS-280])** Provide comment on the deliverability and anticipated availability date of the following: (i) The early years rail provision – 2 trains /day to the Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE): (ii) The DCO baseline rail provision – 3 trains / day; (iii) Enhanced rail provision – 4 trains / day; (iv) The potential to run trains 6 days a week rather than the 5 proposed; and (v) The potential to run 5 trains a day.
	Response	
TT.1.6	The Applicant	**Capacity by Rail** Paragraph 3.2.8 [AS-280] sets out the theoretical capacity of each train in tonnes. On that basis set out the theoretical maximum carrying capacity for each year and in total over the construction period by the nominal number of trains indicated in Table 3.1.
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.7	The Applicant	**Capacity of Rail Wagons** Appendix 9.3A Appendix B Appendix III [AS-257] identifies the rail wagon parameters used in the ground borne noise and vibration report. It states that the payload of a rail wagon is approximately 77.9 tonnes. This would make the theoretical capacity of the rail provision greater at 1558 tonnes per train. This is further supported by the experience set out in Associated British Ports (ABP) submission [AS-307] section 3.2.14 where they also suggest that train capacity can be 1560 tonnes per train. Explain this discrepancy and also if necessary, provide alternative calculations, using train numbers in Table 3.1 [AS-280], as required in previous question of revised rail capacity.
	Response	
TT.1.8	The Applicant	**Additional Marine Capacity - Permanent BLF** Does the revised design reduce the number of AIL that will need to travel by road? If so set out the original and revised numbers of AIL by: (i) By road each year and in total; and (ii) By sea each year and in total.
	Response	
TT.1.9	The Applicant	**Permanent BLF – Usage** Confirm whether, other than AIL, the permanent BLF will be used for other freight deliveries and if so, set out what quantity of freight is expected to be delivered via this facility each year and in total.
	Response	
TT.1.10	The Applicant	**Temporary BLF – Total Capacity** Paragraph 3.3.34 of Appendix 2.2B [AS-202] states that the temporary BLF will operate for approximately 8 years. In paragraph 3.3.35 it goes on to say that 1,275,000 tonnes per year could be achieved. On that basis set out the calculation to show the theoretical maximum marine freight capacity of the temporary BLF each year of operation and in total.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.11	The Applicant	**Provision of Road Capacity – Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Total Capacity** Paragraph 3.2.8 [AS-280]. Using the assumption (HGV capacity = 1250/67.5 = 18.5 tonnes) and understanding that no controls are proposed that limit the size of HGV's to those set out in paragraph 2.1.23 concerning potential HGV sizes, provide the following: (i) The theoretical HGV capacity by year and in total using the original submitted limits set out in paragraph 1.2.4 and the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608]; and (ii) The theoretical HGV capacity by year and in total using the suggested limits in paragraph 4.1.12.
	Response	
TT.1.12	The Applicant	**Change to Percentage of Freight by Road** Paragraph 2.1.15 [AS-280] reduces the freight by road to an anticipated 40%. Using the methodology in the above question how many HGV's does 40% by road equate to and how would that number be distributed over the construction period?
	Response	
TT.1.13	The Applicant	**HGV Higher Capacity Potential** ABP [AS-307] in their submission, section 3.2.14 suggest greater payloads per HGV can be achieved for certain materials. Explain how this is taken into account and if not should this be considered in the calculation of HGV numbers?
	Response	
TT.1.14	The Applicant	**HGV - Associated Development Sites** Table 2.1 [AS-280] shows the total expected import of materials for what is said to be the Sizewell C Project. From reading of the Materials Management Strategy [AS-202] it is assumed that this includes the materials required for the Associated Development Sites. Confirm the following:

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Do the figures in Table 2.1 include all the Associated Development site material requirements; and (ii) Provide a breakdown of the quantities of materials for the main development site (iii) and for each of the associated development sites
	Response	
TT.1.15	The Applicant	**HGV Associated Development Sites** The limits set out in the CTMP [APP-608] refer to HGV movements to the main development site. Provide: (i) The number of HGV movements by year to the associated development sites; and (ii) The yearly and total quantity of materials transported by HGV for the associated developments sites.
	Response	
TT.1.16	The Applicant	**Minimum HGV Numbers** Plate 4.2 [AS-280] Provide the input numbers for this graph in a table and include any missing months at either end of the construction period.
	Response	
TT.1.17	The Applicant	**Freight Management Facility (FMF)** In the Planning Statement [APP-594] the need for the FMF is described as "The facility would provide ancillary buildings and structures where paperwork, and goods can be checked prior to delivery to the Sizewell C main development site, and a location where HGVs can be held and searched while they wait to enter the Sizewell C main development site. The facility would also provide a location where HGVs can be held in the event of an accident on the local road network which prevents access to the Sizewell C main development site". Explain in further detail the requirement for the FMF for each of the following:

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Paragraph 4.1.14 of the CTMP [APP-608] sets out the objectives of the Delivery Management System (DMS), which seems to be a system to manage the flow of deliveries to the site without physical facility; (ii) The Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-107] sets out that the FMF will have 6 screen and search bays out of a total of 154 HGV spaces, so why this level of search facility could not be undertaken at port of arrival or elsewhere; (iii) Taking into account the 154 HGV spaces at the FMF, 90 spaces at the Traffic Incident Management Area (TIMA) , the 80 spaces provided at an early stage at the LEEIE and finally the 75 spaces provided on site why a provision of just under 400 HGV parking spaces are required to manage HGV movements in the event of a traffic management incident; and (iv) The proposed change places less reliance on road freight so is the level of provision still appropriate?
	Response	
TT.1.18	The Applicant	**Freight Management Facility – Control of HGV Flows** Table 7.4 of the TA [AS-017], shows the arrival and departure pattern of HGVs at the Main Development Site. The FMF is intended to be in part used to regulate the flow of HGVs to the Main Development Site. Is it intended that HGVs would leave the FMF in convoys or individually?
	Response	
TT.1.19	The Applicant	**Alternative Freight Management Facilities** ABP [AS-307] in Section 3.1.13 suggest there are adequate staging areas to accommodate the proposed levels of HGV within their port estates. Has this capacity been considered as an alternative to the provision of a separate FMF?
	Response	
TT.1.20	The Applicant	**Alternative Freight Management Facilities** The TA [AS-017] also suggests that Felixstowe Docks may be a point of origin for a number of HGV. If physical facility is needed has consideration been given to doing this within the port in a similar way to that suggested by ABP.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.21	The Applicant	**Freight Modal Shares - Revised Freight Management Targets** Provide: (i) Explanation of how the revised modal targets for freight management and HGV numbers will be secured within the DCO; (ii) A revised CTMP to reflect the updated Freight Management Strategy?
	Response	
TT.1.22	The Applicant	**Freight Management Strategy [AS-280]** Paragraph 4.1.12 sets out the potential to reduce daily HGV movements during construction and Paragraph 5.1.4 sets out the potential to reduce freight transport by road to 40% of the total. Paragraph 5.1.5 states "The relative balance to be struck between transport modes can now be examined and, through this revised approach to its FMS, SZC Co. has provided the environmental, transport and practical information necessary to enable any necessary controls to be put in place to regulate the use of the proposed transport infrastructure to ensure that an appropriate balance is struck in the public interest." Explain: (i) What controls are suggested to ensure target HGV numbers and sizes are limited to those assessed in the application; (ii) The monitoring process to ensure compliance; (iii) Remedial actions should HGV numbers exceed any limits set; and (iv) How such controls, monitoring and remedial actions will be secured within the DCO.
	Response	
TT.1.23	The Applicant, SCC	**Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608], Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) [APP-607], Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609] – Transport Review Group** The Transport Review Group membership, structure, roles and responsibilities is explained in the CTMP, the CWMP and the TIMP. The group consists of six members three appointed by SZC and three from other stakeholders. Notwithstanding information in the draft

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Section 106 [PDB-004], explain how the decisions will be made in this group if there is not a majority vote?
	Response	
TT.1.24	The Applicant	**Traffic Management Monitoring System (TMMS) / Delivery Management System (DMS).** Paragraph 4.4.23 of the CTMP [APP-608] describes the use of the TMMS in monitoring compliance. The use of this information seems from following paragraphs to be largely to be used for monitoring rather than active management of vehicles in the same way the DMS will be used. Given the use of technology proposed, could the TMMS/ DMS be used to actively manage freight movements by road on a daily basis so that any required preventative action could be taken quickly.
	Response	
TT.1.25	The Applicant, SCC	**Traffic Management Monitoring System (TMMS) / Delivery Management System (DMS).** Could the TMMS/ DMS be coordinated and developed to actively manage the following? (i) HGV movements to associated development sites; (ii) HGV movement to avoid sensitive periods in areas where impact might be high, e.g. schools, etc.; (iii) Light Goods Vehicle (LGV) movements and routes; (iv) Bus movements and routes; (v) Route monitoring to ensure that HGV numbers did not exceed those modelled on specific routes; and (vi) Currently the earliest and latest timings of freight movement to/ from the main site will be 07.00 and 23.00, however depending on origins and destinations HGV movements could be on the adjacent highway network for longer periods. In addition to on site monitoring of HGV timings, can HGV movements be managed so as to avoid much earlier and later disruption in sensitive areas?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.26	The Applicant	**Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608], Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) [APP-607], Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609] – Transport Review Group** Will the monitoring reports and assessments against aims and targets be published information?
	Response	
TT.1.27	The Applicant	**Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608]** In the case of the CTMP can the following be included: (i) LGVs are assessed in the TA and the Environmental Statement (ES) so can there be monitoring and reporting of LGV numbers; and (ii) Annual reporting of monitoring and adherence to relevant targets.
	Response	
TT.1.28	The Applicant	**Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) [APP-607]** In the case of the TIMP can this be extended to include management of emergency service responses in the event of: (i) Traffic incidents already covered in the plan; and (ii) Traffic delays created by movement of abnormal loads and their potential impacts on emergency services responses
	Response	
TT.1.29	The Applicant	**Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609]** In the case of the CWTP explain the apparent anomaly of the total workforce on the main site of 1500 in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 for the early years mode of travel when in Plate 1.1 the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		chart shows a total workforce as high as 4000 at the end of construction of the Associated Development sites.
	Response	
TT.1.30	The Applicant	**Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609]** Explain why the CWTP does not cover the construction workers at the associated development sites?
	Response	
TT.1.31	SCC	**Streetworks Permit Scheme** Does the Council operate a streetworks permit scheme for temporary works on the adopted highway? And if so, is the Council satisfied that the permit scheme is adequately covered in the proposed Development Consent Order.
	Response	
TT.1.32	The Applicant	**Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL)** A number of RR's express concern whether movement of AIL will hinder traffic movement and potential response times for emergency services in the area. Explain: (i) How many AIL movements are expected on a typical day in the early years in advance of the Sizewell Link Road being open; (ii) How traffic movement and emergency service access will be maintained during the early years prior to a suitable alternative route being available; and (iii) How many AIL's movement are expected on a typical day during peak construction and on the busiest days.
	Response	
TT.1.33	The Applicant	**Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) – Road Based** Provide details of the likely origin and routes for the road based AIL movements.
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.34	The Applicant, SCC, Scottish Power	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Cumulative Assessment with EA1 and EA2** In the Table 26.2 of Chapter 26 of Environmental Statement (ES) for the East Anglia One North and Two Offshore Windfarm application it is identified that there may be a need for potential structural alterations to the existing bridge on the A12 at Marlesford to facilitate the movement of abnormal load vehicles over this bridge. Has this requirement: (i) Been considered as part of the Sizewell C project? (ii) If this was to be required how would construction work impact on traffic flows on the A12 at Marlesford?
	Response	
TT.1.35	The Applicant	**Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) – Two Village Bypass Bridge** Will the proposed bridge over the River Alde be capable of carrying AIL's?
	Response	
TT.1.36	The Applicant, SCC	**Fly Parking** Fly parking if uncontrolled will potentially lead to several problems not least of which is modelled traffic flows being underestimated on some routes. Paragraph 13.3.2 of the TA Addendum [AS-266] states further work is ongoing about the management of fly parking. Explain how fly parking on the local highway network will be controlled, monitored, and enforced during the construction period.
	Response	
TT.1.37	The Applicant	**Movement Frameworks** In order to assist full understanding of movement patterns around the area and how they will change as the development progresses and after completion, provide movement frameworks by travel mode showing how movement around the main development site, the temporary construction area, the accommodation campus, the LEEIE and their immediate surroundings will develop through the construction process. These movement frameworks should be prepared in a similar phased pattern to the Description of

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Construction Figures [APP-186] but include an operational version and clearly indicate on each, routes by the following modes: (i) HGV; (ii) LGV and cars; (iii) Buses; (iv) Cycle routes; (v) Equestrian routes if any separate routes provided; and (vi) Pedestrian routes /paths, including any construction required diversions.
	Response	
TT.1.38	The Applicant, SCC	**Change 15, New Bridleway Link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills** Figure 2.2.32, of the ES Addendum [AS-202], shows the proposed new bridleway. Explain: (i) Why the former site access road junction is retained for what is assumed, after construction, to be a field access, including the right turning pocket; and (ii) How does the proposed bridleway and crossing relate to the desire lines for intended users in the area.
	Response	
TT.1.39	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] - Scoping** Paragraph 1.6.1 references extensive scoping discussions. Has there been a formal scoping process with the relevant Highways and Planning Authorities on development of the TA? If so, submit copy of agreed scoping report.
	Response	
TT.1.40	SCC, Highways England	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] - Scoping**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Do you consider that the scoping process and the coverage of the TA reflect your pre-application input?
	Response	
TT.1.41	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] - Existing Conditions** In paragraph 2.3.73 justification for not considering August as an analysis month refers to the inclusion in the May analysis of the atypical outages at Sizewell B to provide robust assessment. Provide the following for the traffic level that would be associated with an outage at Sizewell B: (i) 24 hour daily traffic flow as a number and assumed percentage increase over a day without an outage; (ii) 24 hour daily flow as number for August traffic levels and a percentage increase over a day in May used in the assessment; (iii) Peak hour flows both as a number and a percentage of daily peak hours without an outage; (iv) Duration of outages at Sizewell B; and (v) How outages would avoid the peak holiday seasons?
	Response	
TT.1.42	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Daily Traffic Variations** Paragraphs 2.3.74 to 2.3.76 outline the assessment of daily variations set out in Table 2.2. Mention is made throughout the TA about traffic variations being compared to daily variations in traffic. What percentage typical daily variation is assumed for these comparisons and how is this derived?
	Response	
TT.1.43	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Journey Times**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In Paragraph 2.3.78 explain why Route 3 A12 Martlesham to Sizewell C does not use a route from the A12 further south than the B1122 at Yoxford, when more direct and shorter routes are available.
	Response	
TT.1.44	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Policy** Paragraph 3.4.30 states that the Suffolk Rail Prospectus 2015 included the opportunity of achieving a passenger service and station for Leiston as a legacy benefit from the new development at Sizewell should be explored. Explain how this issue has been explored.
	Response	
TT.1.45	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Policy** Paragraph 3.4.33 states that the New Anglia Strategic Economic Plan (2014) details a key transport priority with regards to the Sizewell C development: "A bypass of Stratford St. Andrew, Farnham, Little Glenham and Marlesford is needed to keep HGV traffic off the A12 through these villages." Explain in this context: (i) Why only two of these villages is proposed to be bypassed rather than the four; and (ii) What consideration has been given to the alignment of the Two Village Bypass with respect to the eventual alignment of a four village bypass envisaged in the Plan
	Response	
TT.1.46	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – LEEIE Temporary Park and Ride** Paragraph 4.3.3 of the TA [AS-017] sets out the temporary nature of the LEEIE Park and Ride facility. It is stated not to be required once the remote Park and Ride sites are in operation. Explain when this facility will be removed along with any temporary use for the area for the remainder of the construction period.
	Response	
TT.1.47	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – LEEIE Temporary Caravan Park** Paragraph 4.3.2 states workers would be bused from the caravan park to the main site. No detail is provided of the layout of the LEEIE to show how these workers will connect

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		with bus services. Provide a layout of the LEEIE showing how workers on the caravan park will connect with the bus services operating from the Park and Ride to the main site.
	Response	
TT.1.48	SCC, Highways England	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] / [AS-266] – Modelling Approach** Are you satisfied with the strategic modelling scope and approach outlined in Section 6 of the Transport Assessment?
	Response	
TT.1.49	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Changes to Modelling Approach** Paragraph 6.1.1 identifies that a number of changes to the traffic modelling approach have taken place as result of ongoing consultation with stakeholders. Identify: (i) The changes that have taken place to the modelling approach; and (ii) Summarise the key effect on modelled traffic flows on key routes.
	Response	
TT.1.50	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Trip Generation, Distribution and Mode Share** There is no replacement Table 7.1 in the TA Addendum [AS-266] so the following questions relate to Table 7.1: (i) The routeing of direct bus services is this correct for all services, including from Saxmundham and Leiston? (ii) How is the number of bus passengers derived? (iii) What is the peak number of buses required? (iv) How are LGV numbers derived? (v) How were the HGV numbers derived? and (vi) Why paragraph 7.2.1 [AS-266] states the only change relates to bus frequency but not overall HGV numbers?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.51	SCC	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Car Share Factors** Paragraph 7.2.24 states average occupancies for cars. Are you satisfied this will adequately reflect the pattern of car sharing for the Proposed Development?
	Response	
TT.1.52	The Applicant, SCC	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Classification of HGV.** Paragraph 7.2.43 states "HGVs include, for transport modelling purposes, all goods vehicles over 3.5 tonnes. HGVs are usually classified as goods vehicles over 7.5 tonnes; however, the lower threshold has been applied to provide a robust basis for the Transport Assessment.". Explain this assumption in the following context: (i) It is unlikely that the pattern of sizes of goods vehicles associated with the Proposed Development would replicate the sizes of types of goods vehicles in the existing flows surveyed. It is more likely the Proposed Development HGV traffic would be in the 'usual' classification of HGVs mentioned above. That being the case the same usual classification of HGV size of 7.5 tonnes would seem the most accurate one to use; (ii) With the inflation of the baseline number of HGVs represented by the current assessment it would mean that the baseline (existing) level of HGV's are over estimated and therefore percentage increases in HGVs associated with the Proposed Development are being under estimated both in the Transport Assessment and in the Chapter 10 of the ES; and (iii) If the applicant is satisfied that the HGV traffic associated with the Proposed Development will replicate the size pattern of baseline surveyed traffic, explain how this would be controlled within the DCO process to avoid the dominance of much larger vehicles being used.
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.53	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – HGV movements between LEEIE and Main Site** (i) In Table 7.4, do the numbers of HGV set out in this include HGV trips from to LEEIE? (ii) In TA Addendum [AS-266] it is stated in Paragraph 7.4.3 that the revised Table 7.4 does include these trips but in order to ensure direct comparison confirmation is needed that in the original Table 7.4 [AS-107] is also correct.
	Response	
TT.1.54	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Early Years Construction 2023** Explain: (i) The limit of 300 HGV deliveries to the main site was used as a limiting target for HGV movements on the wider network when in Table 7.10 of the TA there are 380 daily one way movements shown entering and leaving the Main Development site? (ii) Why this limit could not be expressed as total for all Sizewell related construction on the network? (iii) Can limits for particular routes be derived so that impacts do not exceed those identified in the ES?
	Response	
TT.1.55	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Strategic Modelling** Traffic surveys used to build the model were undertaken in 2015. Explain: (i) The extent to which more recent traffic flows have been collected; and (ii) How the model outputs have been validated against more recent traffic flows.
	Response	
TT.1.56	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Strategic Modelling** Explain how the selection of the network peak hours were determined?
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.57	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Strategic Modelling** The workforce profile shown in Plate 1.1 of the Construction Worker Travel Plan [APP-608] and Figure 2.1 of the Accommodation Strategy [APP-614] shows that the total workforce in the early years prior to the completion of the Associated Development sites exceeds 3000. Explain: (i) Why in Table 7.7 of the TA [AS-017] the early years workforce assumption for modelling purposes is 1500 people? (ii) Why using this much reduced figure does not mean modelled levels of predicted traffic would not be underestimated?
	Response	
TT.1.58	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Strategic Modelling** In Table 3 in Appendix 7A car park accumulations are derived from the modelling and the maximum accumulations are significantly less than the car park capacities. Explain: (i) Why car park capacity in excess of these modelled figures is being proposed? (ii) Has modelling been undertaken for flows that would fill the desired car park capacities? and (iii) If not, why has this not been done as if car parks do fill to capacity this will impact on traffic flows on the network.
	Response	
TT.1.59	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Strategic Modelling** Explain how the traffic associated with workers travelling from home to and returning from the accommodation campus and the caravan site on the LEEIE has been taken into account in the modelling?
	Response	
TT.1.60	The Applicant, SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Committed Developments**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Paragraph 8.2.8 does the current reference case traffic modelling take account of all relevant committed developments?
	Response	
TT.1.61	The Applicant, SCC	**A12 improvements: A14 'Seven Hills' to A1152 Woods Lane.** Explain how the development of this project takes account of the impact of the Proposed Development and also whether the submitted modelling of the Proposed Development takes account of any of the improvements planned.
	Response	
TT.1.62	The Applicant, SCC, Scottish Power	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Cumulative Assessment with EA1N and EA2** Is the traffic data input provided used in the modelling of the Scottish Power proposal EA1 and EA2 still the correct current data?
	Response	
TT.1.63	The Applicant, SCC, Scottish Power	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Cumulative Assessment with EA1N and EA2** Explain: (i) How highway mitigations proposed for this project would be aligned with those proposed by East Anglia One North and Two offshore windfarms; (ii) How any overlap of mitigations proposed would be managed to minimise potential abortive work; (iii) How highway works would be coordinated between the projects; and (iv) How the Construction Traffic Management Plans would be aligned and managed to ensure consistent approach to traffic management between all projects and existing highway users.
	Response	
TT.1.64	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling** In their representation both Suffolk County Council a [RR-1174] paragraph 33 and East Suffolk Council [RR-0342] paragraph 1.204 consider that the highway mitigation proposed by the Applicant is not comprehensive. They propose the areas listed in the two cited

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		paragraphs require additional consideration for improvement. Provide a detailed response to these concerns.
	Response	
TT.1.65	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling** In paragraph 9.1.2 says 42 junctions have been assessed but in paragraph 9.5.2 it says that 54 junctions have been assessed. Explain this anomaly.
	Response	
TT.1.66	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 5 A1094/ B1069 junction, explain why the cumulative impact of Scottish Power is not considered given that in the assessment in the TA [AS-107] the cumulative impact has the junction operating over capacity in some time periods in both the Early Years and Peak Construction periods with Scottish Power traffic.
	Response	
TT.1.67	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 5 A1094/ B1069 junction. Are you satisfied that the mitigation proposed is an appropriate response to the proposed development impact at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.68	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 9 B1119 / B1122 / B1069 Leiston Crossroads was modelled to be operating over capacity in the morning peak hour 08.00 to 09.00 in the operational phase of development 2034 onwards in the original TA [AS-017]. Revised modelling results in Table 9.16 show additionally the 15.00 to 16.00 peak construction period over capacity. Is the Council content that no additional mitigation is required beyond what is suggested in the TA and the TA Addendum?
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.69	SCC, ESC, Leiston Town Council	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] - Leiston Public Realm Improvements** Paragraph 12.6.6 are SCC and Leiston Town Council satisfied with the scope and extent of these works as mitigation for the predicted transport effects in Leiston?
	Response	
TT.1.70	The Applicant, SCC	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling** Junction 11 A12 /A144 junction – (i) Explain why Junctions 9 modelling was not undertaken for the existing layout of this junction. Although changes are proposed it would give a comparable assessment of the operation of the junction in its current layout (without mitigation); (ii) Explain in more detail why Junctions 9 could not be used on the proposed layout as it has been used on A12 / B1119 staggered T junctions; and (iii) Suffolk County Council provide your views of the proposed junction assessment and potential improvement.
	Response	
TT.1.71	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling** Junction 13 A12 / B1122 Junction. Provide a Junction 9 assessment of the early years scenario of the existing layout so as to enable direct comparison of performance between the existing and proposed layouts and in addition so comparison can be made with the Junctions 9 assessment undertaken within the East Anglia windfarm applications.
	Response	
TT.1.72	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 13 A12 / B1122 Junction. Paragraphs 9.5.29 and 9.5.30 suggest that the introduction of the roundabout will add or even create queues on the A12. What is the Highways Authority's view of the introduction of this roundabout?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.73	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 14: B1069 / A1094. Explain why this junction is expected to operate better following the additional modelling undertaken.
	Response	
TT.1.74	SCC, Highways England	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 21: A14 / A12 Seven Hills Interchange. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.75	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 22: A12 / Foxhall Road / Newbourne Road. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.76	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 24: A12 / Anson Road / Eagle Way. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.77	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 26: A12 / B1438. Explain how the refined DCO flows changes have created significant changes in junction performance.
	Response	
TT.1.78	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 26: A12 / B1438. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.79	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Junction 27: A12 / B1079 Grundisburgh Road. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.80	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 29 A12 / New Road / Woodbridge Road. Paragraph 9.5.133 states that "SZC Co. propose that the traffic flow, driver delay and road safety performance of this junction be monitored during the construction of Sizewell C via the Transport Review Group (TRG), and impacts managed in alignment with the construction phase management plans. The Draft Section 106 Agreement (Doc Ref. 8.17) [PDB-004] sets out transport contingency effects funds that would be available to the TRG to address any identified issues, should they arise. Are you satisfied with the suggested approach at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.81	The Applicant, SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** Junction 38: A12 / B1125 Angel Lane, Blythburgh. Paragraph 9.5.137 states that "The Refined DCO forecast flows at this location have changed very little, however visibilities in the model have been adjusted to address comments made by SCC. This results in RFCs changing by +/- 0.13 and delays changing by +/- 15s per vehicle.". Explain these comments and the adjustments to visibilities made.
	Response	
TT.1.82	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling** A12 Corridor Assessment. Paragraph 9.6.20 states that "Based on the VISSIM assessment, no perceivable impact is predicted and therefore no mitigation in the form of highway improvements is considered to be required for the A12 corridor between Seven Hills and Melton. SZC Co. will implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Worker Travel Plan to monitor and manage the impacts of Sizewell C freight traffic and workforce movements during the construction of Sizewell C. A Transport Review Group (TRG) will be established to review these plans and review the monitoring report produced each quarter. A transport contingency fund will be made available to the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		TRG to be used if necessary, to implement any further mitigation measures and remedial actions." Do you agree with this analysis and the suggested approach to any necessary mitigation?
	Response	
TT.1.83	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Journey Times** Paragraph 14.2.15. What are the daily variations of journey times along this section of the A12?
	Response	
TT.1.84	SCC	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Road Traffic Collision Forecasts** Section 10.2 sets out the Applicant's approach to assessment of future road traffic collisions. Do you agree with the assessment approach used and also in general where they suggest improvements these are required?
	Response	
TT.1.85	SCC, ESC, Wickham Market Parish Council	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Road Traffic Collision Forecasts** Paragraph 10.3.8 states that "In Wickham Market, between Border Cot Lane and the River Deben bridge, proposals have been developed in consultation with Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council and Wickham Market Parish Council. They include footway widening around the Border Cot Lane / High Street junction, kerb build-outs and parking rationalisation over this length. There would be no change to the existing 30 mph speed limit." Paragraph 10.3.10 in the first bullet point sets out that B1078 safety measures would hope to reduce vehicle speeds. Given there is a section of the B1078 that passes through a residential section of Whickham Market could you explain whether a reduction of the speed limit to 20mph was considered here?
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.86	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Walking and Cycling Routes** References to Access and Rights of Way Plans. Confirm: (i) Paragraph 12.2.7 wrongly references new bridleway being shown on Access and Rights of Way Plans [AS-013] should this be submitted with the Applicant's change request [AS-113]? and (ii) Paragraph 14.3.16, wrongly references changes being shown on Access and Rights of Way Plans [AS-013] should this be submitted with the Applicant's change request [AS-113]?
	Response	
TT.1.87	The Applicant, SCC	**"Rat Running" Traffic Routes** Numerous Relevant Representations have raised concerns around rat running through less suitable routes by workers and traffic associated with Sizewell C. Explain measures that are proposed or that could be employed to ensure compliance with recommended routes including any signing and digital navigation services proposed.
	Response	
TT.1.88	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Rail** Paragraph 2.7.10 explains that Sizewell Halt was last used for the decommissioning of Sizewell A but is not currently used. However, paragraph 2.7.8 also states that the East Suffolk Line carries occasional nuclear flask trains for Sizewell A and B. Explain the current operation used for occasional nuclear flask movements and if this relates to any usage of Sizewell Halt.
	Response	
TT.1.89	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Rail** Was the use of Sizewell Halt considered in relation to construction of Sizewell C?
	Response	
TT.1.90	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Rail**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Rail siding in LEEIE. Will this be used after the opening of the Green Rail Route? If not, will it remain until all of the LEEIE is reinstated?
	Response	
TT.1.91	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis** In [APP-450] the consideration of the alternatives in paragraph 3.2.50 does say initial traffic modelling was done on alternative alignments but presents no findings. Table 3.1 does not have transport as a key environmental factor. Given routes further south could potentially provide alleviation of development traffic on other routes through Knodishall, Leiston and Saxmundham. Provide a more detailed response on the various possible route alignments with reference to the initial modelling undertaken and include any initial modelling assessment
	Response	
TT.1.92	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis** In the case of the preferred route of the Link Road a number of Relevant Representations question the legacy benefit of the proposed alignment. In Tables 8.5, 8.7 and 8.9 of the Transport Assessment [AS-017] it can be derived the traffic levels on the combined B1122 / Sizewell Link Road corridor return to early years levels on the B1122 during operation. Given this level of traffic is considered acceptable on the B1122 in the early years of construction, explain the legacy benefit of the proposed link road in this context?
	Response	
TT.1.93	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis** Paragraph 3.2.64 [APP-450] states that Stage 4 consultation preferences were expressed for the D2 route as it was considered by respondents that this would have provided more of a legacy benefit, a safer route for HGVs, catered better for HGVs coming from the south, and reduced amenity impacts to villages. Provide more detail on the transport analysis in this respect for the alternative routes.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.94	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis** 85% of HGV's are assumed from the south in the Transport Assessment. Using the same basis of analysis, for all remaining traffic including workers on the main site what is the proportion of traffic from the south of the Sizewell Link Road junction on the A12?
	Response	
TT.1.95	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road -Traffic on B1122** Given that traffic levels on some routes such as the B1122 are predicted to be highest in the early years (2023) ahead of completion of the mitigation schemes, explain why: (i) The works on the main development site are started in advance of all the mitigation projects being completed; and (ii) no mitigation is proposed on the existing B1122 to mitigate the increase in traffic during the early years other than highway maintenance.
	Response	
TT.1.96	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road - Pretty Road Vehicle Severance** A number of Relevant Representations are concerned about the severance created by the loss to Pretty Road to vehicular traffic. Explain in detail why vehicle movement cannot be retained on Pretty Road?
	Response	
TT.1.97	The Applicant	**Sizewell Link Road – Route for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL)** Figure 2.4 [APP-449] suggest that AIL will use the Middleton Moor Link road to access the Sizewell Link Road. Explain: (i) Why they will not use the whole length of the Sizewell Link Road; and (ii) Will the new roundabout on the B1122 be designed to accommodate AIL?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.98	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] - Two Village Bypass** Tables 8.4 shows total daily traffic. On the A12 in the vicinity of the Marlesford and Farnham, they peak in the early year's scenario at an increase due to Sizewell traffic of 2000 vehicles/ day. Given the traffic levels through Farnham how will this be managed in the early years especially given the limitations relating to the 'Farnham' bend?
	Response	
TT.1.99	The Applicant	**Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] - Two Village Bypass** In the case of Little Glenham and Marlesford how will the traffic increases shown in these Tables be mitigated throughout the construction programme?
	Response	
TT.1.100	The Applicant	**Northern Park and Ride, Darsham** Given the proximity of the site to the Darsham railway station and the narrow footway provision along the A12 from the site entrance to the station explain what consideration has been given to a direct connection to the eastern platform of the station?
	Response	
TT.1.101	The Applicant	**Northern Park and Ride, Darsham** Have improvements to the existing footway connection to the station been considered?
	Response	
TT.1.102	The Applicant, Network Rail	**Northern Park and Ride, Darsham** Two RR's [RR-0244 and RR-0908] have raised the issue relating to the safety of the level crossing at the station. Their concern is based on Network Rail's classification of the crossing safety being exacerbated by the additional traffic. Has the impact of the proposed development on this level crossing safety been assessed and discussed with Network Rail?
	Response	
TT.1.103	The Applicant	**Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Explain why the use of the existing Park and Ride site at(or adjacent to) Martlesham was not considered as part of the assessment of alternatives?
	Response	
TT.1.104	The Applicant	**Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market** Explain why the existing layout on A12 northbound carriageway would be changed from two lanes to one lane before the northbound slip road from the B1078 joins the A12?
	Response	
TT.1.105	The Applicant	**Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market** Has an initial road safety audit been undertaken for the new site entrance / exit on the A12 slip road? If so either signpost in the submission or provide it
	Response	
TT.1.106	The Applicant	**Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market** In the case of the Traffic Incident Management Area (TIMA) provide: (i) More detail on the number of HGV's that could use the TIMA including maximum occupancy in the event of any traffic incident; and (ii) Details on how its use would be controlled in the DCO so that it would only occur in the event of a clearly defined traffic incident.
	Response	
TT.1.107	The Applicant	**Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market** In the case of the Postal Consolidation Facility provide: (i) Details of whether postal consolidation facility will be used for the main site and Sizewell accommodation provision; and (ii) Details of vehicle type to take consolidated deliveries to main site.
	Response	
TT.1.108	The Applicant	**Freight Management Facility (FMF)**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		On Felixstowe Road, the national speed limit applies on this road. Has an initial road safety audit been undertaken for this access junction? If so either signpost in the submission or provide it
	Response	
TT.1.109	The Applicant	**Freight Management Facility (FMF)** Several Relevant Representations comment that closure of the A14 Orwell Bridge is a regular occurrence and this site would be severely affected by such a closure. Explain how this was considered in the analysis of the suitability of this site?
	Response	
TT.1.110	The Applicant	**Freight Management Facility (FMF)** Also, in relation to the FMF provide: (i) The peak times of activity for HGVs entering and leaving the site; and (ii) The anticipated direction of travel of the vehicles entering and leaving the site.
	Response	
TT.1.111	The Applicant	**Freight Management Facility (FMF) – Temporary Construction Access** Paragraph 2.4.11 [APP-511] states that "It is anticipated that a temporary construction access point would be provided to the site off the A12 until construction of the site access road is completed." This infers that there will be two accesses created, one for the main road and a more temporary construction access. The Schedule of Accesses submitted [AS-297] identifies only one access for the FMF. Explain: (i) This anomaly and if necessary, update the Schedule and any related plans; and (ii) Confirm whether similar temporary site access arrangements will be in place at other Associated Development Sites and if so, identify the sites and amend the Schedule of Accesses and relevant plans.
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.112	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT** Paragraph 10.2.23 states that "For peak construction the representative hour was initially identified as 22:00- 23:00 when 'daytime hours' of 07:00-23:00 were considered. Given the assessments are to primarily assess impact on vulnerable road users, it is important that the representative hour is a reflection of when vulnerable road users are likely to be on the network. As such, the representative hour for peak construction has been taken to be 07:00-08:00". Explain why this "representative" hour was chosen if it is meant to be a period when vulnerable road users are on the network.
	Response	
TT.1.113	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT / ES ADDENDUM [AS-181]** The Institute of Environmental Management (IEMA) Guidance also recommends that the period of highest environmental impact should also be considered. This could be time around the beginning or end of school when children are going to school for example. Why has the period of highest environmental impact not been considered?
	Response	
TT.1.114	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT** Paragraph 10.6.8 sets out that screening has been undertaken using 24hr AAWT. In the IMEA Guidance Paragraph it acknowledges that, "for many impacts such as noise and severance it is considered that average or total daily traffic flows provide insufficient information for any real understanding of environmental effects." Understanding this, what are the implications for the screening process if the hours of greatest change or the hours of greatest impact are used on the screening?
	Response	
TT.1.115	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT** In Table 10.16 the assessment of pedestrian amenity is undertaken on the selected representative hour 07.00 to 08.00 which is the hour of greatest change but has there been consideration of the hour of greatest impact when there are likely to be more

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		pedestrians present? By way of example Table 7.4 in the Transport Assessment [AS-017] shows that the hour of greatest HGV movement is between 15.00 and 16.00.
	Response	
TT.1.116	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT** In terms of Fear and Intimidation the IMEA Guidance suggest that consideration should also be given to areas exposed to higher than average levels of school children and / or vulnerable users that should be separately identified. Has this been considered?
TT.1.117	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT** Given that speed limits on most roads in the area are a minimum of 30mph, explain how in the assessment of the effects on Fear and Intimidation that traffic speeds seem not to have been considered, as recommended in both the IMEA Guidance and Table 10.2, where speeds of +20mph are considered part of the high impact category?
	Response	
TT.1.118	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT** Explain why given the major adverse impact on pedestrian amenity which is considered a significant effect that no mitigation is proposed on sections of the B1122 in the early years of construction prior to the opening of the Sizewell Link Road
	Response	
TT.1.119	SCC, ESC	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT** Do the Council's agree with the Applicant's assessment of the early years environmental traffic effects along the B1122 in the early years of construction? If so please explain the details of any concerns you have about the assessment.
TT.1.120	The Applicant	**ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Paragraphs 10.6.14 to 10.6.17 identify four routes in the early years that are said to have adverse impacts that are identified but none are judged to be significant effects. This in the case of 3 routes is said to be because in the selected representative hour, other activity of the routes would be relatively light. Has the hour of greatest impact been considered in regard to severance when there is likely to be much more activity on these sensitive routes?
	Response	
TT.1.121	The Applicant	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Pedestrian Delay Methodology** Paragraph 2.5.4, explain: (i) Why the methodology has changed; (ii) Explain how pedestrian delay is now calculated; (iii) Whether any comparison has been undertaken of how this has changed the analysis, if so, provide such evidence; and (iv) Why this is apparently contrary to the methodology outlined in paragraphs 1.3.46 to 1.3.48 Volume 1, Chapter 6, Appendix 6F of the ES [APP-171].
	Response	
TT.1.122	SCC, ESC	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Severance 2023 Early Years** Table 2.10 Link 11 B1125 Westleton, this changes from minor adverse to major adverse, but significance is dismissed due to absolute traffic volumes. Given this represents a 61% rise in traffic volumes in the representative hour do the Councils agree with this assessment?
	Response	
TT.1.123	The Applicant	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Severance 2023 Early Years** Paragraph 2.5.23, has the hour when children are likely to be arriving or leaving the Centre and nursery been considered, i.e. the hour of greatest environmental impact?
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.124	The Applicant	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Severance 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day** Table 2.16 Link 4c text states the primary mitigation proposed makes this change not significant. Paragraph 2.5.53 explains the new bridleway with Pegasus crossing will mean there is no severance. The new crossing will be across the B1122 north of the proposed site entrance. This link is south of the entrance and the new bridleway seems not to reflect the overall north south desire line. Explain how the proposed bridleway alignment and crossing addresses severance.
	Response	
TT.1.125	The Applicant	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Amenity 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day** Paragraphs 2.5.64 and 2.5.65 the assessments of amenity are based on revised traffic modelling and assumptions about bus routes. How will these bus route assumptions be controlled through the DCO to ensure any subsequent changes in bus routes does not reintroduce effects that have not been considered or screened out.
	Response	
TT.1.126	The Applicant	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Fear and Intimidation 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day** Paragraph 2.5.67, Link 26 A12 Marlesford given an increased and significant effect has been identified is the Applicant proposing any mitigation?
	Response	
TT.1.127	The Applicant	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Fear and Intimidation 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day** Paragraph 2.5.67, Does the refinement of the bus strategy mentioned and the reduction in vehicles travelling to the southern park and ride affect the demand at the southern park and ride? And If not why?
	Response	
TT.1.128	The Applicant	**ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Driver Delay 2028 Peak Construction**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Paragraph 2.5.89, explain how is this level of delay judged to be not significant in this case?
	Response	
TT.1.129	The Applicant	**Cumulative Impact Appendices [ES-201]- Appendix 10.4 Fear and Intimidation** Explain why Tables 2.13 to 2.18 and Tables 3.13 to 3.18 are entitled in 24hr AAWT when original assessment methodology is undertaken on 18hr AAWT flows
	Response	
TT.1.130	The Applicant	**Cumulative Transport Impacts [ES-201]- Appendix 10.4** Explain why in the cumulative assessment provided with the East Anglia projects none of the assessments have considered traffic levels in the representative hour. Using this methodology, as is used in Chapter 10 [APP-198], it could for example change the Severance assessment in the early years such that it may show a major adverse effect significance on Link 11, B1125 through Westleton, with cumulative traffic added. Provide comparable assessment methodology using the representative hour as in the original Chapter 10 so direct comparison can be made.
	Response	
TT.1.131	The Applicant	**Cumulative Transport Impacts [AS-189] [ES-201]- Hour of Greatest Impact** Why has there been no consideration of the hour of greatest environmental impact in the Cumulative assessment?
	Response	
TT.1.132	The Applicant	**Cumulative Transport Impacts [ES-201]- Appendix 10.4** Scottish Power in the assessment of the transport impacts of both EA1 North and EA2 have identified the following area of mitigation required. Provide explanation why in the assessment of the effects of Sizewell C traffic, the following mitigations are not identified: (i) For the EA projects only footway improvements in Theberton on the B1122; (ii) Cumulative impact with SZC pedestrian improvements at Yoxford on the A12; and (iii) Cumulative impact with SZC pedestrian improvements at Marlesford on the A12

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.133	SCC	**Cumulative Transport Impacts [AS-189] [ES-201]** Explain any issues the Council has with respect to how cumulative impact has been assessed and also any areas where the Council considered mitigation is required and the reasons for any such mitigation.
	Response	
W.1	**Waste (conventional) and material resource**	
W.1.0	The Applicant	**Water Supply Strategy Appendix 2.2D [AS-202]** Paragraph 1.3.1 sets out the options still being considered for water supply solutions. Provide: (i) An update on progress of these options; and (ii) Confirmation that the site water supply demands can be met without any implications for water supply elsewhere.
	Response	
W.1.1	The Applicant	**Water Supply Strategy Appendix 2.2D [AS-202]** Plate 1.2 seems to show that the pipeline transfer connection to Darsham will run along a part of the Sizewell Link Road. Explain: (i) Whether the pipeline will be installed along part of the Sizewell Link Road: and (ii) How this work will be delivered and coordinated within the powers secured by the DCO.
	Response	
W.1.2	Essex and Suffolk Water Company	**Water Supply Strategy Appendix 2.2D [AS-202]** Provide an update on the delivery of water supply to the Proposed Development and the expected delivery timescales.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
W.1.3	The Applicant	**Main Development Site Chapter 8 Conventional Waste and Material Resources - [APP-193]** Table 8.7 shows material resource requirements compared to amounts available in Suffolk and UK. Concrete is a manufactured product consisting mostly of cement, sand, aggregate and water. The Temporary Construction Area is proposed to include batching plants so concrete will be produced on site. Explain why this Table does not take this into account or show the raw materials needed to manufacture concrete?
	Response	
W.1.4	The Applicant	**Main Development Site Chapter 8 Conventional Waste and Material Resources - [APP-193]** Table 8.17. Will concrete used on the associated development sites be manufactured on the Temporary Construction Area or imported?
	Response	
W.1.5	The Applicant	**Cut and Fill Balance** Paragraph 8.6.27 [APP-193]. This states “a neutral cut and fill balance is targeted for the main development site, with any surplus excavated material to be retained on-site for re-use in landscaping.” Further emphasised in Paragraph 1.2.1 [APP-185] where it sets out in the second bullet point that an objective of the Materials Management Strategy is to achieve a neutral cut and fill balance across the main development site and associated development sites. Demonstrate how this neutral balance will be achieved by way of setting out the values of the cut and fill by location either in tonnes or m^3. Include all significant areas of cut and fill, including the following: (i) The main platform area including marine shafts and cut off wall; (ii) All Associated Development sites; (iii) Borrow Pits; (iv) Stockpiles; (v) The SSSI crossing; and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(vi) Any landscape features
	Response	
W.1.6	The Applicant	**Materials Management Strategy Update Appendix 2.2.C [AS-202]** Paragraph 1.2.9 sets out that "Further testing has allowed the project to assume that some of this additional crag material would now also be available for higher specification backfill material when treated with binders. This significantly reduces the amount of such backfill material that would otherwise have needed to be imported (by approximately 2.4 million tonnes). It also significantly reduces the amount of residual material that would otherwise have needed to be either exported off-site or incorporated into the permanent landscape.". Explain in this context why the changed application: (i) Increases the need imported backfill by 1.3 million tonnes (Table 1.20); (ii) Would it mean without the additional crag material that 3.7 million tonnes of imported backfill would be needed? (iii) This paragraph infers that previously material could have been exported off site, how is this consistent with neutral cut and fill? (iv) Is there any disposal off site of non-contaminated arisings, and if so, how much? (v) Has any export of arisings off site been considered in either the Freight Management or the Transport Strategy?
	Response	
W.1.7	The Applicant	**Introduction to the Environmental Statement Chapter 6 EIA Methodology Appendix 6D – [APP-171]** Paragraph 1.1.6 states "It is acknowledged that the use of material resources and the generation and management of waste would be likely to generate adverse environmental effects, predominantly through transportation (both to and from site)". Does the analysis of traffic generation in both the Transport Assessment [AS-017] and Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-198] include any traffic generated by the transport of waste? If so, please signpost

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		where the assumptions about waste removal trip generation from site have been included in the modelling undertaken.
	Response	
W.1.8	The Applicant	**Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296]** Figure 1.1 showing the locations of the borrow pits is missing from the report. Provide this figure and also a plan showing borrow pits and stockpiles.
	Response	
W.1.9	The Applicant	**Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296]** Paragraph 1.2.1 of the Materials Management Strategy Update [AS-202] states that detailed site investigations have led to a revised assumption about arisings. Given this detailed site investigation has been undertaken after the submission of the Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix does the additional site investigation have any implications for the risk assessment undertaken?
	Response	
W.1.10	The Applicant	**Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296]** Will any stockpiling take place over borrow pits?
	Response	
W.1.11	The Applicant	**Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296]** Summarise the main areas of potential environmental effects from the use of borrow pits and set out how such effects will be monitored and potentially mitigated in the DCO.
	Response	
W.1.12	The Applicant	**Conventional Waste and Material Resources Appendix 8A Waste Management Strategy - [APP-194]**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Environment Agency [RR-0373] Appendix A. In the table on page 35 of their representation they highlight the lack of performance indicators and the consequent lack of a monitoring process. Respond to their concerns.
	Response	