



The Sizewell C Project

9.10.16 Statement of Common Ground - East of England Ambulance Trust

Revision: 2
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	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Status of the SOCG	1
1.2	Purpose of this document	1
1.3	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.4	Structure of this Statement of Common Ground	3
2	POSITION OF THE PARTIES	3

TABLES

Table 2.1	Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and EEAST	5
Table 2.2	SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and EEAST	17

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:	ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG	17
-------------	------------------------------	----

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Status of the SOCG

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

1.1.2 This SoCG version 02 has been prepared by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') as the Applicant and the East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST), in consultation. This version updates the first draft submitted at Deadline 2.

1.2 Purpose of this document

1.2.1 The purpose of this SoCG is to set out the position of the parties on health and wellbeing and community safety issues, so far as they relate to the remit of EEAST, arising from the application for development consent for the construction and operation of the Sizewell C nuclear power station, and together with the proposed associated development (hereafter referred to as 'the Sizewell C Project').

1.2.2 This SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the 'Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent' published in March 2015 by the Department of Communities and Local Government (hereafter referred to as 'DCLG guidance').

1.2.3 Paragraph 58 of the DCLG Guidance states:

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

1.2.4 The aim of this SoCG is therefore to inform the Examining Authority and provide a clear position of the state and extent of discussions and agreement between SZC Co. and EEAST on matters relating to the Sizewell C Project.

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

1.3 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

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

1.3.2 EEAST NHS Trust provides response to emergency calls made through the 999 system in Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire and Cambridgeshire. EEAST also responds to health care professional calls, and, where contracted, provides a non-emergency patient transport service. EEAST provides emergency medical treatment, diagnosis, transport and discharge of patients as required. EEAST benefits from lay volunteers who provide support through Community First Responder schemes across the region, with the Leiston responders providing five staff to assist with life threatening calls within a five-mile radius of the village, including Sizewell.

1.3.3 Collectively SZC Co. and EEAST are referred to as ‘the parties’.

1.3.4 Matters of interest to the EEAST and which are detailed in Section 2 of this SoCG are as follows:

- The assessment of health and wellbeing effects in the Environment Statement (ES) (Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 28) and associated appendices, plus updates as set out in the ES Addendum (**Doc Ref. 6.14**).
- The approach to community safety, including roles and responsibilities of the Sizewell C Project and other stakeholders, as set out in the Community Safety Management Plan (**Doc Ref. 8.16**).
- The assessment of transport effects in the ES (**Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 10**) and the Transport Assessment (**Doc Ref. 8.5**) plus measures set out within the transport management plans (**Doc Refs. 8.6-8.8**).
- The major accidents and disasters assessment (**Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 27**), so far as it relates to matters within EEAST's remit (**Doc Ref. 6.3**).

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

- Draft DCO (including the Requirements);
- Community Impact Report;
- Draft Section 106 heads of terms (**Doc Ref. 8.4**) and updates in the form of the Deed of Obligation;
- Code of Construction Practice;
- Mitigation Route map; and
- The **ES** update in the January submission (**Doc Ref. 6.14**).

1.4 Structure of this Statement of Common Ground

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

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

2 POSITION OF THE PARTIES

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

2.1.2 This SOCG focuses on the following areas:

- Health and wellbeing; and
- Community Safety, so far as it relates to health and wellbeing matters.

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



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND
EAST AND ENGLAND AMBULANCE TRUST

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Table 2.1 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and EEAST

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
EE1	<p>RR2</p> <p>Review of the Environmental Statement (ES) and related DCO application documents indicates a lack of recognition of EEAST - as both a key health service provider and emergency service, who form an integral part of a 'Health & Blue Light Partnership Working Group' with the Suffolk & North East Essex CCG's, Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk Fire Service.</p>	<p>EEAST are recognised as a key health stakeholder and have been party to direct engagement throughout the DCO process. The effects on EEAST are assessed in Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 28 Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 6.3). The need for mitigation, in the form of a S106 contribution, is identified in the Draft S106 (Doc Ref 8.4).</p> <p>The Community Safety Management Plan (Doc Ref. 8.16) clearly recognises the role of EEAST, along with the other stakeholders mentioned e.g. see Table 3.1: Summary of community safety roles and functions.</p>	<p>EEAST are a key stakeholder in transportation issues as they are required to attend 999 calls within nationally defined timeframes. There is also a timed element in the transportation of patients to a location of definitive care. Non adherences to these timescales have contractual implications.</p> <p>EEAST are a Blue Light Agency in addition to being a health care provider. Transport issues will impact on "business-as-usual" (BAU) and EEAST needs to be recognised as a stakeholder in respect of transportation impact on a par with police and fire.</p> <p>EEAST needs to be consulted on decisions made by Transportation and Health Working Groups.</p>	<p>Governance and timing of Transport Review Group (TRG) and Community Safety Working Group (CSWG) to be further discussed to enable CSWG/emergency services to engage on highway modifications in a timely manner i.e. ahead of decisions being made on e.g. tie-ins of associated development.</p>	In Progress.
EE2	<p>RR3</p> <p>The level of engagement and scope of joint technical work with EEAST is therefore deficient at this stage:</p>	<p>The effects of "Outbreak of disease (emerging infectious disease or pandemic influenza) pandemic" are assessed in the Major Accidents and Disasters chapter (Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 27). This sets out that, during the construction phase, "Disease outbreak and infestation resulting in increased risk to the safety of members of the public and site workers" would be addressed by</p>	<p>COVID 19 has required a change in working conditions / patterns, whilst the initial response may be managed on site, consideration needs to be given to how to</p>	<p>Noted – agree will work together in the event of a pandemic and ensure escalation processes are developed as required.</p>	Agreed.

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

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	<p>Bullet 1 - The ES is considered to be; INCOMPLETE - as it omits any assessment of the impacts arising from a coronavirus pandemic (such as Covid-19) on health partner service capacity.</p> <p>Bullet 2 - LACK ROBUSTNESS - as the ES assesses the risk of a pandemic as 'minor' which is not borne out by the evidence of infection, urgent care referral & health service impacts associated with the current Covid-19 context.</p> <p>See also RR 25-27.</p>	<p>the Sizewell Health occupational health service. During the operational phase, in compliance with the Nuclear Site Licence conditions of the NSL, security arrangements would be established and adequate arrangements implemented for safe operation.</p> <p>Note that a future epidemic or pandemic may have different transmission vectors and require different management measures – the point of the assessment is to demonstrate that the occupational health care provision and project itself is capable of internalising the response to such an unforeseen event to avoid effects on workers and the community, including the need for additional s106 monies to external stakeholders.</p> <p>As detailed in Health Technical Note 4, Hinkley Health has demonstrated the project's ability to respond to the Covid-19 pandemic and avoid any impacts on health partner service capacity. Hinkley Point C has been commended by Public Health England and its independent regulator, the Office for Nuclear Regulation, for its response to the pandemic.</p> <p>The ES is not required to assess the effect of a pandemic on the community / health service as a whole. SZC Co. is applying for development consent to build a new nuclear power station and therefore the ES must assess the effects of the Sizewell C Project on health, including in the event of a pandemic. This has been done as set out above and evidence from HPC clearly supports the assessment of impact as minor, at worst. In fact, the HPC response also demonstrates how the presence of a major infrastructure project can be a support to the local community, including through providing PPE to health care facilities, nursing homes and schools, provision of meals and food, volunteering and fundraising through to emergency infrastructure construction support at local hospitals. Equally, such projects greatly aid in local and regional economic stability, and will aid economic recovery.</p> <p>On the above basis, the assessment is robust, no gaps have been identified, and the same measures and mitigation offered here, have been tested and proven sufficiently flexible and effective to managing risk from what was a novel virus.</p>	<p>manage a pandemic response collaboratively with local health system partners.</p> <p>This may mean changes in how patients are transported and how EEAST work with on site with SZC Health.</p> <p>This may require additional support though s106 funding.</p>		
EE3	RR3	The key mitigation for journey times is the associated development, including, the Sizewell link road, the two village	EEAST welcome the additional review to the	EEAST to progress discussions with SCC on	In Progress.

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	<p>Bullet 3 - INSUFFICIENT - in its proposals for mitigating & managing the impacts arising on EEAST's staff, fleet & estate assets which would need to provide for increased service delivery as a result of the development.</p>	<p>bypass, Yoxford roundabout and other highway improvements. Use of rail and sea for freight, as well as an on-site accommodation campus, use of park and rides and bussing will also keep traffic off the roads.</p> <p>Associated developments have been designed to be built off-line (i.e. their construction will not impact existing road networks) so even if something has a say 9 month or 2-year construction programme, the vast majority of that time, construction will be in fields and not affect the highway network. Tie ins will be a few weeks only and timings will be agreed through the Transport Review Group.</p> <p>SCC is currently reviewing SZC Co's journey time modelling and will respond formally in due course. As currently set out, SZC Co. do not believe that there will be an adverse effect on drive times / congestion leading to effects on health or other services.</p> <p>The modelling of journey time data has been revisited with additional information provided as part of the ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.14). Modelling suggests minimal journey time delays which do not require mitigation both in early years and at peak.</p> <p>With regard to community health home visits, emergency response and similar services; during construction these will not be materially impacted upon during any one trip, or cumulatively throughout the day, where the delay per trip is measured in seconds. Conversely, once operational, the improved road infrastructure offers enduring road safety and flow improvements over current provision, improving connectivity, response time and care in the community over and above what can be currently achieved.</p> <p>In terms of increased ambulance call outs to site, mitigation is proposed in the form of a S106 payment. Also see response to EE</p>	<p>journey time data and acknowledge the developments designed to be built 'off line'.</p> <p>EEAST are awaiting the outcome of SCC's review of the journey time modelling as any impact identified to impact on Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service will have an impact on EEAST's ability to respond.</p> <p>EEAST would welcome clarification on the predicted 'minimal journey time delays' and propose close monitoring of this as the development progresses. S106 funding will be required to implement robust monitoring within EEAST – e.g.: CAD system and training.</p> <p>EEAST will work with SZC through the appropriate working groups, assumptions are based on the data available via the DCO, should this data change, EEAST will need to revisit and re-open discussions around s106 (or alternative) mitigation.</p> <p>EEAST agrees that the predicted 999 call outs to the</p>	<p>traffic modelling and explore monitoring methodologies to feed into TRG's discussions on draw down of transport contingent funds in the DOO.</p> <p>To support ambulance response times:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) explore opportunities for highway improvements funded by the transport contingent funds to include operationally appropriate ambulance response post; and 2) explore opportunities to utilise SZC Co.'s associated development sites (e.g. park and rides) as appropriate locations for ambulance response post (including whether electrical charging could be provided, toilets and refreshment facilities shared). 	

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
			<p>construction site can be mitigated via s.106 agreements giving due consideration to the specialist nature of the resources that may be required to attend a construction site e.g.: Hazardous Area Response Team (HART) which needs to be factored in.</p>		
EE4	<p>RR 3 Bullet 4 - INCONSISTENT - with aspects of Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1), National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6), the National Planning Policy Framework, & Suffolk Coastal Local Plan.</p> <p>RR 31</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) 2011 – Part 4 Assessment Principles & Part 5 Generic Impacts. ❖ National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) 2011 – Part 1 Introduction, Part 2 Assessment Principles, Part 3 Impacts & General Siting Principles. ❖ National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 – Section 8, Paragraph 92 for promoting healthy & safe communities. ❖ Suffolk Coastal Local Plan, 2020 – Paragraphs 3.52, 3.55, Table 3.6, Policy SCLP3.4 (Proposals for Major 	<p>Legislation and policy is set out in Book 6, Volume 1, Chapter 3, which also signposts to other sections of the development consent order application. Please would EEAST identify their specific concerns in relation to the matters raised in the relevant representation and SZC Co. will address these:</p> <p>https://sizewellcdco.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/SZC_Bk6_ES_V1_Ch3_Legislation_Policy.pdf.</p>	<p>This was a technical point raised by James Lawson Planning Advisor, there is no new information available.</p>	Closed.	Closed.

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	Energy Infrastructure Projects) & Policy SCLP 3.5 (Infrastructure Provision).				
EE5	RR3 Bullet 5 - ADVERSE SOCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - are not therefore sufficiently 'avoided' 'reduced' or 'compensated' & sustainable development is not fully delivered by the proposals at this stage.	Please would EEAST advise if all matters of concern in this respect are covered by this relevant rep or whether there are other matters of concern. It would be helpful if EEAST could be as specific as possible so that SZC Co. can provide an informed response.	Further areas of impact have been identified but not yet explored in detail by EEAST; 1. Understanding the likely impact of transportation delays due to construction and increased road movements on the network 2. The mitigation required to support the additional requirements of the EPRR team for monitoring and routine exercises at the Sizewell site 3. The social, mental and wellbeing impacts to staff subject to delays in commuting but also performing their roles 4. The community impact of the development and impact on volunteers such as CFRs	Point 1 covered by EE3. Principle agreed for point 2, detail to be set out in SRP – exact scope and quantum to be agreed. Points 3 and 4 - concerns noted and mitigation is being put in place to avoid circumstances arising which may lead to accidents or incidents that may cause distress to staff or community first responders. These include the measures set out in the Code of Construction Practice and the Community Safety Management Plan.	In Progress.
EE6	RR4 / RR5 In view of this, including the serious overstretching of EEAST and health partner resources, and ongoing service implications as a result of the current Covid-19 pandemic, an EXTENSION OF TIME is required to work with EDF Energy before the Preliminary	The Examination Timetable is a matter for the Examining Authority - the preliminary meetings on 23/24 March and 14 April will provide an opportunity for interested parties to present their views or concerns on procedural issues. Alongside this, SZC Co. welcomes EEAST's ongoing engagement and looks forward to discussing and resolving any residual concerns.	PINS kindly agreed to an extension for the first draft of the SoCG to be submitted by 23.07.21	Closed.	Closed.

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	Examination Meeting, to address the areas outlined above and below. This will be sought from the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) to enable EEAST (and the CCG's) to comment on the further information necessary to supplement the ES, and to inform the following work areas:				
EE7	RR5 Bullet 1 - Scope the work required to assess how the development can avoid, reduce or compensate for the effects of a coronavirus pandemic on the health and emergency services.	Please see response to EE2 above. SZC Co. does not consider that further work is required on this.	As per EE2	Noted – agree will work together in the event of a pandemic and ensure escalation processes are developed as required.	Agreed.
EE8	RR5 Bullet 2 - Scope the additional AIL modelling work required to determine the likely impact on EEAST (& other health/ blue light partners) emergency & non- emergency response times.	See response to EE3 on Journey Times / Modelling. AILs will be managed through the CTMP which will be agreed with Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Constabulary (draft in Doc Ref. 8.7). The CTMP will include protocols for AIL movements with Suffolk Constabulary support provided where required. Please see response to EE16 below also. SZC Co. consider that this is already being addressed through work in progress with SCC / SC.	As stated in EE3, EEAST need to be acknowledged and recognised as a key stakeholder in transportation issues so that concerns may be raised via the appropriate channels and monitoring groups. EEAST need to be represented at this group or have a named blue light representative at these meetings to raise issues or concerns. AILs will have a similar impact on EEAST to that of Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Constabulary and close monitoring is required to mitigate the impact of this on our response times to patients. EEAST are concerned about the potential delay to emergency patients and transportation of patients to a	EEAST to agree with SCC & Suffolk Constabulary communication methodology for movement of AILs.	In progress with EEAST, SCC & Suffolk Constabulary

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
			<p>place of definitive care. EEAST will monitor through the protocols and Transportation working groups and any deviation or delays will require further discussion and potential mitigation.</p>		
EE9	<p>RR5 Bullet 3 - Scope the level of additional EEAST staff, fleet & estate assets (& additional health & blue light resources) required to mitigate the impacts arising from the development, including any 'Covid-19 specific' impacts.</p>	<p>SZC Co. is proposing a contribution for additional ambulance call outs to the Sizewell C Project. It is intended that evidence is drawn from HPC to define these, as set out in the Technical Note on Residual Healthcare Contribution (Book 6, Volume 2, Appendix 28B). [Note: SZC Co. is awaiting data from HPC re: rates of call outs from the Hinkley Point Project during the Covid-19 pandemic. Note however that as the workforce numbers dropped from around 5,000 to as low as 1,500 during the first lockdown, it is not expected that there were any additional impacts.]</p>	<p>Social Distancing measures as a result of the Pandemic has resulted in impacts in many areas such as staffing, fleet, equipment and estate.</p> <p>Construction Site: We recognise that the data is informed by HPC however EEAST maintain there are differences in the demographics in the East Suffolk Area. EEAST will monitor through the protocols and Health working groups and any deviation will require further discussion and potential mitigation. EEAST will work with SZC Health, but we need to understand the clinical skill level of SZC Health as this will impact on patient handover etc.</p> <p>Wider issues of concerns especially with the transportation network: Particularly with our Patient Transport Service, patients must be transported in isolation which has doubled</p>	<p>Noted – agree will work together in the event of a pandemic and ensure escalation processes are developed as required.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
			workload in some places. Should we be required to continue to operate under these measures EEAST will need to model the impact in further detail.		
EE10	RR5 Bullet 4 - The level of additional health & blue light partner additional resources required to mitigate the impacts arising from the development, including any 'Covid-19 specific' impacts, as appropriate.	Mitigation for other community safety and health and wellbeing stakeholders is being negotiated with them directly. This includes SCC (including fire service), ESC, Suffolk Constabulary and the CCGs.	EEAST will continue to work with commissioners / CCGs to address any concerns in this regard.	Noted.	Agreed.
EE11	RR5 Bullet 5 - Establish appropriate Terms of Reference & Membership - for a Transport, Health & Wellbeing Group to advise on the funding, resource & infrastructure measures necessary, to adequately mitigate the impact of the development (both non- Covid & Covid 19 specific) on service provision by EEAST & its health & blue light partners.	It is proposed that EEAST sits on the Community Safety Working Group. Terms of reference for this have already been shared with the Councils and their initial comments addressed. These will be sent to EEAST with this first draft SoCG. See EE9 regarding mitigation for EEAST / EE10 regarding mitigation for other community safety and health and wellbeing stakeholders.	Invitation to the CSWG has been received with thanks. EEAST still requires an acknowledgement of the importance of its involvement in the Transportation groups. This is key to our ability to plan BAU. Minutes and ToRs of the Transportation group have been requested but not yet received. It is also unclear who the Blue Light representative is on this group and therefore to date, EEAST have not had equity of access to ensure concerns are being addressed.	Governance and timing of TRG and CSWG to be further discussed to enable contribution by CSWG/emergency services to engage on transport matters in a timely manner eg discussed in advance in order to influence decisions. EEAST familiarisation and site visits to be agreed and funded in the DOO to allow more frequent information sharing.	In Progress.
EE12	RR6 This engagement and work would be undertaken in conjunction with the preparation of an evidence base by EEAST, (in liaison with its health/ blue	SZC Co. has set out the evidence base that it is drawing upon to determine mitigation required, noting that the transport evidence is being scrutinised by SCC. It is suggested that EEAST should consider relying on SCC's findings in this area as they are the Highway Authority for Suffolk.	EEAST has assessed the impact of the increase of population and will manage this via commissioners / CCG.	EEAST to progress discussions with SCC on traffic modelling and explore monitoring methodologies to feed into TRG's discussions	In Progress.

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	light partners) to inform the type and level of assets required to adequately mitigate the social and environmental (transport based) effects arising from the development.		EEAST are awaiting the outcome of SCC's transport review to determine any transportation related concerns as this will directly inform the level, type and location of any additional EEAST resources required to maintain BAU.	<p>on draw down of transport contingent funds in the DOO.</p> <p>To support ambulance response times:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) explore opportunities for highway improvements funded by the transport contingent funds to include operationally appropriate ambulance response post; and 2) explore opportunities to utilise SZC Co.'s associated development sites (e.g. park and rides) as appropriate locations for ambulance response post (including whether electrical charging could be provided, toilets and refreshment facilities shared). 	
EE13	RR7 This approach is also supported by EEAST's healthcare and blue light partners (Suffolk & North Essex CCG's, Suffolk Constabulary, Suffolk Fire Service) and by East Suffolk Council and Suffolk CC.	SZC Co. is working separately with all of these stakeholders to establish individual statements of common ground.	Noted.		No further action

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
EE14	RR8 / 10-15 To assist the DCO process, key facts related to EEAST's remit, priorities, staff, fleet and estate assets, service targets and co-working relationship with other healthcare and blue light partners are set out below, and at Annex 1.	Noted - this information is helpful thank you.	Noted.		No further action
EE15	RR16-19 Sizewell C proposals	<p>Note a number of errata - shown in red:</p> <p>16. Sizewell C (SZC) is a nationally significant infrastructure project under the Planning Act 2008, which is understood to have a project value of £40 billion pounds. Not clear what the £40bn refers to?</p> <p>17. With a site generating capacity of 3,340 megawatts, and following an anticipated 12-year construction phase (2023-35) it is expected to deliver electricity to 6 million homes over its operational lifetime to 2100.</p> <p>2022 is predicted start date, based on current Examination timetable. Construction is 9-12 years. 60 year operational lifetime. 6 million homes is per year rather than cumulatively over the operational lifetime.</p> <p>A construction & operational phase site area of approximately 255 ha – significantly larger than the 117 ha area nominated for the project in National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6).</p> <p>Please would EEAST confirm their specific concern over site size?</p> <p>More generally, the National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) (NPS EN-6) identified eight sites, including Sizewell C, as potentially suitable locations for the deployment of new nuclear power stations in England and Wales by 2025. This is further supported by the Government's Energy White Paper: Powering our Net Zero Future (2020) that identifies an 'aim to bring at least one further largescale nuclear project to the point of FID by the end of this Parliament, subject to clear value for money for both consumers and taxpayers and all relevant approvals'. The justification and rationale for building Sizewell C – including the nuclear power station and related associated developments – is set out in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4) [APP-590].</p>	Noted – no further actions	Closed	Closed

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
		<p>A temporary accommodation campus & caravan site for the construction workforce, with capacity for 7,900 persons serviced by 580 staff - a further 600 construction workers would be required to develop the off-site facilities (1,080 persons in total).</p> <p>The campus will be for 2,400 persons. The 580 campus staff are part of the 600 associated development staff, not additional.</p>			
EE16	<p>RR19-22 Sizewell C Impacts Summary – Transportation</p> <p>19. The proposed 'transportation impacts' are set out in Book 6, Chapter 10, Volume 2 of the ES. These are considered to have implications of a strategic scale encompassing the following construction phase impacts, in summary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ 10.1 million tonnes of construction phase material to be delivered to the site by road and rail, excluding the abnormal loads to be delivered to the site by sea via the proposed beach landing facility; ❖ During peak construction, up to 650 two-way lorry movements are anticipated each day rising to 1,000 two-way HGV movements on the busiest days. ❖ Estimates for the Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL's) including loads requiring a police escort, are currently awaited. <p>20. In the absence of sufficient information on AIL's, the ES has</p>	<p>Work is ongoing with Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk County Council to agree the management of abnormal loads and the timing of movements. This will aim to minimise any disruption on the local road network. As with HPC, SZC Co. expects that the majority of movements would not be of sufficient size to require police escort. These would not be wide enough to preclude EEAST being able to pass these with blue lights, in a similar way to HGVs or agricultural vehicles. Where AILs require an escort, the police will be able to direct and hold traffic to enable EEAST to pass in a blue light situation.</p> <p>In terms of traffic modelling, the Transport Assessment addendum submitted in January 2021 included information on the A12 VISSIM model and the impact on journey times. This concluded that there would up to a minute's additional delay on a 14km journey which is not considered to be significant.</p>	<p>Appreciate this work is ongoing, and we will rely on the assistance of constabulary colleagues in the safe management of these types of vehicle manoeuvres.</p> <p>EEAST requires support on monitoring and a reporting route for concerns if faced with a situation where an EEAST resource is unable to pass an AIL when necessary.</p> <p>As stated in EE3 and EE8, EEAST need to be acknowledged and recognised as a key stakeholder in transportation issues so that concerns may be raised via the appropriate channels and monitoring groups.</p> <p>Data on AIL movement and monitoring is crucial to EEAST's ability to plan suitable resources and response routes.</p>	<p>EEAST to agree with SCC & Suffolk Constabulary communication methodology for movement of AIL</p> <p>EEAST to progress discussions with SCC on traffic modelling and explore monitoring methodologies to feed into TRG's discussions on draw down of transport contingent funds in the DOO.</p> <p>To support ambulance response times:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) explore opportunities for highway improvements funded by the transport contingent funds to include operationally appropriate ambulance response post; and 2) explore opportunities to utilise SZC Co.'s associated development sites (e.g. park and rides) 	<p>In progress with EEAST, SCC & Suffolk Constabulary</p> <p>In Progress.</p>

Ref.	EEAST relevant rep comment	SZC Co.'s response	EEAST Response for Deadline 5	Discussion / Further Action	Agreed / Not Agreed / In Progress ¹
	<p>assessed the adverse effects arising during the peak construction phase on driver and passenger delay (requiring traffic to divert onto less suitable routes) as 'minor adverse'.</p> <p>21. The ES has not, however, adequately assessed the likely impacts arising on EEAST's emergency and urgent care services, particularly category 1 and 2 tasking related to life threatening illness/ injury or emergencies, or on health and blue light partner organisations.</p> <p>22. This aspect of the transportation chapter is therefore considered to be deficient, and requires further work (to incorporate AIL modelling) in liaison with EEAST and partner organisations to identify the likely impacts, severity of impact and appropriate mitigation. The baseline environment as set out in section 28.4.</p>			<p>as appropriate locations for ambulance response post (including whether electrical charging could be provided, toilets and refreshment facilities shared).</p>	

APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG

- A.1.1. The preparation of this SoCG has been informed by a programme of discussions between SZC Co. and EEAST. The relevant meetings are summarised in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2 SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and EEAST

Date	Details of the Meeting
5/8/20	Discuss DCO documentation and effects on EEAST - health, socio-economics, transport, major accidents and disasters
22/9/20	Discuss DCO documentation and effects on EEAST - health, socio-economics, transport, major accidents and disasters
8/10/20	Health Working Group
18/3/21	Health Working Group
26/3/21	SZC / A12 Vissim model run through
13/4/21	Health Working Group
14/7/21	Catch up on current positions and initial discussion on statement of common ground issues
21/7/21	Agree D5 version of statement of common ground