



# The Sizewell C Project

## 5.1Ad3 Ch Consultation Report Third Addendum

---

Revision: 1  
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)  
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

---

July 2021

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



## CONTENTS

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
2	INTRODUCTION .....	2
3	PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION REPORT THIRD ADDENDUM 3	
4	CONSULTATION CONTEXT .....	4
5	CONSULTATION PROCESS .....	7
5.1	Overview of consultation .....	7
5.2	Who was consulted and how? .....	7
5.3	Consultation material .....	9
5.4	Ways that feedback could be received .....	10
6	FEEDBACK RECEIVED AND HOW SZC CO. HAD REGARD TO IT 11	
6.1	Analysis of the responses to the consultation .....	11
6.2	Summary of Responses from Prescribed Consultees, Local Authorities and Town and Parish Councils .....	17
7	PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SIZEWELL C PROJECT .....	21
8	CONCLUSION .....	26
	REFERENCES .....	27

## TABLES

Table 4-1: Response received by method .....	11
Table 4-2: Consultation questions and number of responses .....	13
Table 5-1: Summary of changes .....	22

## PLATES

None provided.

## FIGURES

None provided.

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Parties consulted under section 42(1)(a) – (d), including affected persons

Appendix B: Consultation sample letter

Appendix C: Newspaper notices

Appendix D: Site notice

Appendix E: Consultation Document and Response Form

Appendix F: Newsletter

Appendix G: Press advert

Appendix H: Presentation slide pack

Appendix I: Consultation on Proposed Changes 16 to 18 – Issues Tables

## **ANNEX**

Annex A: Copies of all consultation responses



## 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1.1 NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') submitted an application to the Planning Inspectorate under the Planning Act 2008 (the 'Act') for a Development Consent Order for the Sizewell C Project ('Project') on 27 May 2020 ('Application'). The Application was accepted for examination on 24 June 2020.
- 1.1.2 Between 11 June 2021 and midday on 12 July 2021, SZC Co. carried out non-statutory consultation in respect of a number of proposed changes to the Application, known as Proposed Changes 16, 17 and 18.
- 1.1.3 This **Consultation Report Third Addendum** explains how SZC Co. has carried out consultation on Proposed Changes 16 to 18, including how it has engaged with the consultees, provides details of the consultation material used, summarises the responses received and details how SZC Co. has had regard to those responses.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1.1 SZC Co. submitted the Application for the Project on 27 May 2020. The Application was accepted for examination on 24 June 2020.
- 2.1.2 A **Consultation Report** [\[APP-068\]](#) was submitted as part of the Application to provide details on the pre-application consultation.
- 2.1.3 A **Consultation Report Addendum** [\[AS-153\]](#) was submitted in January 2021 detailing the non-statutory consultation that was carried out in November to December 2020 regarding a number of proposed changes to the Application. Fifteen changes were accepted for examination by the Examining Authority on 21 April 2021 [\[PD-013\]](#) and are referred to throughout this report as the 'Accepted Changes'.
- 2.1.4 A **Consultation Report Second Addendum** was submitted in June 2021 detailing the non-statutory targeted consultation carried out in May to June 2021 with a limited number of parties potentially affected by rail noise.
- 2.1.5 This **Consultation Report Third Addendum** has been prepared in respect of non-statutory consultation carried out between 11 June and midday on 12 July 2021 regarding a number of further proposed changes to the Application. Following on from the 15 Accepted Changes, these further proposed changes are numbered Proposed Changes 16, 17 and 18.

### 3 PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION REPORT THIRD ADDENDUM

3.1.1 The focus of this **Consultation Report Third Addendum**, which is submitted in support of the change request, is the consultation carried out in relation to Proposed Changes 16 to 18 to the Application. It has been prepared to demonstrate that SZC Co. has carried out proportionate non-statutory consultation on these proposed changes and has taken into account the feedback from that consultation.

3.1.2 This **Consultation Report Third Addendum** has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1). Figure 3, paragraph g. of Advice Note 16 states that a request to make a material change to an application after it has been accepted for examination should include the following:

*“Where (proportionate) additional non-statutory consultation has been carried out (either voluntarily or at the direction of the ExA) a Consultation Statement confirming who has been consulted in relation to the proposed change should be submitted. Copies of any consultation responses received by an applicant should also be included with any request, as an annex.”*

3.1.3 This document sets out:

- The consultation context and why the process has been undertaken (**Section 4**).
- How the consultation has been undertaken to ensure compliance with Advice Note 16 (**Section 5.1**).
- A description of the consultation undertaken and who has been consulted (**Section 5.2**).
- A description of the consultation materials used as part of the consultation (**Section 5.3**).
- The ways that feedback to the consultation could be received (**Section 5.4**).
- The consultation responses received and how SZC Co. has analysed and had regard to them to inform the change request (**Section 6**).
- The changes that SZC Co. is proposing to the Application (**Section 7**).
- An overall conclusion (**Section 8**).

## 4 CONSULTATION CONTEXT

- 4.1.1 On 21 April 2021, the Examining Authority accepted the 15 Accepted Changes for examination [\[PD-013\]](#).
- 4.1.2 As a result of the ongoing engagement between SZC Co. and stakeholders, including as part of the process of agreeing common ground and ongoing design development, SZC Co. subsequently identified a limited number of further proposed changes that it wished to make to the Application. Following on from the numbering of the Accepted Changes, these further proposed changes are numbered Proposed Changes 16 to 18.
- 4.1.3 As explained in the **Part 1 Change Report** (Doc Ref. 8.21 Ch), SZC Co. considers that Proposed Changes 16 to 18 are non-material changes. However, as it is recognised that materiality is a matter for the Examining Authority, SZC Co. is nevertheless complying with the process for requesting a material change as outlined in Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1).
- 4.1.4 SZC Co. wrote to the Examining Authority at Deadline 2 on 2 June 2021 providing notification that it intended to consult on and request changes to the Application [\[REP2-001\]](#). In accordance with Advice Note 16 (Ref 1.1), a **Second Notification of Proposed Project Changes** [\[REP2-131\]](#) was provided by SZC Co.
- 4.1.5 On 8 June 2021, the Examining Authority issued a letter in response to SZC Co.'s notification of the intention to request changes [\[PD-026\]](#). This provided the Examining Authority's comments on the consultation to be carried out and the information that should subsequently be submitted in support of the change request.
- 4.1.6 Whilst there is no statutory requirement to carry out consultation on the proposed changes to the Application, having regard to Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1) and the Examining Authority's letter of 8 June 2021 [\[PD-026\]](#), SZC Co. carried out non-statutory consultation between 11 June 2021 and midday on 12 July 2021 on the following proposed changes:

### **Proposed Change 16: Lover's Lane and Main Development Site Access Works**

- (i) A different alignment of Public Right of Way ('PRoW') Bridleway 19 south of the new B1122/Lover's Lane junction and the relocation of the Pegasus crossing proposed on Lover's Lane (south of the existing Recycling Centre) approximately 10m further to the south.
- (ii) Change to the alignment of Bridleway 19 to pass along the south of Paines Plantation, and then pass through an existing gap in the



woodland of Paines Plantation, before continuing along the northern edge of Paines Plantation. This would require removal of some trees at the northern edge of Paines Plantation. This would avoid disturbing the established grassland and heathland habitats where reptiles hibernate in the adjacent field.

- (iii) Repositioning of the proposed mammal culvert south of the Leiston Drain watercourse.

**Proposed Change 17: Two village bypass**

- (i) Reduction of the length of the flood relief culverts through the eastern embankment of the River Alde overbridge, and associated changes to the adjacent accommodation track and drainage basin.
- (ii) Removal of the proposed upgrade of existing footpaths E-243/003/0 and E-243/011/0 to a bridleway from the two village bypass proposals, resulting in a reduction of the Order Limits.
- (iii) A new crossing of the eastern arm of the proposed Friday Street roundabout to connect the existing A1094 to the existing A12.

**Proposed Change 18: Sizewell link road**

- (i) Pretty Road bridge - change from a Non-Motorised User (NMU) bridge to vehicular bridge to avoid the closure to vehicles of Pretty Road and increase connectivity across the route of the Sizewell link road. To facilitate this change, a junction between Pretty Road and the Sizewell link road on the south west side of the route is no longer included in the proposals.
- (ii) PRow - changes to ensure that the PRow proposals provide safe crossing points and reflect topography.
- (iii) Additional land for drainage – change to allow for a gravity drainage solution to be achieved to the west of the East Suffolk line.
- (iv) A change to the road layout and minor amendment to the boundary of Work No. 12B where the Sizewell link road joins to the B1122 near Brown's Plantation to address a departure from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards.
- (v) A change to the road layout, carriageway level and boundary of Work No. 12B at the B1122/25 link to address a departure from DMRB standards resulting in an increase to the Order Limits.



- (vi) A small increase to the site boundary and minor amendment to the boundary of Work No. 12B is proposed at Hawthorn Road. This would allow for an improved tie in between the proposed Sizewell link road and the existing Hawthorn Road.
- (vii) Small increases to the site boundary and a change to the boundary of Work No. 12B shown on the Works Plans (Doc Ref. 2.3(D) Ch) are proposed at the Middleton Moor roundabout. This is to allow for an improved tie in between the eastern and western arms of the proposed Middleton Moor roundabout and the existing B1122.
- (viii) Minor revisions to the boundary of Work No. 12B shown on Works Plans (Doc Ref. 2.3(D) Ch) are proposed at the Trust Farm Link/B1122 junction, the Moat Road junction and at the eastern end of the Sizewell link road where it joins the existing B1122. This is proposed to accommodate the detailed design of the road and allow for improved tie ins with the existing highway.

4.1.7 Following the consultation, SZC Co. had regard to all relevant responses to the consultation in finalising the changes and is now making a formal request to the Examining Authority to make Proposed Changes 16 to 18 to the Application, as described in further detail in **Section 7**.

## 5 CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 5.1 Overview of consultation

5.1.1 This section sets out SZC Co.'s approach to the consultation on Proposed Changes 16 to 18. It explains how the consultation was undertaken to ensure compliance with Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1) and the Examining Authority's letter dated 8 June 2021 [\[PD-026\]](#) giving details of:

- who was consulted and how (**Section 5.2**);
- the consultation material (**Section 5.3**); and
- ways that feedback was received (**Section 5.4**).

5.1.2 Whilst there is no statutory requirement to carry out consultation on the proposed changes to the Application, SZC Co. carried out non-statutory consultation between 11 June 2021 and midday on 12 July 2021. This consultation sought views on the proposed changes to the Application set out in **Section 4**.

### 5.2 Who was consulted and how?

5.2.1 SZC Co.'s approach to consultation has been structured to provide a high quality and meaningful process of consultation with statutory consultees and the local community.

#### i. Section 42(1)(a)-(d) consultees

5.2.2 Paragraph 3.3 of Advice Note 16 (Ref 1.1) states '*it is recommended that applicants consult all those persons prescribed in the [Act] under section 42 (a) to (d) who would be affected by the proposed change*'.

5.2.3 Section 42 of the Act lists prescribed consultees (section 42(1)(a)), the Marine Management Organisation (section 42(1)(aa)), local authorities (section 42(1)(b)), and persons within one or more categories in section 44 (section 42(1)(d)).

5.2.4 The Examining Authority's letter dated 8 June 2021 [\[PD-026\]](#) stated that this should include '*any section 42 persons **not** originally consulted on the application but who may now be affected by the proposed changes*'.

5.2.5 SZC Co. chose to consult even more widely than the approach set out in Advice Note 16 (Ref 1.1), by consulting all those persons identified in section 42(1)(a) to (d) of the Act, whether or not they would be affected by Proposed Changes 16 to 18. In accordance with the 8 June 2021 letter [\[PD-026\]](#), this included any section 42 persons not originally consulted on

the Application but who may now be affected by Proposed Changes 16 to 18.

5.2.6 A full list of section 42 consultees is provided in **Appendix A**. This list clearly identifies those persons who:

(i) were consulted in relation to Proposed Changes 16 to 18 but not in relation to the Application as updated by the Accepted Changes (shaded in blue in Appendix A);

(ii) are “affected persons”, meaning those persons over whose land compulsory acquisition powers are proposed to be exercised (shaded in orange in Appendix A); or

(iii) are both, i.e. affected persons who were consulted in relation to Proposed Changes 16 to 18 but not in relation to the Application as updated by the Accepted Changes (shaded in green in Appendix A).

5.2.7 SZC Co. wrote to the section 42 consultees on 11 June 2021 telling them about the consultation and how they could access the Consultation Document and Response Form (see **Section 5.3** below). The consultation ran from 11 June 2021 to midday on 12 July 2021, a period in excess of the minimum 28 days referred to in Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1). **Appendix B** contains a sample consultation letter.

## ii. The local community

5.2.8 Whilst Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1) only refers to consultation with those persons identified in section 42(1)(a) to (d) of the Act, SZC Co. also consulted the local community about the proposed changes.

5.2.9 SZC Co. sent a newsletter containing information about the consultation (see **Appendix F**) to 41,205 homes and businesses within a ten-mile radius of Sizewell, and in parishes neighbouring associated development sites further away, such as the freight management facility site. Those who are subscribed to receive email updates on the Sizewell C Project also received an online copy of the newsletter.

5.2.10 SZC Co. displayed site notices summarising Proposed Changes 16 to 18 and setting out details of the proposed changes consultation, including the deadline for the receipt of responses, at or as close as reasonably practicable to the proposed development sites. A copy of the site notice is in **Appendix D**.

5.2.11 A similar notice was published on 11 June 2021 in the East Anglian Daily Times, the Ipswich Star and the Lowestoft Journal. Copies of the newspaper notices are in **Appendix C**.



- 5.2.12 In addition, the launch of the consultation was publicised through press adverts published in the East Anglian Daily Times on 4 and 11 June 2021. A copy of the adverts is in **Appendix G**.

iii. Other

- 5.2.13 An email was sent by SZC Co. on 11 June 2021 at the start of the consultation to the relevant parish councils to offer them the opportunity to participate in meetings with SZC Co. to discuss the proposed changes.
- 5.2.14 SZC Co. has a Twitter account and followers were updated on the latest events and news during the public consultation (@edfesizewellc).
- 5.2.15 In accordance with the procedural decision letter of 8 June 2021 [PD-026], SZC Co. considered whether or not persons not already registered to participate in the Examination might need an opportunity to comment (such as persons living, or commercial entities operating, outside the Order Limits). SZC Co. is satisfied that the wide range of consultation activities carried out, as explained in this **Consultation Report Third Addendum**, captured any such persons.

## 5.3 Consultation material

- 5.3.1 The consultation material comprised a Consultation Document<sup>1</sup> and Response Form, see **Appendix E**.
- 5.3.2 During the consultation period, copies of the Consultation Document, Response Form and newsletter were made available on the Sizewell C Project website ([www.sizewellc.co.uk](http://www.sizewellc.co.uk)).
- 5.3.3 Consultees were able to request the consultation materials in a different format for accessibility reasons and could request an electronic copy (on a USB stick) or a hard copy by calling Freephone 0800 197 6102 between 09:00 and 17:00 Monday to Friday or emailing [info@sizewellc.co.uk](mailto:info@sizewellc.co.uk).
- 5.3.4 Consultees were able to book an appointment to view the Application and Consultation Document at:
- the Sizewell C Information Office at 48-50 High Street, Leiston IP16 4EW; and

<sup>1</sup> The Consultation Document contained two minor errors. Firstly, paragraph 2.2.4 cited the length of tree removal under the currently accepted proposals in the DCO as being 150m rather than the correct figure of 300m. This did not affect the description of the change (Proposed Change 16ii.) in paragraph 2.2.6, which is designed to reduce the length of tree removal from 300m to 150m. Secondly, page 25 of the Consultation Document and page 37 of Appendix A incorrectly cited the location of a proposed new walking and cycling route as an "approximately 100m to allow a crossing point over the route of the proposed Sizewell link road east of the junction with the Middleton Moor link. The text should have read that an "approximately 80m section is proposed to allow a crossing point over the route of the proposed Sizewell Link Road west of the junction with the Middleton Moor Link". The figures in the Consultation Document however showed the correct proposed alignment. Neither of these minor typographical errors materially affected the ability of consultees to understand the proposed changes. Full details of the proposed changes are provided in Part 1 of the change request submission (Doc Ref 8.12 Ch)

- the Council Offices of the Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council at Council Offices, Main Street, Leiston IP16 4ER.

5.3.5 On 11 June 2021, parish councils in East Suffolk were sent an email noting the start of consultation and offering a presentation on the proposed changes. A copy of the slide pack can be found in **Appendix H**. A presentation to Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council took place on 5 July 2021.

5.3.6 Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, SZC Co. was not able to host any public exhibitions.

## 5.4 Ways that feedback could be received

5.4.1 To optimise the response rate from consultees, those consulted were able to respond to the proposed changes consultation in a variety of ways, including by:

- completing a response form online ([www.sizewellc.co.uk](http://www.sizewellc.co.uk)), which contained a series of questions about Proposed Changes 16 to 18;
- emailing comments on Proposed Changes 16 to 18 to [info@sizewellc.co.uk](mailto:info@sizewellc.co.uk);
- posting comments on Proposed Changes 16 to 18 to FREEPOST SZC CONSULTATION; or
- if shielding and unable to use the above methods, calling Freephone 0800 197 6102 to arrange for the comments on Proposed Changes 16 to 18 to be collected.

## 6 FEEDBACK RECEIVED AND HOW SZC CO. HAD REGARD TO IT

### 6.1 Analysis of the responses to the consultation

6.1.1 This section provides an overview of the responses received to the proposed changes consultation.

6.1.2 A total of 61 responses were received by SZC Co. **Annex A** contains copies of all responses.

6.1.3 **Table 4.1** shows the number of responses received via each of the possible methods of providing feedback:

**Table 4-1: Response received by method**

Response Type	Count
Online response form	17
Email	42
Post	2
Collection	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>61</b>

6.1.4 The Response Form (**Appendix E**) asked consultees to answer 14 questions, but explained that consultees were welcome to answer as many or as few of the questions as they like.

6.1.5 A set of ‘issues tables’ are provided at **Appendix I**. These set out an ‘issues-led’ review of the comments received, and how SZC Co. has had regard to these comments, under the following titles:

- Section 42 consultees
- Local community consultees

6.1.6 The tables are organised under themed headings.

6.1.7 The following process was adopted in the preparation of the tables:

- A systematic methodology was used to analyse responses to the consultation, through which responses were analysed at a sentence level, using themes to group together comments on similar topics.
- A coding framework was developed by senior analysts with codes being applied to each response by an analysis team which regularly discussed



their work and suggested amendments to the coding framework as and when it may be needed.

- An individual response was coded in as many layers as required to ensure the whole sentiment of the comment was captured.
- The coding process enabled all responses to be indexed according to the issues raised by respondents and allowed a summary to be prepared of the content by themes and topics raised.

6.1.8 The number of responses to each question of the Response Form are shown in **Table 4.2**. These questions were only answered by those who took part in the consultation via the Response Form.

**Table 4-2: Consultation questions and number of responses**

	Question within Questionnaire	Number of Responses			Total responses	No response
		Appropriate	Inappropriate	Not sure		
16.	<b>(i) Bridleway 19</b>  We are proposing to improve Bridleway 19 (south of the new B1122/Lover's Lane junction) by changing the alignment of the route to make it less steep. We are also proposing to relocate (10m to the south) the signalised (Pegasus) crossing on Lover's Lane to improve visibility and safety.  Do you think this potential change is:	2	8	3	13	45
	<b>(ii) Removal of trees</b>  To allow enough space for the southern end of Bridleway 19 to comply with highways design guidelines, we are proposing to change the alignment of Bridleway 19 to pass along the south of Paines Plantation, and then pass through an existing gap in the woodland of Paines Plantation, before continuing along the northern edge of Paines Plantation. This would require removal of some trees at the northern edge of Paines Plantation. This would avoid disturbing the established grassland and heathland habitats where reptiles hibernate in the adjacent field.  Do you think this potential change is:	2	11	1	14	44
	<b>(iii) Mammal culvert</b>  We are proposing to reposition the mammal culvert passing under Lover's Lane so it is closer to Leiston Drain. This location would make the crossing more attractive and effective for mammals to use, while fencing would help guide them to it.	4	8	2	14	44

	Question within Questionnaire	Number of Responses			Total responses	No response
		Appropriate	Inappropriate	Not sure		
	Do you think this potential change is:					
17.	<p><b>(i) Flood relief culverts</b></p> <p>Reflecting feedback and Environment Agency advice, we are proposing to reduce the length of the flood relief culverts through the River Alde overbridge embankment from 70m to 50m. This would reduce the risk of blockages and maximise the chances of otters using them.</p> <p>Do you think this potential change is:</p>	4	8	3	15	43
	<p><b>(ii) Removal of bridleway upgrade</b></p> <p>We are no longer proposing to upgrade two existing footpaths (E-243/003/0 and E-243/011/0) to a bridleway. This is in response to feedback from the local community and a review of the DCO application that found the upgrade was not legally justified as a mitigation for the impacts of the two village bypass.</p> <p>Do you think this potential change is:</p>	6	5	4	15	43
	<p><b>(iii) Friday Street roundabout</b></p> <p>We are now proposing to create a crossing for pedestrians and cyclists across the north-eastern arm of the proposed Friday Street roundabout to provide a link between the 'old' A12 and the 'old' A1094. This would improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly between Farnham and Friday Street Farm.</p> <p>Do you think this potential change is:</p>	4	8	3	15	43



	Question within Questionnaire	Number of Responses			Total responses	No response
		Appropriate	Inappropriate	Not sure		
18.	<b>(i) Pretty Road bridge</b>  Previously only for pedestrians, cyclists and horse-riders, we are now proposing a bridge that will also be suitable for vehicles so Pretty Road can continue to provide a road connection, for example between Theberton and Saxmundham.  Do you think this potential change is:	5	9	2	16	42
	<b>(ii) Public rights of way</b>  Our detailed design work has highlighted some changes to public rights of way around the Sizewell link road to improve safety at crossing points and better reflect the local landscape.  Do you think this potential change is:	5	9	1	15	43
	<b>(iii) Gravity drainage</b>  We are proposing changes to allow for a gravity drainage solution - potentially removing the need for pumped drainage - to the west of the East Suffolk Line (south of the proposed Sizewell link road).  Do you think this potential change is:	4	7	4	15	43
	<b>(iv) B1122 near Brown's Plantation</b>  Do you think this potential change is:	2	8	4	14	44
	<b>(v) B1122/25 link</b>  Do you think this potential change is:	2	8	4	14	44

	Question within Questionnaire	Number of Responses			Total responses	No response
		Appropriate	Inappropriate	Not sure		
	<b>(vi) Hawthorn Road</b> Do you think this potential change is:	1	9	3	13	45
	<b>(vii) Middleton Moor roundabout</b> Do you think this potential change is:	2	10	2	14	44
	<b>(viii) Trust Farm link/B1122 junction, Moat Road junction, and where Sizewell link road would join the B1122</b> Do you think this potential change is:	2	10	2	14	44

## 6.2 Summary of Responses from Prescribed Consultees, Local Authorities and Town and Parish Councils

### *East Suffolk Council*

- 6.2.1 In response to Proposed Change 16 (i) - PRow change to Bridleway 19, East Suffolk Council (ESC) noted that the consultation document made reference to an environmental assessment, but that the assessment was not included as part of the consultation.
- 6.2.2 ESC noted that the proposed removal of trees in Proposed Change (ii) would not significantly affect the integrity of the tree belt, but noted that details were not provided on the individual trees to be removed, and in particular, whether any have potential for [REDACTED]. ESC stated that assessments must be undertaken. From an arboriculture and landscaping perspective, ESC did not consider that Proposed Change 16(ii) to have any meaningful adverse impact on public amenity.
- 6.2.3 ESC were supportive of Proposed Change 16(iii), subject to the provision of detailed designs.
- 6.2.4 ESC provided no specific comments on Proposed Change 17(i), however acknowledged the wildlife benefits. ESC accepted that there are no relevant changes to the previously submitted landscape and visual impact assessment conclusions, and on this basis, no further comments were made from a landscaping and arboricultural perspective.
- 6.2.5 ESC welcomed Proposed Change 18(i) relating to a vehicle bridge at Pretty Road, rather than a footway/private access as previously proposed. ESC raised no objections to the revised design and layout of the Pretty Road Bridge. In terms of ecology, ESC noted that the proposed Pretty Road bridge is in a location marked for the provision of a [REDACTED] and considered the re-design of the bridge as an opportunity to improve proposed connectivity for [REDACTED] in this location.

### *Suffolk County Council Highways*

- 6.2.6 Subject to detailed design and road safety audits, Suffolk County Council Highways department (SCC Highways) raised no objection to Proposed Change 16(i). SCC Highways requested details of the layout showing that acceptable visibility for the crossing can be achieved.
- 6.2.7 SCC Highways did not object to Proposed Change 16(ii) subject to assessment of the environmental and ecological impacts and drainage requirements.



- 6.2.8 Subject to an acceptable detailed design, SCC Highways considered Proposed Change 16(iii) as an improvement, providing confirmation can be made that drainage requirements have been taken into consideration.
- 6.2.9 SCC Highways raised no objection to the principle of Proposed Change 17(i), however noted that the location of the eastern infiltration lagoon is different to that in what SCC Highways understands is the latest highway design. SCC Highways stated that they would respond to the applicant on these matters separately.
- 6.2.10 SCC Highways expressed disappointment that Proposed Change 17(ii) is not being upgraded to bridleways however acknowledged the position of local residents. SCC Highways stated that the bridge over the bypass should be retained in its current form and noted that footways E-243/003/0 and E-243/011/0 form an important east west link from Farnham to the minor roads and rights of way to the east towards Blaxhall, Gromford and Snape.
- 6.2.11 SCC Highways welcomed Proposed Change 17(iii), subject to detailed design and road safety audits. SCC Highways noted that Figure 3.3 shows the 'footpath' and not a 'cycleway' ending without any link to rights of way, Friday Street Farm or other highway Non-Motorised User (NMU) facilities. SCC Highways requested further details before they can confirm that these proposals are acceptable.
- 6.2.12 SCC Highways queried how access would be gained to the infiltration lagoon for maintenance. SCC Highways suggested that if access is gained via the A1094 to the west of Friday Street Farm, there would be an opportunity to link Benhall Footway 028 adjacent to the infiltration lagoon to the NMU infrastructure adjacent to the A12.
- 6.2.13 SCC Highways raised no objection to Proposed Change 18(i), on the basis that it does not adversely affect the facilities provided for non-motorised users and that approval in principle can be agreed for the design.
- 6.2.14 SCC Highways raised no objection to Proposed Change 18(ii) (E-344/014/0, E-344/013/0, E-396/020/0, E-396/015/0, E-515/005/0, E-515/007/0, E-515/013/0 and E396/017/0).
- 6.2.15 In respect of Proposed Change 18(ii) (E-584/016/0), SCC Highways considered the proposed changes acceptable to provide a perpendicular crossing of the Sizewell link road and a small reduction in length.
- 6.2.16 SCC Highways accepted the Proposed Changes 18(ii) (Littlemore Road). SCC Highways stated that *"the change whilst shortening the length of the route requires two crossing points rather than one. However, the single crossing is past the junction to the Middleton Link Road and the main SLR*

*so would carry the combined volume of traffic (little traffic is expected to turn in and out of the SLR from the west onto the link road). The changed route is further from the road and likely to be of higher amenity benefit. Thus, on balance the LHA accepts the change”.*

- 6.2.17 SCC Highways were “reluctant to accept” E-396/023/0 (Proposed Changes 18(ii) due to the increased length and reduction in amenity value being close to a busy road. SCC Highways confirmed that they are reviewing any potential alternatives. However, accept that this change may be unavoidable to create a safe crossing point on the Sizewell Link Road.
- 6.2.18 SCC Highways welcomed Proposed Change 18(iii), subject to confirmation that it is achievable. SCC Highways confirmed that their preference is for drainage routes beyond the highway boundary (i.e that adjacent to the carriageway) to be secured by easements or wayleaves.
- 6.2.19 SCC Highways raised no objections to Proposed Changes 18(iv – viii).

*Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council*

- 6.2.20 Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council considered Proposed Change 17(i) as appropriate and were supportive of Proposed Change 17(iii). Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council did not express an opinion on whether Change 17 (ii) was appropriate or not appropriate.

*Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council and Stop Sizewell C*

- 6.2.21 Therberton and Eastbridge Parish Council (TEPC) submitted a joint response with Stop Sizewell C. TEPC and Stop Sizewell C remain opposed to the principle of the Sizewell C Project, however, acknowledged that the Proposed Changes are intended to reduce the impacts on communities.
- 6.2.22 TEPC expressed concern about fly tipping where roads are stopped up, however were supportive of Proposed Change 18(i) subject to detailed design concerns.

*Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council*

- 6.2.23 Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council (LSTC) expressed that they were “broadly happy” with Proposed Change 16 (i – iii) “as they are made with safety considerations in mind and to meet relevant standards”. LSTC suggested that “every effort should be made to minimise tree loss”.
- 6.2.24 In respect of Proposed Change 18(i) - Sizewell Link Road, LSTC expressed that any road proposed should be permanent “to relieve pressure on existing routes and make routes safer and more attractive for

*cycling*". LSTC further stated that if the proposed link road goes ahead then they "*would support the proposed vehicular bridge on Pretty Road as an improvement to the existing plan*".

- 6.2.25 LSTC requested assurances that any further changes resulting from examination would be consulted on and that footpaths and PRowWs should be preserved with the same or improved accessibility and quality.

*Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council*

- 6.2.26 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council (KcCPC) remain opposed to the principle of the Sizewell C Project, however, expressed that they are in favour of Proposed Change 18(i), subject to its detailed design. KcCPC also made a number of other comments, but these comments were not related to the proposed changes that were being consulted upon.

*British Horse Society*

- 6.2.27 The British Horse Society (BHS) considered Proposed Change 16 (i) – 16(iii) as appropriate and were supportive of improving visibility and safety of Pegasus crossing.
- 6.2.28 BHS considered Proposed Change 17(iii) as appropriate, however opposed the removal of the bridleway upgrade as part of Proposed Change 17 (ii) on the basis that it fails to accommodate needs contrary to National and Local policies.
- 6.2.29 In response to Proposed Change 18(i) and Proposed Highways Works (18iv – 18viii), BHS considered the proposals as appropriate. BHS however opposed Proposed Change 18(ii). BHS suggested that the Pretty Road Bridge design should accommodate all non-motorised users and be designed in line with BHS guidance.



## 7 PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE SIZEWELL C PROJECT

- 7.1.1 SZC Co. has had regard to the consultation responses, as explained in detail within the issues tables at **Appendix I**, in finalising the change request that this **Consultation Report Third Addendum** is submitted in support of.
- 7.1.2 SZC Co. is formally requesting that the three proposed changes to the Application set out in **Table 5.1** are accepted into the Examination.



**Table 5-1: Summary of changes**

Proposed Change Number	Proposed Change Description	Environment Effects and Habitats and Protected Species	Order Limit Changes	New Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession	Impact on Businesses or Residents
Proposed Change 16 (Lover's Lane and Main Development Site Access Works)	i. A different alignment of Public Right of Way (PRoW) Bridleway 19 south of the new B1122/Lover's Lane junction and the relocation of the Pegasus crossing proposed on Lover's Lane (south of the existing Recycling Centre) approximately 10m further to the south.	No new or materially different likely significant effects on the environment from that reported in Volume 2 of the ES [APP-178 to APP-347], as updated by the First ES Addendum for the Accepted Changes [AS-179 to AS-260] and the environmental information outlined in the ES Signposting Document <a href="#">[REP2-025]</a> .  No change to Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment or new European Protected Species licence.	None	None	No new or materially different significant effects on businesses or residents.
	ii. Change to the alignment of Bridleway 19 to pass along the south of Paines Plantation, and then pass through an existing gap in the woodland of Paines Plantation, before continuing along the northern edge of Paines Plantation. This would require removal of some trees at the northern edge of Paines Plantation (approx. 30-40 fewer trees would be lost than currently proposed in the Application). This would avoid disturbing the established grassland and heathland habitats where reptiles hibernate in the adjacent field.				
	iii. Repositioning of the proposed mammal culvert south of the Leiston Drain watercourse.				
Proposed Change 17	i. Reduction of the length of the flood relief culverts through the eastern embankment of the River Alde overbridge. The shorter flood relief	No new or materially different likely significant effects on the environment	i. None	None	No new or materially

Proposed Change Number	Proposed Change Description	Environment Effects and Habitats and Protected Species	Order Limit Changes	New Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession	Impact on Businesses or Residents
(two village bypass)	culverts would allow a mammal migration ledge to be provided on the eastern flood relief culvert, removing the need for a separate mammal culvert to the east of the River Alde. The shorter flood relief culverts also require associated changes to the adjacent accommodation track. The associated changes to the accommodation track include a change to the gradient of the track and the insertion of a portal culvert underneath the track.	from that reported in Volume 5 of the ES [APP-409 to APP-443], as updated by the First ES Addendum for the Accepted Changes [AS-179 to AS-260] and the environmental information outlined in the ES Signposting Document <a href="#">[REP2-025]</a> .			different significant effects on businesses or residents.
	ii. Removal of the proposed upgrade of existing footpaths E-243/003/0 and E-243/011/0 to a bridleway from the two village bypass proposals, resulting in a reduction of the Order Limits.	No change to Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment or new European Protected Species licence.	ii. Reduction		
	iii. A new crossing of the north-eastern arm of the proposed Friday Street roundabout to connect the existing A1094 to the existing A12.		iii. None		
Proposed Change 18 (Sizewell link road)	i. Pretty Road Bridge to change from a non-motorised user bridge to a vehicular bridge resulting in the junction between Pretty Road and the Sizewell link road on the south west side of the route no longer being proposed.	No new or materially different likely significant effects on the environment from that reported in Volumes 2 and 6 of the ES, as updated by the First ES Addendum for the Accepted Changes [AS-179 to AS-	i. None	i. None	No new or materially different significant effects on businesses or residents.
	ii. PRow changes to provide safe crossing points and reflect topography.		ii. None	ii. None	

Proposed Change Number	Proposed Change Description	Environment Effects and Habitats and Protected Species	Order Limit Changes	New Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession	Impact on Businesses or Residents
	iii. An increase to the Order Limits to allow for a gravity drainage solution to be achieved to the west of the East Suffolk line.	260] and the environmental information outlined in the ES Signposting Document <a href="#">[REP2-025]</a> .  No change to Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment or new European Protected Species licence.	iii. Increase	iii. Compulsory acquisition powers – consent of all persons with an interest has been obtained.	
	iv. A change to the road layout and minor amendment to the boundary of Work No. 12B where the Sizewell link road joins to the B1122 near Brown's Plantation to address a departure from the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards.		iv. None	iv. None	
	v. A change to the road layout, and carriageway level and boundary of Work No. 12B at the B1122/25 link to address a departure from DMRB standards, resulting in an increase in the Order Limits over highway land.		v. Increase	v. Temporary possession only over highway land.	
	vi. An extension to the Order Limits over highway land to allow for an improved tie in between Hawthorn Road and the Sizewell link road. It is also proposed to make minor revisions to the boundary of Work No. 12B where the		vi. Increase	vi. Temporary possession only over highway land.	

Proposed Change Number	Proposed Change Description	Environment Effects and Habitats and Protected Species	Order Limit Changes	New Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession	Impact on Businesses or Residents
	Sizewell link road joins Hawthorn Road to allow for improved tie ins with the existing highway.				
	vii. An extension to the Order Limits over highway land to allow for an improved tie in between the eastern and western arms of the proposed Middleton Moor roundabout and the existing B1122. It is also proposed to make minor revisions to the boundary of Work No. 12B at the Middleton Moor roundabout to allow for improved tie ins with the existing highway.		vii. Increase	vii. Temporary possession only over highway land.	
	viii. Minor revisions to the boundary of Work No 12B to allow for an improved tie in with the existing highway are proposed at the Trust Farm Link/B1122 junction, the Moat Road junction and at the eastern end of the Sizewell link road where it joins the existing B1122.		viii. None	viii. None	



## 8 CONCLUSION

- 8.1.1 SZC Co. has reviewed and considered all relevant responses to the consultation as explained in detail within the tables at **Appendix I**.
- 8.1.2 The consultation process has been effective and productive, and the content of the change request has been informed and improved as a result. It is considered that the documents provided with this change request provide the detail required to satisfy concerns and requests raised during the consultation period.
- 8.1.3 Overall, the proposed changes received mixed reactions, however, no fundamental issues were raised that would lead SZC Co. to conclude that the changes would not improve the Project or that they should not be taken forward.
- 8.1.4 SZC Co. is very grateful to all parties who have responded to the consultation or engaged with the evolving development of the Sizewell C Project. SZC Co. will continue to work with respondents to provide responses to queries.

---

## REFERENCES

- 1.1 Planning Inspectorate (2018). Advice Note Sixteen: How to request a change which may be material (Online). Available at:  
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Advice-note-16.pdf> (Accessed July 2021)