



The Sizewell C Project

9.73 Comments at Deadline 7 on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines and Subsequent Written Submissions to ISH1-ISH6

Revision: 1.0
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

September 2021

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





CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Purpose of this document.....	1
1.2	Deadline 5 submissions	1
1.3	Deadline 6 submissions	1
1.4	Supplementary Written Submissions to ISHs.....	1
1.5	Structure of this Report	2
2	RESPONSES TO COMMENTS AT DEADLINES 5 AND 6 ON SZC CO.'S REPORTS	3
2.1	Overview	3
2.2	Draft Development Consent Order.....	3
2.3	Draft Deed of Obligation.....	4
2.4	Temporary and Permanent Coastal Defence Feature Plans – Not for Approval.....	10
2.5	Main Development Site Permanent and Temporary Beach Landing Facility and SSSI Crossing Plans	11
2.6	Two Village Bypass Plans for Approval and Plans Not for Approval .	11
2.7	Sizewell Link Road Plans for Approval and Plans Not for Approval ..	12
2.8	Sizewell Link Road Description of Development	13
2.9	Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan	14
2.10	Main Development Site Design and Access Statement	14
2.11	Two Village Bypass Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.....	15
2.12	Rights of Way and Access Strategy	15
2.13	Evaluation Fieldwork Reports.....	16
2.14	Sizewell Link Road Landscape and Ecology Management Plan.....	17
2.15	Code of Construction Practice.....	17
2.16	Mitigation Route Map	18
2.17	Part 1 Further Proposed Changes to the DCO Application	18
2.18	Wet Woodland Strategy	19
2.19	Fen Meadow Reports	20



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – COMMENTS AT DEADLINE 7
ON SUBMISSIONS FROM EARLIER DEADLINES AND
SUBSEQUENT WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS TO ISH1-ISH16

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

2.20	Minsmere Monitoring and Mitigation Plan	20
2.21	White fronted goose survey report	20
2.22	Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Sandlings (Central) and Alde, Ore and Butley Estuaries European Sites	20
2.23	Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan	20
2.24	Natterjack Toad Licence Method Statement	21
2.25	Main Development Site Bat Roost Survey	21
2.26	Aldhurst Farm Technical Note	21
2.27	Statement of Common Ground with Network Rail	21
2.28	Coastal Processes	23
2.29	Preliminary Design and Maintenance Requirements for the Sizewell C Soft Coastal Defence Feature	23
2.30	Storm Erosion Modelling Report of the Sizewell C Soft Coastal Defence Feature	24
2.31	Acoustic Fish Deterrent Report	24
2.18	Comments on Councils' Local Impact Report	26
2.19	Appendices to SZC Co. Comments on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines	34
2.20	Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH1-ISH7	37
2.21	Written Submissions responding to actions arising from ISH1-7	49
2.22	Draft Noise Monitoring and Management Plan and Noise Mitigation Scheme	51
3	RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS AT EARLIER DEADLINES	52
3.1	Overview	52
3.2	East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council	52
3.3	East Suffolk Internal Design Board	53
3.4	RSPB and SWT	53
3.5	Greenpeace UK	53
3.6	Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council	54
3.7	Suffolk Local Access Forum	59
3.8	The Heveningham Hall Estate	61

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

3.9	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council.....	64
3.10	FERN	64
3.11	Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth.....	65
3.12	Suffolk Coastal DMO.....	65
3.13	Responses to Written Representations.....	65
3.14	Other Respondents, including owners of the Order Land	66
4	ADDITIONAL WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS ARISING FROM ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARINGS (ISH1 – ISH6).....	76
4.1	Overview	76
4.2	Issue Specific Hearing 1.....	76
4.3	Issue Specific Hearings 2 and 3.....	76
4.4	Issue Specific Hearing 4.....	77
4.5	Issue Specific Hearing 5.....	77
4.6	Issue Specific Hearing 6.....	77
4.7	Issue Specific Hearing 7.....	77

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: RESPONSE BY SZC CO. TO NATURAL ENGLAND, THE RSPB AND SUFFOLK WILDLIFE TRUST’S RESPONSES TO DEADLINE 6 78
--

APPENDIX B: COASTAL GEOMORPHOLOGY TOPIC BASED RESPONSE TO WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS.....	79
---	----

APPENDIX C: COASTAL GEOMORPHOLOGY RESPONSE TO JACKSON AND COOPER WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS.....	80
--	----

APPENDIX D: PLANTING PHASING STRATEGY	81
---	----

APPENDIX E: ESC RESPONSE TO THE APPLICANT'S RESPONSE ON BAT IMPACTS RAISED IN THE LIR.....	82
---	----

APPENDIX F: SOUTHERN PARK AND RIDE DRAINAGE DESIGN NOTE ..	83
--	----

APPENDIX G: FREIGHT MANGEMENT FACILITY DRAINAGE DESIGN NOTE 84

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

APPENDIX H: SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO BE MADE TO THE TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT PLANS.....	85
APPENDIX I: AVAILABILITY OF A FUND FOR FARMLAND BIRDS	86
APPENDIX J: LANDSCAPING AND NOISE LETTERS TO FERN, MOLLETTS FARM AND MR & MRS LACEY	87
APPENDIX K: MAIN DEVELOPMENT SITE AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT PLANS – COMPATIBILITY SCHEDULE	88
APPENDIX L: RESPONSE TO TOGETHER AGAINST SIZEWELL C, LAWRENCE MOSS AND FRANCES CROWE	89
APPENDIX M: FIGURE B - MITIGATION (SATELLITE MAPPING).....	90
APPENDIX N: AIR QUALITY MITIGATION	91

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this document

1.1.1 This report provides comments from SZC Co. (the Applicant) on additional information and submissions received at earlier deadlines, principally in relation to submissions at Deadline 5 (23 July 2021) and Deadline 6 (6 August 2021). This report also provides supplementary submissions in response to actions arising from the Issue Specific Hearings 1 to 6 where previously specified.

1.2 Deadline 5 submissions

1.2.1 At Deadline 6, SZC Co. responded to Deadline 5 submissions where time allowed or it was considered to be helpful ahead of the Compulsory Acquisition Hearings and Issue Specific Hearings held in August 2021. This response was provided in [REP6-025](#).

1.3 Deadline 6 submissions

1.3.1 SZC Co. has reviewed all submissions to Deadline 6. A number of responses refer to concerns or matters that have been raised previously through Relevant Representations and responded to through the Relevant Representations Report [[REP1-013](#)]. As such, a further response from SZC Co. is not considered necessary. For clarity, this relates to the following responses REP6-060 to REP6-063, REP6-065, REP6-068 to REP6-070, REP6-072, REP6-076 to REP6-079, REP6-082 and REP6-083.

1.3.2 This report provides SZC Co.'s comments to the remaining responses and the structure of this report is outlined below.

1.3.3 In some instances, the comments refer to SZC Co.'s Deadline 6 submissions [[REP6-001](#) to [REP6-031](#)] which were not available at the time of the Deadline 6 responses from Interested Parties. Similarly, some responses within this report refer to the Written Summaries to CAH1, OFH10 and ISH8-10 or the Written Submissions responding to actions from CAH1, OFH10 and ISH8-10 (Doc Refs. 9.74 to 9.85) which provide the latest position and discussions.

1.4 Supplementary Written Submissions to ISHs

1.4.1 A suite of documents was submitted at Deadline 5 containing SZC Co.'s **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from Issue Specific Hearings 1 to 6** [[REP5-113](#) to [REP5-118](#)].

1.4.2 SZC Co. subsequently provided additional written submissions at Deadline 6 in its **Subsequent Written Submissions to ISH1-ISH6** report [[REP6-025](#)], where indicated in its Written Submissions [REP5-113 to REP5-118]. In some instances, the Deadline 6 report [[REP6-025](#)] committed to providing further information or updates at Deadline 7. These are provided within Section 4 of this report.

1.5 Structure of this Report

1.5.1 The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides a response to comments made by Interested Parties at Deadlines 5 and 6 on reports submitted by SZC Co. at earlier deadlines.
- Section 3 provides a response to Deadlines 5 and 6 submissions by Interested Parties that are not specifically in relation to SZC Co. reports.
- Section 4 provides supplementary written submissions to actions arising from ISH1 to ISH6.

2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS AT DEADLINES 5 AND 6 ON SZC CO.'S REPORTS

2.1 Overview

2.1.1 This section provides a response to comments from Interested Parties at Deadlines 5 and 6 on reports submitted by SZC Co. at an earlier examination deadline. This section is structured in relation to each document and in response to submissions made at Deadline 5 and/or Deadline 6 by the following parties:

- East Suffolk Council (ESC);
- Suffolk County Council (SCC);
- Environment Agency (EA);
- Marine Management Organisation (MMO);
- Natural England (NE);
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) and Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT);
- Suffolk Constabulary; and
- Fish Guidance Systems Ltd.

2.2 Draft Development Consent Order

2.2.1 The following parties made comments on the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) at Deadlines 5 and 6:

- EA's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-035](#)];
- MMO's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-039](#)];
- Suffolk Constabulary's Deadline 6 submissions [[REP6-047](#)];
- Natural England's Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-159](#)].

2.2.2 In addition, discussions have progressed with East Suffolk Council (ESC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the draft DCO.

2.2.3 An updated draft DCO is submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)) that incorporates the points raised by these stakeholders to the extent the Applicant agrees with them. Notwithstanding, where matters are not agreed the Applicant will continue to engage with these stakeholders in advance of a further iteration at Deadline 8 and alongside that the Applicant will identify the matters still outstanding between the parties and its rationale for the approach proposed.

2.3 Draft Deed of Obligation

Overview

2.3.1 Suffolk Constabulary's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-047](#)] provided comments on the draft Deed of Obligation (DoO). Some of these, where agreed, have been addressed in updated Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref 8.17(F)). For example:

- Suffolk Constabulary has been added as a member of the Transport Review Group with voting rights.
- The Community Safety Working Group membership has been updated to allow for two members (each) from Suffolk Constabulary and the other emergency services to attend.
- A "Suffolk Constabulary Facilities Contribution" has been added to Schedule 4 of the Draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) in response to Suffolk Constabulary's feedback that they would prefer their team to be based in the community and reads as follows: *"On or before Commencement, SZC Co shall pay £165,000 to Suffolk County Council for onward payment to the Suffolk Constabulary as a contribution towards the cost of Suffolk Constabulary's office facilities in Leiston."*
- Suffolk Constabulary proposed an amendment to the definition of AILs. SZC Co note that an AIL is as defined by the Department for Transport. However, SZC Co. has reviewed Suffolk Constabulary's proposed additions to the definition and they are accepted and will be updated in the CTMP and Deed of Obligation to reflect the proposed wording

2.3.2 Discussions have progressed with East Suffolk Council (ESC) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) on the draft DoO and an updated draft DoO is submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), with work ongoing between the parties in relation to detailed drafting to inform the next iteration to be submitted at Deadline 8. Where items are not agreed with any party

including Suffolk Constabulary, discussions continue, and an update will be provided at Deadline 8.

2.3.3 SZC Co. provided a draft Strategic Relationship Protocol (SRP) to Suffolk Constabulary for comment on 12-4-21 which included detail on some items which Suffolk Constabulary is concerned are not covered in the Deed of Obligation

2.3.4 In some cases, SZC Co considers that issues raised by Suffolk Constabulary are already set out in in the SRP. SZC Co. considers that the SRP is the most appropriate place for such detail, notes that Suffolk Constabulary has yet to comment on the draft and respectfully suggests that Suffolk Constabulary review the SRP as this may provide much of the detail they seek.

2.3.5 SZC Co welcomes the proposals for monitoring and KPIs that Suffolk Constabulary has offered to provide to the benefit of the Community Safety Working Group at **Appendix B** to its Deadline 6 submission [REP6-047]. SZC Co's position regarding monitoring is that metrics should be flexible and proportionate and practicable, and as such can be agreed through the Terms of Reference for the Community Safety Working Group.

a) Accommodation

2.3.6 Suffolk Constabulary consider that they *require appropriately sized and serviced accommodation to be delivered onsite by SZC Co for its officers. The specification for this accommodation needs to be set out in the Deed of Obligation.*

2.3.7 In terms of issues raised in relation to details of the on-site security and team and designated office space for Suffolk Constabulary, the SRP reads: "*Designated office space for the SC on-site team (lockable and secure) on the main development site and the accommodation campus, as required, including IT access (to the Sizewell C network and SC intranet, as required); access passes and the right to unescorted access to the SC on-site team based on the main development site; these will also permit access to the accommodation campus.*"

b) Transport / AILs

2.3.8 Suffolk Constabulary consider that an AILs Strategy needs to be secured through the Deed of Obligation and provides details of how such an AILs Strategy may operate.

2.3.9 SZC Co. notes that the proposed management of AILs is set out in the **Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)** [REP2-054], which is appended to the Deed of Obligation. The CTMP is a live document and can be refined with the approval of the Transport Review Group (TRG). It has been agreed that Suffolk Constabulary will sit on the TRG and will have voting rights and therefore should there be a need to make any refinements to the AIL strategy, then this would be agreed through the TRG. It is therefore not considered necessary to duplicate the AIL strategy within the Deed of Obligation.

c) **Resourcing for Meeting Attendance**

2.3.10 Suffolk Constabulary consider that it *should receive funding in relation to preparation for and attendance at meetings of the Community Safety Working Group (as is provided for the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service and the East of England Ambulance Service Trust).*

2.3.11 SZC Co consider that resourcing is being provided to the Suffolk Constabulary for a dedicated Sizewell C team, including those officers who will prepare for and attend meetings of the Community Safety Working Group. This differs from the other emergency services where dedicated resourcing is not being provided, such that this additional funding is required.

2.3.12 As set out above, SZC Co. has agreed that one representative to be nominated by Suffolk Constabulary will be a member of the Transport Review Group.

2.3.13 Resourcing is being provided to the Suffolk Constabulary for a dedicated Sizewell C team, including the officer who will prepare for and attend meetings of the Transport Review Group. No additional funding is required.

Financial Contributions

a) **Introduction / Overview**

2.3.14 SZC Co has been working with Suffolk Constabulary over several years and has funded the Constabulary's engagement and the development of a crime model by Stantec. SZC Co understands that community safety is a major local concern and is committed to providing the additional resources necessary to mitigate any effects from its non-home based (NHB) workforce.

2.3.15 SZC Co has endeavoured to reach an agreement with Suffolk Constabulary but unfortunately, the Constabulary have been unwilling or unable to

address the very serious concerns that SZC Co has raised about the Stantec model which underpins Suffolk Constabulary's approach to defining mitigation.

b) Evidence for Impacts

- 2.3.16 As set out in previous submissions (see **Chapter 16** of the Applicant's **Comments on Written Representations** [[REP3-042](#)]), the Stantec model is generating an estimate of crime incidents that is over three times the observed data from Hinkley Point C (HPC). Given that the HPC NHB construction workforce will be very similar to the Sizewell C NHB construction workforce (and in many cases, the very same individuals) this is implausible.
- 2.3.17 SZC Co acknowledges that Suffolk Constabulary have raised ways in which the HPC data may be under-reporting incidents, but there is no evidence that these issues are arising or that they would lead to the real HPC numbers being three times higher. Again, as set out in SZC Co's previous submissions (see **Chapter 16** of the Applicant's **Comments on Written Representations** [[REP3-042](#)]) there is no evidence of a background increase in crime around HPC.
- 2.3.18 In SZC Co's view, the real evidence of workforce impacts provides a sound basis for estimating the likely impacts of a very similar workforce and Suffolk Constabulary is wrong to dismiss it on the basis of potential theoretical problems with how the HPC data is collected. Suffolk Constabulary has unfortunately dismissed this evidence and has not meaningfully engaged with SZC Co on it.
- 2.3.19 Instead, the Constabulary's request for resources comes directly from the Stantec model. SZC Co has raised a number of issues about the model that neither Suffolk Constabulary nor Stantec have addressed. These include:
- a) It takes no account of the mitigation SZC Co. is proposing and which is known (from HPC) to be effective; and
 - b) It is missing other important variables – age and gender are not the only things that matter – and excluding them significantly skews the results.
- 2.3.20 In particular, it excludes the effects of repeat offenders and groups with characteristics that are not shared by the Sizewell C workforce.

- 2.3.21 Crime is not randomly distributed across the population. The Stantec model acknowledges this by controlling for age and gender, but it is missing other key information. For example, a relatively small number of individuals account for a large number of crimes. The Stantec model does not take account of this. It assumes that if there are 100 incidents involving 25 year old men and there are 1,000 25 year old men than each 25 year old man has a 10% chance of being involved in an incident. This is simply incorrect – a large number of those incidents will be accounted for by a small number of 25 year old men and the chances of a 25 year old male Sizewell C worker being involved in an incident will be significantly less than 10%.
- 2.3.22 Since Suffolk Constabulary shared the Stantec model at the end of 2020, SZC Co has repeatedly raised these fundamental concerns about how the model works but Suffolk Constabulary has not engaged in detail on any of them. As a result, the model has not been amended to address these issues and therefore unfortunately does not produce reliable estimates for likely impacts.
- 2.3.23 Suffolk Constabulary continues to rely on the model and ignore the evidence from HPC and the effects of mitigation. In their latest correspondence, Suffolk Constabulary have again requested the resourcing that comes directly from the model – seeking 97 one-year full-time equivalent (FTE) roles at a cost of £125,008 per Sergeant £99,515 per PC to a total cost of £10,034,121.50.
- 2.3.24 SZC Co believes that both the number of FTE roles and the associated costs are too high.
- c) **Number of Roles**
- 2.3.25 SZC Co is content that the Stantec model is generating a plausible impact in terms of non-crime incidents. These make up approximately 25% of the Suffolk Constabulary request for resources.
- 2.3.26 The remaining 75% is for crime incidents. As set out above, Suffolk Constabulary is assuming these will be three times higher than for HPC. If the HPC levels are repeated at Sizewell C, the total resource need (for crime and non-crime incidents) would be around 47 one-year FTE roles, just under half of Suffolk Constabulary’s request.
- 2.3.27 However, SZC Co acknowledges Suffolk Constabulary’s concerns about the HPC data and that the Constabulary’s preferred structure of the resource into a dedicated Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) and wider police response teams means that more roles may be required.

2.3.28 Suffolk Constabulary has indicated that the SNT requires around 44 one-year FTE roles. SZC Co has proposed a further 28 FTE roles to support wider police response. This provides for a total of 72 one-year FTEs and is sufficient to deal with crime incidents twice as high as those reported at HPC.

d) **Costs**

2.3.29 The police’s funding request is based on the NPCC model and includes allowances for various overheads. SZC Co does not think this is the appropriate model – the NPCC model was not designed to support cost modelling for long term policing mitigation of a large infrastructure project and is designed for:

- The policing of events;
- The provision of goods and services to third parties;
- Charging for services to Government Agencies; and
- The provision of mutual aid to other police forces.

2.3.30 In SZC Co’s view, overheads should not apply if not at the point of service (so no extra weighting should be applied for custody facilities / administration / intelligence functions), and only direct costs and direct overheads should be included. SZC Co should not be paying for infrastructure that is already established and required by the police to meet its existing statutory obligations, as is included in the application of NPCC rates.

2.3.31 SZC Co therefore believes that more reasonable benchmarks should be used.

2.3.32 The average officer cost of a Sergeant in the London Metropolitan Police in 2019 was £70,508 and a PC £65,310. Along with the direct costs relating to the payment of personnel and pensions; these costs include associated on-costs per officer inclusive of training and equipment. These are two years old, but include a London weighting so remain a reasonable benchmark. Using these numbers gives the following:

Cost per FTE using Metropolitan Police Benchmarks

Role	FTE	Cost per FTE	TOTAL
Sergeant	13	£70,508	£916,604
Other	59	£65,310	£3,853,290

TOTAL	£4,769,894
-------	------------

e) Sizewell C Position

2.3.33 For the reasons set out above, SZC Co has not yet been able to agree funding with Suffolk Constabulary. The Constabulary request is not justified by any reliable evidence and is so far out of line with the observed impacts from the same workforce at HPC that it cannot be considered reasonable.

2.3.34 SZC Co has made its own calculations based on the Stantec model, but using HPC incident rates. This produces a need for 47 one-year FTE roles.

2.3.35 However, SZC Co acknowledges there is some uncertainty and that Suffolk Constabulary would seek to structure its resource differently. SZC Co has therefore made an offer of £8m to Suffolk Constabulary. SZC Co believes this is sufficient to cover all likely significant effects and includes a large element of contingency to deal with impacts being significantly higher than those observed at HPC.

2.4 Temporary and Permanent Coastal Defence Feature Plans – Not for Approval

2.4.1 The following parties made comments on the temporary and permanent coastal defence feature plans [[REP5-015](#)]:

- ESC’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)];
- SCC’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-049](#)]; and
- RSPB and SWT’s Deadline 5 [[REP5-165](#)] and Deadline 6 submissions [[REP6-046](#)].

2.4.2 At Deadline 2 a report describing the design of the sea defences [[REP2-116](#)]. An update to this report detailing the latest design (as shown in [[REP5-015](#)]) will be provided at Deadline 8. The comments of the ESC, SCC and RSPB/SWT will be addressed and/or responded to in the update.

2.4.3 SZC Co. notes the comments that have been made by the various stakeholders in respect of the Coastal Defence Design Report and the Plans, where further clarification, confirmation and new information has been requested. These are currently being considered and a full response will be provided at Deadline 8.

2.5 Main Development Site Permanent and Temporary Beach Landing Facility and SSSI Crossing Plans

2.5.1 The following parties made comments on the Main Development Site permanent and temporary beach land facility and SSSI crossing plans [REP5-009 and REP5-010]:

- ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)];
- EA's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-036](#)];
- NE's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-042](#)];
- RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-046](#)].

2.5.2 Stakeholder concerns in relation to the proposed drainage pipe that would under-hang the temporary construction deck of the SSSI crossing are accepted. This drain has been designed-out and updated plans have been submitted at Deadline 7.

2.6 Two Village Bypass Plans for Approval and Plans Not for Approval

2.6.1 ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)] provided comments on the Two Village Bypass plans for approval [REP5-020 and REP5-021] and plans not for approval [[REP5-018](#) and [REP5-019](#)]:

2.6.2 ESC requested that the plans for approval show the bat 'hop-overs'. ESC also sought clarification on how the bat 'hop-overs' will be secured in the DCO.

2.6.3 The **Second Environmental Statement Addendum** Illustrative Masterplan for the Two village bypass (Figures 3.2.3 – 3.2.5) [[REP5-066](#)] (electronic pages 6-8) show the location of the proposed planting to encourage bat hop-overs. Bat 'hop-overs' will be shown on the plans at the detailed design stage. The **Mitigation Route Map** (Doc Ref. 8.12(D)) sets out at ref: 2VBP-TE14 that the bat hop-overs will be incorporated in the detailed design of the Two village bypass, and that this detailed design is secured by Requirement 22 (highway works), Requirement 23 (AD landscape planting) and Requirement 22A (AD landscape works) in Schedule 2 of the **draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).

2.6.4 The **Associated Development Design Principles** (Doc Ref. 8.3(B)) set the design principles that will be used to develop the detailed design of the

two village bypass. Table 3.4 of the Associated Development Design Principles (landscape design principle ref 8) for the two village bypass states:

“Crossing points (bat hop-overs) to facilitate the passage of bats across the road alignment will be incorporated if key foraging or commuting routes are identified. Bat hop-overs will comprise tall hedgerow planting where the hedgerow meets the road to encourage bats to pass up and over the newly constructed road.”

2.6.5 The **Associated Development Design Principles** (Doc Ref. 8.3(B)) are secured by Requirement 22 in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).

2.7 Sizewell Link Road Plans for Approval and Plans Not for Approval

2.7.1 ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)] contained comments on the **Sizewell Link Road Plans for Approval** [REP5-024 to REP5-026] and Plans Not for Approval [[REP5-022](#) and [REP5-023](#)].

2.7.2 As mentioned above, ESC requested that the plans for approval show the bat 'hop-overs'. ESC also sought clarification on how the bat 'hop-overs' will be secured in the DCO.

2.7.3 The **Second Environmental Statement Addendum** Illustrative Masterplan for the Sizewell Link Road (Figures 4.2.3 – 4.2.8) [[REP5-068](#)] (electronic pages 6-11) show the location of the proposed planting to encourage bat hop-overs. Bat 'hop-overs' will be shown on the plans at the detailed design stage. The **Mitigation Route Map** (Doc Ref. 8.12(D)) sets out at ref: SLR-TE10 that the bat hop-overs will be incorporated in the detailed design of the Sizewell Link Road, and that this detailed design is secured by Requirement 22 (highway works), Requirement 23 (AD landscape planting) and Requirement 22A (AD landscape works) in Schedule 2 of the **draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).

2.7.4 The **Associated Development Design Principles** (Doc Ref. 8.3(B)) set the design principles that will be used to develop the detailed design of the Sizewell Link Road. Table 3.5 of the **Associated Development Design Principles** (landscape design principle ref 8) for the Sizewell Link Road states:

“Crossing points (bat hop-overs) to facilitate the passage of bats across the road alignment will be incorporated if key foraging or commuting routes are identified. Bat hop-overs will comprise tall hedgerow planting where the

hedgerow meets the road to encourage bats to pass up and over the newly constructed road.”

2.7.5 The Associated Development Design Principles are secured by Requirement 22 in Schedule 2 of the **draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).

2.8 Sizewell Link Road Description of Development

2.8.1 SCC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-049](#)] contained comments on the **Sizewell Link Road Description of Development** [[REP5-058](#)] submitted as part of the Accepted Changes (August 2021).

2.8.2 SCC has sought clarity as to when the East Suffolk Line (ESL) bridge will be built. SCC has also stated that the Description of Development does not separate the Middleton Moor link from the Sizewell link road, so it is difficult to understand at what stage sections will be available for use.

2.8.3 To confirm, the ESL bridge is expected to be completed in late 2023. In relation to the question on the Middleton Moor link, all off-line works associated with Middleton Moor Link Road will be constructed in line with Sizewell link road to assist with cut and fill balance. The online section, namely Middleton Moor Link Roundabout and associated approaches from the B1122, will be constructed following the opening of the Sizewell link road. This will ensure that all SZC traffic and local traffic have a suitable, short diversion around the tie in works.

2.8.4 SCC has sought further details on how the haul roads within the Sizewell link road site will operate to allow for the movement of fill between the Sizewell link road, two village bypass and the Main Development Site. With regards to this comment, the use of haul roads along the Sizewell link road will provide an advanced means of access west to east, i.e. from the A12 to the B1122 south east tie in. Following the construction of the ESL over-bridge in late 2023, the majority of the Sizewell link road traffic will be removed from the B1122 by utilising the haul roads. These haul roads will either use completed sections of the Sizewell link road or temporary haul routes constructed parallel to Sizewell link road within the order limits. These will be temporary in nature and phased so as not to impede the construction of the main Sizewell link road works.

2.8.5 This strategy will allow for the movement of material within Sizewell link road from the east (general area of cutting) to the west side (general area of fill) of ESL and for the movement of material along the Sizewell link road to the Main Development Site from the two village bypass, Sizewell link road and other associated developments without adding HGVs to the B1122.

2.8.6 SCC has requested clarity on whether vehicle totals at paragraph 2.4.20 of the Description of Development allow for movement of fill to main site. Refer to SZC Co.'s response to **ExQ2 TT.2.14** (Doc. Ref. 9.71) on this matter.

2.9 Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan

2.9.1 The following parties made comments on the **Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan** (CPMMP) [[REP5-059](#)]:

- ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)]; and
- RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-046](#)].

2.9.2 An update to the **CPMMP** [[REP5-059](#)] is planned for Deadline 10 to incorporate all of the additional SCDF modelling work and all stakeholder comments will be addressed and/or responded to in that version. The Deadline 10 submission will be the final version for comment in the Examination but consultation with the Sizewell C Marine Technical Forum, including ESC and RSPB, will continue to finalise the plan for approval under Requirement 7A and Marine Licence Condition 17.

2.10 Main Development Site Design and Access Statement

2.10.1 ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)] contained comments on the **Main Development Site Design and Access Statement** [REP5-071, REP5-072 and REP5-074].

2.10.2 SZC Co. notes the comments made by ESC on the references made to NPPF and the local designation of Special Landscape Areas and the need to update the document to reflect the current status. This will be updated in the final version of the **Design and Access Statement** [REP5-071, REP5-072 and REP5-074] to be submitted at Deadline 10.

2.10.3 With regards to ESC's comments relating to the gradation effect in the turbine hall cladding, SZC Co. refers ESC to the response to **ExQ2 LI.2.13** (Doc Ref. 9.71) which confirms some proposed amendments to Design Principle 80 of the **Design and Access Statement** [REP5-071, REP5-072 and REP5-074]. These amends confirm that the colour palette and panel profile shall be discussed and agreed with East Suffolk Council as part of pre-submission discussions.

2.10.4 SZC Co. notes all other comments made by ESC on the alterations made to the **Design and Access Statement** [REP5-071, REP5-072 and REP5-074].

2.11 Two Village Bypass Landscape and Ecology Management Plan

2.11.1 The following parties made comments on the **Two Village Bypass Landscape and Ecological Management Plan** [[REP5-077](#)]:

- ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)];
- EA's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-036](#)];
- RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-046](#)];

2.11.2 SZC Co. note the response from ESC at Deadline 6 [[REP6-032](#)] and will provide an updated **Sizewell Link Road Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** [[REP5-077](#)] at Deadline 8 to address these concerns. The approach is set out briefly below.

2.11.3 SZC Co notes that the EA has welcomed the commitment to provide mitigation for the loss of floodplain grazing meadow from the construction of the two village bypass, and the creation of more diverse and higher value habitats. The proposed approach to creating higher diversity grasslands is likely to include some shallow of removal of topsoils, to reduce soil fertility and then sowing with a suitable native sward. The alternative would be to take regular hay cuts of the existing sward (with removal), to reduce soil fertility over time and allow natural re-colonisation by other species of the sward (e.g. where poached by cattle). The approach to creating wetland channels within the floodplain grassland would be aligned with the principles of the approach being undertaken to enhance existing watercourses on the Sizewell link road, albeit that the new wetland channels to be created in the River Alde valley will not serve an active drainage function. The general approach will be to create carefully profiled ditches at least some of which link to existing surface water channels. Natural colonisation of bank margins will be the preferred approach to habitat establishment.

2.11.4 SZC Co. notes the response from RSPB and SWT at Deadline 6 [[REP6-046](#)] but do not intend to include reference to bird boxes within the updated LEMP.

2.12 Rights of Way and Access Strategy

2.12.1 SZC Co. notes the comments made in ESC's Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-138](#)] and SCC's Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-172](#)] regarding the **Rights of Way and Access Strategy**. SZC Co. seeks to address their

comments in the next iteration of the **Rights of Way and Access Strategy** at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 6.3 15l(C)), where practicable.

2.12.2 SZC Co. has provided substantial enhancements to the recreational resources in the area as set out the SZC Co.'s response to **ExQ1 AR.1.8** [[REP2-100](#)].

2.12.3 SZC Co. notes that SCC does not agree with the location of FP21 and discussions are ongoing regarding its location. SZC Co. has sought to address this concern by the additional text included within Sheet 6 of the **Rights of Way and Access plans** [[REP5-008](#)] which states:

“The precise alignment of the permanent footpath commencing at PCF1/4 and terminating at PCF1/5 will accord with the layout and scale details of the hard coastal defence feature to be submitted and approved pursuant to Requirement 12B.”

2.12.4 This ensures that SCC will have to agree the location of FP21 in accordance with Requirement 12B. Discussions are ongoing.

2.12.5 SZC Co. note the comment regarding the link between the Bridleway 19 and Kenton Hills. As the crossing point will not be signalled, the link is not being provided until the main site access is available and the traffic flows along Lover's lane are reduced. SZC Co. notes that the crossing will provide much improved west-east access and provide an off-road link into Kenton Hills from the south, improving access. Once operational, this link will allow an off-road route from Leiston to Sizewell beach via Kenton Hills.

2.12.6 SZC Co. has provided further information within SZC Co.'s **Response to the Local Impact Report** [[REP3-045](#)] regarding the off-road link between the northern end of Bridleway 19 and Eastbridge and within the **Deadline 3 Submission - 9.30 Comments on Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) - Volume 1 - SZC Co. Responses - Revision 1.0** [[REP3-046](#)]

2.13 Evaluation Fieldwork Reports

2.13.1 SZC Co. notes the comments in SCC's Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-172](#)] on the evaluation fieldwork reports submitted at Deadline 3 [[REP3-017](#)], [[REP3-020](#)], [[REP3-021](#)] and welcomes SCC's proposal to provide detailed comments directly to the heritage team and consultants. SZC Co. will work with SCCAS to address all comments to their satisfaction, ahead of submission of the reports into the Historic Environment Record (HER).

-
- 2.13.2 SZC Co. welcomes SCC's approval of the **Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation** – Revision 2.0. [\[REP3-022\]](#).
- 2.14 **Sizewell Link Road Landscape and Ecology Management Plan**
- 2.14.1 The following parties made comments on the **Sizewell Link Road Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (SLR LEMP)** [\[REP5-076\]](#):
- ESC's Deadline 6 submission [\[REP6-032\]](#);
 - EA's Deadline 6 submission [\[REP6-035\]](#);
 - RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [\[REP6-046\]](#).
- 2.14.2 SZC Co. notes the response from ESC at Deadline 6 [\[REP6-032\]](#) and will provide an updated **SLR LEMP** at Deadline 8 to address these concerns.
- 2.14.3 SZC Co. note the response from the EA at Deadline 6 [\[REP6-036\]](#). As noted in the previous version of the **SLR LEMP** [\[REP5-076\]](#) an updated version will be provided that also includes details to measures to mitigate and compensate for the loss of watercourses at the proposed ditch crossings. This will reflect the measures outlined in [\[REP6-024\]](#) (**Appendix C**).
- 2.14.4 SZC Co. note the response from RSPB and SWT at Deadline 6 [\[REP6-046\]](#) but do not intend to include bird boxes within the **SLR LEMP**.
- 2.15 **Code of Construction Practice**
- 2.15.1 The following parties made comments on the **Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)** [\[REP5-079\]](#):
- ESC's Deadline 6 submission [\[REP6-032\]](#);
 - SCC's Deadline 6 submission [\[REP6-049\]](#); and
 - the Examining Authority [\[PD-038\]](#).
- 2.15.2 An updated **CoCP** (Doc Ref. 8.11(D)) is submitted at Deadline 7. This provides updates in line with the comments received.
- 2.15.3 A response to the Examining Authority's comments on the **CoCP** is also provided within the **SZC Co's Response to ExA's Commentary on the draft DCO and Other Documents** (Doc Ref. 9.72).

2.16 Mitigation Route Map

2.16.1 The following parties made comments on the **Mitigation Route Map** [[REP5-081](#)]:

- ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)].

2.16.2 An updated **Mitigation Route Map** (Doc Ref. 8.12(D)) is submitted at Deadline 7. It has been updated:

- in line with some of ESC's comments received at Deadline 6;
- to include updates made for Changes 16-18, which were accepted into examination by the Examining Authority on 10 August 2021; and
- to include cross-references to ES paragraph numbers as requested by the Examining Authority in ExQ2 Bio.2.12.

2.16.3 SZC Co. has noted ESC's comments on the **Mitigation Route Map** (Doc Ref. 8.12(D)) made at Deadline 6 [[REP6-032](#), electronic page 58] and some minor amendments have been made to it as a result.

2.16.4 The majority of ESC's comments were matters to be noted rather than responded to, or they cross-referenced where further information had been sought. SZC Co.'s second set of responses to ESC and SCC's Requests for Information [[REP6-032](#)] is submitted at Deadline 7 as **Appendix 11B** to the **Statement of Common Ground between SZC Co. and ESC/SCC** (Doc Ref 9.10.12 B).

2.16.5 SZC Co. notes that there were multiple references in ESC's Deadline 6 comments on the **Mitigation Route Map** (Doc Ref. 8.12(D)) to the absence of a reference to 'good practice' in the latest revision of the **CoCP** as it was that time, the Deadline 5 version [[REP5-078](#)]. In ESC's view, the absence of a reference to 'good practice' created an inconsistency between the **Mitigation Route Map** (Doc Ref. 8.12(D)) and the **CoCP** [[REP5-078](#)]. However, the references to 'good practice' are contained in **Table 3.1** in both **Part B** and **Part C** of the **CoCP** [[REP5-078](#), [REP5-078](#), electronic pages 52 and 157], so no amendment to the **Mitigation Route Map** (Doc Ref. 8.12(D)) is necessary on this point.

2.17 Part 1 Further Proposed Changes to the DCO Application

2.17.1 ESC's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)] provided a copy of ESC's response to SZC Co.'s non-statutory consultation in respect of proposed changes to Lover's Lane, the Main Development Site access works, Two

Village Bypass and the Sizewell Link Road, which are referred to as Changes 16 to 18. SZC Co. commented on ESC's consultation response in the **Consultation Report Third Addendum** [REP5-041 to REP5-044].

2.17.2 Since Deadline 6, Changes 16-18 have been accepted for examination by the Examining Authority [[PD-039](#)].

2.18 Wet Woodland Strategy

2.18.1 Natural England provided the following comments [[REP6-042](#)] on the **Wet Woodland Strategy** [[REP1-020](#)]:

“i) The quantity of habitat provided from the outset is still less than that lost, with 0.7ha still proposed to be provided post construction which contradicts guidance that states habitats should be established before loss (DEFRA, 2012) not 10-12 years hence.”

“ii) Test of success measures should include monitoring of invertebrate communities; the strategy infers more detail on this will be provided in the Wet Woodland Plan and it is still not clear whether this will be provided within the examination timescale.”

“iii) Many important details which are crucial to understanding whether the strategy is likely to be successful or not have been pushed back to the Environment Review Group and the Wet Woodland Plan and it is still unclear whether or not we will see this information within the Examination. Therefore, we cannot be confident on the likelihood of success of this strategy as a whole.”

2.18.2 In response, it should be noted:

- i) The 0.7ha of wet woodland on site, will be created at the commencement of construction in the first winter.
- ii) The Wet Woodland Plan will include monitoring of invertebrates and will be submitted at Deadline 8.

2.18.3 iii) The locations and areas of the wet woodland are shown on the **Fen Meadow Plan** [[REP6-026](#)] submitted at Deadline 6 and will, along with further details, be included within the Wet Woodland Plan which will be submitted at Deadline 8.

2.18.4 The likely success of the strategy is reflected in the habitat multiplier of 1:1, from which it is inferred that Natural England has a high degree of confidence in the habitat being successfully delivered to the required

standard. SZC Co. agrees that creating wet woodlands is relatively straightforward process although it will clearly take time, particularly given Natural England's preference to use natural successional processes, which are reflected in the **Wet Woodland Strategy** [REP1-020].

2.19 Fen Meadow Reports

2.19.1 Natural England [REP6-042], ESC [REP5-138] and ESIDB's [REP5-146] commented on the Fen Meadow Reports at Deadline 5. The **Fen Meadow Plan Report 2** will be submitted at Deadline 8 and will consider these comments where necessary.

2.20 Minsmere Monitoring and Mitigation Plan

2.20.1 The following parties made comments on the Minsmere Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [REP5-105]:

- NE's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-042]; and
- RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-046].

2.20.2 A detailed response to the points raised is provided in **Appendix A**.

2.21 White fronted goose survey report

2.21.1 A response to the comments raised in the RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-046] will be submitted at Deadline 8.

2.22 Monitoring and Mitigation Plan for Sandlings (Central) and Alde, Ore and Butley Estuaries European Sites

2.22.1 A detailed response to the points raised in RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-046] is provided in **Appendix A**.

2.23 Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan

2.23.1 The following parties made comments on the **Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan** [REP5-088]:

- ESC's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-032];
- EA's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-036];
- NE's Deadline 6 submission [REP6-042];

- RSPB and SWT’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-046](#)].
- 2.23.2 An updated **Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan** [[REP5-088](#)] will be submitted at Deadline 8.
- 2.24 **Natterjack Toad Licence Method Statement**
- 2.24.1 The RSPB and SWT’s provided comments on the draft **Natterjack Toad Licence Method Statement** [[REP5-053](#)] at Deadline 6 [[REP6-046](#)]. A response to the three main concerns raised is provided below.
- 2.24.2 The RSPB and SWT make reference to surveys to be undertaken in 2021. SZC Co. can confirm that no surveys have been undertaken or are proposed during 2021.
- 2.24.3 SZC Co. has reviewed Figure B [[REP5-053](#)] and can confirm that the perimeter fence is shown to extend within the 10m buffer. This is an error and an updated figure has been included within this report (see **Appendix M**).
- 2.24.4 The RSPB and SWT have requested that monitoring is continued annually rather than biennially following the cease of operation of the WMZ. SZC Co. does not consider this to be necessary and no changes are proposed to the **TEMMP** [[REP5-088](#)].
- 2.25 **Main Development Site Bat Roost Survey**
- 2.25.1 ESC [[REP5-138](#)] and RSPB and SWT [[REP5-165](#)] provided comments on the **Bat Roost Surveys in Trees - Main Development Site** [[REP3-035](#)] within their Deadline 5 submissions.
- 2.25.2 A detailed response to these comments will be provided at Deadline 8.
- 2.26 **Aldhurst Farm Technical Note**
- 2.26.1 SZC Co. have provided a response to RSPB and SWT’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-046](#)] in **Appendix A**.
- 2.27 **Statement of Common Ground with Network Rail**
- 2.27.1 The following parties made comments on the **Statement of Common Ground with Network Rail** [[REP5-095](#)]:
- ESC’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)];

2.27.2 ESC raised 3 specific points at page 89 of its Deadline 6 submission. Each of these points were discussed in detail at Issue Specific Hearing 8 and, therefore, only the principle of SZC. Co's position is summarised below:

- Delivery of the Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy (RNMS)

The RNMS is submitted in draft to the Examination [AS-258] and secured by Requirement 25 of the draft DCO, which prevents the operation of Sizewell C freight trains along Work No. 4 between 11pm and 6am until the detailed RNMS has, following consultation with Network Rail, been submitted to and approved by ESC. For reasons explained at the ISH, SZC. Co is confident in the delivery of the components of the RNMS but, in any event, ESC's concern is addressed by the terms of the requirement. SZC Co.'s response to **ExQ1 NV.1.11** [REP2-100] provides more detail.

- Level crossing alarms

Issues in relation to level crossing warning alarms were addressed in response to **ExQ1 NV.1.32** [REP2-100], which confirmed that Network Rail's standard position is that the level of alarms can be adjusted to suit local circumstances. Further engagement with Network Rail has established that there is a general principle that level crossing klaxons will be reviewed on a site-by-site basis and that Network Rail will work with SZC. Co and local communities to ensure that the level of alarms is acceptable, whilst still providing suitable audibility for their main purpose.

With regard to horns from trains, Network Rail advises that there is a general principle that locomotive horns are not sounded at crossings from about 22:00 to 06:00 as limited use is expected of crossings during the night-time period. Again, the detail of this will be reviewed with Network Rail as part of SZC. Co.'s continuing engagement.

- Enhancing track on the East Suffolk Line

As explained at the ISH, SZC. Co is working closely with Network Rail to seek to deliver track enhancements where surveys identify these to be beneficial on the East Suffolk line in advance of train operations. Whilst SZC. Co does not regard these as necessary to meet policy requirements, it agrees that enhancements in principle would be

beneficial and would also create a legacy benefit for communities on the East Suffolk line. SZC. Co provided an update on the timing of track enhancements at the Issue Specific Hearing.

2.28 Coastal Processes

2.28.1 A number of recurring ‘themes’ have been raised by various stakeholders via written representations including:

- Stop Sizewell C;
- National Trust (received Deadline 3);
- Nick Scarr;
- Bill Parker;
- SCAR;
- Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group;
- Alde & Ore Association;
- Natural England; and
- Environment Agency.

2.28.2 The topics raised are covered in **Appendix B** of this report (“*Coastal Geomorphology topic-based response to Written Representations*”).

2.28.3 Also included in the Written Representation of Stop Sizewell C was a report by Professor Andrew Cooper and Professor Derek Jackson. Professors Copper and Jackson both hold positions at the University of Ulster, but as far as we are aware the report is not affiliated to the university, nor whether the report is the sole work of these two authors. A full response to the Jackson and Cooper report is provided in **Appendix C** of this report (“*Coastal Geomorphology response to Jackson and Cooper Written Representations*”).

2.29 Preliminary Design and Maintenance Requirements for the Sizewell C Soft Coastal Defence Feature

2.29.1 The following parties made comments on the **Preliminary Design and Maintenance requirements for the Sizewell C Soft Coastal Defence Feature** [[REP3-032](#)]:

- ESC’s Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-138](#)];

- RSPB and SWT’s Deadline 3 and Deadline 5 submissions [[REP5-165](#)];
- Natural England’s Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-158](#)]; and
- Environment Agency’s Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-149](#)].

2.29.2 An updated version of the **Preliminary Design and Maintenance Requirements for the Sizewell C Soft Coastal Defence Feature** is submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 9.12(B)), which incorporates the additional **Storm Modelling during decommissioning assessment** (Doc. Ref. 9.31(A)) (see below). This update (Revision 3) will address many of the stakeholder comments for example looking at recharge intervals beyond 2100 and into the decommissioning period; a full response to ESC, MMO, RSPB/SWT and Environment Agency will be provided at Deadline 8.

2.30 Storm Erosion Modelling Report of the Sizewell C Soft Coastal Defence Feature

2.30.1 The following parties made comments on the **Storm Erosion Modelling Report** of the soft coastal defence feature submitted at Deadline 3 [[REP3-048](#)]:

- ESC’s Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-138](#)];
- MMO’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-039](#)];
- RSPB and SWT’s Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-165](#)];
- Environment Agency’s Deadline 5 submission [[REP5-149](#)].

2.30.2 An updated **Storm Erosion Modelling of the Soft Coastal Defence Feature** report (Doc Ref. 9.31(A)) is submitted at Deadline 7, which looks at potential erosion of the SCDF through the decommissioning period. This update (Revision 2) will address many of the stakeholder comments for example looking at recharge intervals beyond 2100; a full response to ESC, MMO, RSPB/SWT and Environment Agency will be provided at Deadline 8.

2.31 Acoustic Fish Deterrent Report

2.31.1 RSPB and SWT made comments at Deadline 6 [[REP6-046](#)] relating to the insurmountable technical challenges of installing and maintaining an

Acoustic Fish Deterrent (AFD) system. The **Environmental Statement** and subsequent submissions on further assessments of impacts on fish [[APP-317](#); [APP-326](#); [AS-238](#); [REP6-028](#) and [REP6-016](#)] demonstrate that Sizewell C operating with a Low Velocity Side Entry (LVSE) intake head and Fish Recovery and Return (FRR) system would not have an adverse impacts on marine or migratory fish and this is reflected in the **shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment** [[APP-145](#)].

2.31.2 Fish Guidance Systems (FGS) Ltd also made a written submission at Deadline 6 in relation to AFD [[REP6-059](#)] and a response is provided below.

2.31.3 FGS Ltd criticise the SZC Co. report as it has drawn heavily on information from Hinkley Point C. This criticism is not accepted. A significant amount of the work which EDF has conducted in relation to the potential to fit AFD system at Hinkley Point C is directly relevant to Sizewell C. It is eminently sensible to draw upon information gathered as a part of that process when considering the potential for an acoustic fish deterrent system at Sizewell. Contrary to the criticism of FGS, EDF has not simply ‘read across’ conclusions reached at Hinkley Point C to Sizewell C. Rather it has used information and understanding gathered through the considerable research and design work at Hinkley Point C and applied that to the conditions at Sizewell C.

2.31.4 FGS is incorrect to state that designs not suitable at Hinkley Point would be suitable at Sizewell C – none would be. For example, the scheme illustrated by FGS Ltd in [REP6-059](#) was not suitable at Hinkley Point C and the challenges also apply at Sizewell in relation to access, maintenance and navigational risk. Furthermore, there is no confidence that the arrangement of AFD units would actually provide the perceived benefit being so far from the intake heads – the arrangement taken forward at Hinkley (before detailed design showed that maintenance presented significant safety concerns) had the AFD units mounted on the intake head itself for that same reason. Although the detail (for example, suggested number of AFD units and layout) may be different at Sizewell, the fundamental issues of concern (relating to large numbers of projectors, underwater cabling and connections and nuclear safety related intake heads) remain valid at SZC;

2.31.5 Further, although the specific site conditions (for example tidal velocities, tidal range, turbidity etc) at Sizewell are different (and typically not as severe as Hinkley Point) they remain above the maximum criteria for operability of ROVs or diver access. For example, FGS Ltd questions the current velocities at Sizewell and say they are significantly lower than Hinkley Point, however even at 1 m/s they are significantly greater than speeds suitable for working divers.

- 2.31.6 FGS Ltd make several statements about ‘*reaching out*’ and ‘*simple calls*’ to unspecified ROV manufacturers but provide no evidence to support these statements. For the **SZC Co. Acoustic Fish Deterrent Report** (Doc. Ref. 9.57) [[REP5-123](#)], the Applicant drew on proofs of evidence provided at the Hinkley Point C WDA appeal inquiry which cited statements from an off-shore supplier of ROVs (Oceaneering Ltd.) and an expert on ROV technology (Brian Allen of Rovco Ltd). These statements are equally applicable to Sizewell C since they were made in May 2021, relate to the same AFD and intake head designs and would be operating in not dissimilar conditions. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary SZC Co, does not accept that ROV technology is available that is suitable for the installation and maintenance of an AFD system at Sizewell C (as described in [[REP5-123](#)]).
- 2.31.7 FGS Ltd make the statement that installation of an AFD system is considered best practice by the Environment Agency (see [Turnpenny et al 2010](#)), however, later Environment Agency report ([Scorey and Teague, 2019](#)) demonstrates that such systems have never been installed in offshore coastal environments. So, while SZC acknowledges the benefits and sustainability of AFD in shore-based abstraction points, it does not accept that best practice necessarily applies in circumstances where AFD has never been used in practice. Furthermore, in consultation, the Environment Agency has conceded that, while it still considers the concept of AFDs to be best practice, it is not able to assess whether it is safe to install one in offshore locations.
- 2.31.8 SZC Co is pleased to see that having been corrected at ISH 7, Fish Guidance Systems Ltd has modified its language using the phrase ‘*business decision*’ not to install an AFD system instead of a ‘*commercial decision*’. This is correct and it is entirely proper for SZC Co. to weigh up all evidence available and make decisions based on that evidence, and safety to staff must take priority.
- 2.31.9 In conclusion, FGS Ltd has provided no new information, nor evidence to support the assertion, that an AFD system can be safely installed, operated and maintained at Sizewell C. SZC Co. maintains its position as reported at Deadline 5.
- 2.18 **Comments on Councils’ Local Impact Report**
- 2.18.1 ESC and SCC both responded at Deadline 5 [[REP5-138](#) and [REP5-172](#) respectively] on SZC Co.’s **Comments on the Council’s Local Impact Report** [[REP3-044](#)]. SZC Co. has reviewed the responses and provided subsequent responses or updates below, focusing on where a response is

considered helpful to the Examination and in acknowledgement that matters have progressed since the Deadline 3 submission.

b) Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

- 2.18.2 The Natural Environment Fund has now been agreed with ESC and SCC.
- 2.18.3 As stated in SZC Co.'s comments on the Local Impact Report, an Estate Wide Management Plan has been developed and is submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 9.88). It provides further commentary on the habitats across the EDF Energy estate, including those defined in all of the named plans, and explains how these will be managed.
- 2.18.4 In addition, SZC Co. has also produced a planting phasing strategy which provides information on the indicative timing of these works in relation to the construction phase programme identified in **Chapter 3 (Description of Construction)** of the **Environmental Statement**, this is provided in **Appendix D** of this report.

c) Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity

- 2.18.5 As stated in SZC Co.'s comments on the Local Impact Report, an updated Reptile Mitigation Strategy has been produced and is submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 9.88).
- 2.18.6 Responses to ESC's comments on the bat impacts raised in the LIR REP5-138 are provided in **Appendix E**.

d) Chapter 12: Historic Environment

- 2.18.7 In terms of ESC's comments in [\[REP5-138\]](#) please see **SZC Co.'s Response to Second Written Questions** (Doc Ref. 9.71) HE.2.7 and HE.2.10, which provide an updated position on issues raised with regard to specific assets.
- 2.18.8 In terms of Coastguard Cottages, while ESC and SZC Co. have different views on the significance of the effect, the parties have agreed that it would be appropriate to offer a contribution for National Trust to undertake enhanced interpretation of Coastguard Cottages, including renewal and updating of the information panels on the second floor of the café. ESC has advised that this interpretation should focus on consideration of the asset in its wider context as one of a chain of coastguard lookouts along the Suffolk coast, known for its shifting sandbanks and gravel spits.

e) Chapter 13: Archaeology

2.18.9 In terms of SCC's comments in [REP5-172], SZC Co. is pleased to confirm that the **Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation [REP3-022]** and Requirement 3: Archaeology and Peat (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)) are now agreed.

2.18.10 Please see **SZC Co.'s Response to Second Written Questions** (Doc Ref. 9.71) ExQ2 HE.2.6 in terms of the Peat Strategy.

f) Chapters 15 and 16: Transport

2.18.11 In Section 9.29 of its response to SZC Co.'s **Comments on the Council's Local Impact Report [REP3-044]** at Deadline 5, ESC states that it has only commented on chapters for which ESC is the lead authority. There are no comments from ESC therefore on Chapters 15 and 16 on Traffic and Transport. ESC also states that it has no comments on the **Consolidated Transport Assessment – Revision 4.0 [REP4-005]**, and defers comment to SCC as the local highway authority.

2.18.12 In its response to SZC Co.'s **Comments on the Council's Local Impact Report [REP3-044]** at Deadline 5, SCC provided detailed comments on Chapter 15 and 16 (Traffic and Transport) of SZC Co.'s response. SZC Co. is continuing regular (weekly) detailed discussions with SCC on all of these topics. Through these discussions both parties are progressing towards resolution of the key areas of concern. Rather than provide individual responses to each topic in this response, SZC Co. considers that it is more helpful to respond directly to SCC's key areas of concern, as set out in para. 13 – 16 of its response on Chapters 15 and 16.

2.18.13 SCC highlights four key areas of concern as set out below. SZC Co.'s response at Deadline 7 is provided alongside each.

SCC's key area of concern as summarised in its response [REP5-172] to SZC Co.'s Comments on the Council's Local Impact Report.	SZC Co.'s comments at Deadline 7.
Para. 13. While SCC is generally satisfied with the traffic modelling and assessment of environmental impacts, we are awaiting final reports on a number of issues before reaching full agreement on these matters.	SCC's comment is understood to be primarily related to the on-going discussions to agree the transport effects within the Environmental Statement [APP-198] and Environmental Statement Addendum [AS-181] . SZC Co. has been working closely with SCC to agree the methodology and results. The revised assessment forms part of the fourth ES Addendum, which will be

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	submitted to the Examination at Deadline 7.
<p>Para. 14. While broad agreement has been reached on the management plans, a key remaining matter is controls and monitoring. SCC is in discussions with SZC Co. on these matters. SCC has identified an issue with process by which the Construction Workers Travel Plan transfers to the Operational Travel Plan. Discussions are in progress to clarify this transition process.</p>	<p>As noted in SCC’s response at Deadline 5, discussions are continuing between SZC Co. and SCC to reach agreement on the proposed controls and monitoring measures which will underpin the Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-054] and Construction Worker Travel Plan [REP2-055]. Recent discussions have yielded significant progress in reducing the number of points of difference. A revised CTMP and CWTP will be submitted at Deadline 8, incorporating agreed changes.</p> <p>As stated in the Written submissions responding to actions arising from ISH3 [REP5-115] SZC Co. will prepare an outline Operational Travel Plan (OTP) to be discussed with SCC and submitted to the Examination at Deadline 8.</p> <p>The revised draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) submitted at Deadline 5 clarified in part 2 of Schedule 16 that SZC Co. will prepare a Framework OTP, which will be appended to the DoO. It states that SZC Co. will submit a draft OTP at least 6 months before the end of the Construction Period, for the approval of SCC, ESC and Highways England. The OTP will be enforced for a period of five years from the end of the Construction Period. The end of the “Construction Period” is defined in part 1 of the draft DoO (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) as occurring at the receipt of fuel for Unit 2.</p>
<p>Para. 15. SCC retains its position that the SCC chair should have a casting vote in the TRG.</p>	<p>Section 1.3 of the Written submissions responding to actions from ISH3 [REP5-115] describes SZC Co.’s response to matters in relation to the TRG that were raised at ISH3. In particular, it notes that SZC Co. will review drafting of the draft Deed of Obligation, CTMP and CWTP to clarify or address the powers of the Transport Review Group (TRG) and its ability to enforce the controls in the CTMP and CWTP, the responsiveness of the TRG and protocols in place to resolve an inability of the TRG to reach agreement. SZC Co. do not agree that SCC or any other member of the TRG should have a casting vote. See SZC</p>

	Co.'s response to ExQ2 TT.2.0 for a response on this matter.
Para. 16. SCC's detailed comments on transport related items in the deed of obligation are included in the separate SCC Deadline 5 submission on the Deed of Obligation.	For SZC Co.'s response to the draft Deed of Obligation comments from SCC, see section 2.3 of this document.

g) Chapter 20: Flood and Water

2.18.14 SCC highlights eight key areas of concern as set out below. SZC Co.'s response at Deadline 7 is provided alongside each.

SCC's key area of concern as summarised in its response [REP5-172] to SZC Co.'s Comments on the Council's Local Impact Report.	SZC Co.'s comments at Deadline 7.
Table 8 Line 1 Whilst infiltration rates have been shared with SCC for MDS, the raw data (results of infiltration testing) has not been provided for this site. Infiltration rates, including the raw data have been provided for LEEIE. SCC have not received design calculations for either of these sites, contrary to the Applicants statement.	SZC Co. has subsequently shared the raw infiltration data and source control calculations with SCC.
Table 8 Lines 2 and 4 Whilst the Outline Drainage Strategy sets out basic principles and proposed strategies, as a standalone document, it is not sufficient to demonstrate that sufficient & suitable mitigation can be delivered within the Order Limits in accordance with national and local policy, best practice and guidance. The FRA & ES are reliant on the implementation of SuDS as primary mitigation. It must therefore be demonstrated that this primary mitigation can be delivered, in accordance with national and local policy, best practice and guidance. Without this detail, it is not possible to rely on this primary mitigation in the ES. This work must therefore be completed as part of outline design during the Examination. Detailed design would be required for Requirement 5.	SZC Co. has submitted a series of drainage technical notes that validate the Outline Drainage Strategy [REP2-033] and Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3 2A(B)) (submitted at Deadline 7). The additional information and detail demonstrate how the design solutions can be developed within the site boundaries: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix B 'ACA Drainage Strategy Technical Note (DCO Task 4)' and Appendix D 'Main Development Site Water Management Zone Summary (DCO Task D2)' to SZC Co. Comments on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines (Deadlines 2-4) Appendices (Doc Ref. 9.54) [REP5-120]. Appendix F 'Sizewell Link Road Preliminary Drainage Design Note', Appendix G 'Two Village Bypass Preliminary Drainage

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>Design Note' and Appendix H 'Yoxford Roundabout Updated Drainage Strategy' to SZC Co. Comments on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines (Deadlines 2-4) Appendices (Doc Ref. 9.54) [REP5-120].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix E 'Temporary Marine Outfall Operation Summary (DCO Task D3)' to SZC Co. Comments on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines (Deadlines 2-4) Appendices (Doc Ref. 9.54) [REP5-120]. • Appendix A 'Northern Park and Ride Drainage Design Note' to Comments at Deadline 6 on Submission from Earlier Submissions and Subsequent Written Submissions to ISH1-ISH6 – Appendices (Doc Ref. 9.63) [REP6-024]. • Southern Park and Ride Drainage Design Note submitted at Appendix F to this document. • Freight Management Facility Drainage Design Note submitted as Appendix G to this document. <p>SZC Co. is developing a further drainage design note for the green rail route for submission at Deadline 8.</p>
<p>Table 8 Line 4 Whilst productive discussions on Sizewell Link Road, Two Village Bypass and Yoxford Roundabout have taken place, the level of information shared with SCC to date, short of results of infiltration testing, is limited. No comprehensive outline surface water drainage strategy has been presented with supporting calculations, plans and sections, for either of these three schemes.</p>	<p>SZC Co. will provide the calculations to SCC for the Sizewell link road, two village bypass and the Yoxford roundabout prior to Deadline 8. The plans and sections form part of the next design stage and will be provided at that time, once fully developed, further to Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1(F)).</p>
<p>Table 8 Line 4 To confirm, is the Applicant stating they do not intend to provide any further information, to supplement that contained within the Outline Drainage Strategy, for any of the listed sites? If this is the case,</p>	<p>SZC Co. confirms that the statement made in the Applicant's comments on Chapter 20 of the LIR [REP3-044] Table 20.1 Ref. 22c relates to the provision of site infiltration data. SZC Co. is currently progressing additional ground investigations for the AD sites, however,</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

<p>SCC have serious concerns regarding this approach.</p>	<p>this will not be available within the period of the Examination for the park and ride sites, freight management facility and green rail route. The data will support the preliminary designs for submission in relation to Requirement 5 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).</p> <p>SZC Co. has submitted the following AD drainage technical notes into Examination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix A 'Northern Park and Ride Drainage Design Note' to Comments at Deadline 6 on Submission from Earlier Submissions and Subsequent Written Submissions to ISH1-ISH6 – Appendices (Doc Ref. 9.63) [REP6-024]. • Southern Park and Ride Drainage Design Note submitted as Appendix F to this document. • Freight Management Facility Drainage Design Note submitted as Appendix G to this document. <p>SZC Co. is developing a further drainage design note for the green rail route for submission at Deadline 8.</p>
<p>Table 8 Line 5 SCC acknowledge that the latest surface water drainage design iteration for LEEIE uses appropriate principles. However, SCC have not been provided with sufficient detail at this stage to be in a position to confirm that the design is sufficient to manage a 1:100 + climate change rainfall event.</p>	<p>SZC Co. believe they have provided sufficient information within the following documents to demonstrate that the LEEIE design can manage a 1:100 + climate change storm event:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix B 'ACA Drainage Strategy Technical Note (DCO Task 4)' and Appendix D 'Main Development Site Water Management Zone Summary (DCO Task D2)' to SZC Co. Comments on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines (Deadlines 2-4) Appendices (Doc Ref. 9.54) [REP5-120].
<p>Table 8 Line 6 As stated in response to Table 20.1 Ref 22 c, information should be submitted to the Examination to demonstrate that sufficient & suitable mitigation can be</p>	<p>SZC Co. is developing a further drainage design note for the green rail route for submission at Deadline 8.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

<p>delivered within the Order Limits in accordance with national and local policy, best practice and guidance. To date, SCC have seen no such information for the Green Rail Route.</p>	
<p>Table 8 Line 8 SCC requires detail for sites proposing direct connections into below ground attenuation structures from traditional gully and pipes systems and does not see monitoring and maintenance as sufficient mitigation for problems that may arise from this approach.</p>	<p>SZC Co. has not developed the preliminary design at this stage for the southern park and ride and freight management facility, which incorporate below ground attenuation structures. This design stage will support Requirement 5 and address this specific concern raised by SCC.</p>
<p>Table 8 Line 9 SCC cannot say with any certainty what the proposed operational drainage strategy is. This remains a serious concern.</p>	<p>SZC Co. has focused effort on the highest risk and largest scale activities, and those delivered in the near future. The ongoing data collection, design development and operation of the construction water management zones will provide considerable and valuable information for the subsequent design of the operational (non-nuclear island) drainage, which are far smaller in scale and risk, and are to be delivered towards the end of the construction period. These designs will be required to fulfil Requirement 5. For SZC Co.'s response to the draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) comments from SCC, see section 2.3 of this document. For the main platform, the operational design is ongoing and being developed in tandem with ongoing safety case assessments which extend beyond the period of Examination.</p>

h) Chapters 23, 24, 26, 28 and 29

2.18.15 In terms of matters relating to ESC's comments in [REP5-138](#) and SCC's comments in [REP5-172](#) on Chapters 27, 28 and 29, please refer to the Statement of Common Ground between SZC Co. and the Councils [[REP2-076](#)] for details on the status of discussions between the parties.

2.19 Appendices to SZC Co. Comments on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines

a) Appendix B: ACA Drainage Strategy Technical Note

2.19.1 SCC's comments [[REP6-049](#)] are noted and will be taken into consideration during the design stage. In terms of addressing key concerns over stormwater management, pollution control and sustainable design principles SZC Co. believes that the approach outlined in the **Drainage Strategy** (Doc. Ref. 6.3 2A (B) submitted at Deadline 7) and the supplemental ACA Drainage Strategy Technical Note, to which these SCC comments refer, provide an appropriate level of information and assurance. SZC Co. can confirm that it will provide source control calculations informally to SCC prior to ISH11.

2.19.2 In response to ESIDB's comments [[REP6-037](#)], SZC Co. can confirm that it will provide source control calculations informally to ESIDB prior to ISH11.

b) Appendix C: Sizewell Drain Water Management Control Structure

2.19.3 In response to ESIDB's comments [[REP6-037](#)], SZC Co. can confirm it will take these design constraints into consideration at the next design stage, for eventual submission of details for approval by ESIDB for the associated drainage consent.

c) Appendix D: Main Development Site Water Management Zone Summary

2.19.1 SCC's comments [[REP6-049](#)] are noted and will be taken into consideration during the design stage. In terms of addressing key concerns over stormwater management, pollution control and sustainable design principles SZC Co. believes that the approach outlined in the Drainage Strategy (Doc. Ref. 6.3 2A (B) submitted at Deadline 7) and the supplemental Main Development Site Water Management Zone Summary, to which these SCC comments refer, provide an appropriate level of information and assurance. SZC Co. can confirm that it will provide source control calculations informally to SCC prior to ISH11.

2.19.2 In response to ESIDB's comments [[REP6-037](#)], SZC Co. can confirm that it will provide the source control calculations informally to ESIDB prior to ISH11.

c) **Appendix E: Temporary Marine Outfall Operation Summary**

- 2.19.3 SCC's comments [[REP6-049](#)] are noted and will be taken into consideration during the design stage. In terms of addressing key concerns over stormwater management, pollution control and sustainable design principles SZC Co. believes that the approach outlined in the Drainage Strategy (Doc. Ref. 6.3 2A (B) submitted at Deadline 7) and the supplemental Main Development Site Water Management Zone Summary and Temporary Marine Outfall Operation Summary, to which these SCC comments refer, provide an appropriate level of information and assurance.
- 2.19.4 In response to ESIDB's comments [[REP6-037](#)], SZC Co. can confirm that the Temporary Marine Outfall (TMO) would be used prior to the construction of the CDO and 'spine network', and would be used as redundancy to support drainage from the MCA, WMZ1 and WMZ2 only.
- 2.19.5 In regard to the operation of the TMO and CDO, there are several balancing factors including the health and safety of construction workers and potential impacts and opportunities on the environment. Consequently, SZC Co. feel that this dynamic would be best considered as part of the subsequent consenting process, supported by sufficient design detail and enabling consultation with a range of key stakeholders.
- 2.19.6 In regard to consenting, SZC Co. is actively and regularly engaging with ESIDB on the requirements for consents and will provide further details in that context as that process continues.

d) **Appendix F: Sizewell Link Road Preliminary Drainage Design Note**

- 2.19.7 SCC's comments [[REP6-049](#)] are noted and will be taken into consideration during the design stage. In terms of addressing key concerns over stormwater management, pollution control and sustainable design principles SZC Co. believes that the approach outlined in the Drainage Strategy (Doc. Ref. 6.3 2A (B) submitted at Deadline 7) and the supplemental Sizewell Link Road Preliminary Drainage Design Note, to which these SCC comments refer, provide an appropriate level of information and assurance.
- 2.19.8 ESIDB's comments [[REP6-037](#)] are noted and SZC Co. therefore understands that as the works and their likely impacts are outside of the Drainage District the Board defers to the Environment Agency and Suffolk County Council on this matter.

e) **Appendix G: Two Village Bypass Preliminary Drainage Design Note**

2.19.9 SCC's comments [[REP6-049](#)] are noted and will be taken into consideration during the design stage. In terms of addressing key concerns over stormwater management, pollution control and sustainable design principles SZC Co. believes that the approach outlined in the Drainage Strategy (Doc. Ref. 6.3 2A (B) submitted at Deadline 7) and the supplemental Two Village Bypass Preliminary Drainage Design Note, to which these SCC comments refer, provide an appropriate level of information and assurance.

2.19.10 ESIDB's comments [[REP6-037](#)] are noted and SZC Co. therefore understands that multiple parts of the proposed works fall within the East Suffolk Internal Drainage District including works to two ordinary watercourses within the Alde floodplain, and that these works may require Land Drainage Consent from the Internal Drainage Board, as per Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.

f) **Appendix H: Yoxford Roundabout Updated Drainage Strategy**

2.19.11 SCC's comments [[REP6-049](#)] are noted and will be taken into consideration during the design stage. In terms of addressing key concerns over stormwater management, pollution control and sustainable design principles SZC Co. believes that the approach outlined in the Drainage Strategy (Doc. Ref. 6.3 2A (B) submitted at Deadline 7) and the supplemental Yoxford Roundabout Updated Drainage Strategy, to which these SCC comments refer, provide an appropriate level of information and assurance.

2.19.12 ESIDB's comments [[REP6-037](#)] are noted and SZC Co. therefore understands that as the works and their likely impacts are mostly outside of the Drainage District the Board defers to the Environment Agency and Suffolk County Council on this matter.

g) **Appendix J: Future Adaptation of the SSSI Crossing in the DCO Submission**

2.19.13 In response to RSPB and SWT's Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-046](#)] SZC Co. refers RSPB and SWT to the Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (Doc. Ref 5.2A) [[AS-018](#)] and Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment Addendum (Doc. Ref 5.2A_Ad) [[AS-157](#)]. The revised design of the SSSI Crossing has a wider opening and higher soffit, and thus performs no worse hydraulically than the assessment findings provided to date, and consequently the flood risk impact on the RSPB Minsmere reserve is no worse than presented.

h) Appendix Q: Potential combined impact of the MDS and SLR on bats

2.19.14 ESC and RSPB and SWT’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#) and [REP6-046](#) respectively] provided comments on Appendix Q to SZC Co.’s Comments on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines in respect of potential combined impacts of the Sizewell Link Road and Main Development Site on bats. ESC requested further information on the bat hop-overs as detailed above in Section 2.6 (Two Village Bypass Plans for Approval and Plans Not for Approval) and the response provided therein also applies here.

2.20 Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH1-ISH7

2.20.1 ESC and SCC’s Deadline 6 submissions [[REP6-032](#) and [REP6-049](#) respectively] both provided comments on SZC Co.’s Written Summaries of ISH1-7 [REP5-106 to REP5-112].

a) Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH1

2.20.2 ESC commented in relation to discussions between ESC and SZC Co. on controls for the construction programme and embedded mitigation, including the delivery of the accommodation campus. An update on discussions is provided in Section 4 of this report.

b) Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH2 and ISH3

2.20.3 SCC commented on Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH2 and ISH3 [REP5-107 and REP5-108] and, in some instances, raised additional questions for SZC Co. ESC also provided a limited number of comments on the Oral Submissions at ISH3 in its Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)].

ESC comment on SZC Co. Oral Submissions – ISH3 [REP5-108].	SZC Co. response at Deadline 7.
(In relation to structuring the TRG with involvement of Community Groups). ESC looks forward to reviewing the structuring proposed by SZC Co. for these groups and will comment on these at Deadline 7.	A revised set of management plans will be submitted to the Examination at Deadline 8. See SZC Co.’s response to ExQ2 TT.2.0 (Doc Ref. 9.71) for the updated position in relation to TRG governance.
ESC maintain that a control ensuring delivery of the Accommodation Campus prior to 7000 workers on site would not be detrimental to SZC Co.’s construction programme but would ensure that the mitigation is in place and available prior to peak workforce numbers being reached.	SZC Co has agreed with ESC an approach to the phased delivery of Project Accommodation, linked to Housing Fund contingency payments, which is set out in detail in Appendix 3B to Cl.2.1, 2, 3 to Doc Ref. 9.71]

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

2.20.4 SZC Co.’s response to SCC's comments on Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH2 and ISH3 [[REP5-107](#) and [REP5-108](#)] are set out below. A number of comments do not require further response, and so these have been omitted from the table below in the interests of brevity.

SZC Co. comment paragraph ref.	SCC comment on SZC Co. Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH2 and ISH3.	SZC response at Deadline 7.
[REP5-107] 1.2.5	<p>Can SZC Co. give any indication as to the likelihood of the bidding process being unsuccessful or the timetable being affected or disrupted by other works?</p> <p>Trains travelling from Birmingham are likely to route via Ely which has limited, if any, spare capacity. SZC Co. is requested to confirm that capacity to route trains from Birmingham has been discussed with operators and Network Rail.</p>	<p>The timetable planning process has a c.24 month lead time, and SZC Co. is undertaking a pathing study to ensure these requirements are available in advance of this period commencing for the relevant timetable change.</p> <p>As part of the pathing study, paths have been identified from the origin points through to Sizewell, including through Ely where required.</p> <p>The paths comply with the relevant timetable planning rules, and these account for items such as line closures for maintenance.</p> <p>SZC Co. has an ongoing dialogue with Network Rail’s freight team, and emerging findings of the pathing study continue to be regularly shared.</p>
[REP5-107] 1.2.10	<p>SCC would suggest aspirational targets for the proportion of marine and rail should be set. However, SCC notes with some concern that, notwithstanding the helpful statement of intent by Mr Davies, SZC Co. also stated (at para 1.2.14) that ‘a binding commitment to maximise marine would unnecessarily cut down on operational flexibility and the important resilience that flexibility provides’. SCC sees this as inconsistent. SZC Co. appears to want to take credit for making greater use of the marine facilities where achievable but is resistant to any suggestion that it should be obliged to identify or take</p>	<p>SCC’s comments regarding maximising marine where practicable are noted and understood. To this extent SZC Co. has a shared objective. Marine and rail both offer reductions to road import and the proportions between these non-road transport modes is based on the material type, nature and origin. SZC Co. will seek to continue to maximise these transport modes over road where practicable and economical as part of a blended approach to sustainable means of delivery.</p> <p>SZC Co. has set out its position on this and related delivery issues in response to the ExA’s Commentary on the draft DCO and other documents (Doc Ref. 9.72) and in response to EXQ A1.2.0.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	up such opportunities. SCC accepts that there are practical reasons why greater use of marine could not be made into a 'hard control' but sees no reason why the FMS should not commit to maximising the use of marine where practicable. By recognising that the objective is subject to what is practicable, operational flexibility would be maintained.	
[REP5-107] 1.2.27	SCC would request SZC Co. to clarify if the site accommodation campus will generate any AIL movements, for example if constructed in prefabricated units.	<p>The use of prefabricated modular units is intended for the construction of the accommodation campus. The size of these individual modules are well established with existing supply chain and haulage logistics to support their movement and delivery to sites.</p> <p>The general size is based on standard transport lengths up to 12.5m with a width of circa 3.5m, which would constitute AILs due to their width being over 2.9m. Allowance has been made for pre-fabricated modular units being delivered to site within the AIL forecast.</p>
[REP5-107] 1.2.31	SCC notes that while Darsham Level Crossing has laybys enabling AILs to pull off the carriageway the Middleton Level Crossing does not.	<p>The B1122 level crossing will primarily be used by AILs during the early years (i.e. prior to the SLR being operational) and to a lesser extent at peak construction just for AILs from the north. SZC Co. is liaising with the appropriate stakeholders to agree a protocol to allow AILs to notify Network Rail on their approach to the B1122 level crossing that they are about to cross it and have safely crossed it without having to stop and use the phone at the level crossing. The protocol will be incorporated into the CTMP.</p>
[REP5-107] 1.3.17	While considering delivery of the whole length of the SLR before commencement is desirable SCC considered that to place a Grampian condition to do so was not proportionate. However, it has made strong representations that the	<p>The design of the tie in points on the existing highways, namely the A12 and B1122 have been developed so that the majority of the construction work can be undertaken off-line without disruption to traffic. The final tie in works will have a minimum impact on traffic flows.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>highway works affecting the A12 and B1122, for example the roundabouts and junction connections to the TVB, SLR and Yoxford Roundabout should be complete before the route is used by SZC construction vehicles to avoid disruption to road users including SZC Co. (15.27 in REP1-045). SCC sees no reason why these elements of the works cannot be prioritised as advance works within the construction programme set out in the Implementation Plan. (REP2-044). The phasing of these works is a matter that SCC expects to see adequately addressed in the Implementation Plan but if that is not the case then a requirement would be appropriate to ensure they are delivered in advance of the construction commencing on the MDS.</p>	<p>The delivery of these tie in points is scheduled to be undertaken early in the construction when the main works traffic will be at its lowest.</p> <p>The SLR tie in to the A12 and south-eastern end of the B1122 are the first works on the SLR to be undertaken in parallel with the ESL overbridge construction. The SLR strategy to complete the main alignment prior to the online works for the Middleton Moor roundabout and B1125 junctions ensures these works do not conflict with the SZC construction traffic or general traffic.</p> <p>In addition, the same approach has been adopted for the TVBP, with focus initially on the Friday Street roundabout and then the southern A12 roundabout.</p> <p>The delivery of Yoxford roundabout is also phased early in the construction programme, with the same design philosophy to maximise the offline construction. Detailed phasing continues to be developed to minimise the impact on traffic flows for both the existing highway users and SZC construction traffic.</p>
<p>[REP5-107] 1.3.18</p>	<p>SCC was unaware that significant volumes of fill were expected to be moved from the TVBP and SLR to the main site. The use of a haul road on the alignment of the SLR to remove these trips off the B1122 is welcomed. However, SCC is mindful that this requires early delivery of a bridge over the East Suffolk Line and the construction of a haul route parallel to the SLR will complicate construction of the permanent works.</p>	<p>A response to this issue has been provided in response to [REP5-058]: SCC comments on SLR DoO 2.4.17 and 2.4.20 (see Section 2.10).</p>
<p>[REP5-107] 1.4.1</p>	<p>SCC will continue to engage with SZC Co. on our concerns; however, we remain of the position that more extensive monitoring of workforce</p>	<p>Discussions are continuing between SZC Co. and SCC to reach agreement on the proposed controls and monitoring measures which will underpin the Construction Traffic</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>numbers is required as per [REP3-079].</p>	<p>Management Plan [REP2-054] and Construction Worker Travel Plan [REP2-055]. Recent discussions have yielded significant progress in reducing the number of points of difference. In [REP3-079] SCC requested that the number of workers during the construction phase are monitored annually. The number of workers during the construction phase is to be monitored every 6 months through the workforce survey, which is secured in Schedule 3 of the Deed of Obligation, which has been agreed with SCC.</p>
<p>[REP5-108] 1.2.2</p>	<p>SCC is not convinced that restrictions on car parking and the mode share targets set out in REP2-055 are sufficient without adequate monitoring to provide early identification of issues. Appendix 7B of the Transport Assessment Appendices (Part 1 of 6) include the car park accumulation assessment [REP2-046]. The assessment shows that for a significant amount of the time the car parks have significant spare capacity indicating potential for additional vehicle movements without exceedance of currently proposed controls. Be that as it may, it also would not address SCC's concerns regarding greater number of movements during the peak periods than SZC Co. has assessed.</p>	<p>Refer to SZC Co.'s response to ExQ2 TT.2.9 with regards to parking controls, which are to be controlled via Requirement 8, which has been amended as part of draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).</p> <p>Parts 2a) and 2b) of draft Requirement 8 provide a control of the maximum limit of car parking within Work No. 1A before the northern or southern park and ride facilities are operational to 650 car parking spaces and after the northern or southern park and ride facilities are operational to 1,000 car parking spaces. Both the main development site car park and Land East of Eastlands are included in Work No. 1A. This is in addition to the car park phasing which is set out in Table 4.1 of the Construction Method Statement [REP5-048], which Requirement 8 requires SZC Co. to build and use the car parking in accordance with.</p> <p>It is considered that the combination of the car park phasing and the absolute limits on car parking set out in Requirement 8 alongside the commitment by SZC Co. to meet the mode share targets in the Construction Worker Travel Plan will ensure that the mode share targets are met.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		<p>In addition, the CWTP proposes to provide an arrival and departure profile of buses in and out of the MDS as part of the quarterly transport monitoring report, which will provide a useful indication of the shift pattern. In addition it is proposed to undertake an Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) survey 1 week per quarter at the site accesses (i.e. MDS, LEEIE (early years) and northern and park and ride facilities), to provide monitoring data of the profile of arrival and departure of workers. Shift patterns do not change regularly and therefore it is considered that the proposed monitoring will provide sufficient data to the TRG to understand the movement of workers over the course of the day and in particularly during the peak periods.</p>
<p>[REP5-108] 1.2.3</p>	<p>As per 1.2.1 above and in SCC's Post Hearing Submission for ISH3 [REP5-174], further clarity is needed on how mode share targets are met in situations where infrastructure has not been delivered and the modal split cannot be achieved. SCC welcomes discussions with SZC Co. on this. The vast majority of trips by foot or cycle are by workers in the site campus. It should be noted that workers will have to drive to the site accommodation campus, as evidenced by the 1,360 parking spaces provided, and will make non-work related trips to and from the main site. See also 1.2.0 which excludes the site accommodation campus in SZC Co.'s consideration of parking.</p>	<p>Requirement 8, Schedule 2 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)) defines the maximum number of construction car parking spaces that can be used before either the northern or southern park and ride site is available. This limits the number of car parking spaces to levels that are consistent with the mode share targets in the CWTP. The draft Deed of Obligation (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) states that SZC Co. will use reasonable endeavours to deliver the accommodation campus in accordance with the Implementation Plan. As stated in SZC Co.'s Written summaries of oral submissions made at ISH3 [REP5-108], the modal split targets cannot be achieved without this infrastructure in place. The early years mode share target by walk and cycle is 2% and by peak of the peak construction it is 30%. As with any Travel Plan mode share targets are set over a time period and progress is made to meet them through the continued implementation of the Travel Plan. This will be the case for Sizewell C. Once the northern/southern park and ride facilities are operational the Travel Plan commits to achieve the peak</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		<p>construction mode share targets. The CWTP is to be updated to enable the TRG to set interim mode share targets to monitor progress in achieving the proposed peak construction targets by the time the workforce is at its peak.</p> <p>The on-site campus would provide many facilities to suit the needs of workers for personal and social purposes to minimise the number of non-work based trips. In addition, SZC Co. is providing a free direct bus between the campus and Leiston and workers would also be able to access rail services at Darsham via the park and ride buses from the main development site. SZC Co. is providing significant improvements to walk and cycle facilities in the MDS area, which will enable workers living at the campus to access local facilities by active travel. Notwithstanding this, the assessment takes account of non-work based vehicular trips which are forecast to occur. Appendix 7B of the Consolidated Transport Assessment [REP2-046] describes the derivation of non-work related trips associated with the main development site accommodation campus accounted for in the assessment.</p>
[REP5-108] 1.2.4	<p>SCC remains of the opinion that if an impact resulting from construction traffic has not been assessed then it is not possible to determine the harm and therefore a process to avoid that potential harm is appropriate. It follows that monitoring to identify whether the development is exceeding the assessed parameters is reasonable. Whilst SCC can accept as a generality that not every element of a development which is assessed needs then to be reflected in either a control or monitoring, it is necessary to make a planning judgment as to what degree of regulation is required. That judgment is,</p>	<p>Discussions are continuing between SZC Co. and SCC to reach agreement on the proposed controls and monitoring measures which will underpin the Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-054] and Construction Worker Travel Plan [REP2-055]. Recent discussions have yielded significant progress in reducing the number of points of difference. An updated position statement on the management plans is provided in the note entitled ‘Summary of changes to be made to the Transport Management Plans’ (Appendix H to this document).</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>necessarily site/case specific, having regard to the particular local context (here a predominantly rural road network not suited to construction traffic), the scale of the construction traffic activity, and the duration of the construction traffic activity. SZC Co. makes reference to the fact that this is a unique project in terms of scale, complexity, and duration. SCC concur with this appreciation and consider it pertinent to the controls place on traffic arising from construction of the project Automatic Traffic Counters (ATC) as identified at [REP3-079] are inexpensive and would in a lot of cases provide a sufficient level of monitoring to identify issues as they arise; SCC also does not understand how they would affect the delivery of the project. SCC remains of the view that monitoring (and the potential for remedial measures) is required to ensure that the development's construction traffic remains within the assessed effects.</p>	
<p>[REP5-108] 1.2.6</p>	<p>As above, SCC does not understand how ATCs and associated monitoring are considered to be a burden. Compared to quarterly surveys ATC allow real time collection of data and allow for more immediate responses to issues as they arise as well as to understand profiles and to identify atypical traffic patterns.</p>	<p>SZC Co. is concerned that SCC is seeking ATCs in order to validate data that is already being collected through the DMS and GPS systems and it is not necessary to collect two different types of monitoring data. SZC Co. has agreed to collect ATC data for 1 week per quarter at the site accesses to provide data on the arrival and departure profile of cars, which are not included in the DMS but it is not considered necessary to collect this data on a daily basis as shift patterns do not change on a daily basis. ATC data will also differ from DMS data as the definition of an LGV and HGV is different between the two monitoring systems.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		Further justification for the proposed approach to collecting data is set out in the note entitled ' Summary of changes to be made to the Transport Management Plans ' contained at Appendix H to this document.
[REP5-108] 1.2.7	As per [REP3-079] and SCC's ISH3 Post Hearing Submission at Deadline 5 [REP5-174], SCC maintains its position that SCC should be able to have the casting vote in the event of a deadlock. As the local highway authority for the roads (and road users) most likely to experience impacts from construction traffic, SCC is well-placed to fulfil this role, acting in the public interest. Whilst Brightwell Lakes is a large scale development, its impact is more constrained geographically i.e. around Martlesham. It is not considered that the construction traffic activity is comparable in scale to SZC. SCC does not therefore consider that it provides a sensible comparator in relation to the effect of SZC Co.'s proposal.	Refer to SZC Co. response to ExQ2 TT.2.0 with regards to the TRG and SCC's request for a casting vote (Doc Ref. 9.71).
[REP5-108] 1.2.22	SCC remains of the position that it should have the casting vote as per [REP3-079] and the SCC's ISH3 Post Hearing Submission submitted at Deadline 5 [REP5-174].	Refer to SZC Co. response to ExQ2 TT.2.0 with regards to the TRG and SCC's request for a casting vote (Doc Ref. 9.71).
[REP5-108] 1.2.25	SCC supports the Police having voting rights within the TRG, as per SCC's response to TT.1.23 at Deadline 5 [REP5-172].	It has been agreed that Suffolk Constabulary will be a member of the TRG and will have voting rights. SZC Co. will have 4 members of the TRG in order to maintain the proposed balance.
[REP5-108] 1.2.29	The comment that LGV trips are generally not new trips on the network only applies to those LGVs dropping off items at the postal consolidation facility in the southern park and ride, not any LGV trips to	Chapter 6 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP2-054] describes the measures proposed to manage and monitor LGV traffic through the Delivery Management System (DMS). SZC Co.'s response to ExQ1 TT.1.25(iii) describes the

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>the main site or AD sites. The justification of not tracking LGVs is based on the route choice assumed in the traffic modelling and no mechanism is provided to manage changes in the routing and potential impacts on the local highway network. SCC is also concerned that if LGVs are allowed into the main construction site rather than the main park and ride there will be no control on their numbers. It is requested that SZC Co. confirms if LGVs will be permitted to enter the main site for work purposes and if so what quantity of vehicles does this involve. Being mindful of the comments about the reasonableness of any control measures, SCC would consider a monitoring total LGV numbers travelling to and from the site against a programme related profile and maximum number would, together with the TRGs ability to invoke tracking proposed in 1.2.30 would be appropriate.</p>	<p>measures proposed to manage LGV movements through the DMS.</p> <p>Appendix 7D of the Consolidated Transport Assessment [REP2-046] describes an assessment of LGV movements to/from the main development site. The technical note also includes comparison of LGV movements at Hinkley Point C as a comparator for Sizewell C LGV movements. The work concluded that the LGV demand assumed in the Sizewell C assessment is reasonable and robust.</p> <p>There may be some workers that use LGVs rather than cars travelling to the MDS, but these would fall under the Construction Worker Travel Plan (CTWP) [REP2-055] and would need to qualify for a parking permit at the MDS as set out in the CTWP [REP2-054]. LGV movements not undertaken by workers would fall under the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP2-054] and would be booked into the DMS and monitoring data provided to the TRG.</p>
<p>[REP5-108] 1.2.46</p>	<p>SCC would welcome submission of a Framework Operational Travel Plan as per our ISH3 Post Hearing Submission [REP5-174]. This would be beneficial as it could set out the process of review of the Travel Plan. There are a number of differences between the transport options available to workers during construction and in the operational phase. An outline operational travel plan would enable good behaviour to be embedded in workers behaviour at an early stage. SCC's view is that the operational travel plan is a useful tool to manage workers choice of transport modes during outages to reduce dependence on car travel and</p>	<p>As stated in the Written submissions responding to actions arising from ISH3 [REP5-115], SZC Co. will prepare an outline Operational Travel Plan (OTP) to be discussed with SCC and submitted to the examination at Deadline 8.</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>hence the requirement for excessive temporary parking areas. SZC Co. is correct that SCC only ask for a workplace travel plan to be submitted to SCC for the first five years. However, there is nothing to prevent a travel plan being extended and a voluntary extension of the travel plan is recommended for such a significant project. SCC Guidance: The Owner covenants to submit to the County Council on an annual basis on the anniversary of the date that the Full Workplace Travel Plan is first implemented the Full Workplace Travel Plan Monitoring Report until the anniversary of the date that the Full Workplace Travel Plan was first implemented which falls after the fifth (5th) anniversary of the date of Occupation of the final Commercial Unit forming part of the Commercial Development.</p>	
[REP5-108] 1.3.2	<p>SCC and SZC Co. have been working together to resolve our concerns regarding the ES, and this has included updates that should address many of our concerns; however, we are awaiting further information on elements of the assessment and completion of the updated workstream. Therefore, we cannot say that the process is fully agreed at this point.</p>	<p>SCC's comment is understood to be primarily related to the on-going discussions to agree the transport effects within the Environmental Statement [APP-198] and Environmental Statement Addendum [AS-181]. SZC Co. has been working closely with SCC to agree the methodology and results. The revised assessment is to be included in the Fourth ES Addendum (Doc Ref. 6.18), which is to be submitted to the examination at Deadline 7.</p>
[REP5-108] 1.3.10	<p>SCC have not yet received proposals of mitigation along the B1125 beyond a number of concepts and inclusion as a 'headline' item in the Deed of Obligation.</p>	<p>SZC Co. is continuing to develop concept proposals for mitigation on the B1125 and based on recent discussions with SCC it is envisaged that a preliminary concept can be agreed prior to the end of the Examination and included as part of the finalised Deed of Obligation. The design would need to go through</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		further refinement, public consultation and technical approval by SCC prior to the delivery of the scheme.
[REP5-108] 1.3.14	SCC note there is still disagreement between SZC Co. and the authority regarding the provision of safe pedestrian facilities between the northern end of BW19 and Eastbridge.	SZC Co. has provided further information within SZC Co.'s. Response to the Local Impact Report [REP3-045] and within the Deadline 3 Submission - 9.30 Comments on Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) - Volume 1 - SZC Co. Responses - Revision 1.0 [REP3-046]

c) **Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH4**

2.20.5 In response to the **Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH4 [REP5-109]**, ESC commented on the economic cost of congestion and the magnitude of the tourism fund **[REP6-032]**. Such matters have now been agreed between the parties; refer to the **draft Deed of Obligation** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F) for details.

2.20.6 SCC provided additional responses or queries in respect of:

- pre-employment vetting processes;
- definition of home-based workers (HBW) and commitment to the quantum of HBW; and
- effects of displacement.

2.20.7 Pre-employment checks and, where appropriate, vetting will be mandatory for any member of the Sizewell C Construction Workforce as defined by the Deed of Obligation.

2.20.8 Home-based workers will not contribute to any adverse socio-economic effect as is made clear by the assessment within the Socio-economic Chapter of the **ES (Volume 2, Chapter 9) [APP-195]**.

2.20.9 By definition, home-based (HB) workers are those that do not move permanently as a result of gaining employment on the Project – the importance of this definition is the corollary – that non-home-based (NHB) workers will move temporarily and contribute to socio-economic effects.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

2.20.10 As set out in the Deed of Obligation, the Project will monitor the location of HB workers in order for SCC to assess the local economic benefit of gains in employment and skills

d) Written Summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH7

2.20.11 A response to relevant points made in the RSPB and SWT’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-046](#)] will be provided at Deadline 8.

2.21 Written Submissions responding to actions arising from ISH1-7

a) Written Submissions responding to actions from ISH2 and ISH3

2.21.7 SCC’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-049](#)] provided comments on SZC Co.’s Written Submissions responding to actions arising from ISH2 and ISH3 [[REP5-114](#) and [REP5-115](#)]. SZC Co. is responding to these comments through on-going engagement with SCC and ESC in relation to relevant documents.

2.21.8 SZC Co. is working with SCC, ESC, Highways England and Suffolk Police to agree revised versions of the **CTMP** [[REP2-054](#)], **CWTP** [[REP2-055](#)], **TIMP** [[REP2-053](#)], the **Deed of Obligation** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) and a package of appropriate controls and monitoring. In addition, it was agreed as an action from the ISH3 that SZC Co. would prepare a **Framework Outline Travel Plan**, and that will be committed to as a template for a detailed Travel Plan in the Deed of Obligation (to be submitted at Deadline 8).

2.21.9 A note summarising proposed revisions to these documents entitled ‘**Summary of changes to be made to the Transport Management Plans**’ contained in **Appendix H** of this document.

2.21.10 Furthermore, SZC Co. is progressing towards agreement with SCC and ESC on the revised transport related environmental impacts. Refer to the **Fourth ES Addendum**, including the updated transport effects, submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 6.18) for details.

2.21.11 A number of comments in SCC’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-049](#)] are addressed directly in the table below.

SZC Co. comment paragraph ref.	SCC comment on SZC Co. Submissions responding to actions arising from ISH2 and ISH3.	SZC Co. response at Deadline 7.
--------------------------------	--	---------------------------------

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

<p>[REP5-114] Appendix 1 Figure 2</p>	<p>The profile provided indicates that the proposed peak HGV movements would only be predicted to be exceeded once with 300 HGVs only exceeded during a few weeks. Whilst recognising that the figures are indicative, SCC would query why the peak HGV movement cap cannot be reduced to 600 HGV movements to reflect these profiles through good management with the DMS, as the number of exceedances does not appear particularly different to the early years?</p>	<p>The purpose of the HGV profile was to show the 'unfettered' profile without additional management of the DMS to ensure that the HGV movements remain within the proposed caps. The unfettered HGV profile shows limited exceedances, which could be managed within the spare capacity around those exceedances in the profile. Notwithstanding this, a 'smoothed' out HGV profile has been provided in response to ISH8 Written Submissions responding to Actions (Doc Ref. 9.83).</p>
<p>[REP5-114] Appendix 1 '4.2.1' 'Enabling Works Backfill'</p>	<p>While sourcing fill from the TVBP and SLR reduces the need for trips from further afield it still generates a significant number of movements along the B1122 corridor. The proposal for a haul road is welcome but SCC is concerned regarding the phasing of this, in particular the bridge across the East Suffolk Line. SZC Co. is requested to confirm that this material is included within the 12.1 million tonnes estimated in the materials strategy (AS-280).</p>	<p>The 12.1M t of material referred to in Table 2.1 of the FMS [AS-280] is the material import for the project and excludes the mass balance of material between the main site and the TVBP and SLR.</p> <p>The detailed phasing of the East Suffolk Line overbridge and the SLR / TVBP as well as the vehicles movements are provided in response to ExQ2 TT.2.14 (Doc. Ref. 9.71), and the response to REP5-058.</p> <p>Please also refer to the section of this report entitled 'Sizewell Link Road Description of Development'.</p>

b) [Written Submissions responding to actions from ISH4](#)

2.21.12 SCC's Deadline 6 submission [\[REP6-049\]](#) provided comments on SZC Co.'s Written Submissions responding to actions arising from ISH4 [\[REP5-116\]](#). These are being considered in light of the current position of the parties since the submissions were made; and if necessary a response will be provided at Deadline 8.

c) [Written Submissions responding to actions from ISH5](#)

2.21.13 ESC and SCC's Deadline 6 submissions [\[REP6-032\]](#) and [\[REP6-049\]](#) respectively] both provided comments on SZC Co.'s Written Submissions responding to actions arising from ISH5 [\[REP5-117\]](#). These are being considered in light of the current position of the parties since the submissions were made; and if necessary a response will be provided at Deadline 8.

2.22 Draft Noise Monitoring and Management Plan and Noise Mitigation Scheme

- 2.22.1 An update on noise matters was provided in the Deadline 6 cover letter [[REP6-001](#)], alongside the submission of the Noise Mitigation Scheme (NMS) [REP6-015] and Draft Noise Monitoring and Management Plan (NMMP) [REP6-029]. ESC [[REP6-032](#)] and SCC [[REP6-051](#)] provided corresponding comments to the NMS and NMMP as part of their Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-032](#)]. The NMS and NMMP were discussed further at Issue Specific Hearing 8 (ISH8) held on 25 August 2021 and the **Written Summaries** (Doc Ref. 9.83) and **Written Submissions** (Doc Ref. 9.87) for ISH8 reflect the latest discussions.
- 2.22.2 Updated versions of both the **Noise Monitoring and Management Plan** (Doc Ref 9.68(A)) and the **Noise Mitigation Scheme** (Doc Ref 6.3 11H(C)) are submitted at Deadline 7, taking account of discussions with ESC and SCC, the discussions during ISH8 and in light of the ExA's second written questions.

3 RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS AT EARLIER DEADLINES

3.1 Overview

3.1.1 Section 2 of this report provides a response to comments at Deadlines 5 and 6 to SZC Co.'s reports submitted at earlier deadlines.

3.1.2 This section provides a response to submissions at earlier deadlines that are not specific to a report or plan. The responses in this section principally relate to submissions at Deadlines 5 and 6, but also provide feedback on Written Representations submitted at Deadline 2 relating to coastal geomorphology matters.

3.2 East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council

3.2.1 At Deadline 6, ESC [[REP6-032](#)] commented on SCC's submission regarding an alternative outage car park.

3.2.2 SZC Co supports the concerns raised by ESC in respect of the likely disruption caused by temporary park and ride facilities on local residents and also from a landscape and visual perspective.

3.2.3 At Deadline 5, SCC [[REP5-172](#)] commented on previous submissions from SZC Co. on pylons/gas insulated lines, including comments on the Technical Recommendation Report.

3.2.4 The comments made by SCC at Deadline 5 [[REP5-172](#)] relate to SZC Co's previous submission on pylons/gas insulated lines, including comments on the Technical Recommendation Report. In that document, SCC submits that an alternative approach to pylons, using gas insulated lines, "*appears to be possible*" and reiterates comments provided in [[REP2-189](#)]. SZC Co.'s position is unchanged as it has already considered this option and provided full details of why it would not be an acceptable solution for the Sizewell C site. A concise summary of SZC Co's position has been provided in the Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH5 [[REP5-117](#)] paragraphs 1.9.1-1.9.11, and in the Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at ISH5 [[REP5-110](#)] paragraphs 1.5.11-1.5.16.

3.2.5 At Deadline 6, SZC Co. committed to providing further information on electric vehicle charging points and the use of low- or zero-emitting buses [[REP6-025](#)]. This is addressed in the ExQ2 responses (Doc Ref. 9.71).

3.2.6 SZC Co. also committed to providing a flow chart to show how the dust control processes interact, namely the Code of Construction Practice, Outline Dust Management Plan, Dust Monitoring and Management Plan (DMMP) and contractors' Construction Environmental Management Plans. This is appended to this document at **Appendix N**. The DMMP is to be secured through the Code of Construction Practice (requirement 2, Schedule 2 of the Draft Order).

3.2.7 SZC Co. has committed to a Farmland Bird Mitigation Fund (refer to the Deed of Obligation for details) to mitigate the impact of habitat loss during the early years of construction on farmland birds, which arises when cumulative habitat loss is considered alongside other proposed developments which are likely to occur at the same time. This details a support fund for landowners to provide suitable farmland bird habitat and/or management practices within their land and so mitigate the cumulative effects of the project on farmland birds. Refer to **Appendix I** for further details of the rationale for and approach to the fund.

3.3 East Suffolk Internal Design Board

3.3.1 The Outline Drainage Strategy has been supplemented by a series of drainage technical notes which have been submitted at Deadlines 5 and 6 in [REP5-120](#) and [REP6-024](#) respectively. A further series of drainage technical notes are appended to this report as follows:

- **Appendix F:** SPR Drainage Technical Note; and
- **Appendix G:** FMF Drainage Technical Note; and

3.3.2 With the presentation of the additional design information SZC Co. feel it is appropriate to upgrade the Outline Drainage Strategy to a Drainage Strategy, which is guided by this additional information.

3.4 RSPB and SWT

3.4.1 SZC Co. has prepared a response to RSPBs' and SWT's comments [[REP5-165](#)] on recreational impact and SANG and this is provided at **Appendix L** of this report.

3.5 Greenpeace UK

3.5.1 SZC Co. has considered the issues raised by Greenpeace at Deadline 6. Those issues challenge the Sizewell C project but more particularly question Government policy. To the extent that they are relevant to the examination, they were addressed at Issue Specific Hearing 9.

3.6 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council

a) Blight – land outside the Order Limits

- 3.6.2 Compensation for owner-occupiers of property not inside the Order limits may be payable in accordance with the ‘compensation code,’ most particularly section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 and Part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as modified by the draft DCO, along with relevant case law.
- 3.6.3 Section 10 claims for injurious affection compensation may be brought where, in consequence of the works which are being undertaken pursuant to the DCO powers, legal rights held in land are interfered with but the land is not acquired from the claimant. The measure of compensation is the reduction in the value of the claimant’s land as a result of the interference. Compensation is not payable as a result of damage arising from the use of the works.
- 3.6.4 Part 1 claims for compensation may be brought for depreciation of land value by physical factors (such as noise or vibration) caused by use (not construction) of public works. A Part 1 claim cannot be made before 1 year and 1 day that the public works have been operational.
- 3.6.5 Section 152 of the Planning Act 2008 creates a right to compensation in cases where there is no right to claim in nuisance as the DCO provides a defence of statutory authority by virtue of section 158.
- 3.6.6 Unlike Generalised Blight, the Property Price Support Scheme (PPSS) is an additional and voluntary scheme being provided by SZC Co. It is not required by law or policy and does not impact upon any other legal rights which those eligible may have.
- 3.6.7 The PPSS brochure clearly identifies the properties which fall within the PPSS and the relevant criteria. In addition, SZC Co. has made extensive efforts to ensure those properties within the PPSS boundary are aware and as such it is not considered necessary or appropriate to list those properties here. There are no plans at current to extend the boundaries of the PPSS. A copy of the brochure will be provided to Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council.
- 3.6.8 The PPSS was first issued in November 2019 and the scheme went live when the Planning Inspectorate accepted the DCO application for examination on 24 June 2020. The PPSS brochure was revised and updated before being re-issued in October 2020 with a covering letter to all prospective applicants within the PPSS boundaries. This was followed up

in November 2020 by phone and e-mail to ascertain if the homeowner had any queries, required any further information, or would like to meet with a representative in person or by other means. For those that SZC Co. did not have contact numbers or e-mail addresses for, a further letter was issued in November 2020. At that time some of the general feedback was that applicants wanted to await the outcome of the DCO application.

3.6.9 The PPSS is designed to address concerns of a loss of property value for residents in the immediate vicinity of the Sizewell C proposals (but are outside of the DCO Order Limits) who would not be eligible to make a statutory blight claim.

3.6.10 In setting the PPSS boundary, SZC Co. was mindful of the duration of the construction period, the proximity to the proposed works and the extent of change in the character of the rural nature of the areas currently surrounding these properties.

3.6.11 It only relates to residential properties and successful applicants must satisfy the following eligibility criteria:

- have owned the property prior to the scheme announcement date (see the table within the PPSS Brochure for the dates relevant to the specific site);
- own the property on the date of sale;
- not have a wider property interest being acquired by SZC Co. in relation to the Sizewell C Project; and
- have lived in the property continuously for at least six consecutive months prior to applying for the PPSS and be the owners' place of principal private residence.

3.6.12 The scheme was designed to fulfil a similar function to those implemented by developers of other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects such as Hinkley Point C. The individual nature of developments mean that no two schemes will be the same.

b) Tourism

3.6.13 In terms of tourism, the details on the Tourism Fund and Tourist Accommodation element of the Housing Fund are set out in the **Draft Deed of Obligation** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)). The Tourism Fund detail is set out in Schedule 15: Tourism and the Tourist Accommodation element of the Housing Fund is set out in Schedule 3: Accommodation and Housing.

c) Human Health & Well being

- 3.6.14 The approach to emergency planning is set out in **Volume 2, Chapter 27** of the **ES** [APP-344]. This explains that the Nuclear Site Licence establishes 36 licence conditions that SZC Co. must operate in accordance with. Nuclear Site Licence Condition 11 requires appropriate emergency plans and arrangements to be established and agreed with the local authority, for the range of accidents and incidents that could occur.
- 3.6.15 In addition, SZC Co. would have to comply with the requirements of Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2019 (REPPIR): this sets out the requirements for emergency preparedness and response in relation to premises which work with ionising radiation. These regulations require operators to identify all events that have the potential to cause a radiation emergency, and then evaluate the possible on and off-site consequences for the range of events identified. The hazard evaluation and consequence assessment is provided to the local authority, with a recommended distance for a Detailed Emergency Planning Zone.
- 3.6.16 The local authority would be able to use this information to be better able to develop and implement an effective and proportionate emergency response plan (Off-Site Emergency Plan) specific to the site recognising the local geographical limitations and demographics. ONR would provide independent oversight to this. These duties partially overlap with the requirements of the Nuclear Site Licence discussed above.
- 3.6.17 In terms of access to health services, as set out in **Volume 2, Chapter 28** of the **ES** [APP-346] and the **Draft Deed of Obligation** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), Schedule 6, as well as the on-site occupational health service, SZC Co. will provide a residual healthcare contribution. Please see **SZC Co.'s Response to Second Written Questions** (Doc Ref. 9.71) HW.2.3 for further detail.

d) Cultural Heritage Assets

- 3.6.18 SZC Co. does not agree that the choice of location for the SLR puts at risk Kelsale or Carlton's cultural heritage assets: no effects on designated or undesignated heritage assets are predicted. As set out in the **Historic Environment Settings Scoping Recommendations** report, which is an annex to the Historic Environment legislation and methodology appendix (**Volume 1, Appendix 6L** of the **ES** [APP-171]) , designated assets in Carlton and Kelsale were scoped out of the assessment because '*setting of assets within these smaller settlements is defined by their relationship to adjacent buildings and agricultural land on the fringes. Visibility of proposed*

development will precluded by topography, buildings and intervening planting and asset is located away from proposed road and rail access routes’.

e) Noise

3.6.19 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council’s Deadline 6 submission [[REP6-064](#)] requests clarification as to where in the submitted assessments a number of receptors can be found.

3.6.20 Not every property within the study areas for each element of the project is assessed in the submitted assessments. As is standard practice in the Environmental Impact Assessments, a representative sample of affected locations is assessed, with those assessed likely to be the worst-affected properties in each group of receptors.

3.6.21 In relation to the noise and vibration assessments, the most straight-forward method of locating the receptors that have been assessed in the Sizewell link road and rail chapters is to refer to the following figures:

- For the Sizewell link road, **Figure 4.1 in Volume 6, Chapter 4** of the **ES** [[APP-453](#)]
- For rail, **Figure 4.1 in Volume 9, Chapter 4** of the **ES** [[APP-547](#)]

3.6.22 These figures show the assessed receptors graphically, with a list of numbered receptors in the key.

3.6.23 Once the relevant receptors are identified, the effects for them can be found in the following locations for the Sizewell link road:

- The main assessment is contained in **Volume 6, Chapter 4** of the **ES** [[APP-451](#)].
- Road traffic flow data used in the assessment are contained in **Volume 6, Appendix 4A** of the **ES** [[APP-452](#)].
- The assumptions and calculations for the assessment of the construction works are contained in **Volume 6, Appendix 4B** of the **ES** [[APP-452](#)].
- **Volume 6, Figures 4.1 to 4.2** of the **ES** [[ES-453](#)] contain the figures showing receptor locations and baseline monitoring locations.

- The updated assessment of road traffic noise is contained in the **Third ES Addendum** submitted at Deadline 6 [[REP6-017](#)].

3.6.24 The effects for identified receptors can be found in the following locations for rail:

- The main assessment is contained in **Volume 9, Chapter 4** of the **ES** [[APP-545](#)].
- Assumptions relating to the construction of the green rail route are contained in **Volume 9, Appendix 4A** of the **ES** [[APP-546](#)].
- The assessment of operational railway noise is contained in **Volume 9, Appendix 4B** of the **ES** [[APP-546](#)].
- **Volume 9, Figures 4.1 to 4.4** of the **ES** [[APP-547](#)] contain figures showing the assessed receptor locations and the locations of night-time speed limits for the railway.
- An update to the assessment of noise and vibration from the use of the railway line is contained in **Volume 1, Chapter 9** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-188](#)].
- Details of the August 2020 rail noise and vibration survey are contained in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.A** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)], with the following supporting information:
 - Airborne Noise Survey Report in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.A, Appendix A** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)].
 - Groundborne Noise and Vibration Survey Report in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.A, Appendix B** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)].
 - Speed Limit Zones in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.A, Appendix C** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)].
 - List of Properties Close to Railway Line in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.A, Appendix D** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)].
 - Woodbridge Survey Results in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.B** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)].
 - Update to **Volume 9, Appendix 4B** (operational rail noise assessment) in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.C** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)].

- A paper on sleep disturbance in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.D** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-257](#)].
- The draft **Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy** in **Volume 3, Appendix 9.3.E** of the **ES Addendum** [[AS-258](#)].

3.6.25 Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council has not provided full addresses for the properties of interest to them, so SZC Co. is not able to definitively identify their locations. However, the following properties on Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council’s list are included in the assessments:

- Laurel Farmhouse is Receptor 31 in the Sizewell link road assessment.
- Mile Hill Gallery and Barn is Receptor 32 in the Sizewell link road assessment.
- Rosetta Cottage is Receptor 30 in the Sizewell link road assessment.
- Fir Tree Farm is Receptor 1 in the Sizewell link road assessment.
- Buskie Farm is Receptor 2 in the Sizewell link road assessment.
- The Bungalow, Clayhills Road is close to Receptor 10 in the rail assessment.
- Oak Tree Farm, Clayhills Road is Receptor 10 in the rail assessment.
- The Barn, Oak Tree Farm, Clayhills Road is close to Receptor 10 in the rail assessment.

3.6.26 Using the figures identified in this response, it should be possible to locate the assessed receptor point closest to the property of interest to Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council, and the outcomes at that property will be no worse than at the assessed receptor.

3.7 Suffolk Local Access Forum

3.7.1 In its Deadline 6 comments on additional information received by Deadline 5 [[REP6-084](#)], the Suffolk Local Access Forum makes a number of comments, which are addressed below by SZC Co.

Para. ref.	SLAF comments on additional information	SZC Co. response at Deadline 7.
------------	---	---------------------------------

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	received by Deadline 5 [REP6-084].	
Impact on rights of way network	<p>Welcome the provision of the Bridleway 19 diversion but request link extension to Eastbridge.</p> <p>Safe pedestrian link through Aldhurst Farm to meet with Sandy Lane.</p> <p>Alignment of the Suffolk Coast Path</p>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the comment regarding the provision of the off-road Bridleway diversion. However, the link from Bridleway 19 to Eastbridge does not form part of the proposals.</p> <p>The Bridleway 19 diversion provides a pedestrian link from Eastbridge road, through Aldhurst Farm on to Sandy Lane. Further information on the route can be found within the Rights of Way and Access plans [REP5-008].</p> <p>SZC Co. note the disagreement with the alignment of the Suffolk Coast Path. The foreshore will remain as open access land so the top of the HCDF will be able to be walked. The new alignment of the coast path will be located at +5.2m which represents an improvement from existing levels. In addition, the SCDF will be maintained to ensure that the Coast Path will remain unaffected by erosion.</p>
Impact on proposed road schemes	Request that safe road crossing points are subject to risk assessment audit.	SZC Co. will ensure that road crossings are designed safely and in accordance with design standards. The designs will be subject to technical approval by SCC, as the local highway authority.
Access strategy and legacy	<p>Request that communications prioritised regarding access around main development site.</p> <p>Request legacy benefits to the public access around the power station, including</p>	<p>SZC Co. will ensure that all closures are communicated effectively.</p> <p>SZC Co. have provided substantial enhancements to the recreational resources in the area as set out the SZC Co.'s response to AR.1.8 in the first set of examining questions</p>

	making permissive routes definitive a new link to the coast path and better off-road cycle routes between Aldeburgh and Southwold.	[REP2-100] and within the Rights of Way and Access strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3 15I(C)).
--	--	---

3.8 The Heveningham Hall Estate

3.8.1 In its Deadline 6 comments on additional information received by Deadline 5 [REP6-073], the Heveningham Hall Estate (HHE) makes a number of comments, which are addressed below by SZC Co.

Para. ref.	HHE comments on additional information received by Deadline 5 [REP6-073].	SZC Co. response at Deadline 7.
[REP5-114] 1.12.4	TPA disagrees with SZC Co.'s assessment that the calibration graphs in the Consolidated Transport Assessment demonstrate a "high degree" of correlation with observed conditions. TPA also regards the difference between the modelled and observed queues to be unacceptable, given that the VISSIM model is the tool used by SZC Co. to estimate the impact along the corridor.	Results from the Yoxford VISSIM model reported in the Consolidated Transport Assessment [REP2-045 to REP2-052] are aggregated to individual hours, so the specific timing in the model of traffic queues at the level crossing is of less importance than the overall representation of traffic across the full modelled period. Indeed the stochastic nature of VISSIM is intended to produce a range of slightly different results which reflect natural day-to-day variation. All results were therefore reported as an average of multiple simulation runs in line with best practice. The Yoxford VISSIM models have been developed in accordance with DfT guidelines and subject to technical review by SCC and its appointed consultants. The models have been agreed with SCC and ESC as an "acceptable basis for assessing the transport effects of the proposed development" as stated in the Initial Statement of Common Ground [REP2-076].
[REP5-114] 1.13.3 – 1.13.4	SZC Co.'s response wholly fails to address the HHE's	The purpose of the traffic modelling is to identify the potential traffic impacts

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>point regarding the tidal movement of workers on a Friday night or a Sunday night from their homes to the main construction site. Please see the HHE's Deadline 5 submission at paragraphs 3.2-3.3 [REP5-278] for further details.</p>	<p>of Sizewell C considering a range of time periods which cover existing peak hours and times when there may be more Sizewell C traffic outside of the existing peak hours. The process to identify the hours for modelling is set out in Appendix 6A to the Consolidated Transport Assessment [REP2-046] and these hours were agreed with SCC and ESC.</p> <p>The assessment of a development in transport terms should consider the typical traffic flows of the development; the Sizewell C traffic that has been assessed is based on the peak estimations of both workforce and HGV volumes in each phase of the development, and in reality these are not likely to coincide, so this is already considered to provide a robust level of Sizewell C traffic on the network. The model also includes non-work trips made by all non-home based workers (including those on campus and in caravans) on a typical day (for example shopping). It is acknowledged that there would also be workers travelling to and from the campus/caravan site, as well as other non-home based residences, at the beginning and end of a shift rotation, for example on a Sunday evening or Friday evening (referred to as the 'weekend effect'). However, given that the assessed Sizewell C traffic generation assumes that 100% of the construction workforce would be present on an average weekday, and on Fridays only around 85% of the workforce would be present due to the proposed shift rotations, this is already considered to provide robust assessment of the Sizewell C traffic impact and the addition of 'weekend effect' trips would overestimate the likely realistic traffic levels.</p>
--	---	---

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

		Sundays do not represent a period of significant existing traffic or Sizewell C traffic levels therefore it was not considered appropriate to assess this period when there may be 'weekend effect trips' present, as other time periods have been assessed which contain more traffic.
[REP5-114] 1.13.7-1.13.8	The HHE's reference to workers from Saxmundham was but one example used to illustrate that SZC Co.'s methodology to design the model contradicts statement in the Construction Worker Travel Plan [REP2-055] that "all [...] workers will be allocated to the northern or southern park and ride facilities, depending on which is closest to their place of residence" (see paragraph 4.8.1). Please see paragraph 4.5 of the HHE's Deadline 5 submission at REP5-278 for further details as to why SZC Co.'s approach undermines its justification for the size of the Northern Park and Ride.	As set out in [REP5-114], the park and rides will be allocated based on postcode and not Census output area and judgements will be made but the assessed number of workers allocated to each park and ride is considered to be a reasonable estimation for the purpose of the assessment.
[REP5-115] 1.5	As detailed in the HHE's Deadline 5 submission [REP5-278, paragraph 4.5], the park and rides are employee car parks. If SZC Co. were to assign car parking spaces to employees, it would negate the need for a 20+% buffer of "spare" parking spaces. As a result, and allowing for a 5% buffer (not 15% or 22%), smaller park and ride sites would be sufficient to meet the anticipated demand. Using the figures in Table 13 of Appendix 7B	Parking spaces at the park and ride sites will not be individually allocated to a specific worker in the way suggested in HHE's response. If parking spaces were allocated to individual employees it would lead to a much greater demand for spaces, due to the fact that employee shifts would mean that each space would only be occupied for a part of the day, and empty otherwise. By allowing employees to park anywhere on arrival, the occupancy of each space is maximised, and the overall size of the car park kept to a minimum. The car parks have been design in accordance with the theoretical

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

	<p>of the Consolidated Transport Assessment [REP4-005] the peak parking demand across the two park and ride sites is 1,948 spaces (1,054 spaces at the Northern Park and Ride site and 894 at the Southern Park and Ride site). With a 5% buffer, this equates to a total of 2,046 (rather than 2,500) spaces.</p>	<p>capacity is described in the Institute of Highways and Transportation (IHT) document 'Guidelines on the Preparation of Parking Strategies and Management' (2005).</p>
--	--	--

3.9 Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council

3.9.1 Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council, Stop Sizewell C and B1122 Group representations at Deadline 6 [REP6-074] and [REP6-075] state that the Route D2 or Route W North would have a greater legacy benefit than the proposed Sizewell Link Road Route within the DCO. SZC Co. has set out the legacy benefits of the Sizewell Link Road at [REP2-108](#), Appendix 5D from paragraph 2.1.123 (electronic page 240). The legacy benefits of the Sizewell Link Road are also set out by SZC Co in SZC Co.'s response to **ExQ2 CA.2.10** (Doc Ref. 9.71) and within SZC Co.'s written submissions following the **Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 Part 1** (Doc Ref. 9.74), submitted at Deadline 7.

3.9.2 SZC Co. has set out the route selection for the Sizewell Link Road, including why Route D2 and Route W North are not suitable at [REP2-108](#), Appendix 5D from paragraph 2.1.123 (electronic page 260-264) and in SZC Co.'s response to **ExQ1 AI.1.27, AI.1.30 and AI.1.30** [[REP2-100](#)] (electronic pages 192-195). SZC Co. has also explained that Route W is unsuitable within SZC Co.'s written submissions following the **Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 Part 1** (Doc Ref. 9.74), submitted at Deadline 7.

3.9.3 SZC Co. is looking to arrange a meeting with Mr Collins in relation to the BNG assessment. An update will be provided to the ExA following the meeting, through the SoCG process.

3.10 FERN

3.10.1 A response on the Dormouse Survey Methodology will be provided at Deadline 8. The **Dormouse Survey Report** (Doc Ref. 6.13B) is however submitted at Deadline 7 and provides the methodology deployed. As set out in SZC Co.'s response to CA.2.17 (Doc. Ref. 9.71), SZC Co. met with

representatives of FERN on 21 July 2021 to discuss potential detailed landscaping amendments to further reduce visual and noise effects.

3.10.2 Draft landscaping proposals were submitted to FERN on 20 August 2021; these are included at **Appendix J**.

3.10.3 It was found that the landscaping, including a 2m high bund, would deliver a reduction of up to 1dB at Farnham Hall. A quiet road surface was found to be likely to deliver close to its 2.5dB theoretical improvement at Farnham Hall. A combination of both bund and quiet road surface would deliver a reduction in future road traffic noise levels of around 3dB. Further discussions are expected in September 2021 to discuss the findings and an update will be provided at Deadline 8.

3.11 Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth

3.11.1 SZC Co. is continuing to engage with SCFoE across all areas of concern and an updated Statement of Common Ground is submitted at Deadline 7.

3.12 Suffolk Coastal DMO

3.12.1 SZC Co. notes the comments and directs readers to the **Draft Deed of Obligation** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) that includes details of the Tourism Fund that has been agreed with ESC.

3.13 Responses to Written Representations

3.13.1 Stop Sizewell C's Written Representations at Deadline 2 [[REP2-440g](#)] contained a review of **Volume 2, Appendix 20A** (Sizewell Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics: Synthesis for Environmental Impact Assessment) of the **ES** [[APP-312](#)]. **Appendix C** of this report provides a response to Stop Sizewell C's review.

3.13.2 A number of Written Representations submitted at Deadline 2 raised common themes on coastal geomorphology matters and a response is provided at **Appendix B** of this report. For clarity, this relates to the following Written Representations and includes a response to the National Trust's comments on the coastal pathway:

- Stop Sizewell C [[REP2-449a](#) to [REP2-449u](#)]
- National Trust [[REP2-150](#) and [REP2-151](#)]
- Nick Scarr [[REP2-392](#) and [REP3-393](#)]

- Bill Parker [[REP2-230](#)]
- Suffolk Coast Acting for Resilience (SCAR) [[REP2-509](#)]
- Minsmere Levels [[REP2-377](#)]
- Alde and Ore Association [[REP2-202](#) and [REP2-204](#)]
- Natural England [[REP2-153](#)]
- Environment Agency [[REP2-135](#)]

3.14 Other Respondents, including owners of the Order Land

3.14.1 SZC Co. notes that a number of respondents to Deadlines 5 and 6 made submissions ahead of the Compulsory Acquisition and Issue Specific Hearings, including the following:

- LJ and EL Dowley [[REP6-053](#) to [REP6-056](#)]
- The Grant Family [[REP6-057](#) and [REP6-058](#)]
- Stephen Beaumont [[REP6-071](#) and [REP6-081](#)]
- Wickham Market Parish Council [[REP6-080](#)]
- Alex Johnston [[REP5-188](#)]

3.14.2 Some of the matters raised in those submissions were subsequently discussed at the relevant hearing and SZC Co.'s response is contained in the **Written Summaries** and **Written Submissions** (Doc Refs. 9.74 to 9.85).

a) **Alex Johnston**

3.14.3 SZC Co. provided a response to Mr Johnston's questions in his written representation [[REP5-188](#)] on 27 August 2021, with an apology for the late reply. All of the information requested by Mr Johnston was included in the submitted assessments, and the response sign-posted to where it could be found.

3.14.4 SZC Co. notes Mr Johnston's comments that the assessment using L_{Aeq} noise levels is '*seriously misleading*' and '*in no way an accurate reflection of the situation*'.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- 3.14.5 The use of L_{Aeq} noise levels is widely adopted, not least in the Noise Insulation Regulations¹ for rail, where it is the only noise indicator considered. Mr Johnston's noise advisors agreed, in correspondence forwarded to SZC Co. by Mr Johnston, that the L_{Aeq} noise metric is widely used in noise assessments.
- 3.14.6 Notwithstanding the widespread use of L_{Aeq} for the assessment of railway noise, SZC Co. has also assessed the potential impact of railway noise using the L_{AFmax} metric, which considers the effect of passing trains on a train-by-train basis. This approach is significantly more rigorous than is required by the statutory Noise Insulation Regulations, and SZC Co. considers it be a robust approach.
- 3.14.7 SZC Co. notes that the L_{AFmax} threshold used to determine the LOAEL, below which there is no adverse effect on health and quality of life, is based on the World Health Organisation's (WHO) internal guideline value of 45dB L_{AFmax} ².
- 3.14.8 The WHO guidance states that the internal 45dB L_{AFmax} value should not be exceeded more than 10 to 15 times per night to maintain good sleep. SZC Co. has adopted this value without reference to the number of events, instead adopting a precautionary approach that the disturbance could occur on the basis of a single event.
- 3.14.9 Furthermore, the L_{AFmax} value adopted as SOAEL for railway noise, which is the level at which a significant adverse effect occur on health and quality of life, is similarly precautionary. The underlying research that informed the SOAEL for the Project also informed the approach adopted by HS2, but HS2 translated the findings directly into its assessments; SOAEL for HS2 is based on the external thresholds of 85dB L_{AFmax} where there are 20 events or fewer per night, and 80dB L_{AFmax} where there are more than 20 events per night.
- 3.14.10 Despite the precedent set by HS2, a scheme promoted by a Government-owned body that went through a parliamentary procedure, SZC Co.'s SOAEL is based on the lower 80dB L_{AFmax} figure, even though there will be fewer than 20 trains per night.
- 3.14.11 Overall, SZC Co.'s approach is considered to be highly precautionary.

¹ The Noise Insulation (Railways and Other Guided Transport Systems) Regulations 1996 SI 1996 no. 428

² World Health Organisations 'Guidelines for Community Noise' (1999)

b) Mollett's Partnership [[REP6-066](#)]

3.14.12 As acknowledged within [[REP6-066](#)], engagement is ongoing between SZC Co. and Mollett's Partnership in relation to the matters raised in this submission.

3.14.13 Mollett's Partnership believe that substantive discussion and debate has not been had in relation to the alignment of the Two Village Bypass. The extensive consideration given to the route proposed is included in the following documents:

- Volume 5 Two Village Bypass Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution [[APP-414](#)],
- The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report (Section 6) [[APP-591](#)] (electronic page 132),
- Two Village Bypass Summary Paper (Appendix 5C of the SZC Co. responses to ExQ1) [[REP2-108](#)] (from electronic pages 170 - 180), and;
- response to ExQ1 AI.1.16 [[REP2-100](#)] (electronic page 175).

3.14.14 Mollett's Partnership has raised concerns about the safety of the proposed rights of way across the two village bypass. SZC Co. can confirm that the proposed crossing location has been agreed with SCC whose preference is to minimise any required diversion to the existing route. The crossing location is subject to the progression of the detailed design with SCC as the local highway authority and would have to accord with visibility standards in design manual for roads and bridges, road safety audits as part of the technical approval process. A final road safety audit will also be undertaken once the road has been completed and if there are any residual road safety concerns that remain they must be resolved.

3.14.15 Mollett's Partnership raise concerns in relation to the approach taken to drainage and irrigation. SZC Co. will make provision for reinstatement of drainage and irrigation severed by the proposed two village bypass. In order to design this an understanding will be sought from landowners within and adjoining the order limits where applicable to further understand the existing arrangements and inform the engineering solution. To clarify, SZC Co. will not be relying on landowners to provide technical engineering solutions.

3.14.16 SZC Co. notes Mollett's Partnership's [[REP6-066](#)] comments on the potential opportunities for worker accommodation, particularly section 4.6 which sets out the concern that: *"Even if a financially viable way was found*

to substitute tourist bookings with those resulting from the Sizewell C project, we are constrained by a provision in our planning permission that prohibits any guest staying longer than 56 days per year, ruling out any prospect of providing long-term Sizewell C accommodation." The Housing Fund to be secured in the **Draft Deed of Obligation** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) (Schedule 3) provides for a "Tourist Accommodation Plan", to be produced by East Suffolk Council and approved by the Accommodation Working Group, to set out measures to provide additional capacity and support to the tourist accommodation sector.

- 3.14.17 This would include loans and grants for local accommodation providers e.g. to expand provision to accommodate workers. It would also provide support for outreach, licencing, enforcement and pre-application advice from ESC, to facilitate accommodation providers to alter the terms of their planning permission or licence to enable them to accommodate Sizewell C workers longer-term.
- 3.14.18 On noise, SZC Co. met with the owners of Mollett's Farm on 21 July 2021 to discuss potential detailed landscaping amendments to further reduce visual and noise effects; the meeting is acknowledged in Mollett's Farm's submission [[REP6-066](#)].
- 3.14.19 Draft landscaping proposals were submitted to the owners of Mollett's Farm on 20 August 2021; these are included at **Appendix J**.
- 3.14.20 It was found that the landscaping, including a 2m high bund, would deliver a reduction in road traffic noise of up to 1 to 1.5dB. A quiet road surface was found to be likely to deliver close to its 2.5dB theoretical maximum improvement at Mollett's Farm, and a combination of both bund and quiet road surface would deliver a reduction in future road traffic noise levels of between 3 and 4dB. Mollets Partnership suggest that additional land take will be required to deliver landscaping, SZC Co. can confirm no additional land take is proposed and this matter is clarified in SZC Co.'s response to **ExQ2 CA.2.17** (Doc. Ref. 9.71).
- 3.14.21 Further discussions are scheduled for 2 September 2021 to discuss the findings.
- c) Mr & Mrs Lacey [[REP6-067](#)]
- 3.14.22 On noise, SZC Co. met with Mr and Mrs Lacey at Oakfield House on 21 July 2021 to discuss potential detailed landscaping amendments to further reduce visual and noise effects.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- 3.14.23 Draft landscaping proposals were submitted to Mr and Mrs Lacey on 20 August 2021; these are included at **Appendix J**.
- 3.14.24 The landscaping scheme includes additional planting and the potential for some bunding to assist screening. Further discussions are scheduled for 9 September 2021 to discuss further the development of the scheme.
- 3.14.25 From a noise perspective a quiet road surface was found to be likely to deliver close to its 2.5dB theoretical maximum improvement at Oakfield House.
- d) LJ and EJ Dowley
- 3.14.26 Two noise reports have been prepared by Create Consulting Engineers (CCE) on behalf of LJ and EJ Dowley, one relating to Theberton House [[REP6-054](#)] and one relating to Potters Farm [[REP6-053](#)]. The two reports follow a very similar format, so unless stated otherwise, SZC Co.'s responses refer to both reports.
- 3.14.27 There is a third submission [[REP6-056](#)], which appears to be identical to [[REP6-054](#)].
- 3.14.28 CCE has set out a number of criticisms of SZC Co.'s submitted noise assessments, which SZC Co. does not accept.
- 3.14.29 CCE describes the assessment of construction noise as “a preliminary assessment” (paragraph 2.3 and repeated at paragraph 2.5), noting the absence of detailed method statements.
- 3.14.30 CCE “strongly urge that a more detailed and exhaustive construction noise and vibration assessments should be undertaken once works processes have been finalised” (Appendix A paragraph 6.20 in [[REP6-054](#)] and Appendix A paragraph 6.21 in [[REP6-053](#)]).
- 3.14.31 This process of refining the assessments to define more detailed mitigation measures is exactly the process proposed by SZC Co. under the **Noise Monitoring and Management Plan**, an updated draft of which is submitted at Deadline 7 for the main development site (Doc Ref 9.68(A)).
- 3.14.32 Under the **Noise Monitoring and Management Plan**, the contractor and SZC Co. will be required to undertake further noise calculations in advance of the works, with the benefit of detailed contractor method statements, to determine how the works will be managed and monitored. Where the works are predicted to exceed a threshold of 55dB $L_{Aeq,16hrs}$, SZC Co. and the

contractor must submit details of the construction methods and mitigation to ESC for approval, without which the works cannot be undertaken.

- 3.14.33 Despite the criticisms of the level of detail included in the construction noise assessments, SZC Co. welcomes CCE’s statement that the level of detail is appropriate for this stage of the project, stating:

“The results and predictions presented in the EDF ES would be considered suitable for the ES stage in the development” (Appendix A paragraph 6.20 in [\[REP6-054\]](#) and Appendix A paragraph 6.21 in [\[REP6-053\]](#)).

- 3.14.34 For Theberton House, CCE has undertaken what it claims are ‘repeat’ calculations, seeking to demonstrate that SZC Co.’s construction noise levels for the preparatory works were underestimated.

- 3.14.35 However, CCE’s repeat calculations include all of the plant items listed under the ‘Site set-up and Clearance’ phase of works, at the closest distance of 250m.

- 3.14.36 As is clear from the distances set out in **Table 1.4** in **Volume 6, Appendix 4B** of the **ES** [\[APP-452\]](#), only the vegetation clearance is expected to occur at this distance, with the remainder of the works relating to the temporary contractor’s compound at Pretty Road being undertaken 1,200m from the receptor. Similarly, the CCE calculations assume that all of the activities happen within the same day, which is unlikely to happen in practice.

- 3.14.37 The comparison is not undertaken on a like-for-like basis and does not support CCE’s subsequent claims that noise from the preparatory phase of works has been under-estimated.

- 3.14.38 For Theberton House, CCE notes that “Over the specified 24-month duration, it has been stated that the Theberton House Estate receptor would experience each stage”; this is quoted from **paragraph 1.2.5** in **Volume 6, Appendix 4B** of the **ES** [\[APP-452\]](#).

- 3.14.39 CCE appears to use this quote to justify summing all of the noise from all of the phases of work at their shortest possible separation distance to quote a total noise level of 64dB, which they state is 24dB above the residual ambient level (Appendix A paragraph 6.13 in [\[REP6-054\]](#)).

- 3.14.40 It is not clear if CCE is suggesting that all phases of work across a 24 month construction programme would occur on the same day at the same shortest separation distance; if that is the case, then clearly it is not realistic.

- 3.14.41 The fact that SZC Co. states that each receptor would be affected by each phase of works is a reflection of the likely outcome over the course of the construction work, i.e. each phase of works will, in turn, affect each of the receptors to some degree; there is no suggestion in the submitted assessment that all phases will combine in the manner suggested by CCE.
- 3.14.42 CCE states that where two phases of work occur simultaneously, citing ‘pavement works’ and ‘kerbs, footways and paved areas’ as an example, the total noise level would be 61dB. The point being made by CCE is not clear as the noise level assessed by SZC Co. for the main construction works was 63dB, and therefore a higher level than CCE suggests is likely to happen.
- 3.14.43 Similar points are made in respect of Potter’s Farm in [\[REP6-053\]](#).
- 3.14.44 CCE states that SOAEL for construction noise should be based on the ‘ABC’ method set out in DMRB LA111³, which they claim would lead to a SOAEL 10dB lower than that adopted by SZC Co.
- 3.14.45 In response, SZC Co. notes:
- The SOAELs for construction noise, which are shown in **Table 11.11** in **Volume 2, Chapter 11** of the **ES** [\[APP-202\]](#), electronic page 24] in the submitted assessments is in accordance with the approach adopted across numerous NSIPs or schemes of similar stature, including Tilbury 2, HS2 and West Midlands Interchange. In the case of HS2, it was promoted by a Government-owned body that went through a parliamentary procedure, such that it is considered to be a very weighty precedent.
 - ESC confirmed at ISH8 that it agrees the SOAELs across the noise sources associated with the Project to be acceptable, including those for construction noise.
 - DMRB LA111 states that alternative methods of determining SOAEL can be acceptable.
- 3.14.46 Furthermore, there is an incoherence in the relationship between SOAEL and a significant adverse effect, in an EIA context, in DMRB LA111 that undermines the adoption of the approach set out in that document.

³ Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA111 Noise and vibration (May 2020)

- 3.14.47 The definition of significance in an EIA context in DMRB LA111 is subject to a duration test⁴, where a significant effect in an EIA context only occurs where SOAEL is exceeded for a period of 10 days in any consecutive 15 days, or 40 days in any consecutive six months.
- 3.14.48 This duration test is not applied to SOAEL in DMRB LA111, resulting in an imbalance between the two tests; exceeding SOAEL does not necessarily result in a significant adverse effect in an EIA context, for example where the exceedance only occurs for 8 days. This is counter-intuitive.
- 3.14.49 Secondly, significant adverse effects are only declared where SOAEL is exceeded⁵, which the policy test in paragraph 5.11.9 of NPS EN-1 would not permit; in accordance with paragraph 5.11.9 of NPS EN-1, consent should not be granted where SOAEL is not avoided.
- 3.14.50 While SZC Co. is clear that SOAEL and significant adverse effects in an EIA context do not necessarily have to align, it is illogical if SOAEL is set below the threshold for significance in an EIA context.
- 3.14.51 This inherent contradiction in how DMRB LA111 defines SOAEL relative to significant adverse effects, in an EIA context, is only resolved if SOAEL is aligned to the top level category in the ‘ABC’ method, i.e. Category C, which is broadly equivalent to the values adopted by SZC Co., and a significant adverse effect in an EIA context is identified at a lower threshold or the same threshold but without the duration being tested as well.
- 3.14.52 Give the agreement of ESC to the adopted construction noise SOAELs, which was confirmed at ISH8, and the precedents referred to above, SZC Co. is content that its approach is appropriate and robust.
- 3.14.53 CCE has undertaken baseline noise monitoring at both properties in their submissions on behalf of LJ and EJ Dowley. They report baseline noise levels that are 6-7dB lower than SZC Co.’s measured baseline levels for Theberton House and 2dB lower for Potters Farm. In both instances, the CCE measurements were undertaken at the properties themselves, which were not at the same locations used by SZC Co.
- 3.14.54 These differences in measured noise level do not make a material difference to the submitted assessments, because:
- the baseline noise level affects whether a construction noise effect is regarded as negligible or minor adverse, as the threshold between the

⁴ See paragraph 3.19 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA111 Noise and Vibration (May 2020)

⁵ See Table 3.16 and paragraph 3.19 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA111 Noise and Vibration (May 2020)

two categories is defined by the measured ambient noise level. Neither outcome is significant in an EIA context; and

- the LOAEL adopted for construction noise is deemed to be equal to the existing ambient noise level. However, the consequence of being above LOAEL is that steps should be taken to mitigate and minimise noise effects⁶. Mitigation will be implemented irrespective of whether LOAEL is exceeded or not through the **Code of Construction Practice [REP5-078]** and **Noise Monitoring and Management Plan**, which apply throughout the works.

3.14.55 SZC Co. considers that there is no material effect on the assessment outcomes of baseline noise data that is lower than that relied on in the submitted assessments.

3.14.56 CCE notes that the noise assessments only consider the dwellings, and not the wider landholdings. However, the approach to assessing construction noise and vibration in BS5228-1: 2009+A1: 2014, and the approach to assessing road traffic noise in DMRB LA111, both relate to effects at dwellings, not to effects at land around dwellings. On this basis, it is considered that the submitted assessments are appropriate.

3.14.57 For Theberton House, CCE notes that the transport noise assessment is “within acceptable tolerances” but that “when comparing these levels to the measured sound levels however, the significance was found to increase from Not Significant to Significant” (Appendix A paragraph 10.4 in [\[REP6-054\]](#)).

3.14.58 It is likely that this conclusion relates just to the predicted long-term effect of the Sizewell link road after the power station is complete and operational, as in the short-term during the construction of the power station, the outcomes SZC Co. identified at Theberton House are already significant.

3.14.59 It is noted that the assessment outcomes quoted by CCE in Table 9.1 of [\[REP6-054\]](#) relate to Theberton Hall, not Theberton House, and are taken from **Volume 6, Chapter 4** of the **ES [APP-451]**. The current outcomes for all receptors assessed for traffic noise from the Sizewell link road are contained in the **Third ES Addendum [REP6-017]**.

3.14.60 Using DMRB LA111, baseline monitoring can be used to inform baseline modelling, or to validate baseline modelling. However, the only option set

⁶ Paragraph 5.11.9 of NPS EN-1

out in the document for the assessment of changes in road traffic noise is the use of calculations⁷.

3.14.61 It is therefore considered that the submitted assessments are appropriate and follow the approach set out in DMRB LA111 correctly.

e) Mr and Mrs Grant [[REP6-057](#)]

3.14.62 The report on behalf of Mr Grant [[REP6-057](#)], which relates to Fordley Hall, follows the same format as the reports for LJ and EL Dowley, and makes the same points.

3.14.63 SZC Co.'s responses set out above in relation to Create Consulting Engineers' reports submitted on behalf of LJ and EL Dowley also apply to the submission on behalf of Mr Grant.

f) Mr Beaumont [[REP6-081](#)]

3.14.64 The report on behalf of Mr Beaumont [[REP6-081](#)], which relates to Theberton Hall, follows the same format as the reports for LJ and EL Dowley, and makes the same points.

3.14.65 SZC Co.'s response set out above in relation to Create Consulting Engineers' reports submitted on behalf of LJ and EL Dowley also apply to the submission on behalf of Mr Beaumont.

3.14.66 A number of Written Representations submitted at Deadline 2 raised common themes on air quality matters and a response is provided at **Appendix N** of this report. For clarity, this relates to the following Written Representations:

- Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) [[REP2-481g](#), [REP2-481n](#)]
- Lawrence Moss [[REP2-353](#)]
- Frances Crowe [[REP2-275](#)]

⁷ See paragraph 3.51 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA111 Noise and Vibration (May 2020)

4 ADDITIONAL WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS ARISING FROM ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARINGS (ISH1 – ISH6)

4.1 Overview

4.1.1 This section provides further information or updates to SZC Co.'s **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH1 to ISH6** [REP5-113 to REP5-118] where specified in the **Subsequent Written Submissions to ISH1-ISH6** report [[REP6-025](#)] submitted at Deadline 6.

4.2 Issue Specific Hearing 1

4.2.1 An updated **Draft Deed of Obligation** (DoO) (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) is submitted at Deadline 7 taking account of discussions at the Issue Specific Hearings and feedback from ESC and SCC. In respect of the proposed controls on the provision of the Project Accommodation in the draft Deed of Obligation, please refer to Schedule 3 and 9 for details.

4.2.2 **Appendix K** contains a note demonstrating how the Works Plans listed at Schedule 4 of the **draft Development Consent Order** (DCO) (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)) and the Approved Plans listed at Schedule 7 adhere to the Parameter Plans listed at Schedule 6 of the same document.

4.3 Issue Specific Hearings 2 and 3

4.3.1 An updated **Construction Traffic Management Plan** (CTMP) (Doc Ref. 8.7(B)) and **Construction Worker Travel Plan** (CWTP) (Doc Ref. 8.8(B)) will be submitted at Deadline 8. The updated management plans will take account of feedback at the Issue Specific Hearings and subsequent discussions with ESC and SCC. The **draft DoO** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) has been updated to address feedback on the clarity of commitments in respect of the CTMP and CWTP. In respect of the CTMP and CWTP, the updated **draft DoO** includes:

- Drafting to confirm the power of the Transport Review Group to require SZC Co. to submit mitigation measure for its approval to address the impact of any shortfalls or exceedances against the targets or limited within the CTMP and CWTP identified through the monitoring and ensure SZC Co. is required to implement any approved mitigation measures.

4.3.2 An updated transport environmental assessment has been included within the **Fourth Environmental Statement (ES) Addendum** (Doc Ref. 6.18) submitted at Deadline 7.

4.4 Issue Specific Hearing 4

4.4.1 An update on discussions with ESC on the proposed controls in the provision of the Project Accommodation is detailed above.

4.5 Issue Specific Hearing 5

4.5.1 In terms of SZC Co.'s commitment to engage with the Suffolk Design Review Panel prior to discharging relevant requirements, please refer to the emerging drafting in the **Draft Deed of Obligation** (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), Schedule 17, the principle of which has been agreed with ESC and the coordinator of the Panel itself.

4.5.2 Following ISH5, SZC Co. committed to provide additional visualisations to National Trust, including visualisations from Coastguard Cottages. This will be provided at Deadline 8.

4.6 Issue Specific Hearing 6

4.6.1 An updated **Construction Method Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.3 3D(B)) is submitted at Deadline 7 addressing updates to paragraph 3.1.61 of the report regarding additional terrestrial piles.

4.7 Issue Specific Hearing 7

4.7.1 The updated Landscape Retention and Clearance Plans (Doc Ref 2.5(B)) are being submitted at Deadline 7 to reflect the revised engineering proposals around the SSSI crossing in order to retain a greater degree of the existing vegetation to the west of the SSSI crossing. The updated (reduced) temporary landtake figures, referred to in paragraph 1.2.8 of [REP6-002], which are based on these updated plans, will be provided at Deadline 8.