

Chapter 16 - HW.1 Health and wellbeing

HW.1.0	ESC, SCC, CCG, Sizewell Health Working Group	<p>Methodology</p> <p>(i) Do you agree that the methodology and scope for assessment of effects from the proposed development as set out in [APP 346] is appropriate and has properly assessed the potential health and wellbeing impacts of the proposed development on the local community?</p> <p>(ii) Do the Councils agree with the methodology in determining the degree of intimidation from traffic and in particular from HGVs?</p> <p>(iii) Do you consider the findings of this part of the ES have been adequately justified?</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	No response from SZC Co. is required.
	Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2	<p>(i) Although ESC has been a member of the Sizewell C Health working Group, we do not have a public health responsibility. It is our understanding that the methodology [APP-346] has been agreed with that Group, but we leave to others to expand further. However, the focus has been on the impacts arising from bringing a workforce and their families into the locality rather than health impacts the construction and development may have on existing residents. However, the assessment does consider aspects of the proposal with the potential to influence health such as change in air quality which is an area of ESC's responsibility along with noise exposure. Crossreferencing between documents is a challenge that could have been avoided by having a comprehensive assessment in one chapter.</p> <p>(ii) ESC defers to SCC as local highway authority to determine if the methodology for determining the degree of intimidation from traffic is acceptable.</p> <p>(iii) Elements of the findings in this part of the ES have been adequately justified but it cannot be said that they all have, given identified gaps including wider health and wellbeing impacts of the increase of traffic, influx of workers etc. on mental health as a result of stress and anxiety. Community safety concerns of the project and their impact on health and wellbeing of existing residents are not considered. See section 30 of the LIR [REP1-045] for further detail.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	<p>Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>(i) SCC considers that the methodology and scope of [APP 346] does not result in the provision of a comprehensive overview of health and wellbeing impacts, as a) While cross-referring to other DCO documents with regard to other determinants (e.g. transport, access to health services), it does not provide a clear overview of the health and wellbeing impacts of a number of these determinants;</p> <p>b) it omits a number of determinants of health and wellbeing, including construction impacts on natural environment and detrimental impacts on its enjoyment, adverse impacts on amenity and recreation, and the perception of community safety; and</p> <p>c) it does not fully consider all of these determinants in combination with regard to their impact on the affected communities and their health and wellbeing;</p> <p>d) The methodology set out in Environment Statement (ES) Chapter 10 (Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 10 Transport) [APP-198] and ES Addendum (Volume 1: Chapter 2 Main Development Site) [AS-181] is not yet fully agreed due to outstanding queries.</p> <p>(ii) As set out in the LIR [REP1-049], SCC agrees with the Applicant that construction traffic has adverse impacts in terms of accidents and road safety; access and accessibility; community severance; and pedestrian fear and intimidation, as set out in para 18.6.17 of [APP 346]. The LIR sets out locations where mitigation is required to reduce these impacts. However, SCC considers there will be an important residual impact on local communities affecting the wider health and wellbeing of its residents. We consider that the assessment in [APP 346] is somewhat narrow, as these road traffic impacts are likely to have an impact on mental health and reduce the attractiveness to e.g. walk and cycle in the area which has an impact on amenity, mental health and physical health. With regards to the specific assessment of Fear and Intimidation, the methodology of assessment in relation to Fear and Intimidation, as set out in ES Chapter 10 (Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 10 Transport) [APP-198] and in ES Addendum (Volume 1: Chapter 2 Main Development Site) [AS-181], is still to be agreed, on issues such as the sensitivity of links and the representative hour at some locations (e.g. surrounding schools, nurseries).</p> <p>SCC considers the magnitude of impact for Fear and Intimidation as reasonable in terms of total traffic and HDV classification (based on The Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic), however:</p> <p>a) the criteria mentions speed which is not considered in the assessment</p> <p>b) Total vehicle flows used in the Fear and Intimidation section of the ES Addendum [AS181] assessment are not currently correct, especially near Marlesford, and these are, we understand, being updated by the Applicant's consultant within a separate Technical Note to be provided.</p> <p>(iii) SCC considers that the effects during the construction phase have been too narrowly defined and/or too narrowly considered in terms of in-combination impacts across the project: The summary in Table 28.9</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>in [APP 346] indicates that the main factors that have been considered during the construction phase relate to noise and air quality (as well as road accidents, health care impacts and socio-economic factors). The assessment indicates the noise and air quality impacts on health and wellbeing as being minor adverse or negligible adverse. This does not seem to take account the wider health and wellbeing impacts of the increase of traffic on mental health, as result of stress and anxiety, and physical health as healthy lifestyles may be affected as a result of reduced amenity. No consideration seems to have been given to health and wellbeing impacts from e.g. perceived and real community safety concerns, housing impacts, reduced enjoyment of the natural environment and amenity and recreation.</p> <p>The LIR sets out in its Quality of life and wellbeing chapter (chapter 30) a more comprehensive overview of expected impacts on quality of life and wellbeing. It also includes an overview of impacts and proposed mitigation measures on e.g. highway related impacts and health impacts.</p> <p>In summary, SCC disagree that impact on quality of life, health and wellbeing are not significant. We consider there to be residual adverse impact on quality of life and wellbeing, particularly when considering the combined impacts across the project, which will also affect the health of our communities. In addition to further embedded mitigation in the various subject areas (as set out in the LIR), SCC considers there to be a residual impact on quality of life, health and wellbeing. This needs to be reflected in scope and scale of the proposed Community Fund.</p>
	<p>Response by Ipswich and East Clinical Commissioning Group for Deadline 2</p>	<p>The CCG remain concerned that methodology and scope for assessment does not go far enough within APP346 to establish the impacts of the proposed development on the community. Many comparisons with Hinkley Point C are not suitable as the demographic and local health outcomes between the two areas are significantly different. The summary of effects detailed in table 28.9 show low impact and negligible adverse effects on the local population. One of the main differences is the road network, in Leiston and the surrounding roads for access to the development, there are narrow busy streets to navigate high volumes of HGV traffic which will have a significant impact on the community regarding health effects from Air quality, noise and flow rate of traffic with the potential to cause accidents and injury, all of which are stated as not significant impacts. The travel impact assessment talks about average journey times over the entire day and doesn't recognise the challenge of traffic at peak times. It is essential that the impact on journey times are recognised and appropriately mitigated against. There is no recognition of the impact of local traffic movement whilst the proposed link road and roundabout at Yoxford is constructed which will take the first 2 years of the construction period to be available. During this time the impact will predominantly be on the health and wellbeing of the local community and could disrupt access to healthcare services including the ability for GP and District Nurse visits.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3</p>	<p>The CCG do not recognise that the findings of this part of the ES have been adequately justified and are working with the applicant to review the data which has been used as part of the methodology used throughout APP346</p> <p>ESC AND SCC RESPONSE</p> <p>Cross-referencing (ESC)</p> <p>The Health and Wellbeing assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346]) draws from and builds upon a number of technical disciplines, cross referencing to and summarising the most relevant information and key outputs from the inter-related technical disciplines that inform the Health and Wellbeing assessment. Where cross referencing is used, the Health and Wellbeing chapter replicates or paraphrases the relevant text within those chapters.</p> <p>Cross referencing was necessary to avoid repetition and to keep the Health and Wellbeing chapter as concise and user friendly to communities as possible. This is as requested by the Health Working Group at its inception.</p> <p>Range of impacts considered (ESC / SCC) / Outcome of assessment (SCC)</p> <p><u>Overview</u></p> <p>It is important to firstly distinguish between tangible health impacts and broader wellbeing/quality of life impacts. As explained in paragraph 28.6.119 of the Health and Wellbeing chapter (Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346]), there are a number of factors which influence an individual's wellbeing and quality of life, which include emotions such as stress and anxiety. The tangible aspects associated with the proposed development which underlie local community risk perception have been investigated and addressed within the Health and Wellbeing chapter, which provides a robust assessment supported by an appropriate scientific evidence base. The assessment is therefore intended to help address local community concerns and perceived risk in addition to informing decision making.</p> <p>The intangible and more subjective aspects which are often not possible to quantify have been explored and addressed through meaningful consultation, to inform and refine the proposed development. Should consent be granted, engagement with local communities will be maintained during construction and operation to investigate, address and respond to concerns. Details of the Sizewell C Project's approach to communication, community and stakeholder engagement are set out in the Code of Construction Practice [REP2-056].</p> <p>The remaining sections focus on how the tangible aspects raised above have been addressed.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><u>Increase in traffic (ESC / SCC)</u></p> <p>As detailed in Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES [APP-346], , the potential change in traffic-associated noise and air pollutant emissions are not of a nature, timing, magnitude or exposure sufficient to quantify any measurable change in local population health outcomes.</p> <p>The assessment of accidents and road safety, pedestrian severance, pedestrian amenity and pedestrian fear and intimidation (which are all considered relevant to health and wellbeing) are all addressed within Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Transport Assessment [REP2-045].</p> <p>As the most direct health and wellbeing hazard resulting from changes in transport nature and flow rate is human injury resulting from road traffic accidents, the assessment of health and wellbeing effects in Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346]) further communicates the potential effects on accidents and road safety. While the wider health and wellbeing impacts associated with the increase in traffic (i.e. pedestrian severance, pedestrian amenity and pedestrian fear and intimidation) were not further communicated in Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346]), SZC Co. considers that these were sufficiently assessed in the Transport Assessment [REP2-045].</p> <p>A package of transport and public realm improvements in Leiston have been developed in consultation with Leiston Town Council, East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council. Proposals include one-way streets, wider footways, gateway features, crossings and cycle facilities to control speeds, discourage Sizewell C traffic and improve the attractiveness to pedestrians and cyclists. Valley Road is also proposed to be closed to motorised traffic to create a suitable route for cycling and walking between Leiston and the main site. Any change in the status of a street will be carried out in accordance with the process set out in Article 22 of the draft DCO. Further details are provided in response to TT.1.68, TT.1.69 and TT.1.87.</p> <p><u>Community safety concerns (perceived and real) (ESC / SCC)</u></p> <p>Perception of community safety is addressed within the "General stress and anxiety impacting upon quality of life and wellbeing" section of the Health and Wellbeing assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346]). Here, it is explained that the tangible aspects associated with the proposed development which underly local community risk perception have been investigated and addressed through a robust assessment supported by an appropriate scientific evidence base. The assessment is therefore intended to help address local community concerns and perceived risk in addition to informing decision making.</p> <p>From the LIR, it seems that community safety concerns are primarily in relation to the influx of the non-home based workforce. In relation to this specifically, all credible socio-cultural hazards have been</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>investigated and assessed, and further addressed through a series of mitigation measures - summarised within the Community Safety Management Plan [APP-635] - including provision of project accommodation and an on-site occupational health service, as well as implementation of a Worker Code of Conduct. The Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(D)) will provide a Public Services Resilience Fund and contributions to the emergency services which will also support community safety.</p> <p>The intangible and more subjective aspects which are often not possible to quantify, have been explored and addressed through meaningful consultation, to inform and refine the proposed development. Should consent be granted, engagement with local communities will be maintained to investigate, address, and respond to questions and concerns. Details of the Sizewell C Project's approach to communication, community and stakeholder engagement are set out in the Code of Construction Practice [REP2-056].</p> <p><u>Construction impacts on natural environment and detrimental impacts on its enjoyment, adverse impacts on amenity and recreation (SCC)</u></p> <p>The potential impact upon amenity, local community facilities and areas of open space, important to supporting good health and wellbeing, is addressed fully within the Amenity and Recreation assessment (Volume 2, Chapter 15 [APP-267] and Volumes 3-9, Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-366], [APP-397], [APP-429], [APP-464], [APP-497], [APP-526], [APP-558] A2. For the sake of brevity, it was not considered necessary to replicate the results of this within the Health and Wellbeing chapter.</p> <p>In a health and wellbeing context, while reduction in amenity may deter use of a specific resource, this does not remove the opportunity to engage in a physical activity or live a healthy lifestyle on the basis that comparable and accessible alternative resources exist.</p> <p><u>In combination assessment (SCC)</u></p> <p>Several health determinants are assessed within Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES [APP-346] – all of which vary in magnitude of impact, geographic distribution (i.e. the communities they affect) and how they can potentially impact health/wellbeing outcomes. As an example, communities experiencing adverse changes in noise exposure are not necessarily the same as those experiencing adverse changes in air quality as the location of the pollution source and distribution of the impact is not necessarily the same.</p> <p>On this basis, it is not possible to predict the in-combination effects of all health determinants assessed on the affected communities with any meaningful degree of accuracy. While this is the case, as set out in</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) of the ES [APP-195], SZC Co. would provide a Community Fund to ensure that residual in-combination effects of the Sizewell C Project may be addressed and to enable communities to maximise the opportunities offered by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p><u>Disagreement that impact on quality of life, health and wellbeing is not significant (SCC)</u></p> <p>SCC considers there to be a residual adverse impact on quality of life and wellbeing, which needs to be reflected in scope and scale of the proposed Community Fund.</p> <p>The result of the assessment reported in Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES [APP-346] is that there would be a likely minor adverse impact on health and wellbeing that would not be significant (see also Chapter 30 of SZC Co. Response to the LIR (Doc Ref. 9.29). However, SZC Co. agrees that the Community Fund would be an appropriate tool to address residual effects on quality of life and wellbeing during the construction phase.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>On the above basis, SZC Co does do not agree that there are any gaps in the assessment or that the residual effects assessed are not correct. However, SZC Co. does agree that, as per Section 30 of the LIR, residual impacts on wellbeing, while intangible, can be addressed through a Community Fund.</p> <p>CCG RESPONSE</p> <p><u>Use of Hinkley Point C data</u></p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that the local demography and health circumstance of the communities surrounding Sizewell C and Hinkley Point C are different. The local demography and health circumstance of the communities living within the study area (East Suffolk) is captured within the locally specific baseline environment assessment detailed in Volume 2, Chapter 28, Appendix 28C [APP-347] and summarised in section 28.4 of Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES [APP-346]. The baseline environment assessment for the Health and Wellbeing chapter does not include any information relating to communities living around Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>The only data used from Hinkley Point C relates to the split of home-based and non-home-based construction workforce / likely number of dependents moving to the area associated with the non-home-</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>based construction workforce and the number of medical referrals to the external health service that have occurred during the construction of Hinkley Point C so far.</p> <p>As outlined in Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES [APP-346], Hinkley Point C is uniquely comparable to Sizewell C because it is similar in type and scale, will require a similar workforce to build (in some cases, exactly the same people) and will necessitate similar occupational and public health requirements. On this basis, SZC Co considers the data to be comparable and suitable for the purposes of assessing the impact on external healthcare services. Data relating to Hinkley Point C does not influence any assessment of health and wellbeing associated with changes in transport nature/flow rate, air quality or noise exposure.</p> <p>The only data that could improve the accuracy of the impact assessment on external healthcare services is local referral rates and cost data from the CCG (e.g. the number and average cost of one GP appointment or the average cost of one hospital A&E visit with no overnight stay). This has been requested from the CCG.</p> <p><u>Peak journey times and the Yoxford roundabout</u></p> <p>The potential health and wellbeing effects associated with construction of the Sizewell link road and Yoxford roundabout have been assessed in Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES [APP-346], assuming the implementation of mitigation and monitoring measures detailed within an effective Code of Construction Practice [REP2-056].</p> <p>As set out in Volume 7, Chapter 2, paragraph 2.4.24 of the ES [APP-480], Yoxford roundabout would be largely constructed offline, avoiding the need for long-term temporarily road closures or the diversion of the A12 in this location. Traffic management measures would be required during construction of the tie-ins back to the A12 and B1122 once the roundabout is constructed. This would likely comprise shuttle working under traffic light control when the two A12 and B1122 tie-ins are being undertaken. Each is anticipated to last approximately two weeks and access to properties on the south side of the site would be maintained throughout construction.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road would also be largely constructed off-line (noting its route predominantly through agricultural land). As set out in Volume 3, Appendix 6.2.A of the ES Addendum [AS-243], tie-ins which would be built on-line using temporary traffic management provided to minimise disruption to public traffic, utilising off-peak traffic management where possible.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>This largely removes the potential for disruption on the existing road and therefore it is incorrect to state that access by healthcare services, including GP and District Nurse visits, would be impeded for 2 years.</p> <p><u>Review of data</u></p> <p>The CCG notes that it is working with the applicant to review the data which has been used as part of the methodology used throughout [APP-346] (Volume 2, Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) of the ES. To clarify, there was some concern from the CCG that the assessment assumed spare health care capacity. This was not the case. No spare health care capacity has ever been considered available, and all health care services were classed as high value and highly sensitive community assets. The ongoing work is in relation to confirming healthcare services cost data to calculate the residual health care fund. SZC does not intend to rework any of Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346] and stands by the data used and assessment conclusions set out within that chapter.</p> <p>SZC Co welcomes continued discussions with the CCG in order to agree the scope and quantum of mitigation to be secured in the Deed of Obligation (latest draft Doc Ref 8.17(D)).</p>
	<p>Response by Ipswich & East Suffolk and West Suffolk CCGs - Deadline 5</p>	<p>In response to the Applicant SCZ</p> <p><u>Review of data / Use of Hinkley Point C data</u></p> <p>The CCG acknowledges and concluded during discussions with the applicant that the data provided in the methodology in APP-346 provides a baseline on which to agree KPIs to work through as part of reporting and governance of the Health Working Group – governance yet to be agreed as part of the Deed of Obligation. The CCG expects to see available a contingency fund in which to draw upon mitigation should following agreed monitoring processes show an impact over an above that which the methodology used by the applicant and agree a governance process in which to validate any such evidence as part of the Health and Wellbeing Group.</p>

		<p><u>Peak journey times</u></p> <p>The CCG would again expect an agreed method of monitoring of journey times to be part of the KPI's agreed to be reported through the Health and Wellbeing Group and should there be any evidence of increased journey times in relation to District Nurse or GP Visits, access to an agreed contingency fund be provided through the yet to be approved governance process of the Health and Wellbeing Group.</p>
HW.1.2	The Applicant, SCC, ESC part (ii)	<p>Severance</p> <p>Concern has been expressed by a number of RRs including (RR-0758, RR-1008) with regard to the degree of severance that could occur for their local community either through physical barriers – e.g. Sizewell Link Road, or through volume of additional traffic.</p> <p>(i) Please advise how you consider the proposal minimises these affects for each community and how the scheme has taken into account consideration for more vulnerable groups.</p> <p>(ii) Do the Councils consider the assessment of severance has justified the approach taken, or do you consider there are more adverse effects than have been reported?</p> <p>(iii) In answering please comment on the suitability of the methodology used and be specific in respect of the locations where there remain concerns should this be the case.</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	<p><u>Response to (i)</u></p> <p>The purpose of the Sizewell link road and two village bypass is to mitigate the environmental effects on local communities associated with the Sizewell C Project. Were these new roads not provided, the communities of Stratford St Andrew, Farnham, Yoxford, Middleton Moor and Theberton would experience an increase in traffic, resulting in adverse environmental effects, including adverse severance effects. With the new roads in place, general traffic and Sizewell C traffic will be diverted away from these communities and onto the new</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>roads, which will result in beneficial environmental effects within the communities as a result of the lower traffic flows. The beneficial environmental transport effects within these communities once the new roads are in place are summarised in Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [AS-181].</p> <p>However, any new road/bypass brings new severance effects. The alignment of the two village bypass dissects existing public rights of way (PRoW). The Sizewell link road alignment dissects existing PRoW as well as a number of rural roads. The severance effects of the new roads crossing the existing public rights of way are summarised in Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. In order to mitigate these effects, a new non-motorised user bridge is proposed over the two village bypass as well as over the Sizewell link road at Pretty Road. In addition, junctions have been provided along Sizewell link road to provide access to the existing network of rural roads.</p> <p>It is considered that the new roads themselves provide mitigation of severance effects within communities that would have been experienced if the roads were not provided. Furthermore, the new roads have been designed to provide connectivity across the roads both for non-motorised users and vehicles.</p> <p>The Equality Statement [APP-158] paragraphs 1.6.28-1.6.31 notes that severance, delay, amenity, or fear/intimidation effect from traffic has the potential to differentially affect people with particular protected characteristics, where that characteristic affects their mobility. It goes on to note that any effects on transport may potentially disproportionately affect older people but that due to the mitigation set out above, no equality effects are expected to arise.</p> <p><u>Response to (ii) and (iii)</u></p> <p>No response from SZC Co. is required.</p>
	<p>Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>Part ii) only</p> <p>ESC considers that severance will be an issue for residents on the A12, B1122 (particularly early years), Two Village Bypass and the Sizewell Link Road. Severance as an issue is being looked at in some areas but further work may be necessary to manage this. The existing provision for crossing roads will need to be considered alongside PRoWs that exist. There is potential for further crossing points to have a detrimental impact on the free flow of traffic in the location creating localised issues of noise (brakes screeching), pollution (from exhausts), and delays.</p> <p>The question of whether there are more adverse effects than have been reported relates primarily to highway traffic impacts, ESC defers to SCC for that assessment.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	<p>Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>i) SCC does not consider that the Applicant’s proposals sufficiently minimise the impact of severance on communities, and considers that there are number of locations that require, or in some instances may require, mitigation. SCC also notes that the Applicant’s methodology is not yet fully agreed due to outstanding queries (see part (ii) of this answer and its findings cannot be accepted at this stage. Thus, the level of proposed mitigation for severance is not deemed acceptable at this stage.</p> <p>All locations with concerns cannot be identified at this stage as methodology is still to be agreed; however, those locations where SCC currently considers mitigation for traffic impacts are (or may be) required, including for severance, are set out in Tables 3 and 4 in LIR Annex M (examination library reference pending), as well as in our Relevant Representation [RR-1174] and Table 13/14 of the LIR [REP1-049].</p> <p>The Rights of Way & Access Strategy relates only to the main development site. SCC has asked that the principles outlined in para 1.1.14 (APP-270) apply to all affected sites including the Sizewell Link Road. The Strategy does not currently address the effects of increased traffic on public users for the wider highway network such as the A12.</p> <p>That being said, the Applicant’s proposals do include a number of mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of severance associated with road traffic; these are supported by SCC and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of the Sizewell Link Road (for those communities currently on the B1122 between Middleton Moor and east of Theberton but not in the early years) [note that, as set out in the LIR, SCC supports the Sizewell Link Road for the construction period only, and requests for it to be removed afterwards]. • Provision of the Two Village Bypass (for residents currently living on the A12 at Farnham and Stratford St Andrew, but not in the early years). • Provision of the Lover’s Lane crossing facilities. • Leiston Improvement Scheme • Wickham Market Improvement Scheme • Marlesford and Little Glemham Transport Contribution • Routing of HGVs and buses on the most suitable routes available. • Park and Ride facilities to reduce construction workforce vehicle movements on the road network east of the A12 and north and south of their respective locations. • Direct bus services to/from relevant communities. • Accommodation campus and LEEIE caravan park to reduce construction workforce vehicle movements.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Environmental Statement (REF) shows significant levels of severance associated with the Two Village Bypass and the Sizewell Link Road. To minimise this impact, access for users of rights of way and highways severed by the new roads has been maintained, although not necessarily on the direct line and (except for one overbridge on each relief road) necessitating passing over the carriageway via an uncontrolled crossing.</p> <p>ii) The methodology set out in Environment Statement (ES) Chapter 10 (Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 10 Transport) [APP-198] and ES Addendum (Volume 1: Chapter 2 Main Development Site) [AS-181] is not yet fully agreed due to outstanding queries. Severance reported in Chapter 10 of 6.3 Volume 2 Main Development Site and the Transport chapter of ES Addendum is still be agreed in terms of methodology of assessment. This relates to sensitivity of links and representative hour at some locations (e.g. surrounding schools, nurseries).</p> <p>The magnitude of impact used by the Applicant for severance is in line with the 'Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic', however professional judgement has been used. Further clarification on the use of professional judgement has been sought from the Applicant.</p> <p>The findings and mitigation are therefore not deemed reasonable at this stage. A revised methodology could result in additional adverse effects which will not be known until the methodology is agreed. Notwithstanding this, SCC has identified those locations that we currently consider require, or may require, mitigation, with regards to impacts that include severance these include communities along the A12, B1122, B1125, A1120 and the B1069 corridors. See the LIR [REP1-049] for further discussion.</p> <p>iii) See answers (i) and (ii) above</p> <p>See also answer HW.1.10 regarding Equality.</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3</p>	<p>SZC Co. continues to liaise with the Councils to address comments on the environmental transport assessment summarised in Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. An update will be provided in due course in terms of agreement on the methodology, assessment and significant impacts. See response to TT.1.119 in relation to the on-going work on the Environmental Transport Effects methodology. Also, the Initial Statement of Common Ground with East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council [REP2-076], items ET01 to ET12 set out the current position in relation to the ES methodology of assessment and assessed effects. The Initial Statement of Common Ground with East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council [REP2-076], ref. MI05 to MI18 describe the position in relation to mitigation in addition to that proposed by SZC Co.</p>
<p>HW.1.3</p>	<p>Relevant local authorities, CCG</p>	<p>Severance</p> <p>Do the Councils and CCG agree the assessment of severance as set out in [APP-198] reasonably reflects the degree of effects of severance on the local communities concerned such that the ExA can be confident</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		that the proposed development would not have any indirect health impacts or adversely affect access to key public services as sought by the NPS EN-1.
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	No response from SZC Co. is required.
	Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2	See answer at HW.1.2. above, currently this matter is continuing to be discussed with the Applicant with the aim to resolve outstanding concerns.
	Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2	SCC does not currently agree but is continuing to work with the Applicant to aim to resolve our concerns. See details in answer to HW.1.2.
	Response by Ipswich and East Clinical Commissioning Group for Deadline 2	Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council are managing this area of expertise. Please refer to the local authority responses.
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	See response to TT.1.119 in relation to the on-going work on the Environmental Transport Effects methodology. Also, the Initial Statement of Common Ground with East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council [REP2-076], items ET01 to ET12 set out the current position in relation to the ES methodology of assessment and assessed effects.
HW.1.4	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	On Street Parking B1078 Concern has been expressed [RR-0762] that the removal of on street parking in this locality would have an adverse effect particularly on the disabled and elderly, please respond to this concern and whether this has been considered as part of any equalities assessment.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2</p>	<p>The expressed concern relates to proposals presented at Stage 3 consultation where there was an option for the temporary removal, and provision elsewhere, of on-street parking places on the B1078 between Border Cot Lane and River Deben bridge to create a more continuous two-way road in order to minimise potential delays. This has not been taken forward to the application for development consent and has not been considered.</p> <p>Sizewell C has been working with representatives from the local parish council to agree a mitigation scheme for Wickham Market to be provided for within the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref 8.17(C)). The development of this scheme is focussed on improving the safety and amenity for pedestrians and road users within the village and incorporates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Village gateways consisting of a lane width build-out, designed to reduce the speed of vehicles. • Carriageway narrowing to remove opportunities for misjudgement by creating a space that is clearly single file, with a distinct start and end to each section. The design includes wider footpaths where they are most needed. • Clear convenient places to cross the road utilising pedestrian build-outs. Where possible, these crossings have been positioned adjacent to footways that lead to adjacent streets, providing greater visibility for users whilst also highlighting their location. <p>Any loss of on street parking in order to deliver this scheme will be very limited.</p>
	<p>Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>Provision of disabled parking has been a matter of discussion with Wickham Market Parish Council as part of the Applicant's discussions for alterations to Wickham Market town centre to mitigate for the southern park and ride. No final agreement has been reached regarding what, if any, provision will be made. Formal restrictions to provide disabled bays would be included within a traffic regulation order. Alternatively, informal (but unenforceable) disabled bays can be provided without legislation. In either case the bays would be available to any road user with the necessary dispensation, not just residents. This has not, to ESC's knowledge, been considered as part of any equalities assessment.</p>
	<p>Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>Provision of disabled parking has been a matter of discussion with Wickham Market Parish Council, but no final agreement has been reached regarding what, if any, provision will be made. Formal restrictions to provide disabled bays would be included within a traffic regulation order. Alternatively informal (but unenforceable) disabled bays can be provided without legislation. In either case the bays would be available to any road user with the necessary dispensation, not just residents. This has not, to SCC's knowledge, been considered as part of any equalities assessment.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	See response to AR.1.22 in relation to proposed scheme on the B1078 through Wickham Market, and effect on on-street parking. The scheme has been developed in consultation with Wickham Market Parish Council, SCC and ESC and is subject of on-going discussions. The proposed improvements at Wickham Market do not form part of the Sizewell C DCO and instead are to be funded by SZC Co. via an obligation within the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(D)) and delivered by Suffolk County Council. The scheme proposals are expected to be put to public consultation in summer 2021, which would be a consultation outside of the DCO process. The approach to public consultation is part of ongoing discussions with Wickham Market Parish Council and SCC. See Statement of Common Ground with East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council (ref. MI09) [REP2-076] for status of on-going discussions on the Wickham Market Improvement Scheme.
HW.1.9	SCC, ESC	<p>Equality Statement</p> <p>The Applicant considers that with mitigation significant adverse transport effects on schools, nurseries, places of worship, GP surgeries and community facilities would not be significantly adverse. Paragraph 1.6.39 [APP 158]</p> <p>(i) Do you agree that the mitigation identified would overcome any significant adverse effects?</p> <p>(ii) Do you consider the mitigation is adequately secured?</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	No response from SZC Co. is required.
	Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2	(i) and (ii) ESC defers to SCC as local highway authority to answer this question as it relates to transport effects.
	Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2	i) The Equality Statement [APP 158] states at paragraph 1.6.40 that the assessment contained within Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-198] does not identify any significant adverse transport effects on schools, nurseries, places of worship, GP surgeries and community facilities after mitigation. The methodology set out for assessment within the ES, and the subsequent ES Addendum [AS-181], is not yet fully agreed therefore the conclusion drawn within the Equality Statement remains under discussion and is not fully agreed by SCC. The criteria applied to define the impact on the sensitivity of the receptor on the links assessed is not agreed by SCC due to concerns over the criteria utilised and as well as a slight inconsistency in application. SCC also seeks clarification with regard to differences between the impacts

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>identified by the Applicant on the sensitivity of the receptors and those identified within the assessment made in relation to the East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm application. Further discussions are required between SCC and the Applicant. Notwithstanding the above, there are a number of locations on the highway network with construction traffic impacts which are in proximity to referenced facilities, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A12 Woodbridge; including in near proximity to a High School. • B1125 through Westleton; including adjacent to a village hall, church and public house. • A1120 through Yoxford; including adjacent to a primary school, public house and convenience store. • A12 through Yoxford: public house • A1120 at Peasenhall / Sibton; including adjacent to a nursery, a church, convenience stores, and in near proximity to another church • B1122 through Theberton; including adjacent to a church and public house. • B1069 at Coldfair Green / Knodishall, including adjacent to public houses and in close proximity to a primary school, church, village hall and a residential home. • A12 Little Glemham; including adjacent to a public house and on route to a church. • A12 Marlesford; including adjacent to a farm shop and café. • A12 Blythburgh: convenience store and public house and in close proximity to the church • Many of these locations correspond to those locations where SCC currently believes • mitigation for traffic impacts is (or may be) required due to severance, as set out in • Tables 3 and 4 in LIR Annex M [REP1-058]. <p>ii) The mitigation can be secured through obligations in the s106 agreement but with the exception of Wickham Market, Leiston, Marlesford and Little Glemham no mitigation has yet been secured.</p>
HW.1.10	The Applicant, SCC, ESC, CCG	<p>Equality Statement</p> <p>The Applicant advises that the Public Services Contingency Fund which would be secured through the S106 would be an appropriate response to the concerns identified in respect of the difficulties associated with recruiting and retaining staff. Paragraph 1.6.49 [APP 158]</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	See response to TT.1.119 in relation to the on-going work on the Environmental Transport Effects methodology. Also, the Initial Statement of Common Ground with East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council [REP2-076], items ET01 to ET12 set out the current position in relation to the ES methodology of assessment and assessed effects.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i)) Please provide an update on the progress of the S106</p> <p>(ii) Do the Councils and CCG regard this as an appropriate method of mitigation?</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2</p>	<p><u>Response to (i)</u></p> <p>Schedule 5 of the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)) sets out the progress on development of the Public Services Resilience Fund (renamed from Contingency at SCC's request). This includes within its scope <i>'Social Care Resilience Measures... including: (a) measures to provide resilience to workforce planning within Suffolk County Council's Adult Social Care and Children's Services including support for recruitment, training, and retention of staff'</i></p> <p><u>Response to (ii)</u></p> <p>No response from SZC Co. is required.</p>
	<p>Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>(i) ESC continues to progress section 106 discussions with the Applicant.</p> <p>(ii) With specific reference to difficulties associated with recruiting and retaining staff, ESC defers to SCC to respond in detail as this is a challenge they will face alongside other public services that is not specific to ESC.</p>
	<p>Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>(i) SCC continues to be in discussion with the Applicant the detail of the S106, including provisions in relation to the Public Services Contingency Fund. Whilst SCC supports the principle of a Public Services Contingency Fund, discussions are still be had with the Applicant in relation to the scale, content, criteria and governance of the Fund, so cannot confirm at this stage whether the provisions are appropriate mitigation. We note that the Applicant has not yet clarified in how far the Public Services Contingency Fund would be accessible to organisations other than the two local authorities, therefore it is not clear whether the health system could access this funding; SCC would support such flexibility in the fund to allow for effective multi-agency preventative and responsive measures. SCC is pro-actively working with the CCGs, ESC and the Applicant to develop such an approach.</p> <p>(ii) As set out in the LIR (para 27.28-27.31 [REP1-049]) SCC is concerned that labour market churn could result in a shortage of health, social work and care workers to provide health, social care, and care services, which could have a negative effect on the level of care and support available. SCC considers that the Public Services Contingency Fund can play a role to mitigate for impacts on the social care and health sector, and considers that there may be role of the fund to fund measures to provide resilience to workforce planning within SCC's Adult Social Care and Children's Services including support for recruitment, training, and retention (as proposed in Schedule 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement). It is</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>noted that, at the moment, the proposals to not include the wider health system, but SCC considers that the workforce in community health services will be affected in a similar way to the workforce of Adult Social Care and Children's Services; therefore coordinated mitigation would be desirable.</p> <p>However, SCC considers that, to address specifically the concerns in respect of difficulties associated with recruiting and retaining staff and deal with negative impacts of labour market churn on the deliverability of adult social care services and community health care provision, the main method of mitigation should be embedded in the Applicant's mitigation package for employment skills and supply chain activities, which would complement the provisions of the Public Services Contingency Fund,. Therefore, SCC expects that employment, skills and supply chain activities put forward by the Applicant include measures to mitigate such adverse impacts on other employment sectors, in particular health and social care sectors. (see LIR para 25.14)</p>
	<p>Response by Ipswich and East Clinical Commissioning Group for Deadline 2</p>	<p>The CCG would look to the applicant to sign up to a non competitive approach when recruiting staff for their onsite facility to ensure public sector organisations do not find themselves in a negative retention situation.</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3</p>	<p>(i) The scope of the Public Services Resilience Fund ("PSRF") as drafted in the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(D)) allows for both SCC and ESC to commission multi-agency activities combining social care with Public Health Suffolk (including mental and sexual health) services and initiatives including community liaison and third party support for specific issues which SCC considers are required as a result of potential effects arising from the Project and the Sizewell C construction workforce.</p> <p>This is set out at Schedule 5 (Definitions) of the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(D)) under the terms of the Social Care Resilience Measures (SCC) and Local Community Safety and Community Health Measures (ESC). Under the scope of both elements of the PSRF it is stated that measures can be provided by the Councils or by such multi-agency groups or third parties as each Council considers is a fit and proper person to provide the initiatives required to address the impacts of the Project.</p> <p>(ii) SZC Co welcomes the recognition that the PSRF includes funding for workforce resilience within social care. The Project does not currently foresee this extending to community healthcare, subject to discussion. The social care sector is a specific statutory service identified as having potential difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff, which the Council contends could be exacerbated by the Project.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Primarily, this is an economic function of the wage paid to staff in this sector, and an individual moving to a new job, if it is better paid, is a positive economic effect.</p> <p>Nonetheless, SZC Co recognises that the Project may result in some vacancies being harder to fill, both in construction and non-construction roles that are needed by the Project, and as such has developed a range of measures within Schedule 7 of the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(D)) including a Jobs Service to enable backfilling in those circumstances.</p>
	<p>Response – Deadline 5 Ipswich and East Suffolk, CCG, West Suffolk CCG</p>	<p>The CCG continues to work closely with stakeholders and the applicant to ensure our involvement in the specification and procurement process of the onsite Occupational Health Facility.</p>
<p>HW.1.11</p>	<p>Ipswich and East Suffolk, CCG, West Suffolk CCG</p>	<p>Anchor Institution</p> <p>(i) Please explain what you mean when you refer to ‘an Anchor Institution approach’ [RR-500] and how you envisage this approach might be delivered through the DCO.</p> <p>(ii) In light of point 7 of your [RR-500] please explain in detail your concerns regarding the shortcomings of the assessment and how you consider these could be addressed to ensure appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>(iii) Has the reliance on historic data as referred to in the [RR-500] at paragraph 6 diminished the findings of the ES such that you consider the findings could not be relied upon?</p> <p>(iv) How would the CCG wish to see this issue addressed?</p> <p>(v) At paragraph 10 of your [RR-500] you refer to ‘most active county’ objectives – what/where does this come from? If the ExA is to rely on this document it will need to be submitted into the Examination?</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2</p>	<p>No response from SZC Co. is required.</p>

**Response by
Ipswich and
East Clinical
Commissioning
Group for
Deadline 2**

(i) An anchor institution is an organisation who by its very nature is a key influencer and the Integrated Care System of which the CCG is part of has a charter which we would encourage the applicant to sign up to the charter which would ensure collaboratively as public sector organisations and a global organisation we could actively commit to focusing on maximising influence over the socio-economic wider determinants of health and wellbeing in our communities. The CCG had this as a point to note rather than an expectation to determine mitigation within the DCO.

(ii) The CCG are working with the applicant to closely as part of the health working group to work through our concerns. The CCG do not wish to progress this further within the examination process.

(iii) The CCG have produced some further data which has been provided to the applicant in the form of a data sharing agreement in order to ensure that the mitigation is based on the latest findings.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(iv) The CCG would like assurance that the applicant will review the revised data in line with the proposed mitigation and continue to work with the healthcare service through the Health working group to support future requirements.</p> <p>(v) The most active county is a website launched in 2012 as Suffolk's legacy programme from the Olympic and Paralympic games and Suffolk has a long term ambition to become the most active county in England. Most active county works with local and national partners across sectors to create, promote and commission physical activity opportunities. This was a statement in our representation rather than a concern that requires further examination of the applicant.</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3</p>	<p><u>Review of data (iv)</u></p> <p>The CCG seeks assurance that the applicant will review the revised data. As set out in response to HW.1.1. above, SZC Co requested specific healthcare services cost data to calculate the residual health care fund. In response to this, the CCG provided their own calculation of the impacts rather than the raw data requested. SZC Co. does not consider that it is necessary or appropriate to revise Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346] and considers that the data used and assessment conclusions set out within that chapter remain valid.</p> <p>SZC Co. welcomes continued discussions with the CCG in order to agree the scope and quantum of mitigation to be secured in the Deed of Obligation (latest draft Doc Ref 8.17(D)).</p>
HW.1.17	<p>ESC, SCC, CCG, Suffolk Safeguarding Partnership</p>	<p>Vulnerable Groups</p> <p>In light of the concerns expressed [RR-1179, RR-500, RR-1140, RR- 0342, RR-1174] in respect of the age demographic in the locality and the potential effects on the older population, do you consider the assessment on health and wellbeing and the equality assessment is adequate?</p>
	<p>Response by Ipswich & East Suffolk and West Suffolk CCG's Deadline 5</p>	<p>The CCG continues to work with the applicant on the scope and quantum of mitigation to be secured in the deed of obligation.</p>

Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	No response from SZC Co. is required.
Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2	ESC considers that table 1.1 in [APP-158] accurately reflects the disproportionate effect of the construction impacts on the elderly. ESC would like it noted that the "Study on the impacts of the early stage construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Nuclear Power Station" (Oxford Brookes University 2019, commissioned by the ESC, SCC and other new nuclear local authorities) (LIR Appendix 2: 1 [REP1-089]) questions whether the wellbeing of the communities local to HPC is being adequately monitored, referring

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>particularly to the possible impacts on older residents, and whether the Community Impacts Mitigation fund effectively responds to project impacts on local wellbeing (page 35).</p> <p>ESC considers that in defining mitigation and compensation measures, it should be carefully considered how the disproportionate effect of the impacts on the elderly can be reflected/addressed, e.g., in the scope of the community fund, and in embedded mitigation measures.</p>
	<p>Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>SCC considers that table 1.1 in [APP 158] accurately reflects the disproportionate effect of the construction impacts on the elderly. SCC wishes to note that the "Study on the impacts of the early-stage construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Nuclear Power Station" (Oxford Brookes University 2019, commissioned by the SCC and other local authorities) (LIR Appendix 2:1 [REP1-089]) questions for HPC whether the wellbeing of the communities local to HPC being adequately monitored, referring especially to the impacts on the older residents, and whether the Community Impacts Mitigation fund effectively responds to project impacts on local wellbeing (page 35). SCC considers that in defining mitigation and compensation measures, it should be carefully considered how the disproportionate effect of the impacts on the elderly can be reflected, e.g. in the scope of the community fund, and in embedded mitigation measures.</p>
	<p>Response by Ipswich and East Clinical Commissioning Group for Deadline 2</p>	<p>Please find a formal response from the Suffolk Safeguarding Partnership chair [Please refer to REP2-139 for response.]</p> <p>The CCG remains of the same stance as what has been stated in our RR (RR-500) that the equality assessment is not adequate in supporting the potential affects on the older population.</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3</p>	<p>SZC Co considers that the mitigation and enhancement measures – both embedded within the Development Consent Order and secured as additional mitigation through the Deed of Obligation (latest draft Doc Ref. 8.17(D)) – respond to the impacts of the Project and the sensitivities of those people and communities affected by them.</p> <p>In its decision making, the Secretary of State must be assured that the governance and implementation of measures has regard to differential and disproportionate effects on people with Protected Characteristics under the Equality Act (2010).</p> <p>SZC Co notes that in response to HW.1.23, Public Health England note that it is "<i>satisfied that the Environmental Statement and Equalities Assessment adequately address reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect effects on population health</i>".</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Please refer to SZC Co's comments on response to AR.1.27 for further consideration of equality and the Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act (2010).</p> <p>Specific Response to Suffolk Safeguarding Partnership [REP2-139; RR-1179]</p> <p>SZC Co recognises the important role of the Suffolk Safeguarding Partnership (SSP) in ensuring the cross-agency protection of children and adults at risk in the county.</p> <p>SZC Co has been engaging closely with Suffolk County Councils Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's Services to-date to understand risks relating to safeguarding and community safety (summarised at paragraph 9.7.192 in Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-195]) and to define (subject to finalisation) the principles of a Public Services Resilience Fund and other measures both embedded and additional that would contribute to reducing risks for vulnerable people as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The SSP raise concerns related to (precis):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Potential increase in prostitution and brothels, putting some people at risk of exploitation; b) The potential for a new County Line (East) to develop in response to the NHB workforce's disposable income; c) Fear of crime and exploitation, and changes to quality of life of older people; d) A lack of positive statement about securing work for people with mental health problems or a degree of disability; e) Demand for healthcare and emergency services; f) Lack of demonstration of improvement of well-being for older people; g) Traffic, environmental change and a transient population leading to anxiety; h) equity assessments for specific health conditions adversely affected by dust and noise pollution; i) Effects on the provision of care in the community (due to traffic); j) specific safeguarding concerns in the north of Suffolk relating to the high number and level of individuals with a learning disability within the community; and k) Sizewell C identifying a better legacy than the 35 years which to date has followed the construction of Sizewell B. <p>SZC Co considers that all of the above risks have been taken into consideration when assessing potential effects across Chapter 9 (Socio-economics) [APP-195] and Chapter 28 (Health and Wellbeing) [APP-346] of Volume 2 of the ES, and where relevant, considered as part of the Equality Statement [APP-158],</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and subsequently in the development of mitigation for identified risks within the DCO itself and the Draft Deed of Obligation across Schedules 3, 4 and 5 (Doc Ref. 8.17(D)).</p> <p>With regard to specific concerns raised by the Suffolk Safeguarding Partnership:</p> <p>SZC Co recognises concerns about exploitation related to the potential for increase in prostitution, brothels and drugs (via County Lines) as a result of the NHB workforce, and is working with both Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council and Suffolk Constabulary to address this. The workforce will be carefully managed – they will be subject to pre-employment check and security vetting before employment, will be subject to a Worker Code of Conduct, and will be regularly, randomly tested for drugs and alcohol. Taking part in risk-taking activity would put their employment at risk and has been an important deterrent at Hinkley Point C. Notwithstanding this, SZC Co is intending to take a precautionary and pro-active approach to these risks and has developed the scope of a Public Services Resilience Fund, intended to be used to extend existing initiatives and where relevant develop new ones within the remit of the Community Safety Partnerships and Safer Stronger Communities Board which include outreach, educational and support measures to safeguard potentially vulnerable people. SZC Co also recognises the importance of supporting the police to respond to crime and investigate potentially illegal activities, and as such is working to develop an appropriate mitigation package to support local policing.</p> <p>Fear of crime may be considered to lead to anxiety, leading to effects on quality of life for some people. SZC Co wants to reassure that pre-conceptions of the Project may be just that, and would be unlikely to manifest. Data from Hinkley Point C reported to the Socio-economic Advisory Board has shown that the rate of crime per worker is lower than that of the existing population, and that overall ‘fear of crime’ has not increased since the start of the Project.</p> <p>SZC Co proposes that an Outreach Fund and SZC Bursary are provided to improve social mobility and target areas where there are more barriers to the labour market in order to promote diversity and employability particularly in deprived areas. SZC Co is already working with Access Community Trust and Inspire Suffolk on this and welcomes the written representation from Inspire Suffolk [REP2-468] which reads: <i>‘I am writing in support of the work that the EDF - Sizewell C team are doing in engaging with ALL members of society in the wider Suffolk area in which my charity operates. Inspire Suffolk works to transform the lives of young people (particularly those between 16-24 years) who are in need of support and guidance either into education or the workplace. It is VITAL that ALL individuals, irrespective of background or circumstance, have the ability to transform their lives and I truly believe that the EDF - Sizewell C team share our goals to make sure that this happens. Thank you’.</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HW.1.18	The Applicant, Suffolk Constabulary	<p>Community Safety</p> <p>From the [RR- 1140] it would appear you are working together on a Strategic Relationship Protocol (SRP). Assuming this is agreed, is this intended to form part of the examination and be delivered through the DCO or a separate side agreement between the parties?</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	<p>SZC Co. is working towards agreeing Strategic Relationship Protocols (SRPs) with Suffolk Constabulary, Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service and the East of England Ambulance Service Trust.</p> <p>The SRPs will set out the roles and responsibilities of SZC Co. and each emergency service provider. These SRPs will be private agreements between SZC Co. and the emergency services.</p> <p>Where the roles and responsibilities in the SRPs require a financial contribution to be provided by SZC Co. to an emergency service provider, the scope and level of the financial contributions will be secured through Schedule 4 of the Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(C)) and so the Deed of Obligation will summarise, where relevant and applicable, the content of those SRPs. The Deed of Obligation will equally secure, and in doing so summarise where relevant and applicable, the commitments of SZC Co. set out in the SRPs which are considered necessary.</p>
	Response by Suffolk Constabulary at Deadline 2	<p>As the SRP is not a legally binding document, nothing within it will or can override established Police procedures and policy, including with regards to the Constabulary's response to calls for service. The Constabulary's focus during Examination is to secure adequate, appropriate and effective mitigation for the community of Suffolk through the terms of any DCO granted and an associated S106 Agreement.</p> <p>Given the lack of legal status, the Constabulary does not currently have strong views as to whether the SRP is a DCO requirement, a S106 planning obligation, or otherwise. The Constabulary will continue to work with the Applicant to establish how the two organisations can work together for the benefit of the existing Suffolk community and emerging community resulting from the SZC development</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	No further comments to add to SZC Co. response for Deadline 2.
HW.1.19	The Applicant, Network Rail	<p>Rail Safety</p> <p>Network Rail [RR-006] identifies concerns, that by introducing any Freight Trains onto the East Suffolk line will (due to their slower running speeds), cause an increased risk and delay to users of level crossings.</p> <p>(ii) Please respond to this concern and advise if any mitigation could be provided to address this issue.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) If this were appropriate, how would it be delivered through the DCO?
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	SZC Co. and Network Rail are working together to identify level crossings on the East Suffolk line where there may be an increase in risk. If mitigations are required, these will be pursued by Network Rail as the asset owner and organisation with responsibility for the management of safety risks at the level crossings.
	Response by Network Rail for Deadline 2	<p>A high level review of impacts to level crossings users was undertaken on the East Suffolk Line between Ipswich and Saxmundham Junction. The key impacts are:</p> <p>Sectional Running times - An unacceptable increase in section running times would make it difficult for the signaller to inform members of public when it is safe to traverse a level crossing, this is purely as a result of the slower trains. Up to 5 locations have been identified and the introduction of new Miniature Stop lights are to be installed at these locations.</p> <p>Darsham Park & Ride - Option to include Station Car Park in new Park & Ride facility removing increased impact from station car park users who find it increasingly difficult to traverse the A12 to access the station. The only reasonable option is to traverse when the barriers are lowered, which means if they need to get an Ipswich bound train they have to cross the level crossing when the barriers are lowered and it is unsafe to do so.</p> <p>Middleton ABCL - Red Light Safety enforcement cameras should be installed ahead of any increase in traffic to Sizewell C, consideration should be given to installing lay-by's such that there is somewhere safe to park for those users required telephone to gain permission to cross the level crossing or confirm to the signaller they are safely over the level crossing.</p> <p>Operational freight pathing constraints will also be considered to eliminate issues at both Jetty and Bloss level crossings, trains must not be stopped in Woodbridge station to allow the single line to from Saxmundham to Melton to clear, this would cause a freight train to block Jetty level crossing, which is unacceptable. Trains will only traverse Melton AOCL+B crossing in the down direction in between the hours of 07:00 and 21:00, it is unacceptable for trains to pass in the up direction as this would block Bloss level crossing which is an operational boat yard, this would be acceptable in-between the hours of 21:00 and 07:00 as the likelihood of anybody using the crossing in between these times would be slim.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Including the protective provisions requested by Network Rail would ensure that before track access was granted to the Applicant appropriate agreements and mitigation would need to be in place with Network Rail. In addition it could be a requirement in the DCO for the Applicant to agree a programme of mitigation with Network Rail before running any additional trains to the proposed development
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	SZC Co. continues to liaise with Network Rail. If mitigations are required, these will be pursued by Network Rail as the asset owner and organisation with responsibility for the management of safety risks at the level crossings.
HW.1.22	The Applicant, ESC	Ozone Please respond the concern raised in [RR-392] over the potential effects from the proposed development on the release/creation of ozone.
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	Ozone is not emitted from any activity during the construction or operation of the proposed development. Nitrogen oxides are emitted from construction traffic, mobile plant and diesel generators and these are precursors to the formation of ozone in the atmosphere. However, the reaction to form ozone takes several days and takes place gradually over long distances from the emission sources. Elevated ozone concentrations in south England are formed primarily as a result of emissions of precursors in France. Locally to an emission source of nitrogen oxides, ozone concentrations are actually reduced, since the ozone reacts with nitric oxide (NO). This is why ozone concentrations are lower in urban areas.
	Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2	[RR-0392] states the Applicant has given insufficient attention to PM2.5 particulates of ozone pollution omitted without explanation, and notes ozone pollution levels have consistently exceeded government objectives in this region, levels which will increase as a result of Sizewell C traffic and congestion. Please see our detailed response at AQ.1.2.
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	No further comments to add to SZC Co. response for Deadline 2.
HW.1.23	ESC, SCC, CCG, East of England Ambulance Service, PHE	Effects on Mental and Physical Health A number of RRs including [RR-376, 546, 853, 291, 241] express concerns over the direct or indirect effects on health that the construction could have on an individual's health. (i) Please respond to the concerns and advise whether you consider the assessment properly addresses the potential effects of the proposed development.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Additionally, is there confidence that the mitigation proposed adequately addresses any concerns and that this is appropriately secured?
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	No response from SZC Co. is required.
	Response by East Suffolk Council at Deadline 2	(i) Is partially answered in our response at HW.1.0. Please also see the LIR [REP1-045] at sections 27: Public Services, 28 Community Impacts and 30 Quality of Life and Wellbeing. (ii) Further detail is required in relation to the Public Services Contingency Fund and Funding proposed to support the health services and emergency services.
	Response by Suffolk County Council at Deadline 2	(i) Impacts on mental and physical health are covered in SCC's answer to HW1.0. As referred to above, SCC does not consider the impacts on health and wellbeing, including on mental health, to have been properly addressed by the Applicant. The LIR [REP1-049] points out the secondary impact of a potential increase of mental health and missing person incidents requiring multi-agency responses. These will also affect the resourcing of Suffolk Constabulary as the usual first responders to such incidents. (ii) SCC considers that the public service impacts of mental and physical health impacts need to be addressed through scale and scope of the Public Services Contingency Fund and appropriate levels of contributions to the health system and Suffolk Constabulary, with appropriate monitoring measures. Further embedded mitigation to reduce the impacts on health and wellbeing, e.g. in relation to road safety measures or amenity and recreation enhancement, should be considered. The Community Fund should also consider the impacts on quality of life and wellbeing. See also SCC's answer to HW1.0
	Response by Ipswich and East Clinical Commissioning Group for Deadline 2	The CCG considers that the public service impacts of mental and physical health impacts need to be addressed through scale and scope of the Public Services Contingency Fund and appropriate levels of contributions to the health system including appropriate monitoring measures. Further embedded mitigation to reduce the impacts on health and wellbeing, e.g. in relation to road safety measures or amenity and recreation enhancement, should be considered. The CCG would like to propose that The health working group monitor the ongoing effects and agree steps in line with the Section 106 funding allocation.

**Response by
Suffolk
County
Council for
Deadline 2**

SCC considers it imperative that that all efforts are taken to mitigate adverse effects above LOAEL and to avoid significant adverse effects above SOAEL, as set out in the NPS EN-1. This means mitigating noise at source as first option, through the implementation of quiet road surfacing, road noise barriers and landscaping; once these options are exhausted, noise insulation for residual impacts should be offered to residents. SCC believe that this should be provided as part of construction of the Sizewell Link Road. It will

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		be necessary, as part of the mitigation strategy, for the Applicant to monitor the noise levels and provide a process where SCC can be periodically informed about road noise levels and any proposed actions to address them.
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	Further steps are under consideration which may be taken to mitigate and minimise adverse noise effects as part of the detailed design of the road, which may include the use of a quiet road surface. This was not originally proposed as this road surface is more expensive to maintain. However, this will be discussed with Suffolk County Council (SCC) and East Suffolk Council (ESC) and an update will be provided within the Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 5.
HW.1.25	ESC, SCC, CCG, Sizewell Health Working Group	<p>Methodology</p> <p>(i) Is it agreed that the methodology and scope for assessment of effects from the proposed development is appropriate and has properly assessed the potential health and wellbeing impacts of the proposed development on the local community?</p> <p>(ii) Do you consider the findings of this part of the ES have been adequately justified?</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	No response from SZC Co. is required.
	Response by East Suffolk Council at Deadline 2	Please see response at HW.1.0.
	Response by Suffolk County Council at Deadline 2	See SCC's answer to HW1.0
	Response by Ipswich and East Clinical Commissionin	The CCG has no further comment to make regarding the methodology following on from their response in HW.1.0 The CCG stand with the Local Authority stance – Suffolk County Council. The Sizewell Health Working Group has not been established long enough to add any benefit to this question.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	g Group for Deadline 2	
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3	<p>SZC Co notes that there has been a significant turnover of members within the Health Working Group. However, the Health Working Group has been established since 2015, with the CCG in attendance since 2018. The CCG were also consulted during scoping in 2014 and 2019 [APP-168]. On this basis, the Health Working Group (including the CCG) have actively participated in not only informing the agreed scope, focus and methodology of the health and wellbeing assessment; but facilitated more health conscientious planning tailored to local community health needs and public health priorities.</p>
	Response by Ipswich & East Suffolk and West Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>There is no further comment the CCG wishes to make at this stage.</p>
HW.1.27	The Applicant, Network Rail	<p>Change Request No. 2</p> <p>The Change Request could see an increase in the number of freight trains running along the line. Please advise how this could be safely delivered to ensure there would not be unacceptable risks to users of level crossings both for the branch line and the Ipswich to Lowestoft main line.</p>
	Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2	<p>Risk assessments have been completed on the level crossings on the Sizewell branch line which have identified that major interventions are not necessary from a risk perspective. Upgrades will however be made to level crossings to enhance the operational capability of the line, and avoiding the current requirement for trains to stop while the gates are manually operated. This will have the effect of also further reducing the already low risk at level crossings on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line.</p> <p>SZC Co. and Network Rail are working together to identify level crossings on the East Suffolk line where there may be an increase in risk. If mitigations are required, these will be pursued by Network Rail as the asset owner and organisation with responsibility for the management of safety risk at the level crossings.</p>

**Response by
Network Rail
for Deadline 2**

Network Rail and the Applicant undertook a high level review of impacts to Level Crossings on the East Suffolk Branch Line between Ipswich and Saxmundham Junction. The review covered all public level crossings, Passive footpaths and User Worked crossings. A systematic review of train lengths, anticipated barrier down times, signaller constraints, sightlines as well as impacts from additional HGV traffic over Level Crossings was undertaken, resulting in a list of impacted crossings. These crossings have mitigating actions identified and we are continuing to work together with SZc and the local authorities to ensure all appropriate actions are taken.

For most Level crossings the mitigation interventions involve the installation of Miniature Stop Light and overlay systems. These works are not complex in nature and require relevant agreements to be put in place to ensure timely delivery.

Some additional Level Crossings were identified as requiring some mitigation work to manage the risk so

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>far as reasonably practicable. Network Rail will ensure these works have been delivered before any freight trains start to operate.</p> <p>Level Crossing impacts on the branch line from Ipswich to Lowestoft have not yet been reviewed.</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3</p>	<p>No further comments to add to SZC Co. response for Deadline 2.</p>
<p>HW.1.28</p>	<p>The Applicant, Network Rail, Suffolk Constabulary, East of England Ambulance Service, Suffolk Fire and Rescue, SCC, ESC</p>	<p>Change Request No. 2</p> <p>In the event the number of trains were to be increased, please explain what implications this may have for the operation of level crossings on the branch line and the main Ipswich to Lowestoft line and the effect on severance of communities or impacts on emergency services.</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 2</p>	<p>On the Ipswich to Lowestoft line and Sizewell branch the level crossing barriers would be down for approximately two to three minutes for the passage of each train, seven out of eight of which will operate overnight. This has been assessed in the ES [APP-198] to have a minor adverse effect on driver delay, which would not be significant.</p>
	<p>Response by Suffolk Constabulary at Deadline 2</p>	<p>The Constabulary refer in the first instance to the response given to this question by Suffolk County Council (SCC).</p> <p>The Constabulary is broadly supportive of measures that seek to reduce the volume of HGV movements but does have some concerns as to the impact on level crossing closures and the associated impact on police and other emergency service response times. The way in which policing is delivered across the county means that any additional waiting time at level crossings has the potential to impact on the response times of various policing units including roads and armed policing and dog units in addition to local emergency response units. Even additions short delays can have a significant impact on the Constabulary's ability to meet its response targets. The A1152 forms an important access route for</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		significant parts of East Suffolk i.e. Bawdsey Peninsula, Bentwaters and Rendlesham and is thus particularly sensitive to any disruption.
	Response by Network Rail for Deadline 2	For the East Suffolk Line between Ipswich and Saxmundham Junction Network Rail anticipate that barrier down time will be significant however we believe the Level Crossing risks created by this are tolerable, notwithstanding any separate impacts to Emergency Service operations. Level Crossing impacts on the branch line from Ipswich to Lowestoft have not yet been reviewed.
	Response by East Suffolk Council for Deadline 2	<p>Leiston Branch Line</p> <p>The most significant level crossing on the branch line is on Station Road, Leiston which is hand operated. Any significant delays would require emergency vehicles to divert via King George Avenue and Lovers Lane. However, ESC understands that this level crossing would only be used while the LEEIE sidings are in operation (early years only). The temporary "Green Rail route" level crossing on Abbey Road will impact on traffic, including emergency vehicles using the B1122. While the location will not affect access to Lovers Lane and Sizewell B, it would be a constraint on access to the north of there.</p> <p>The temporary "Green Rail route" level crossing on Buckleswood Road west of Leiston will have some localised impact on local movement although this is a minor road with low volumes of traffic. It is understood that the level crossing on King George Avenue will not be used as no trains access the sidings to the south.</p> <p>In terms of importance, the level crossing at Buckleswood Lane, just north of the B1119 Saxmundham Road is of next importance as this is a locally important north south link. This crossing would be affected both by trains using the "Green Rail route" and LEEIE sidings. The remainder of the level crossings are on minor roads and generally used by small numbers of local residents and landowners.</p> <p>A number of rights of way also cross the branch line although barriers are not generally present, and these are not used by emergency service vehicles. An increase in the number trains would have greatest impact on the B1122 Abbey Road and Buckleswood Lane (not Road) Level Crossings. The scale of the impact will depend on the timing of train movement as the majority of road movements at these locations is in the daytime. If additional trains result in long delays, particularly for those locations with manually operated barriers, alternative routes are limited and mostly on minor roads which could significantly increase journey or emergency service response times.</p> <p>Of greatest importance for a small number of residents and the emergency services is that a number of properties (Cottage Farm, Red Cottage Farm and Westhouse Farm) where the sole vehicular access is by private road or minor public highways via a level crossing.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>East Suffolk Line</p> <p>An increase in the number of trains would have some impact, and this is considered to be greatest if these trains were operated at daytime primarily as they would have a significant impact on timetabling of the passenger service. However, the alternative, which is night-time operation of trains on the East Suffolk Line has potentially significant adverse impacts arising with regards to noise impacts on receptors living close to the railway line. This is discussed further at NV.1.18, 1.19, 1.26, 1.27, 1.28 and 1.29.</p> <p>Issues of delivering five Trains Per Day</p> <p>Network Rail are currently working with the Applicant to understand the level of impact that the operation of the freight trains will have on the branch line and East Suffolk Line. Eight level crossings are required to be upgraded on the Saxmundham to Leiston Line and 21 level crossing on the East Suffolk Line will require mitigation to operate four trains per day. Although paragraph 3.4.38 of Volume 9 Chapter 3 [APP544] states that is possible to run five trains per day on the East Suffolk Line, Network Rail has indicated that the requirement to operate four trains per day (albeit all at night) at speeds of 20mph or 10mph would present challenges for some Level Crossings. Operation during the day would present unacceptable circumstances at Melton Road Level Crossings and cause issues at Woodbridge and at Darsham level crossings. No further indication is provided about the likely affect across the rest of the rail network.</p> <p>There is not enough capacity at night to run a fifth train, so the operation of two freight trains during the day would be required. This would disrupt the running of two passenger trains between Lowestoft and Ipswich. ESC would like to see the delivery of a passing loop between Woodbridge and Saxmundham to create the additional capacity required for daytime running of freight trains. Any increase of trains is likely to affect waiting times and risk at level crossings such as Melton, Woodbridge, Darsham, Middleton, Haywards, Ferry Lane and at Westerfield, Bloss and Brick Kiln. For some footpath crossings, if they cannot be mitigated with Miniature Stop Lights, then closure and route diversion would be considered. Discussions are ongoing on this between the Applicant and Network Rail and progress is expected, but this remains a key concern.</p>
	<p>Response by Suffolk County Council for Deadline 2</p>	<p>Leiston Branch Line</p> <p>The most significant level crossing on the branch line is on Station Road, Leiston which is hand operated. Any significant delays would require emergency vehicles to divert via King George Avenue and Lovers Lane. However, SCC understands that this level crossing would only be used while the LEEIE sidings are in operation.</p> <p>The temporary "Green Rail route" level crossing on Abbey Road will impact on traffic, including emergency vehicles using the B1122. While the location will not affect access to Lovers Lane and Sizewell B, it would</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>be a constraint on access to the north of there. The temporary "Green Rail route" level crossing on Buckleswood Road west of Leiston will have some localised impact on local movement although this is a minor road with low volumes of traffic.</p> <p>It is understood that the level crossing on King George Avenue will not be used as no trains access the sidings to the south.</p> <p>In terms of importance the level crossing at Buckleswood Lane, just north of the B1119 Saxmundham Road is of next importance as this is a locally important north south link.</p> <p>This crossing would be affected both by trains using the "Green Rail route" and LEEIE sidings</p> <p>The remainder of the level crossings are on minor roads and generally used by small numbers of local residents and landowners.</p> <p>A number of rights of way also cross the branch line although barriers are not generally present, and these are not used by emergency service vehicles.</p> <p>An increase in the number trains would have greatest impact on the B1122 Abbey Road and Buckleswood Lane (not Road) Level Crossings. The scale of the impact will depend on the timing of train movement as the majority of road movements at these locations is in the daytime. If additional trains result in long delays, particularly for those locations with manually operated barriers, alternative routes are limited and mostly on minor roads which could significantly increase journey or emergency service response times.</p> <p>Of greatest importance for a small number of residents and the emergency services is that a number of properties (Cottage Farm, Red Cottage Farm and Westhouse Farm) where the sole vehicular access is by private road or minor public highways via a level crossing.</p> <p>East Suffolk Line</p> <p>An increase in the number of trains would have some impact, and this would be greatest if these trains were operated at daytime. SCC's main concern would be the A1152 level crossing in Melton which is on a part of the highway network under some stress during peak hours. The A1152 forms an important access route for significant parts of East Suffolk i.e. Bawdsey Peninsula, Bentwaters and Rendlesham and is thus sensitive to any disruption. This is particularly true for large vehicles where the alternative route is particularly onerous (A12-A1094-B1069) The impact of additional trains on minor road level crossings and Rights of Way will generally be minor on an individual basis but important when summed up across the route.</p> <p>Issues of delivering five Trains Per Day</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Network Rail are currently working with The Applicant to understand the level of impact that the operation of the freight trains will have on the branch line and East Suffolk Line.</p> <p>Eight level crossings are required to be upgraded on the Saxmundham to Leiston Line and 21 level crossing on the East Suffolk Line (ESK) will require mitigation to operate four trains per day. Although paragraph 3.4.38 of Volume 9 Chapter 3 states that is possible to run five trains per day on the East Suffolk Line, Network Rail has indicated that the requirement to operate four trains per day (albeit all at night) at speeds of 20mph or 10mph would present some challenges for some Level Crossings. Operation during the day would present unacceptable circumstances at Melton Road Level Crossings and cause issues at Woodbridge and at Darsham level crossings. No further indication is provided about the likely affect across the rest of the rail network.</p> <p>There is not enough capacity at night to run a fifth train, so the operation of two freight trains during the day would be required. This would disrupt the running of two passenger trains between Lowestoft and Ipswich. SCC would like to see the delivery of a passing loop between Woodbridge and Saxmundham to create the additional capacity required for daytime running of freight trains. Any increase of trains is likely to affect waiting times and risk at level crossings such as Melton, Woodbridge, Darsham, Middleton, Haywards, Ferry Lane and at Westerfield, Bloss and Brick Kiln. For some footpath crossings, if they cannot be mitigated with Miniature Stop Lights, then closure and route diversion would be considered. Discussions are ongoing on this between the Applicant and Network Rail and progress is expected, but this remains a key concern.</p>
	<p>Response by SZC Co. for Deadline 3</p>	<p>SZC Co.'s short response to this question at Deadline 2 provides the detail of the number, timing and frequency of closures at level crossings due to the passing of Sizewell C freight trains. The effects are limited in duration and 7 out of 8 movements occur at night (when severance and delay would be less significant), whilst the day time movement occupies an existing train path. These limited impacts are inherent in the use of rail, which the authorities strongly support but have been limited by the use of night time capacity. Network Rail's response is helpful in its assessment of any risk involved. There is some misunderstanding apparent in responses about the scale of level crossing intervention required. The best current understanding of the detail of potential level crossing interventions is provided in the Statement of Common Ground between SZC Co. and Network Rail, submitted at Deadline 2 [REP2-074].</p>

