

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>CC.2 Climate change and resilience</b>		
CC.2.0	The Applicant	<p><b>General Climate Change and Policy Issues</b></p> <p>On 20 July 2021, the Environment Agency published updates to the climate change allowances for flood risk assessments. The changes updated peak river flow allowances to reflect the UK Climate Projections (UKCP18) and modelling for rainfall. Please indicate whether there are any differences to the Sizewell C Project assessment resulting from the new projections?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>An update to the National Planning Policy Framework, published on 20 July 2021, was supported by the publication of updated guidance on climate change allowances by the Environment Agency on the same date. A clarification to this update was subsequently published by the Environment Agency on 27 July 2021 to confirm that UKCP18 projections were used in the updated guidance.</p> <p>SZC Co. has reviewed the updated Environment Agency guidance. SZC Co. notes that the latest changes relate to peak river flow allowances. They do not include amendments to the guidance on sea level rise values or the peak rainfall intensity approach, which were previously updated on 17 December 2019 and have already been reviewed by SZC Co. for applicability to the Project and, therefore, do not require further review.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, SZC Co. has carried out a review of the revised guidance on peak river flow allowances for both the main development site and associated developments. For a project of this nature (i.e. a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP)), the guidance requires the consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the upper end allowance for peak river flow for the main development site; and</li> <li>• the central allowance when considering off-site impacts for most cases; or</li> <li>• the higher central allowance when the affected areas contain essential infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>The main development site and the associated developments are mostly located in the East Suffolk Management Catchment. This requires consideration of the following values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2020s (2015 – 2039) Central – 8%</li> <li>• 2020s (2015 – 2039) Higher Central –13%</li> <li>• 2020s (2015 – 2039) Upper End– 25%</li> </ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2050s (2040 – 2069) Central – 7%</li> <li>• 2050s (2040 – 2069) Higher Central – 13%</li> <li>• 2050s (2040 – 2069) Upper End – 29%</li> <li>• 2080s (2070 – 2125) Central – 19%</li> <li>• 2080s (2070 – 2125) Higher Central – 29%</li> <li>• 2080s (2070 – 2125) Upper End– 54%</li> </ul> <p>For the Cam and Ely Ouse Management Catchment, in which the Pakenham fen meadow habitat site is proposed, the updated Environment Agency guidance on climate change allowances for fluvial flows are lower than those presented above for the East Suffolk Management Catchment.</p> <p>SZC Co. confirms that climate change scenarios for all sources of flooding, including peak river flow allowances, have been assessed in the <b>Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (MDS FRA)</b> [<a href="#">AS-018</a>] and <b>MDS FRA Addendum</b> [<a href="#">AS-157</a>]. The values assessed within the fluvial modelling, to reflect future increases in peak river flows, are 35%, 65% and 80% for both the 1 in 100 year and 1 in 1,000 year event. Furthermore, SZC Co. confirms that the assessment of fluvial flood risk for both the two village bypass and Sizewell link road has also considered the 35% and 65% allowances. Flood risk assessment for the remaining associated development sites has not required modelling and the outputs of the assessment have the approval of the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority, as confirmed in the respective Statements of Common Ground to be submitted at Deadline 8 (refer to Doc Ref. 9.10.4(A) and Doc Ref. 9.10.12(A) respectively).</p> <p>On this basis, SZC Co. considers that a precautionary approach has been adopted as the values assessed within the Project are greater than the worst-case scenario from the revised guidance and there are no requirements for further assessment resulting from the new projections.</p>
CC.2.1	The Applicant, EA	<p><b>General Climate Change and Policy Issues</b></p> <p>In response to ExQ1 CC.1.17 [REP2-100], the Applicant states that: <i>“UKCP18 RCP8.5 95th percentile climate change allowance has been adopted within the assessment of flood risk, in respect of the main platform and sea defence designs, in accordance with the guidance set out in the Position Statement on the Use of UK Climate Projections 2018 (UKCP18) by</i></p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>GB Nuclear Industry, March 2019, which was the latest guidance at the time of the assessment</i>". Please confirm that that still remains the latest guidance and that the assessment does not need to be updated?</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>Revision 1 of the <i>Use of UK Climate Projections 2018 (UKCP18)</i> by GB Nuclear Industry guidance was published in November 2020. SZC Co. has reviewed the updated guidance to confirm the use of appropriate climate change allowances for the Project.</p> <p>Table 3 of the updated guidance specifies which Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) should be used to comply with requirements set out by the regulators, such as the ONR and the Environment Agency. The ONR does not prescribe the use of a particular RCP, whereas the Environment Agency specifies that for sea level rise, the allowances should be based on the 70th and 95th percentiles of the RCP 8.5 scenario.</p> <p>As stated in response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) CC.1.17 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>], SZC Co. has applied the 95th percentile of RCP8.5 for sea level rise allowance in the assessment of flood risk, and concludes that this remains in accordance with the latest guidance and no update to the assessment is required.</p>
<p>CC.2.2</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p><b>General Climate Change and Policy Issues</b></p> <p>In response to ExQ1 CC.1.7 [REP2-100], the Applicant states that the CoCP requirement to measure, monitor, and report energy and water consumption and GHG emissions during construction will be passed to SZC Co. contractors through their contracts. Contractors' performance will be monitored by SZC Co. through the recording and reporting tool, and audits will be undertaken to identify any non-compliance(s) against contractual requirements (including compliance with the CoCP). However, this means that there would be no independent third party verification of CoCP and hence DCO requirement compliance. Should the reports not be shared with other relevant independent parties with a means of ensuring that they would be effectively utilised, and actions instigated where necessary secured through the DCO?</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>The CoCP explains how SZC Co. will ensure that commitments it has made are implemented fully on such a large infrastructure project with many contractors. Appropriate levels of reporting and sharing of monitoring results within the planning</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>context has been included within the Level 1 control documents. Through the construction and operation of Sizewell C, SZC Co. will be subject to all applicable existing legislative regimes, many of which have their own requirements for reporting. SZC Co. has also committed to various voluntary regimes to ensure high levels of transparency and accountability as is standard within the nuclear industry.</p> <p>Specific to climate change SZC Co.'s construction environmental arrangements will be subject to independent audits for accreditation to the ISO14001 standard. This includes an assessment of performance against compliance obligations and opportunities for continual improvement.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project will also be subject to a CEEQUAL assessment, which considers monitoring requirements and results for energy, carbon and water use. The CEEQUAL assessment will be independently verified and ratified by BRE assessors.</p> <p>Monitoring results for energy, water and GHG emissions will be made available to East Suffolk Council for inspection, if requested.</p>
CC.2.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b></p> <p>A response has been provided to ExQ1 CC.1.3 in relation to the implications of the CCC sixth carbon budget. The Carbon Budget Order 2021 came into force on 24 June 2021, which secures the carbon budget for 2033-2037 as a matter of law. Please provide any further response and/or addition to the original response and/or the Planning Statement Update to reflect that.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. recognise that the Carbon Budget Order 2021 came into force on 24 June 2021. SZC Co.'s response within <a href="#">[REP2-100]</a> for ExQ1 CC.1.3 set out an assessment against the 6<sup>th</sup> carbon budget and this assessment remains valid.</p>
CC.2.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to EXQ1 CC.1.3 states that since the preparation of the ES it has undertaken a Life Cycle Carbon Assessment (LCA) and this is provided at Appendix 9A to its response <a href="#">[REP2-110]</a>. TASC <a href="#">[REP3-145]</a> submits that the LCA appears to provide data by way of percentages but offers no reconciliation of absolute figures in terms of the carbon debts arising from the relevant contributory elements and the calculations that use these figures to produce the summarised figures in the LCA report. Elements of the SZC project will likely decarbonise at different rates. The Applicant is requested to explain what</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>assumptions have been adopted in the revised calculations and which transport strategies have been assumed?</p> <p>The LCA was done from first principles through an extensive data calculation and gathering exercise rather than an evolution from the work done from the ES. Although there is some cross over for some of the data inputs used between the LCA and ES, much of the data for the LCA was collected or calculated specifically to undertake the LCA and was not available for use in the ES. Differences in data are therefore a function of many factors (see response to <b>Question CC.2.6</b>).</p> <p>Although the presentation of the current report does not specify explicitly Mt of carbon by activity this is because the analysis followed the Product Category Rules (PCR) for electricity generation which specify requirements for conducting and reporting LCA analysis as part of an Environmental Product Declaration under the International EPD System. The PCR for electricity generation requires reporting in the form of kg carbon equivalent per 'functional unit', which is kWh of electricity generated (rather than report absolute carbon amounts per contributory element). The absolute carbon figures can be calculated from the report using lifetime net generation (page 3) and data presented in Section 5. However, SZC Co. acknowledges that this is not immediately visible and will add absolute carbon figures in our forthcoming updated EPD style document to make the presentation of data clearer.</p> <p>Transport strategies assumed were consistent with those provided in the updated view of the bulk materials transport assessment – including the detailed models of delivery and source of the material. Consistent with the transport assessment, 40% of bulk materials are assumed to be brought to site by HGVs (and 60% by rail/sea). The LCA requires a tonnes per km measure for all transport associated with the power station. To produce this some additional data was required for the LCA that was not required for the transport assessment) – for example distance of journey (including international deliveries), some LGV movements, operating phase transport movements. In these instances a bespoke calculation was done for the LCA.</p>
CC.2.5	TASC	<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b></p> <p>The initial SoCG [REP2-067] between the Applicant and TASC identifies as an area of disagreement the adequacy of the Applicant's evidence on the carbon impacts of the</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>construction, decommissioning and storage phases of the proposal. TASC is requested to provide further details of that criticism of the Applicant's evidence and indicate whether there has been any subsequent narrowing of the area of disagreement between the parties?</p>
CC.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b></p> <p>TASC [REP3-145] points out that in their answer to question CC.1.3, the Applicant states that they have updated their analysis of the construction carbon footprint and calculated a revised carbon footprint of 3.8Mt. This figure compares to 6.2Mt stated in the documents submitted in January 2021. TASC have been unable to find a detailed explanation for this change in figures. Likewise, the ExA is unclear as to how this latest figure has been derived and a further detailed explanation is sought for this change, setting out how the two figures have been calculated and a reconciliation of the differences?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Please note the response below repeats the response to question G.2.13 (ii).</p> <p>The difference in calculated construction phase emissions in the Environmental Statement (ES) with those calculated in the LCA arise because of differences in the factors described below (these factors also affect estimates of operating and decommissioning phase carbon emissions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) input data for the volumes/amounts of materials, energy and transport used during construction (for example the tonnes of steel used during construction) – in particular the data input collection for the LCA was more detailed and granular (see below);</li> <li>b) different sources for life cycle impacts of the materials, energy and transport used during construction (for example the carbon footprint of a tonne of a type of steel): The ES calculation used a number of sources; while the LCA exclusively used a specialist life cycle impact (LCI) database which is considered the leading and most consistent LCI database in the market (ecoinvent v3.7);</li> <li>c) the LCA calculation was undertaken using a specialist LCA software package (SimaPro); the ES calculation was done using a Microsoft Office tool (Excel).</li> </ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The LCA was done as a standalone exercise from first principles (i.e. was not an evolution of the ES) and therefore diverged from the ES as set out above. In particular, the LCA was undertaken in line with requirements of the International EPD System's (IES) Product Category Rules (PCR, see reference for a generic description<sup>1</sup>), by a specialist LCA consultancy and in line with the best practice for producing a through life LCA.</p> <p>In practical terms there were a number of important differences between the LCA calculation and the ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Following the PCR meant a more granular approach to the data collection for the LCA, with many inputs requiring bespoke detailed work and estimating.</li><li>- The LCA exercise was conducted in conjunction with Hinkley Point C in order to assimilate detailed data that was relevant to both projects (in particular where the design of the plant is the same).</li><li>- As the data inputs for the LCA were collected after the ES there was more information available on construction methodology and a more mature design</li></ul> <p>The underlying estimate of materials use (steel, concrete, etc) for construction is particularly important for the difference in construction emissions. For the LCA, the data was collected through an extensive exercise with HPC taking several months to generate data inputs that were not available at the time of the ES. As a result of the detailed work that was undertaken and the benefits of collaboration with the HPC project, SZC Co. is confident that certain materials inputs used for the LCA calculation represent a more accurate estimate than those available for the earlier ES calculation.</p> <p>It should be noted that for SZC specific construction work (where the material inputs would be different to HPC – for example earthworks), the estimated materials inputs were very similar for the ES and LCA as the same sources were largely used.</p> <p>The large numbers of differences in input data and methodological approaches set out above means that it is not possible to precisely quantify the causes of the differences in carbon emissions between the January documents and the LCA. However, it is possible to</p>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.environdec.com/product-category-rules-pcr/the-pcr>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>identify key drivers of the difference, which are responsible for the majority of the divergence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Lower volumes of some materials (in particular steel): The detailed materials input assessment for the LCA found lower estimated amounts of certain construction materials than had been available for the ES calculation (in particular significantly lower amounts of steel and bitumen). Steel is a carbon intensive material and forms the majority of the carbon associated with materials use (around 60% in the LCA). This means the reduction in its estimated usage gives rise to significant reduction in total estimated construction emissions.</li><li>- The lower updated bitumen estimate also reduced carbon emissions, but had a smaller impact than steel.</li><li>- More accurate steel carbon intensity assumptions: Collection of more accurate data with respect to steel use for the LCA also allowed a more accurate assessment of the types of steel that would be used at the plant. For example, splitting the estimated total steel use into categories such as reinforcement bar and equipment. Different types of steel have different carbon intensities (kg of carbon per kg of steel). To the example above, reinforcement bar typically has a lower carbon intensity per kg than steel used in equipment. With data available on different types of steel for the LCA, it was possible to apply different carbon intensities for the different categories of steel (for instance applying a lower carbon intensity for steel reinforcement bar and a higher carbon intensity for the steel used for equipment). A detailed breakdown in types of steel use was not available at the time of the ES. In light of this and in order to be conservative, the ES applied a uniform and relatively high steel carbon intensity to all steel. The net impact of being able to use different carbon intensities for different types of steel in the LCA is a further reduction in construction carbon emissions associated with steel use.</li><li>- Carbon intensity of 'other' materials in the ES: The 'other' category of materials in the ES is assumed to mostly comprise aggregates. Review of the ES calculation has identified a spreadsheet error which resulted in the carbon intensity factor (kg carbon per kg material) applied to 'other materials' being too high in the ES. This error increased construction carbon emissions in the ES.</li><li>- Higher energy use in the LCA: The LCA has a higher energy consumption during construction than the ES, mainly driven by the assumed electricity use. This</li></ul>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>increases estimated construction emissions in the LCA partly offsetting the impacts above. It should be noted that, following further work with HPC, the SZC electricity consumption assumption used for the LCA is considered an overestimate, is currently being updated and will be incorporated in the EPD style document discussed in question CC.2.7., but the LCA carbon impact of energy use is expected to remain higher than the ES estimate.</p>
CC.2.7	Applicant	<p><b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b></p> <p>The Appendix 9a to the responses to ExQ1 carbon focused life cycle assessment (LCA) of the proposed Sizewell C nuclear power plant development [REP2-110] indicates that a full LCA and EPD will come at a later point and this report is focused purely on Global Warming Potential (GWP).</p> <p>(i) Please indicate the stage at which the full LCA and EPD will be carried out?</p> <p>(ii) The report indicates that both downstream and to some extent upstream processes are outside of SZC's control – does that lack of control give any cause for concern?</p> <p>(iii) What steps, if any, does SZC propose to take in response to the recommendations of the report?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) For clarification, an EPD (Environmental Product Declaration) is produced for an activity that is being undertaken and creating a 'product' rather than a potential future activity. As Sizewell C is not yet generating electricity it will not be able to produce an EPD. At the time of producing the Deadline 2 responses SZC Co. and Ricardo AEA (the consultant undertaking the LCA analysis) had understood that IES (International EPD System) was considering introducing a new 'design EPD' for Sizewell C (in effect an EPD for a future product), as described in the Executive Summary and Introduction of the LCA report. However, SZC Co. understands that the IES position has since changed and the future report is unlikely to use EPD branding. This does not change the content of the future report, which will contain the same information, and it can be presented as an EPD-style report (i.e. provides the same information as would be produced in an EPD report) and to the extent practicable meet the data requirements of an EPD report (for example granularity of data, activities included within the assessment).</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>While the EPD style document will contain a number of environmental indicators, the carbon footprint (global warming potential) component of the future EPD-style LCA is the same as the carbon focused LCA analysis that has been provided, so SZC Co. would not expect the LCA carbon assessment to change materially (there are likely to be a small number of updates for new data that has become available in the interim).</p> <p>(ii) Downstream processes are essentially the UK transmission and distribution power network. The lack of 'control' is a reflection of the fact that these are owned and operated by different parties to SZC Co. This is the same for all UK power generation connected to the power network (which is the vast majority of power generation). The UK transmission and distribution networks operate within the UK's legislative and regulatory arrangements, and SZC Co. does not consider potential environmental implications of its lack of control to be a concern.</p> <p>Upstream activities (related to the production, manufacture and transport of nuclear fuel) are not within SZC Co.'s control today because SZC Co. is not procuring any nuclear fuel and it will be a number of years before it does. At the point that SZC Co. is close to or is procuring fuel and has established commercial relationships with the nuclear fuel supply chain, it is likely to be possible to exercise control/influence.</p> <p>SZC Co. notes that the following factors facilitate good environmental outcomes: uranium mining today typically follows international standards, and the process of enriching, fabricating and transporting nuclear fuel is conducted under rigorous and robust nuclear and environmental regulations. Furthermore, as noted in the LCA report, SZC Co. is investigating ways it could reduce its requirement for uranium mining (e.g. through enriching depleted uranium tails or use of reprocessed fuel) which would be expected to provide beneficial environmental impacts (these potential benefits are not quantified in the LCA).</p> <p>(iii) All the recommendations in the report are or are likely to be acted on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- SZC Co. is considering options for its nuclear fuel supply arrangements (as described in the report).</li></ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SZC Co. will continue to evaluate its energy options (though this has many factors to consider as well as environmental impact – including health and safety).</li> <li>- SZC Co. has collected some data on a potential UK GDF which it will look to include in the lifecycle analysis in the EPD style document.</li> <li>- SZC Co. is are considering the reporting requirements for the supply chain through construction.</li> </ul>
CC.2.8		<p><b>Climate Change Adaptation</b></p> <p>The ONR in response to ExQ1 CC.1.3 (i) [REP2-159] states that information shared to date suggests it is likely that the Applicant's approach to assessing and managing climate change, including adaptation measures, will meet ONR's expectations for nuclear site licensing. Please indicate whether that remains the position at this stage of the ONR assessment?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	It is assumed this question is for the ONR and therefore no response from SZC Co. is required.
CC.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Climate Change Adaptation</b></p> <p>The Applicant in its comments on the EA response to ExQ1 CC.1.16 [REP3-046] indicates that is currently in talks with and will continue to engage with the landowners for the affected area, with the view to obtaining confirmation that the increased flood depth is accepted by the landowners. Please provide an update as to the progress of any such talks and indicate whether any agreement has been reached?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Engagement with landowners in proximity to the main development site is on-going on a number of issues, including sharing details of the anticipated flooding risk to land. The levels of increased flooding have been confirmed as minimal, after the application of primary mitigation, and not considered to be significant. As explained in SZC Co.'s response to ExQ1 CC.1.16 [REP3-046], the Environment Agency has acknowledged that any potential increase in flood risk would be to areas that are currently already at risk of flooding and that any increase in depth can be considered to be insignificant. Due to the low significance and specific characteristics of the future flooding, SZC Co. does not believe it would be possible or proportionate to secure easements or any other interest in land. SZC Co. will continue to seek confirmation from landowners that the increased flood</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		depth on their land is accepted. Currently, discussions are ongoing and no landowners have confirmed acceptance.
CC.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Climate Change Adaptation</b></p> <p>The Applicant in its comments on the EA response to ExQ1 CC.1.16 [REP3-046] states that it considers that, in accordance with the policy in EN1, paragraph 5.1.17, an increase in flood depth is acceptable. That policy exceptionally allows an increase in flood risk elsewhere if it cannot be avoided or wholly mitigated, and if the increase in present and future flood risk can be mitigated to an acceptable level taking account of the benefits of, including the need for, nationally significant energy infrastructure.</p> <p>(i) Please summarise why such an increase in flood risk cannot be avoided or wholly mitigated in this case?</p> <p>(ii) Are there any other factors other than the anticipated level of increase in flood depths that support the Applicant's view that the increase in flood depth would be acceptable?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) Paragraphs 2.2.23 and 2.3.12 of the <b>MDS FRA Addendum</b> [<a href="#">AS-157</a>] conclude that the impact on flood levels is largely caused by the occupation of part of the floodplain by the main platform and the embankments of the SSSI crossing; however, this would be a relatively minimal impact on off-site receptors (i.e. a relative increase in flood depth of 0.02m).</p> <p>NPS EN-6 identifies Sizewell as being one of eight sites potentially suitable for new nuclear development. The proposed location of the Project was identified in NPS EN-6, and its siting and the size of the platform is driven by the infrastructure requirements, as summarised in <b>Chapter 4</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-175</a>] and <b>Appendix 8.4A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> [<a href="#">APP-591</a>]. Therefore, it is not considered possible to avoid the limited impact on flood levels associated with the loss of floodplain within the main platform area.</p> <p>SZC Co. has undertaken a thorough assessment of potential mitigation measures, including consideration of various flood mitigation areas and the revised design of the SSSI crossing to reduce the footprint of the embankments. This <b>Embedded Mitigation Measures Paper</b> is currently being drafted and will be submitted at Deadline 8 following review by the Environment Agency. This assessment has concluded that the optimal design options have been identified and that further flood mitigation areas or a wider</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>crossing opening would not provide a significant reduction in flood levels or further offset the impacts of floodplain occupation by the main platform. Therefore, SZC Co. concludes that the impact to off-site receptors (residential or non-residential properties) (i.e. a relative increase in flood depth of 0.02m) could not be fully mitigated.</p> <p>(ii) In section 3.3 and 3.4 of the <b>MDS FRA Addendum</b> [<a href="#">AS-157</a>], SZC Co. has assessed the change in flood levels, velocity and hazard rating as a result of the Sizewell C Project considering fluvial, coastal inundation and tidal breach flood risk. The assessment concluded that the Sizewell C Project would not result in a significant change in flood velocity or hazard rating for any residential or non-residential properties or other off-site receptors. On this basis, and considering that the relative change in flood depth is limited, SZC Co. considers that such level of change is not significant and would be acceptable.</p>
CC.2.11	EA	<p><b>Climate Change Adaptation</b></p> <p>The Applicant in its comments on the EA response to ExQ1 CC.1.16 [REP3-046] queries whether the approximation of area quoted by the EA has been calculated based on known third party landownership, excluding areas within the EDF ENGL and BEGL ownership. Please can the EA confirm if that is the case?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
CC.2.12	EA	<p><b>Climate Change Adaptation</b></p> <p>The Applicant in its comments on the EA response to ExQ1 CC.1.16 [REP3-046] states that a review of the change in flood depth within the third party land ownership shows that it is variable and that an increase in flood depth above 0.2m affects only approximately 15% of this area, whilst approximately 40% of this area has an increase in flood depth of less than 0.1m. In addition, there is no change in the flood extent within this third party landownership during this event. Does the EA agree that correctly reflects the position in relation to third party land?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
CC.2.13	The Applicant	<b>Climate Change Adaptation</b>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>In response to ExQ1 CC.1.17 [REP2-100], the Applicant refers to the response to FR.1.2, and states that the impacts of climate change on sea level rise would be monitored and assessed at set intervals (e.g. 10 years) to determine the trajectory of the projections and consider whether any change is required. For the avoidance of doubt, please confirm that this monitoring and assessment will be included within the CPMMP and overseen by the MTF and would be in addition to any Nuclear Site Licence requirements?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Sea level will be reported as part of the CPMMP and provided to the Sizewell C "External Hazards" team. The MTF will have visibility via the CPMMP reporting but sea level itself is not of particular significance to the CPMMP itself.
<b>CA.2 Compulsory acquisition</b>		
CA.2.0	The Applicant	<p><b>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ CA.1.1 [REP2-100] rejects the suggestion that the notice period pursuant to draft DCO Article 25(2) should be extended from 14 to 28 days. It is noted that ESC considers a period of 28 days to be more appropriate. Whilst there may be a greater need for urgency in the Article 24 situation where protective works are required to buildings, there would not seem to be a similar degree of urgency in relation to matters covered by Article 25. Please reconsider the notice period in Article 25(2) and explain further:</p> <p>(i) What consideration has been given to the interests of landowners and the difficulties they might have in allowing access, for example, to agricultural land accommodating livestock at short notice?</p> <p>(ii) What would be the impact upon the timing of the works overall should the notice period be extended to 28 days?</p> <p>(iii) Please provide further details of the types of survey and investigative works that would be undertaken pursuant to this power and justify the need for speed in carrying out those works setting out the difference that an additional 14 days would make to the entire timeline for addressing impacts that might arise from the development, if authorised.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	(i) SZC Co. and its agents have liaised with the landowners and their agents (and the NFU) over a number of years, not least in respect of access for surveys. The 14 days' notice period is consistent with the majority of licence agreements that have been entered into with all landowners with whom access for surveys is required, and the 14 days' notice

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>period has been included in the Heads of Terms signed by the significant majority of landowners and is included in the draft option agreement. SZC Co. is mindful of how surveys have the potential to disrupt (particularly) agricultural operations and as such ensures that, wherever possible, early visibility of survey programmes are shared with landowners to enable owners and occupiers of land to plan accordingly. However, the principle of the 14 days' notice period has not been challenged by landowners and (as discussed in (iii) below) it would not be appropriate to extend the notice periods beyond the 14 days' notice provided for within the draft DCO. The notice period is also consistent with other DCOs, including the following recent examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A303 Sparksford DCO 2021</li><li>• Riverside Energy park DCO 2020</li><li>• Cleve Hill DCO 2020</li><li>• Hornsea 3 windfarm DCO 2020</li><li>• Norfolk Vanguard windfarm DCO 2020</li><li>• Immingham Open Cycle Gas Turbine DCO 2020</li></ul> <p>In respect of livestock, the vast majority of land required for surveys is arable land, and whilst SZC Co. is mindful of ensuring that agricultural operations are disrupted as little as possible, provisions for the payment of compensation have also been provided for within the licence agreements (and draft option agreements).</p> <p>ii) Many of the surveys undertaken are seasonal, and as such any failure to complete the required survey programme could delay the project programme by approximately 12 months. There may be the requirement to relocate protected species which can only be completed at certain times of the year and constraints such as weather or availability of specialists means that the flexibility provided for through the 14 days' notice period is essential to ensure the windows are not lost. It is also the case that surveys themselves may result in information being secured that predicate further surveys being undertaken (that had not initially been anticipated); the 14 days' notice period mitigates the risk that survey teams will have been de-mobilised for that survey programme and avoids seasonal windows being missed with the subsequent programme delays.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		(iii) Surveys could include seasonally limited ecological surveys such as bat roost or activity surveys, water vole surveys or great crested newt surveys where failure to secure relatively narrow optimal survey windows could lead to substantive delays of up to 9-12 months (in the case of great crested newts in ponds) until the next available survey window.
CA.2.1	The Applicant	<b>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</b> The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.2 [REP2-100], submits that the Applicant has a strong incentive to adopt a proportional approach to drafting restrictive covenants and to consult with the owners and occupiers of any land affected to avoid any constraint beyond that needed to ensure adequate protection and maintenance of the works. However, should landowners not be provided with such safeguards in the drafting of Article 30 to ensure a proportional approach, rather than rely upon the Applicant acting upon such incentives?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	As stated in SZC Co.'s response to ExQ1 CA 1.2, SZC Co. is not aware of any other DCOs where 'safeguards' of the sorts suggested have been imposed in the relevant article. The principle of consistency in decision-making would mean that good reasons would need to be identified as to why a different approach was necessary in this case, having regard to the extensive precedents identified. SZC Co. is not aware of any evidence that these provisions have given rise to difficulty or unfairness in practice, or of any other factors which would justify a different approach here.  In addition to the factors identified in response to ExQ1 CA.1.2(ii), provisions of the type contemplated by ExQ1 CA.1.2 would be onerous and are unnecessary to achieve fairness to landowners, on the basis that:  (i) The DCO application has been put forward on the basis that full compulsory acquisition is sought over all of the land shaded pink or orange on the land plans (and described in the book of reference as land over which Class 1 rights are sought), as the freehold of all such land may need to be acquired for the project.  (ii) If, however, it were to transpire following detailed design that full freehold ownership of any part of that land were not to be required provided that a restrictive covenant were imposed, then this would be a less extensive interest in land to be acquired from the relevant land owner than full freehold acquisition (which is authorised by the DCO).



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(iii) From a human rights perspective SZC Co. does not consider that further consultation prior to the imposition of a restrictive covenant via compulsory acquisition (i.e. a lesser degree of interference) is necessary.</p> <p>(iv) SZC Co. assume it is for the above reasons that no such safeguards have been imposed by other DCOs. The Secretary of State should be wary of setting a new and onerous precedent for all DCOs, which would add further delay, complexity and cost to the delivery of new infrastructure.</p>
CA.2.2	The Applicant	<p><b>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.17 [REP2-100] indicates that the draft DCO provides for all Order Land to be occupied temporarily prior to land being acquired permanently to ensure that only land confirmed as being required permanently is acquired, with land occupied temporarily being returned to the landowner. Article 37 authorises the Undertaker to enter onto, or temporarily occupy, the land specified for the purposes of carrying out various temporary or permanent works on that land, without having to acquire a permanent interest in the land. However, please explain further by reference to specific draft DCO articles how it would be ensured that only land confirmed as being required permanently is acquired, or would that be simply left to the discretion of the Applicant?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Article 26 (Compulsory acquisition of land) is an umbrella provision which sets out the undertaker's power to acquire 'land' (which is defined to include 'any interest in land or right in, to or over land'). It also governs the acquisition of rights or imposition of restrictions on land, further provisions in relation to which are provided for in article 30 (Compulsory acquisition of rights and imposition of restrictive covenants). Article 26 provides that the undertaker may <i>'acquire compulsorily so much of the land within the permanent limits as is required for the construction, operation, or maintenance of the authorised development or to facilitate it, or as is incidental to it'</i>. There is no further stage of approval by any party when the undertaker comes to exercise the compulsory acquisition powers in the DCO.</p> <p>However, as explained in response to ExQ1 CA.1.4(ii) (and at paragraph 1.2.33 and 1.2.34 of the Written Summaries of SZC Co's Oral Submissions at the CA Hearing Part 1 [Doc Ref 9.74], the approach adopted is inherently proportionate – and has been recognised as such - because it enables the ultimate extent of permanent acquisition to be</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>reduced where appropriate. The alternative would be simply to acquire a permanent interest in all of the land at the outset. Whilst that less flexible approach would enable the Undertaker to carry out the relevant works and maintain them thereafter, it would also mean that some land may be acquired that is not ultimately required on a permanent basis. That level of rigidity is not in the interests of the landowner or the Undertaker, who will have to pay more compensation than is otherwise required and will bear the costs of maintaining any surplus land thereafter.</p> <p>Under the approach adopted in this case, and in a number of other made DCOs, once the authorised development has been implemented and its final design and location are thus fixed, the Undertaker has no incentive to exercise its powers of compulsory acquisition so as to take more land than is required. Thus whilst it would be a matter for the Undertaker to determine how much land is required permanently, that could never lead to more land being taken than the Secretary of State has assessed and authorised as being justified and proportionate, but may in appropriate cases lead to a reduction because there is a strong incentive for the Undertaker to limit the extent of permanent acquisition where possible due to costs associated with acquisition and ongoing maintenance thereafter.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Undertaker must exercise that discretion lawfully and it is in the final resort something that could be regulated by the courts. SZC Co. is not aware of litigation having been necessary in any other case (which is a further indicator that the application of provisions of this sort has not proved problematic in practice). Nevertheless, in the event that for some reason less land or rights over land are required by the Undertaker than expected (due to the detailed design requiring less land than anticipated), but the Undertaker nevertheless acquired the whole of the land in question, this could be challenged by means of judicial review.</p>
CA.2.3	The Applicant	<p><b>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.6 [REP2-100], sets out the interaction between draft DCO Articles 37 and 38 in relation to the time limit for the temporary possession period. However, the Article 37(3) time limit refers to that limit as being "<i>...after the end of the period of 1 year beginning with the date of completion of the part of the authorised development...</i>". To ensure that these powers are exercised in a manner that is reasonable and proportionate, should Article 38 not contain an overall stop-gap time limit to safeguard the landowner in the eventuality that the completion of the authorised</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>development is unreasonably delayed or there is a total failure to complete that part for reasons that are unforeseen at this time?</p> <p>We are not aware of such a long-stop date being imposed on any other DCOs. We assume this is because:</p> <p>(i) It is not in the undertaker's interest to hold onto land longer than required for the project, given the fact that compensation must be paid to the landowner for such temporary possession, and that use of the land temporarily possessed is only authorised for the purpose of carrying out the authorised development. The undertaker would not lawfully be able to keep hold of it to use for some other commercial purpose.</p> <p>(ii) In the unlikely event that the undertaker did not return the land to its owner after the period specified in Article 37 (i.e. 1 year after that part of the authorised development is completed etc), or otherwise failed to return the land in circumstances where it was unreasonable in the <i>Wednesbury</i> sense not to do so having regard to the statutory purposes for which temporary possession had been authorised, the landowner could bring a legal challenge on the grounds that further possession of the site was ultra vires.</p> <p>(iii) Given the national significance of the project, in the unlikely event that completion of some element of the project for which temporary possession was required were to be delayed, it would not be in the public interest for the landowner to be able to take back possession, which could result in the whole project being unable to be completed. As regrettable as such a delay might be from the landowner's perspective, retention of temporary possession would be necessary and appropriate in the circumstances.</p> <p>(iv) The identification of a suitable time limit to cater for unforeseen and unknowable circumstances, as opposed to linking the duration of possession to the purpose for which it is required (Article 37(3)) is fraught with difficulty.</p>
CA.2.4	The Applicant	<p><b>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.7 [REP2-100] provides a table setting out the total number of plots falling within each of the six classes listed in the SoR [APP-062] and the response to CA.1.8 provides further information in relation to amendments to the Order Land since the submission of the application as set out in the SoR Addendum [AS-149]. In the event that the latest changes to the application are accepted, please provide an updated table and a revised response to CA.1.8 to include those additional plots.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:							
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Scheme	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Class 5	Class 6	
		MDS	88	0	20	148	25	15	
		SF	0	0	2	2	0	0	
		FM (HALESWORTH)	3	0	0	4	1	0	
		FM (BENHALL)	3	0	0	5	2	0	
		MH	2	0	0	4	2	0	
		NPR	4	0	0	14	3	7	
		SPR	5	0	0	10	5	0	
		2VBP	18	0	<del>28-23</del>	<del>56-51</del>	0	10	
		SLR	<del>94</del> <b>95</b>	2	65	<del>195</del> <b>200</b>	<del>04</del>	34	
		FMF	1	0	0	8	7	0	
		YOX	1	0	3	10	6	0	
		A12/B1119	0	0	0	2	2	0	
		A1094/B1069	0	0	0	7	7	0	
		A12/A144	3	0	1	11	7	0	
		FM (PAKENHAM)	9	0	0	12	3	0	
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<del>231</del> <b>232</b>	<b>2</b>	<del>119</del> <b>114</b>	<b>488</b>	<del>70-74</del>	<b>66</b>	

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>An updated response to ExQ1 CA.1.8 <a href="#">[REP2-100]</a> is provided below. Where text is marked as strikethrough below, this indicates where the previous response to ExQ1 CA.1.8 <a href="#">[REP2-100]</a> is no longer applicable in respect of the changes to the application (Changes 16-18) submitted by SZC Co to the Planning Inspectorate by letter dated 23 July 2021 <a href="#">[REP5-002]</a>. A revised response is subsequently provided.</p> <p>(i) <del>The extent of the new land to be included within the Order limits in respect of which compulsory acquisition powers are sought is shown in the Land Changes Plans (Revision 1.0) [AS-152]. These plans show all the proposed changes to the Order limits as submitted in January 2021. The land over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought is shown shaded pink. The new land over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought is also listed in the SoR Addendum [AS-149], Table 2.1. Column 3 of this table identifies the land over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought with the 'Yes' entry.</del> The extent of the new land to be included within the Order limits in respect of which compulsory acquisition powers are sought is shown in the Land Plans (Revision 3.0) <a href="#">[REP5-004]</a> on sheet 19 of 28 and identified as plot number SLR/19/11b. These plans show all land in respect of which compulsory acquisition is sought in the existing application and including the changes to the application as submitted in July 2021. The new land over which compulsory acquisition powers is sought is also listed in the Book of Reference Supplement (Revision 1.0) <a href="#">[REP5-037]</a>, plot number SLR/19/11b. Consent of all persons with an interest in this plot has been obtained.</p> <p>(ii) The total area of land within the Order limits over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought is <b>13,238,694.41</b> <del>13,232,099.36</del> <b>sqm</b>. This includes both the <del>original</del> existing application land and the additional new land. For the avoidance of doubt, this land is shown shaded pink, blue and orange in the <del>Land Plans (Revision 2.0) [AS-108]</del> Land Plans (Revision 3.0) <a href="#">[REP5-004]</a> and the <del>Land Plans Showing Proposed Land Changes [AS-290]</del> Land Plans Showing Proposed Land Changes <a href="#">[REP5-040]</a>.</p> <p>(iii) <del>The extent of the new land included within the Order limits in respect of which temporary possession powers are sought is shown in the Land Changes Plans</del></p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><del>(Revision 1.0) [AS-152]. These plans show all the proposed changes to the Order limits as submitted in January 2021. The land over which temporary possession powers are sought is shown shaded yellow. The new land over which temporary possession powers are sought is also listed in the SoR Addendum [AS-149], Table 2.1. Column 3 of this table identifies the land over which temporary possession powers are sought with the 'no temporary possession only' entry.</del></p> <p>The extent of the new land to be included within the Order limits in respect of which temporary possession powers are sought is shown in the Land Plans (Revision 3.0) [REP5-004] on sheets 20 and 21 of 28 and identified as plot numbers SLR/20/03c, SLR/20/03d, SLR/21/19b and SLR/21/28c. These plans show all land in respect of which temporary possession powers are sought shaded yellow and green in the existing application and including the changes to the application as submitted in July 2021. The new land over which temporary possession powers are sought is also listed in the Book of Reference Supplement (Revision 1.0) [REP5-037], plot numbers SLR/20/03c, SLR/20/03d, SLR/21/19b and SLR/21/28c. These plots are all temporary possession only over highway land.</p> <p>(iv) The total area of land within the Order limits over which temporary possession powers are sought is <b>599393.58 603,537.35 sqm</b>. This includes both the original application land and the additional new land. For the avoidance of doubt, this land is shown shaded yellow and green in the <del>Land Plans (Revision 2.0) [AS-108]</del> Land Plans (Revision 3.0) [REP5-004] and the <del>Land Plans Showing Proposed Land Changes [AS-290]</del> Land Plans Showing Proposed Land Changes [REP5-040].</p> <p>There has been no additional land included in the changes (Land Plans (Revision 3.0) [REP5-004]) in respect of which compulsory acquisition of rights only is sought. Therefore, the previous response provided for parts v) and vi) remains as submitted in response to CA.1.8 and is provided again below:</p> <p>(v) The extent of the new land to be included within the Order limits in respect of which compulsory acquisition of rights only are sought is shown in the Land Changes Plans (Revision 1.0) [AS-152] on sheet 19 of 28 and identified as plot</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>number SLR/19/08a. The new land over which compulsory acquisition of rights only are sought is also listed in SoR Addendum <a href="#">[AS-149]</a>, Table 2.1. Column 3 of this table identifies the land over which temporary possession powers are sought with the 'yes – acquisition of rights' entry and identified as plot number SLR/19/08a.</p> <p>The total area of land within the Order limits over which compulsory acquisition of rights only powers are sought is 5,580.79 sqm. This includes both the original application land and the additional new land. For the avoidance of doubt, this land is shown shaded blue in the Land Plans (Revision 2.0) <a href="#">[AS-108]</a> and the Land Plans showing Proposed Land Changes <a href="#">[AS-290]</a>.</p>
CA.2.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Whether all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition have been explored</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.23 [REP2-100] refers to the considerations of alternative sites in Volume 2 Main Development Site Chapter 14 Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology Appendix 14C4 Fen Meadow Compensation Study [APP-258]. The assessment of the potential for fen meadow restoration at Pakenham Fen highlights the need for further detailed studies to determine with certainty the potential afforded by these sites. It explains the conclusion reached at that stage that each of the five sites identified for further investigation would be of sufficient area to provide fen meadow habitat capable of compensating for unavoidable losses at Sizewell. It does not appear to consider the extent of the land now required. Please provide an update summarising and explaining:</p> <p>(i) The need for this land and justifying the extent of the land sought.</p> <p>(ii) The further investigations that have been carried out and how the initially anticipated difficulties in the creation of fen meadow in this location identified in that document would be overcome?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) <i>'The need for this land and justifying the extent of the land sought.'</i></p> <p>Details of the proposals for compensatory fen meadow habitat and how the extent of the Pakenham site was initially defined are provided in the <b>Fen Meadow Strategy</b> [Section 2.9D of AS-209]). The <b>Written Submissions arising from CAH1 Part 1, Appendix A</b> (Doc Ref. 9.74) explains why, as a result of further studies, SZC Co. has now been able to</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>identify with much greater certainty the extent of the land required at Pakenham and that SZC Co. is therefore proposing to reduce the Order limits at this site.</p> <p>(ii) <i>'The further investigations that have been carried out and how the initially anticipated difficulties in the creation of fen meadow in this location identified in that document would be overcome?'</i></p> <p>The <b>Fen Meadow Baseline report</b> [<a href="#">REP3-051</a> and <a href="#">REP3-052</a>], and the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>], submitted at Deadline 6, have between them detailed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The further studies undertaken and summarised the findings;</li><li>• The suitability of each site for fen meadow creation;</li><li>• The proposed layout and features;</li><li>• Proposed conservation management and required habitats creation works</li><li>• Monitoring; and</li><li>• The area of potential fen meadow.</li></ul> <p>Based on the results of the studies it has been concluded that it will not be necessary to control ditch water levels and this avoids off-site effects. Water level control is not necessary because recorded water levels to date indicate that, through sculpting of the ground surface, it will be possible to create a matrix of terrestrial, wetland and shallow open water habitat niches to maximise the potential for target fen meadow species to colonise.</p>
CA.2.6	The Applicant	<p><b>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.25 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>], and its response to the comments on those question responses [<a href="#">REP5-129</a>], refers to Government's Ten Point Plan and the Energy White Paper. It also alludes to ongoing discussions with the Government on the development of a RAB funding model and positive engagement with third party investors to secure the financing required for the project. The Applicant's response to CA.1.32 is also noted.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Can the Applicant provide any further evidence at this stage to assist in the consideration of whether financial viability has been properly assessed by it?</p> <p>(ii) Can the Applicant provide any updated evidence to support the assertions that, <i>“good progress that has been made in the ongoing discussions with the Government”</i>, and that positive engagement continues to be had with third party investors to secure the financing required for the project. Please confirm that remains the position?</p> <p>(iii) The Applicant relies upon its DL2 submission in relation to the DL3 response by Stop Sizewell C [REP3-133] and does not seek to rebut or clarify the quoted comment made by EDF CEO Simone Rossi to Reuters’ Global Energy Transition conference. Does that comment to the effect that there is no Plan B in the event the government did not advance with the legislation for the RAB model represent the Applicant’s position?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) The financial viability of the project is linked to the regulated asset base (RAB) funding model being discussed by SZC Co. and Government, which will provide a recovery of appropriate costs (including a return on investment for investors in the project) through a stable long-term revenue stream which is inflation linked. We also note that the Minister for Energy, Clean Growth and Climate Change stated on 20 July 2021: <i>“as set out in our response to the consultation on the Regulated Asset Base (RAB), RAB is a credible model for financing large-scale nuclear projects”</i>.</p> <p>RAB models inherently benefit financial viability because they provide confidence that all categories of costs (construction, operating and financing) will be funded throughout the lifetime of the project through the revenue stream that the asset base earns – in other words, appropriate costs (as determined under the RAB model) will be recovered.</p> <p>In turn, this confidence in cost recovery underpins the ability of assets under RAB models to attract finance from equity investors and lenders – which is a requirement for financial viability.</p> <p>Although the details of the Sizewell C RAB model are still under development with the Government, the fundamental characteristic that appropriate costs are recovered will apply (it is inherent in RAB models) providing a strong basis for financial viability. As discussed in ExQ1 CA.1.32 [REP2-100], RAB funding models have an extensive track</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>record for attracting finance in large infrastructure projects, providing further confidence in the project's financial viability.</p> <p>(ii) An update on the current status of discussions with Government in relation to funding is included in the <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at CAH1 Part 1</b> (Doc Ref. 9.74). The discussions between SZC Co. and Government are continuing and SZC Co. can confirm that such discussions as well as engagement with third party investors continue to be positive in nature. The Examining Authority will understand that SZC Co. is unable to provide further details at this stage due to the confidential nature of those discussions.</p> <p>However, in addition to the Minister's Statement (above) we note the <a href="#">Secretary of State's statement to Parliament</a><sup>2</sup> (May 2021) provided a 6 month update following the announcement of the Ten Point Plan: "<i>sensitive discussions are being held all the time....The third point of the Prime Minister's 10-point plan was all about nuclear power. It said explicitly that we are committed to having a decision on a plant before the end of the Parliament. We are in conversations with operators and developers—very fruitful conversations, I might add—to bring that about, and we have an ongoing commitment to increasing, not decreasing, capacity in nuclear power.</i>"</p> <p>(iii) In relation to any Plan B for Sizewell C, the Government response to the consultation on the RAB Model for Nuclear (December 2020) notes that: "<i>we believe that a RAB in line with the high-level design principles set out in the consultation remains a credible basis for financing large-scale nuclear projects</i>", and the support was reiterated by the Minister (as mentioned above). As SZC Co. has noted, it continues to believe that the RAB model is a tried-and-tested model which will attract investors to the project. The RAB model is the current focus of discussions with Government and SZC Co. is confident that these discussions will successfully enable the project to come forward. As the choice of funding model is a question for Government, SZC Co. considers that the existence of a Plan B funding model is also a question for Government. However, SZC Co notes its</p>

<sup>2</sup> <https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-05-18/debates/05FD7786-FAA8-4969-AE55-7769771AEFD3/10-PointPlanSixMonthsOn>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>confidence that the RAB model discussions will be successful and observes that a number of funding models have historically been applied (internationally and in the UK) to successfully bring forward other new nuclear projects.</p>
CA.2.7	The Applicant	<p><b>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s response to ExQ1 CA.1.27 [REP2-100], and to the comments on those question responses [REP5-129] draws support from the “<i>proven track record</i>” of EDF Energy and the “<i>existing substantial financial commitment</i>” of EDF Energy Holdings Limited and General Nuclear International Limited, as evidence to support the conclusion that there is a reasonable prospect that the scheme, if granted consent, would actually be taken forward within the anticipated timescales.</p> <p>(i) Given the draft DCO Article 2 interpretation of “<i>undertaker</i>” and the inclusion of Articles 8 and 9, what reliance can be placed upon the track record and participation of EDF Energy Holdings Limited and General Nuclear International Limited in relation to this particular scheme?</p> <p>(ii) The Applicant relies upon its DL2 submission in relation to the DL3 [REP3-133] response by Stop Sizewell C and does not seek to rebut or clarify the quoted comment made by Sizewell C’s Safety, Licencing and Assurance Director, Mike Lavelle to a meeting of the Whitehall Group on 27 May that the FID could be made in early 2023. Does that comment in relation to the anticipated timing of the FID represent the current position of the Applicant and, if so, does it have any implications for the Implementation Plan?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) As noted previously, although EDF Energy will become a minority shareholder in SZC Co. in the future, it will still: (i) remain a key element of the supply chain; (ii) provide access to relevant skills and experience, including responsibilities for the Development Consent Order and Deed of Obligation remaining with the Chief Planning Officer; and (iii) enable key learnings to be passed through from Hinkley Point C. Further, as Sizewell C will be a nuclear licensed site, the ONR will ensure that SZC Co. has the necessary organisational capability in respect of the project, and this responsibility will apply regardless of the shareholding level of EDF Energy or GNI.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>(ii) The comments by Mike Lavelle have been quoted out of context as they did not imply that FID is anticipated to occur in 2023. The specific quote was '<i>we're looking to get a financial investment decision sometime in 2022 or early '23</i>'. SZC Co. is targeting FID in 2022 and planning the implementation of the project on that basis, though FID will be the function of different aspects such as the ongoing discussions with Government, legislative timeline and engagement with investors. SZC Co. is confident of achieving FID in 2022 but no one can be definitive at this stage and it is this inevitable uncertainty to which Mike Lavelle was referring.</p>
CA.2.8	The Applicant	<p><b>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.28 [REP2-100], and its response to the comments on those question responses [REP5-129], in relation to states that "<i>Under the RAB model, updates in the cost estimate will be reflected in the funding model arrangements. In simple terms, this means the project's anticipated revenue stream (the funding from consumers) will adjust to reflect changes in the cost estimate before FID.</i>"</p> <p>(i) Does that mean that without the RAB model, and with an alternative means of funding, the changes to the cost estimate between now and FID could impact the ability of the project to secure the required financing to meet the updated cost estimate and enable the project to proceed?</p> <p>(ii) Would the RAB model be expected to include any cap on the level of funding from consumers in relation to updates in the cost estimate as the project proceeds, or would such elements of the risk fall upon them, as opposed to private investors hence increasing the attractiveness of investing in the project to the latter?</p> <p>(iii) What reliance can be placed upon key parts of the supply chain for Hinkley Point C being re-used at Sizewell C and how would that be secured by the draft DCO?</p> <p>(iv) Please respond to the queries raised by the Stop Sizewell C DL3 comments [REP3-133] in relation to whether the predicted cost and/or contingencies include the potential for multiple adaptive approaches to the sea defences and price rises in construction materials?</p> <p>(v) Please indicate whether the assessment of the costs implications of the remaining changes, if accepted, has been concluded?</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) It is difficult to assess a hypothetical counterfactual no-RAB without specifying what the counterfactual funding model would be, which would be a matter for Government. However, and as mentioned above: (a) it is clear that Government's current policy position considers the RAB model as a credible basis for financing large-scale nuclear projects; and (b) SZC Co. continues to believe that the RAB model is a tried-and-tested model which will attract investors to SZC. That belief has been reinforced through SZC Co.'s discussions with Government and potential investors in the project.</p> <p>(ii) Discussions are currently ongoing between SZC Co. and Government regarding the structuring of the RAB model for Sizewell C.</p> <p>(iii) It would not be appropriate for specific levels or locations of spending on contracts to be secured through the DCO - that depends on local businesses wanting and being able to take advantage of the opportunity and businesses involved in Hinkley Point C being minded to re-apply their experience to Sizewell C.</p> <p>Sizewell C is essentially a replication of Hinkley Point C (with the exception of some differences in ground conditions and site preparation) and as such will have broadly the same spending profile on supply chain as Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project is learning from Hinkley Point C and the expertise built up there - that does not mean that every opportunity will go to a company or a worker that has previously worked on Hinkley Point C, but some of it will.</p> <p>As set out in the Economic Statement [<a href="#">APP-610</a>], paragraph 7.3.3 "... SZC Co. will support 'intelligent replication' - using the as-built design of Hinkley Point C, while taking into account local conditions in order to develop and implement Sizewell C. Replication does not mean that the entire Hinkley Point C supply chain and workforce will be transferred to Sizewell C, rather than key contracts that are critical to replication of the power station are transferred."</p> <p>Some contracts will be won, and workforce will be used, from Hinkley Point C where expertise and project knowledge has been developed, but this does not affect the proportion of home-based labour and supply chain benefits estimated (they are effectively accounted for by the non-home based workforce and non-regionally-retained element of the supply chain spend).</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>There will not be a limit on local and regional supply chain retention benefits – some will just be local. Local and regional firms have a competitive advantage in winning work (even without the proposed measures in the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref: 8.17(F)). They have shorter travel times, smaller carbon footprints, and logistical benefits that translate into economic advantages. It is likely that some Tier 1 contractors will replicate from Hinkley Point C to Sizewell C but given the scale of contracts and requirement for local goods and services, as set out above there is a high likelihood that even where a contract is replicated at Tier 1 level, it will include delivery by local and regional businesses at Tier 2, 3 and lower levels.</p> <p>(iv) SZC Co.’s cost estimates are being regularly updated.            (v) Yes, the cost team is aware of the change and have regard to changes as part of their regular updates to the cost estimate.</p>
CA.2.9	The Applicant	<p><b>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s response to ExQ1 CA.1.30 [REP2-100] and its response to the comments on those question responses [REP5-129], concludes that the combination of anticipated construction cost reductions, and financing cost reductions are expected to result in the Sizewell C Project meeting or exceeding the cost reduction target.</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details of the anticipated construction cost reductions for the Sizewell C Project compared to Hinkley Point C and the anticipated division of costs reduction between that factor and financing cost reductions.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide further details of the range of financing costs for other infrastructure assets financed under the RAB model and why the financing costs for the Proposed Development are reasonably expected to fall within that range?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) SZC Co. notes that the cost reduction target has been set as an industry wide target for new build plant by the Nuclear Industry Council and agreed by the nuclear industry and the Government – it is not a specific target for Sizewell C. Nor is the industry cost reduction target necessarily the cost that Sizewell C must meet (or come lower than) in order to meet a Government future value for money test for the project (as submitted previously, the details of the Government’s value for money test are questions for the Government).</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>SZC Co. is currently in the process of negotiating construction arrangements with the supply chain and the RAB arrangements with Government (which will be integral to the investment case for the project and therefore the financing costs). The financing costs equity investors require for the project may be set through a competitive process between potential equity investors at (or shortly before) Final Investment Decision (FID) (an alternative approach could be for the Government or an Economic Regulator to set the cost of finance administratively). Therefore, the cost of finance for the project: a) is unlikely to be confirmed until close to or at FID; and b) will ultimately be determined by third-parties currently external to the SZC Co.</p> <p>Given that neither construction costs nor financing costs are confirmed today, SZC Co. is unable to provide a precise breakdown of cost reduction and, given the commercial sensitivities concerning both these elements, it is likely to be inappropriate to provide an indicative view. However, as previously submitted in ExQ1 CA.1.30 (and reported as part of the Nuclear Sector Deal<sup>3</sup>), financing costs were around two-thirds of the Hinkley Point C Strike Price (£92.50/MWh - £2012) which provide an indication of potential for reductions in financing costs to reduce the costs to consumers.</p> <p>(ii) Financing costs for other RAB assets are typically not fully publicly disclosed by the owners of those assets. However, the economic regulator does publish allowed financing costs (typically referred to as 'allowed rate of return' or 'allowed WACC'). In recent Ofgem (RIIO2) and Ofwat (PR19) regulatory decisions for the network companies allowed returns have been just below 3% (real, CPIH linked).</p> <p>SZC Co. does not necessarily expect Sizewell C to achieve the same cost of finance as other RAB assets (but considers that it is a possibility). Ultimately the outturn cost of finance will depend on a number of factors not currently confirmed including the design of the funding model agreed with Government; the level of intrinsic risk at Sizewell C; the credit ratings Sizewell C achieves; and the required investment return of potential investors. As described above, the cost of financing at Sizewell C will not be determined</p>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.niauk.org/media-centre/member-news/blueprint-cheaper-nuclear-power-unveiled/>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>until later in the process and may be set through a competitive process based on the investment requirements of third-party investors.</p> <p>However, SZC Co. believes that with the combination of the intrinsic risk reductions that Sizewell C benefits from (as a follow on to HPC), combined with the investment profile provided by a RAB model, it will be possible to achieve a reduction in the cost of finance at Sizewell C relative to HPC and therefore a substantial reduction in the £/MWh price.</p>
CA.2.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</b></p> <p>The Applicants response to ExQ1 CA.1.38 [REP2-100] states that where land is required permanently (outside of the main development site) it is intended that there will be permanent legacy benefits where possible. However, the legacy benefit of the Sizewell Link Road (SLR) remains controversial. The DL5 submission of SCC [REP5-173] stating that <i>“the net legacy benefit of the Sizewell Link Road is very low”</i>, and that <i>“that once traffic levels move to that for the operational phase, then the harm clearly outweighs the benefits”</i>. The legacy benefit of the SLR is also raised on behalf of LJ &amp; EL Dowley [REP5-260]. Notwithstanding the information provided in response to CA.1.70:</p> <p>(i) Please provide further and clear justification for the permanent acquisition of this land as opposed to its temporary occupation during the construction period for that purpose.</p> <p>(ii) Detail the frequency and “significance” of the levels of traffic that would be generated during the construction period due to outages.</p> <p>(iii) Please provide further details to support the claim of “significant positive legacy benefits” in relation to the B1122.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) SZC Co. proposes to retain the Sizewell link road for the reasons set out in SZC Co.’s response to ExQ1 AI.1.32 and ExQ1 AI.1.33 [REP2-100] (electronic pages 196 – 201) and at electronic pages 240 – 243 of the Sizewell link road Response Paper [REP2-108].</p> <p>Retaining the Sizewell link road would result in benefits, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permanent reduction in traffic for communities along the B1122. SCC commissioned a report in December 2014 (referred to as the ‘Sizewell C, Route D2 and B1122</li> </ul>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Study<sup>4</sup>) to provide a high level assessment of options for providing relief to communities along the B1122. Page 254 of the study stressed the need for a bypass, both in the construction and in the operational phase by stating “If the bypasses were not constructed, the number of HGVs on the existing B1122 both during and after the Sizewell C construction period would be unacceptable.” (paragraph 2.1.20 of Appendix 5D [<a href="#">REP2-108</a>]).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The B1122 is substandard for the traffic that it currently carries – particularly in relation to forward visibility, carriageway width and its lack of amenity for cyclists and pedestrians. That analysis, together with the amenity effects of its operation on the communities that front the road is set out in Section 2.1 of Appendix 5D, the ‘Sizewell Link Road – Principle and Route Selection Response Paper’ [<a href="#">REP2-108</a>].</li><li>• Table 8.9 of the consolidated TA [<a href="#">REP4-005</a>] provides information on the traffic levels during the operational phase of Sizewell C. This shows that there would be a 94% reduction in traffic on the B1122 Theberton during operation should the Sizewell link road be in place (there would be 7,000 daily AAWT traffic flows in 2034 without the Sizewell link road but 400 with the Sizewell link road in place)</li><li>• Sustained improvements in noise and air quality would be achieved, particularly in Theberton from the permanent reduction in traffic along the B1122 (Table 2.2 of Appendix 5D in <a href="#">REP2-108</a> confirms the effects on the B1122 and local communities with and without a Sizewell link road. Paragraph 2.1.100 of Appendix 5D in <a href="#">REP2-108</a> states that “by 2034, when construction traffic is no longer present, there would be either a negligible effect or beneficial [noise] effects as a result of the Sizewell link road for the majority of receptors, with only one receptor recording significant major adverse noise effects on a typical day”. Paragraph 2.1.128 of Appendix 5D [<a href="#">REP2-108</a>] states “Retaining the Sizewell link road offers permanent benefits, particularly in relation to the Theberton element of the bypass, including sustained improvements in noise and air quality in the village. The Councils summarised these benefits in their joint response to the Stage 4 consultation. Paragraph 246 of the Councils’ response states: “The Councils consider the Theberton Bypass as a legacy benefit of the development, by removing through traffic from the village, with likely associated benefits on noise and air quality and</li></ul>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Sizewell/141211-Sizewell-Study-REXH-final.pdf>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>greater network resilience, and strongly believe it should be retained following construction."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The opening and retention of the Sizewell link road would enable the existing B1122 to be re-purposed in response to dramatically reduced traffic levels. Lower traffic volumes on the B1122 would result in the route becoming more popular among cyclists and would contribute substantially to enhanced cyclist connectivity in the area (para 5.4.42 of Consolidated TA [<a href="#">REP2-045</a>]). This would be directly consistent with the East Suffolk Council Quiet Lanes initiative. This initiative seeks to maintain the existing tranquillity of a suitable rural road and encourage the use of it through active and sustainable means such as walking, cycling, and horse riding. SZC Co. is working with the local authorities to contribute funds to achieve the repurposing of the road and to develop a cycle network that would maximise the use of the quieter roads, creating recreational routes that link up with local destinations.</li><li>• ESC rightly identify this opportunity as "hugely significant" [<a href="#">REP3-060</a>] at paragraph 2.11 onwards.</li><li>• The proposed Sizewell link road offers long term benefit to Yoxford. As the design of the Sizewell link road includes a link off the A12 south of Yoxford and the Middleton Moor link, it allows traffic from both the north and south travelling to Sizewell to avoid needing to pass through Yoxford.</li><li>• The environmental harm that would be caused by removing the road would be avoided (further details about his harm are provided below).</li></ul> <p>SZC Co. consulted on the option of a temporary Sizewell link road at Stage 4 pre-application consultation. 161 responses were received to the question on its removal, of which, 41 responses gave a view on whether the Sizewell link road should be removed and land restored. 68% opposed the removal of the Sizewell link road. This is set out in SZC Co.'s response to ExQ1 Al.1.32 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>] (electronic pages 197).</p> <p>Middleton- cum-Fordley Parish Council conducted a survey of their own in May 2021 and survey results were obtained from 138 individuals [<a href="#">REP5-242</a>]. The survey found that, should the Sizewell link road be delivered on its proposed route, 61% considered it should be permanent (Question 4, 80% response rate).</p> <p>Removing the Sizewell link road would result in a significant amount of construction work and environmental damage. The impacts of the removal of the Sizewell link road are set</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>out in SZC Co.'s response to ExQ1 AI.1.32 and ExQ1 AI.1.33 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>] (electronic page 192); at electronic pages 240 – 243 of Appendix 5D of the Sizewell link road Response Paper [<a href="#">REP2-108</a>] (submitted at Deadline 2); and at electronic page 149 of <b>SZC Co.'s Comments on the Councils' LIR</b> [<a href="#">REP3-044</a>].</p> <p>The Sizewell link road would need to be built to a high standard and this was recognised and accepted by SCC at the Issue Specific Hearing. With a 10-12 year overall construction period, and given the scale and nature of traffic involved, it is misconceived to think the Sizewell link road could be built as some form of temporary haul road.</p> <p>If the Sizewell link road was made temporary, the removal works would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Removal of the Sizewell link road itself, pavements, road drainage networks, utilities (e.g. cables, overhead lines) and the Pretty Road Overbridge.</li><li>• Reinstating parts of the A12 and B1122, including: removal of A12 Western Roundabout and reinstating the existing A12 alignment; removal of Middleton Moor roundabout; and reinstatement of the existing B1122 alignment.</li><li>• Removal of the Sizewell link road tie-in to the B1122 at the eastern end of the Sizewell link road and reinstatement of the existing B1122 alignment.</li></ul> <p>The preliminary environmental information provided as part of the Stage 4 Consultation Document [<a href="#">APP-082</a>] stated that "During the breaking of surfaced areas and removal of the road and associated infrastructure, there is the potential for significant adverse noise and vibration effects on nearby residential properties, as well as on the amenity of users of PRowS and the setting of Theberton Hall".</p> <p>These activities would result in a significant amount of construction traffic. To construct the Sizewell link road, a large amount of material is proposed to be moved to the main development site. If the Sizewell link road was temporary, this material would have to be transported back to the Sizewell link road site to reinstate the land.</p> <p>It is estimated that to move just this material from the main development site to the Sizewell link road site to reinstate the land would require 10,556 one way truck movements alone. This would be in addition to other construction traffic movements that would be needed for other works, including drainage and landscaping.</p> <p>At the Stage 4 consultation, ESC raised concerns about the potential environmental impact of the removal of the road. In particular, the removal of the SuDS that serve the</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Sizewell link road could have a negative impact on the biodiversity that would have established in the SuDS from the time they were constructed.</p> <p>Given the benefits of retaining the Sizewell link road and the drawbacks of removing it following construction of Sizewell C, there are clear and compelling benefits in its retention and justification for the permanent acquisition of this land.</p> <p>(ii) Based on the existing numbers for Sizewell B outage traffic, it is expected that an outage at Sizewell C, would result in approximately 700 vehicles per day (630 cars, 63 LGVs, 3 HGVs). A planned outage occurs approximately every 18 months and lasts approximately 6 weeks. With Sizewell C the number of planned outages would triple.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road would act as a dedicated promoted route from the A12 to the site to facilitate movement of workers (and their cars) to the main development site with less disruption to residents of the B1122 and through Leiston. The road would also serve Sizewell A and B, the Sizewell community (including the beach) and provide convenient access to parts of Leiston. HGVs and AILs would be required to route via the Sizewell link road, even during operation, which would ensure that any HGVs and AILs would not travel through the villages of Yoxford, Theberton and Middleton Moor. SZC Co. would ensure that HGVs and AILs route onto the Sizewell link road in the operation phase through the Operational Travel Plan, which is to be secured via the <b>Deed of Obligation</b> [REP5-082]. This is set out in SZC Co.'s response to ExQ1 AI.1.33 [REP2-100] (electronic page 199) and at electronic pages 240 – 243 of the Sizewell link road Response Paper [REP2-108]. With the benefit of the Sizewell link road, it is anticipated that signage would ensure that all but immediately local traffic would use the link road.</p> <p>(iii) The significant legacy benefits of the Sizewell Link Road are set out within the response to part <i>i</i> of CA.2.10 above.</p>
CA.2.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.45 [REP2-100] is noted. Please provide the following additional information:</p> <p>(i) For the Round House, please explain why permanent acquisition as opposed to temporary possession is sought; justify the extent of the land sought in this location to</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>accommodate the construction activities and the alternatives to the acquisition of this property that have been considered. Notwithstanding the details provided in the SoR Appendix B [REP5-036] please provide an update on the discussions between the Applicant and the freeholder.</p> <p>(ii) For 54 and 55 Stockhouse Cottages, please explain the consideration given to the impact upon these dwellings in the selection of the route for the two village bypass; provide details of the existing use of the parcel of land and justification for the extent of the land sought to be acquired. Could lesser powers than outright acquisition be used to secure and maintain the visibility splay?</p> <p>(iii) For Anninson’s Cottage, please explain in detail why the land would be required for construction of the SLR and why it would need to be retained thereafter for access? Could an alternative means of access and/or lesser powers not achieve what is required?</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p><b>i) The Round House</b></p> <p>In 2019, discussions were held with the landowner regarding temporary possession or permanent acquisition of the property by SZC Co. Since then, more detailed discussions have been held, primarily with the agent representing the landowner, and SZC Co. understands that the landowner’s preference is for permanent acquisition of the property by SZC Co. The rights sought in the DCO for permanent acquisition reflect the terms being progressed by negotiation with the landowner.</p> <p>The land adjoining all boundaries of The Round House is owned by third parties, including EDF Nuclear Generation Limited who also owns the only means of vehicular and pedestrian access to the property. All of these surrounding land parcels including the access track will form part of the construction site and, for safety and security reasons, will be within the security fence thereby restricting access throughout construction.</p> <p><b>Figure 2.2.3 in Volume 2 of the Second ES Addendum</b> ‘the Construction Masterplan’ for the main development site [REP5-065] illustrates that significant construction activity would be carried out in the immediate vicinity of the Round House, including topsoil and sub-soil stripping, grading, excavation and earth moving.</p> <p>The land surrounding the property is proposed to be used for the creation of several borrow pits and a stockpile area for excavated materials (up to 5 metres in height); refer</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>to <b>Volume 2, Chapter 3 Description of Construction</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">REP5-047</a>] and <b>Volume 2, Appendix 3D</b> of the <b>ES</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3 3D(B)).</p> <p>The Round House would be surrounded by the construction site for the duration of the construction period. The highest noise levels would be associated with the excavation and backfill of the borrow pits and the removal of the temporary facilities using articulated dump trucks and excavators taking place in the early years and later years of the Project. Currently, the ambient noise levels at the Round House are characterised by typically rural natural noise levels at a low level, but the construction noise which would surround the property would represent a moderate-adverse effect from noise which is considered to be a significant impact on this property.</p> <p>Given the proximity, nature and duration of the proposed works that would surround the Round House, the impacts on access and amenity, the lack of reasonable mitigation measures that could be put in place to permit the dwelling to remain satisfactorily habitable, the uncertainty around the timing for compensation associated with temporary possession and landowner preference, it is considered to be appropriate to provide for the acquisition of the property on a permanent basis. If compulsory acquisition powers were not to be granted over this land, it is likely that this would significantly jeopardise the timely delivery of the Project in particular due to the restrictions around working that would need to be imposed within this area.</p> <p>Adopting a borrow pit approach substantially reduces the need to import aggregate from off-site locations and export excavated material. It is more sustainable and in accordance with the Waste Framework Directive. The location of the borrow pits and subsequent stockpiles has been selected as it contains underlying material which comprises a thin layer of top-soil and sub-soil over Lowestoft Formation sands and gravel, which is suitable as general fill for the Main Construction Area.</p> <p>The borrow pit location is elevated above the surrounding Temporary Construction Area and is not near to surrounding watercourses. This helps to ensure sufficient material can</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>be excavated whilst retaining a minimum 2m of undisturbed ground between the lowest formation level of the borrow pits and the groundwater level.</p> <p>Locating the borrow pits away from the Round House outside of the AONB would have caused greater disruption to other landowners, greater disruption to the local road network and moved the borrow pits closer to where a greater number of people live. An option for a borrow pit west of Eastbridge Road was consulted upon and discounted for the reasons set out in Paragraph 6.6.33 of <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Alternatives and Design Evolution</b> [<a href="#">APP-190</a>]. Locating the borrow pits elsewhere within the AONB is also not considered suitable as it would either: impact on designated habitats sites; substantially impact the local road network; or require an unfeasibly large footprint due to the reduced depth between the underlying material and the groundwater level. The latter point would also cause a substantial knock-on effect to much of the rest of the Temporary Construction Area by displacing other temporary uses and making less efficient use of the land.</p> <p>A valuation has been conducted on this property and a meeting was held with the agent on 24 March 2021 following which Heads of Terms were issued on 30 March 2021. Since then, SZC Co. has contacted the agent on several occasions requesting feedback and it is not clear whether the agent has discussed the terms in detail or even shared them with his client. Accordingly, SZC Co. has made attempts to engage the landowner directly, however the agent has subsequently confirmed they remain instructed and will revert once the current terms have been fully considered.</p> <p><b>ii) 54 and 55 Stockhouse Cottages</b></p> <p>Alternatives to the two-village bypass that were considered are set out in <b>Volume 5 Two Village Bypass Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution</b> [<a href="#">APP-414</a>]. If the two-village bypass were not progressed, junction alterations would still be required on the A12/A1094 junction as it is an existing road safety concern to Suffolk County Council and therefore the use of this area (plot number 2VBP/18/02) as a tie in and visibility splay would be required in this location in all circumstances. The approach taken in relation to</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>private loss is set out in <b>Appendix B of the Written Submissions arising from the CAH Part 1</b> (Doc Ref. 9.76).</p> <p>As can be seen in <b>Book 2.8, Two Village Bypass Plans For Approval</b> (dated July 2021) [<a href="#">REP5-020</a>], the proposed two village bypass works would take place approximately 30m to the east of these properties. The ES identified no significant effects on these properties during the construction of two village bypass (refer to <b>Volume 10, Appendix 2B</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">AS-016</a>] for a summary of the effects; the receptor was referenced as Benhall Stock Cottages within the ES). During operation, the properties would benefit from a significant beneficial effect due to the reduction of noise on the A12, as traffic is diverted onto the two village bypass, but all other effects were assessed as not significant.</p> <p>The parcel of land that is required for the Project is currently used by 54 and 55 Stockhouse Cottages as part of the visibility splay of the driveway to allow safe access to and from the A12. The proposed works required to be carried out on this land parcel include a temporary working area to create a permanent highway verge and erection of a boundary fence. The final use for this land will be continued use as a visibility splay and it is essential to ensure the continued safe access to and from Stockhouse Cottages from the A12. The access to the properties lies outside the Order limits and would be maintained throughout the works.</p> <p>SZC Co. has explored the possibility of using restrictive covenants, rather than acquisition, to ensure the area remains in use as a visibility splay in perpetuity, however the owner has confirmed that their preference is for SZC Co. to acquire this section of land. Advanced discussions are ongoing and documented in heads of terms to secure the rights required to implement the Two Village Bypass.</p> <p><b>iii) Annisons Cottage</b></p> <p>The land at Annisons Cottage is essential for the construction of the Sizewell link road and associated road embankment as shown in <b>Volume 2: Second Environmental Statement Addendum Figures; Chapter 4: Sizewell Link Road</b> [<a href="#">REP5-068</a>](page 9)</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>and the <b>Sizewell Link Road Plans Not For Approval Part 2 of 2</b> [<a href="#">REP5-023</a>] (page 8). These proposed works provide the PROW diversion and essential drainage outfall pipe from the proposed attenuation basin to the existing watercourse. It also provides a maintenance access route to the attenuation basin</p> <p>SZC Co. has considered alternatives to the Sizewell Link Road route as set out in <b>Volume 6 Sizewell Link Road Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution:</b> [<a href="#">APP-450</a>]. To avoid Annisons Cottage the alignment of the Sizewell Link Road would need to move approximately 35m south which would result in greater impacts for more properties.</p> <p>The 0.03 acres of the garden of Annisons Cottage included in the Order Limits (plot no. SLR/21/16) proposed to be acquired would be substantially changed by the proposed works. This land would be included in the highway boundary for the Sizewell Link Road in order to ensure ongoing maintenance and management of the highway as set out in the <b>Highway Maintenance Operational Plan</b> [<a href="#">REP1-100</a>], and as such permanent acquisition is the only viable option available to deliver this.</p>
CA.2.12	<p>The Applicant</p> <p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p><b>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.43 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>] states that in relation to the additional land design alternatives were considered to ensure that a solution which achieved lesser land take was not possible. Please provide further details of the design alternatives considered in relation to the additional land and the reasons for their rejection.</p> <p>As explained in the covering letter that accompanied the change request for Changes 16 to 18 [<a href="#">REP5-002</a>], the only change that fell within the definition of 'additional land' in the Infrastructure Planning (Compulsory Acquisition) Regulations 2010 was Change 18(iii) (gravity drainage solution to the west of the East Suffolk line). Changes 18v, vi and vii resulted in an extension to the Order limits over highway land but powers of compulsory acquisition have not been sought over the land and it did not fall within the definition of additional land.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>With regard to the gravity drainage solution to the west of the East Suffolk line, the alternative design considered and included within the original Application was a pumped drainage solution. However, through further engagement with SCC, which advocates natural gravity drainage solutions, SZC Co. concluded that the preferred option was a gravity drainage solution and this change was therefore proposed and subsequently accepted by the ExA. As confirmed in the covering letter [<a href="#">REP5-002</a>], all persons with an interest in the additional land consented to the inclusion of compulsory acquisition powers over this additional land. Appendix F of <a href="#">REP5-120</a> (paragraph 7.1.13) explains that the chosen drainage option would have the "minimum impact on land use since it would follow a field boundary and be the shortest distance".</p> <p>With regard to the highway land, as explained in the response to ExQ1 CA.1.43 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>], when considering amendments to the Order limits to accommodate these highway works, the design team considered whether they could instead make amendments to the existing road design within the limits of deviation or agree a departure from standard with SCC rather than increase the Order limits. Where a departure from SCC highway design standard was not accepted in principle by SCC highways to meet the safety requirements for driver forward visibility distance along the proposed road alignments and at tie-in to existing roads, alternative measures were considered to avoid extending the Order limits that comprised a reduction in speed limit and design speed (following a review of actual speed measurement surveys of the existing roads), and proposed line markings and signage. Only at locations where measures were still insufficient to meet SCC highway visibility requirements were the Order limits extended. The Initial <b>Statement of Common Ground with ESC and SCC</b> [<a href="#">REP2-076</a>] sets out the current position in relation to technical approval.</p>
CA.2.13	The Applicant, NDA, Magnox	<p><b>Adequacy of the protective provisions set out in the draft DCO and the need for any other protective provisions to protect relevant interests</b></p> <p>The DL5 updated SoCG between the Applicant and the NDA/Magnox [<a href="#">REP5-100</a>], records that NDA and Magnox still believe that plots MDS/05/06 and MDS/05/07 should be excluded from the Book of Reference (BoR), notwithstanding the draft DCO Article 26(2)(c) which precludes the Applicant from acquiring any rights held by NDA/Magnox in the plots listed and the proposed Protective Provisions.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Please provide an update in relation to the finalisation of the agreed wording of the Protective Provisions and the provision of a co-operation agreement.</p> <p>(ii) If agreement has not been reached NDA and Magnox are requested to explain further why the inclusion of these plots would be inconsistent with the regulatory regime established by the Nuclear Site Licence and Nuclear Installation Act 1965 and contrary to section 151(a) PA 2008.</p> <p>(iii) Please provide an update in relation to the additional plots that NDA and Magnox wish to see included within Article 26(2)(a).</p> <p>(iv) The Applicant is requested to provide evidence that it has undertaken diligent enquiry in relation to these plots.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) The Protective Provisions are in an advanced stage and negotiations have progressed significantly throughout Examination and will be included in the <b>draft DCO</b> at deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)). SZC Co. is acutely aware of the importance of NDA and Magnox's ability to perform their respective statutory functions and regulatory responsibilities alongside the construction of Sizewell C and as such this co-operation agreement has been prioritised. Alongside the discussions on Protective Provisions there is a mature draft of a co-operation agreement in circulation between SZC Co. and Magnox and the NDA.</p> <p>(ii) No response needed by SZC Co.</p> <p>(iii) This is not being progressed as the advanced draft of the Protective Provisions afford the protections which would have been by including additional plots within Article 26(2)(1)</p> <p>(iv) Class 4 powers are required to facilitate the construction of the project, the diligent enquiry undertaken as part of the land referencing process carried out by SZC Co. means the relevant parties including Magnox and the NDA are aware of the powers being sought. The Protective Provisions included in the <b>draft DCO</b> at this deadline (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)) ensure the implications of exercising those powers do not impact on the ability for NDA and Magnox to carry out their respective statutory functions and regulatory responsibilities.</p>
CA.2.14	The Applicant, SCC	<b>Adequacy of the protective provisions set out in the draft DCO and the need for any other protective provisions to protect relevant interests</b>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.67 [REP2-100], and its response to the comments on those question responses [REP5-129], records that the parties are working to ensure that the draft DCO provisions as a whole adequately secure the highway works.</p> <p>(i) Please provide an update on progress and indicate whether this will take the form of a set of Protective Provisions to be inserted as a schedule to the DCO.</p> <p>(ii) Please also clarify the position in relation to the Protective Provisions additionally sought by SCC for other topic areas.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) SZC Co. are not negotiating protective provisions in relation to highways with SCC. Our position, as we have always made clear to SCC, is that protective provisions for highways are unnecessary. Most DCOs (and other 'Works Orders' such as TWA Orders or hybrid Acts) require works to highways, and yet very few have sought to include 'protective provisions' for existing highways. We are not aware that absence of such provisions has caused any difficulties, and certainly has not at Hinkley Point C. The Highway Act 1980 protects existing highways from interference without 'lawful excuse' by persons other than the highway authority. Ordinarily, such interference is therefore authorised by a s278 agreement entered into by a developer wishing to carry out works to an existing highway or to create a new highway which will connect into an existing highway. The dedication of the new highway would ordinarily be dealt with via a s38 agreement, again made under the Highways Act 1980. The position is slightly different with a DCO, in that a DCO provides the undertaker with statutory authority to carry out the authorised works (including works which interfere with an existing highway), and therefore the DCO itself in principle authorises the entry onto the highway without the need for a lawful excuse in the form of a s278 agreement. For this reason, however, DCOs generally provide an express power for the local highway authority and undertaker to enter into an agreement to s278/38 agreements (under art 21 in the case of the SZC dDCO). We have added a new sub-paragraph to article 21 (art 21(3)) which prevents SZC Co from carrying out any highway works without completing such an agreement with SCC. This therefore places SCC in exactly the same position with regard to their ability to control the terms on which a highway may be interfered with as they would have but for the statutory authority</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>afforded by the DCO. SZC Co. consider this to be the simplest and most appropriate means of ensuring SCC has the necessary level of control over works affecting existing highways. For additional clarity, Rev 8 dDCO provides expressly that art 21 agreements may include such matters as might otherwise be included in a s278 or s38 agreement. We have invited SCC to offer further drafting to enhance article 21 should they wish to.</p> <p>(ii) SZC Co. are not currently discussing and are not aware of any Protective Provisions sought by SCC in addition to those referenced above.</p>
CA.2.15	The Applicant	<p><b>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</b></p> <p>The DL3 submission on behalf of Ms Dyball, Ms Hall and SR Whitwell &amp; Co [REP3-118], opposes the proposed compulsory acquisition of this land and raises a number of issues. This has been supplemented at DL5 [REP5-246]. The Applicant has provided a responses at various deadlines [REP3-049], [AS-153], [REP5-001], [REP5-112] and [REP5-119]. However, please clarify and provide further details in relation to the following points:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further the exploration of reasonable alternatives to the compulsory acquisition of this land including search data for the Waveney Valley and Suffolk Coastal areas and demonstrate that a diligent search for reasonable alternatives has been undertaken.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain why alternative fen meadow recreation land could not be found nearer to the proposed development, for example, on EDF land in Leiston or elsewhere in Suffolk Coastal.</p> <p>(iii) Please explain in full the need to acquire these particular plots for the proposed development.</p> <p>(iv) The Applicant's DL3 response [REP3-049] in relation to the feasibility of re-creating fen meadow at Pakenham refers to feasibility assessment work that began in March 2021 and requires 12 months of hydrological data collection. Please justify the acquisition of this land for the purpose stated in the absence of that data and the conclusion of the feasibility work.</p> <p>(v) Please confirm the area of fen meadow that would be lost as a result of the proposed development and provide full justification for the extent of the land sought to be acquired.</p> <p>(vii) The Applicant's DL3 response [REP3-049] indicates that it is not expected that all the</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>area within the identified Pakenham site boundary will become meadow. and that the precise area of fen meadow that could be created is uncertain and subject to the outcome of ongoing studies. Please explain further why a reduced area of land would not suffice? Given the acknowledged uncertainty and the absence of relevant data, how can the compulsory acquisition proposals be regarded as necessary and reasonable and how can the extent of the land-take be regarded as proportionate?</p> <p>(viii) The Applicant's DL3 response [REP3-049] indicates that relevant hydrological data collection has not been completed. Please respond to the concerns raised in relation to the prospect of the scheme having an adverse impact upon the use of the surrounding farmland, and the local Watermill. Please explain how Requirement 14A of the draft DCO would ensure that the potential impact upon Pakenham Water Mill and other neighbouring landowners would be satisfactorily controlled or are any additional controls required?</p> <p>(ix) The Applicant's DL3 response [REP3-049] indicates it is seeking to understand the impact of these proposals on landowners and to respond to their queries relating to the continued use of the land following establishment of the proposed fen meadow. Please provide an update in relation to that engagement.</p> <p>(x) What regard has been had to the livelihood and wellbeing of the farmer of the land and the implications for the cattle and arable enterprises and the agricultural operation as a whole when assessing the private loss to those who would be affected by the proposed compulsory acquisition?</p> <p>(xi) Please explain the consideration given to the human rights of these particular landowners and tenant.</p> <p>(xii) Please respond to the concerns raised in relation to the proposed removal and/or disturbance of the peat topsoil as part of the works.</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p><b>Response (i):</b> <i>'Please explain further the exploration of reasonable alternatives to the compulsory acquisition of this land including search data for the Waveney Valley and Suffolk Coastal areas and demonstrate that a diligent search for reasonable alternatives has been undertaken.'</i></p> <p>The key aim of the search for compensatory fen meadow sites was for the sites to be sustainable in the long term. This objective informed the criteria used in the study to</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>identify potential sites. The criteria were detailed in Wood, 2018 [REP4-007] and the key steps followed in identifying potential sites to take forward for further study are summarised below, from REP4-007:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. GIS-based screening;</li><li>2. Review of web-based data for land parcels identified by the GIS against non-GIS based criteria;</li><li>3. Site visits from public rights of way (PRoW); and</li><li>4. Ranking of land parcels identified using Red/Amber/Green, with any ranked green proposed to be taken forward to project Phase 2. Stakeholder consultation was undertaken on the study approach and results.</li></ol> <p>The study [REP4-007] commenced in 2016 and initially sites within close proximity of Sizewell Marshes were sought, with the study restricted to the Alde, Minsmere and Blyth valleys. All land within the search area was included, including all EDF land. However, this study identified insufficient potential sites to deliver the necessary quantum of fen meadow habitat implied as likely to be necessary by stakeholders in 2016, including by SCC in a meeting on 26 April 2016 where it was stated: 'Clearly we would expect to see considerably more habitat restored, than will be lost..'. As a result the site search was extended to the whole of Suffolk in 2018.</p> <p>The GIS analysis, review of web-based data, site visits from PRoW and consultations with stakeholders in 2016 identified a total of 69 sites that were then visited in 2016, 2017 or 2018, where access was possible from PRoW.</p> <p>Only five sites in the whole of Suffolk were given a green ranking (two identified new in 2018, one re-ranked from 2016, and 2 retained from 2016) and were recommended to be carried forward into the next phase (Wood, 2018 [REP4-007]).</p> <p>The Benhall (sites 10 and 11), Halesworth and Pakenham sites, plus an additional site (33), were the only sites in the whole of Suffolk that met the screening criteria adopted and were therefore proposed to be taken forward for further study (Wood, 2018, [REP4-007]). However, upon further consideration of site specifics, based primarily on an almost</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>complete absence of indicators of groundwater influence in the ditches visible from the PRow and in the sward, it was considered that Site 33 did not have the same level of potential for fen meadow creation as the other four sites listed and was therefore not progressed.</p> <p>In addition to the five green sites, 17 sites remained amber and on hold in Wood, 2018 [<a href="#">REP4-007</a>], subject to further assessment of the green sites. Sites were assigned amber where it was considered that they had potential for creating only very limited areas of fen meadow (much smaller than the sites indicated as green), they would need significant engineering works, and/or were not accessible during the site visit due to no nearby PRow. Wood 2018 [<a href="#">REP4-007</a>] indicated that the majority of the sites assigned an amber ranking were assigned this because they could not be assessed due to lack of nearby PRow but that if it had been possible to assess them, then based on likely similar sites in the vicinity, it is considered that they would probably have been assigned a red ranking.</p> <p>It should be noted that the great majority of surviving fragments of fen meadow vegetation in East Anglia are designated and/or subject to an agri-environment agreement. Other sites have succeeded to alder-dominated woodland, have been abandoned, or remain as faint traces in otherwise productive valley grasslands. These factors would either result in sites being screened out, or the sites would not be detectable via the desk study, although it would be expected that the consultation with stakeholders with local knowledge, undertaken in 2016 and 2019, would have identified further sites with potential had they been known. This however was not the case.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that, as the study has encompassed all land within Suffolk and included consultation with stakeholders with local knowledge on identifying sites with potential, a diligent search for reasonable alternatives has been undertaken.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Response (ii):</b> <i>'Please explain why alternative fen meadow recreation land could not be found nearer to the proposed development, for example, on EDF land in Leiston or elsewhere in Suffolk Coastal.'</i></p> <p>The answer to this is covered in the response to part (i) above. However, additionally, the search would not have been extended to the whole of Suffolk had sufficient sites been identified in the initial 2016 site search.</p> <p><b>Response (iii):</b> <i>'Please explain in full the need to acquire these particular plots for the proposed development.'</i></p> <p>The Benhall (sites 10 and 11), Halesworth and Pakenham sites, plus an additional Site 33, were the only sites in the whole of Suffolk that met the screening criteria adopted and were therefore proposed to be taken forward for further study (Wood, 2018, <a href="#">[REP4-007]</a>).</p> <p>However, upon further consideration of site specifics, based primarily on an almost complete absence of indicators of groundwater influence in the ditches visible from the PRow and in the sward, it was considered that Site 33 did not have the same level of potential for fen meadow creation as the other four sites listed and was therefore not progressed.</p> <p>The Benhall, Halesworth and Pakenham sites were therefore considered the only sites that merited detailed evaluation. Following the further investigation undertaken in 2019 (reported in Wood, 2019 <a href="#">[APP-258]</a>) it was concluded that the Benhall, Halesworth and Pakenham sites all had potential for the development of fen meadow. Although Site 11 has relatively limited potential, it was adjacent to Site 10 and so warranted further consideration in that context.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Based on the extensive search and subsequent site based studies these were the only sites that SZC Co. could locate that had the potential for fen meadow creation. Therefore, to deliver the appropriate quantum of fen meadow compensatory habitat, SZC Co. has no other reasonable alternative to the acquisition of these sites. The <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>], submitted at Deadline 6, confirms that the creation of fen meadow habitats is viable at each of the three sites, to the extent defined in the plan. <b>Appendix A of the Written Submissions arising from the CAH Part 1</b> (Doc Ref. 9.76) explains that the results of further studies have allowed SZC Co. to identify with greater certainty what land within these sites is needed for the fen meadow habitat and SZC Co. is therefore proposing to reduce the Order limits to remove the land that is no longer required.</p> <p><b>Response (iv):</b> <i>The Applicant's DL3 response [REP3-049] in relation to the feasibility of re-creating fen meadow at Pakenham refers to feasibility assessment work that began in March 2021 and requires 12 months of hydrological data collection. Please justify the acquisition of this land for the purpose stated in the absence of that data and the conclusion of the feasibility work.</i></p> <p>The <b>Fen Meadow Baseline report</b> [<a href="#">REP3-051</a> and <a href="#">3-052</a>], and the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>], detail the results of the on-going studies at the site. Although a full 12 months' data are not yet available, the hydrological monitoring data available do encompass the spring and early summer period (early July). The <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>] has therefore been informed by hydrological monitoring over the period in which groundwater levels would typically be expected to recede and thus provide a good indication of likely summer groundwater level behaviour, and what influences this. Based on the data available, the substrate type in the areas targeted in the Fen Meadow Plan Draft is appropriate and, with implementation of the measures detailed, it is considered that it will be possible to deliver groundwater influenced surface conditions that will be suitable to support fen meadow habitat. The <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>] establishes a good level of confidence in this respect but does however recognise the on-going nature of the data collection process indicating:</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><i>The proposals have been prepared with reference to the data available to the beginning of July 2021 and data collection is on-going at each site. It remains possible therefore that future data may indicate the necessity to make minor adjustments to the proposals. However, the most likely changes that may be necessary will be to depths of sculpting indicated.</i></p> <p>This would not fundamentally change the proposals at Pakenham and it is on this basis the acquisition of land at Pakenham is being pursued.</p> <p><b>Response (v):</b> <i>Please confirm the area of fen meadow that would be lost as a result of the proposed development and provide full justification for the extent of the land sought to be acquired.</i></p> <p>The extent of fen meadow to be lost at Sizewell Marshes SSSI is 0.46ha. Stakeholders including Natural England [<a href="#">RR-0878</a>] expect the compensatory habitat to extend to nine times the area of fen meadow to be lost from the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. This would require between 4.14 to 4.5 hectares of replacement habitat. Note that the upper limit of 4.5 hectares is based on a previous calculation of 0.5ha of fen meadow lost, which has since been corrected to 0.46ha.</p> <p>However, it is necessary to account for uncertainty in the habitat creation process, particularly in respect of fen meadow which has been recognised as difficult to recreate, with relatively few documented successful examples. Appendix E <b>of the Written Submissions arising from the CAH Part 1</b> (Doc Ref. 9.76) provides an explanation on the extent of land being sought. The <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>] recognises this situation and explains the rationale for inclusion of greater than 4.5ha in the plan. Specifically, section 5 of the Plan states:</p> <p><i>'The proposals are therefore anticipated to deliver conditions suitable to support fen meadow habitat across the site areas summarised below:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>• Benhall – 2.4 ha of fen meadow, 0.6 ha of wet woodland;</i></li><li><i>• Halesworth – 1.0 ha of fen meadow; and</i></li></ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="902 252 1928 284">• <i>Pakenham: 4.73 ha of fen meadow, 1.76 ha of wet woodland.</i></li></ul> <p data-bbox="902 300 2159 368"><i>In total therefore the plan could deliver up to <b>8.13 ha of fen meadow</b> and <b>2.36 ha of wet woodland</b>.</i></p> <p data-bbox="902 384 2136 491"><i>The 8.13 ha area, across which conditions suitable to support fen meadow habitat are anticipated, exceeds the 4.14 to 4.5 ha stated in the Fen Meadow Strategy [Section 2.9D of <a href="#">AS-209</a>] as revised by paragraph 1.1.4 [of the Fen Meadow Plan ].</i></p> <p data-bbox="902 507 2159 922"><i>Within any of the sites, it is not considered possible to set a single ground level that will deliver appropriate conditions for fen meadow year round allowing for a smaller area to be identified for fen meadow delivery, because of the uncertainties in groundwater level fluctuation with a limited ability to control these on these sites, and uncertainties in the precise development of the habitat in any one particular location within the site. Instead, the sculpting approach proposed, results in a variable micro-topography that will support a range of hydrological conditions, varying from shallow open water through to more terrestrial habitat. This maximises the provision of areas with appropriate hydrology, and hence potentially suitable area for fen meadow, whilst allowing for the uncertainties in groundwater level fluctuation and limited ability to control these.'</i></p> <p data-bbox="824 979 1861 1011"><b>Response (vi):</b> No question apparent, assumed to be a mislabelling.</p> <p data-bbox="824 1075 2136 1337"><b>Response (vii):</b> <i>The Applicant's DL3 response [REP3-049] indicates that it is not expected that all the area within the identified Pakenham site boundary will become meadow. and that the precise area of fen meadow that could be created is uncertain and subject to the outcome of ongoing studies. Please explain further why a reduced area of land would not suffice? Given the acknowledged uncertainty and the absence of relevant data, how can the compulsory acquisition proposals be regarded as necessary and reasonable and how can the extent of the land-take be regarded as proportionate?</i></p> <p data-bbox="824 1394 2136 1465">The <b>Fen Meadow Baseline Report</b> [<a href="#">REP3-051</a> and <a href="#">3-052</a>], and the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>], detail the results of the on-going studies at the Pakenham site. The</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [REP6-026] also indicates that the area of the site that will be subject to fen meadow creation activities is limited to three fields, as indicated in Figure 4.1 of the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [REP6-026]. It is therefore concluded that a reduced area of land is required at Pakenham and the proposed Order limits can be re-drawn to reflect the reduced requirement. A reduced area of land will therefore suffice. See <b>Appendix A of the Written Submissions arising from the CAH Part 1</b> (Doc Ref. 9.76) for further information.</p> <p>In the response to <b>Bio 2.17</b>, further details are provided in relation to the need for land at Pakenham. The Pakenham site is considered to be viable for the creation of both wet woodland and fen meadow as defined in the Fen Meadow Plan Draft 1 submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6-026]. Having reviewed the baseline documents, Natural England stated at REP6-042, that '<i>Natural England advise that in principle the creation of Fen Meadow M22 within the sites investigated appears feasible</i>'. Given this and that the Pakenham site is needed to achieve the 4.14ha habitat quantum expected by Natural England, the compulsory acquisition proposals is regarded as necessary and reasonable and the extent of the reduced land-take to deliver that quantum is regarded as proportionate .</p> <p><b>Response (viii):</b> <i>The Applicant's DL3 response [REP3-049] indicates that relevant hydrological data collection has not been completed. Please respond to the concerns raised in relation to the prospect of the scheme having and adverse impact upon the use of the surrounding farmland, and the local Watermill. Please explain how Requirement 14A of the draft DCO would ensure that the potential impact upon Pakenham Water Mill and other neighbouring landowners would be satisfactorily controlled or are any additional controls required?</i></p> <p>The proposals for the creation of fen meadow at Pakenham are detailed in the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [REP6-026]. There would be no direct off take of water from the Pakenham Stream and no water control structures would be placed in the Stream. The supply of water to Pakenham Mill would not be affected.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>No activities would be undertaken during creation, and subsequent management, of the fen meadow habitat that would affect the surrounding farmland. Habitat creation and management works will be restricted land within the proposed Order limits, as indicated in Figure 4.1 of the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>].</p> <p>As detailed immediately above, proposals in the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>] avoid effects on Pakenham Water Mill and the surrounding farmland.</p> <p>Requirement 14A of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)) requires that fen meadow plans must be prepared and approved by the relevant council in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body. These fen meadow plans must be in general accordance with the Fen Meadow Strategy. No additional controls are required.</p> <p><b>Response (ix):</b> <i>The Applicant's DL3 response [<a href="#">REP3-049</a>] indicates it is seeking to understand the impact of these proposals on landowners and to respond to their queries relating to the continued use of the land following establishment of the proposed fen meadow. Please provide an update in relation to that engagement.</i></p> <p>SZC Co. provided an update to Appendix B of the Statement of Reasons at Deadline 2 – 'Status of negotiations with Owners of the Order Land' [<a href="#">REP2-021</a>], which has been updated for Deadline 3 [<a href="#">REP3-005</a>], Deadline 6 [<a href="#">REP6-011</a>] and Deadline 7 (Doc Ref 4.1B (F)). There has been extensive engagement and SZC Co. and its agents have continued to engage with the landowners (tenants and agents) to confirm the project requirements and the anticipated impacts on the existing use of the land and to provide responses to the queries raised. The latest onsite meeting was held on 11 August 2021 with the relevant discipline lead from SZC Co. and the respective agents for the parties.</p> <p>The grazing methodology of the farm and locations of the pasture land was discussed at the meeting on 11 August with the tenant (and owner of the cattle). The tenant and SZC Co. are working together to allow the proposed use of this land as Fen Meadow to work within the existing grazing system where possible.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Response (x):</b> <i>What regard has been had to the livelihood and wellbeing of the farmer of the land and the implications for the cattle and arable enterprises and the agricultural operation as a whole when assessing the private loss to those who would be affected by the proposed compulsory acquisition?</i></p> <p>The impact on the farming operations of the site at Pakenham was considered in the ES Addendum <b>First ES Addendum Volume 1, Chapter 2</b> [<a href="#">AS-181</a>]. The document confirms (paragraph 2.12.17) that 'Following completion of works, it is anticipated that grazing of the land would continue, albeit with a possible reduction in intensity. This is not considered likely to result in a significant effect on existing farming operations.'</p> <p>,Any anticipated private loss would be compensatable (in financial terms) by application of the compensation code. However, SZC Co. and its agents are pursuing a private treaty agreement that would ensure that a reduced land area (to reflect the revised areas discussed in response to <i>vii</i> above) and land rights are secured, reducing further any private loss – this will shift the balance further as the financial terms that would be provided by way of any private treaty agreement would go beyond financial 'equivalence' provided by the compensation code.</p> <p><b>Response (xi):</b> <i>Please explain the consideration given to the human rights of these particular landowners and tenant.</i></p> <p>SZC Co. has considered the relevant articles of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) as follows:</p> <p>Article 1 of the First Protocol – a right to protection of property - SZC Co. recognises that the Article 1 rights of the landowners and tenants, as persons who have an interest in the Order Land which is to be compulsorily acquired or temporarily possessed, would be affected and their peaceful enjoyment of their property would be interfered with. However, this proposed interference would be in the public interest and lawful, as set out 's response to</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Question CA.1.40 in SZC Co.'s <b>Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Question</b> <a href="#">[REP2-100]</a>.</p> <p>Article 6 – a right to a fair trial, which includes determination of the issues within a reasonable time - As Affected Persons with an interest in the Order Land, the landowners and tenants have been entitled to a fair and public hearing of any objection they have to the granting of the compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of the Order Land in accordance with their Article 6 rights. This includes the opportunity to submit Relevant and Written Representations and to make subsequent written and oral submissions into the examination in respect of matters related to the compulsory acquisition powers being applied for, in addition to any other project related concerns.</p> <p>Further, Section 118 of the Planning Act 2008 creates a legal mechanism whereby the grant of a development consent order may be challenged through judicial review.</p> <p>In respect of the determination of matters relating to compensation, any claimants disputing compensation that may be payable (pursuant to a claim under the Compensation Code) can make a reference to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) for determination, providing the claimant with a fair trial in a timely manner.</p> <p>Article 8(1) – a right to respect for private and family life including respect for a person's home - No dwellings are proposed to be acquired in respect of the Fen Meadow proposals, and as such Article 8(1) is not engaged.</p> <p><b>Response (xii):</b> <i>Please respond to the concerns raised in relation to the proposed removal and/or disturbance of the peat topsoil as part of the works.</i></p> <p>The Representation on behalf Ms Dyball, Ms Hall and SR Whitwell &amp; Co <a href="#">[REP5-246]</a> indicates that the top layer of soil in these meadows is rich in peat. Soil cores reported in Wood, 2019 <a href="#">[APP-258]</a> do not universally support this, with layers of sand present in some locations also. Nonetheless, proposals for fen meadow creation works set out in the</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [REP6-026] have targeted areas with a combination of the most appropriate soil types (earthy peat, peat, marl) and water tables that, based on available data, are close enough to the surface such that the measures available could create groundwater influenced conditions at the ground surface.</p> <p>Peat forms in the presence of continuously waterlogged conditions and it is considered likely that the majority of the site was very wet, supported by groundwater, until the 1960s at which point both Clarke and Simpson on behalf of Ms Dyball, Ms Hall and SR Whitwell &amp; Co [REP3-118] and the Representation on behalf Ms Dyball, Ms Hall and SR Whitwell &amp; Co [REP5-246] indicate that the owner drained the land through installation of a network of land drains, funded by the then Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, now the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. In addition to significantly reducing the water table such that the land became manageable for grazing, this process could have had a number of effects including subsidence of the peat, increased mineralisation (i.e. drying out and mineralisation of the surface layers), eutrophication of surface waters and replacement of calcareous groundwater by rainwater, all of which are negative factors in respect of establishment and maintenance of fen meadow.</p> <p>To establish fen meadow habitat it is necessary to restore the appropriate abiotic and biotic conditions, as detailed in Appendix 7H of REP2-110. Development of the abiotic and biotic conditions for fen meadow referable to the M22 <i>Juncus subnodulosus</i> – <i>Cirsium palustre</i> fen meadow community will have the highest chances of success if the following techniques are employed [REP2-110], all of which are included in the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [REP6-026]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Topsoil removal.</b> Complete or partial topsoil removal should be undertaken within the context of sediment disposition, surface topography and valley flooding regimes, in order to reduce nutrient levels and increase the influence of groundwater on target species.</li><li>• <b>Creation of microtopography.</b> The ground surface should be sculpted within hydrologically significant tolerances to assist in the successful colonisation and</li></ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>regeneration of target groundwater-dependent species, particularly those with high light requirements, low competitive abilities and low tolerance of drought or flooding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="824 363 2181 555">• <b>Rewetting from appropriate water sources.</b> Rewetting should be undertaken using groundwater-dominated sources to facilitate an appropriate hydrological regime for the target vegetation. Sufficient control is likely to be required to minimise the impact of extreme events leading to flooding by nutrient-rich waters and/or periods of drought, within acceptable limits.</li><li data-bbox="824 587 2181 778">• <b>Use of hay transfers.</b> The transfer of hay from suitable sites – or of turves from the Fen Meadow donor site – should be undertaken following established best practices. The conditions and timing of collection, transfer and introduction of plant propagules – and their initial establishment – should be carefully monitored to meet restoration requirements.</li><li data-bbox="824 810 2181 1034">• <b>Habitat management.</b> An agreed annual programme of water and vegetation management should be established and undertaken at appropriate times. These operations – and their impact on the developing fen meadows – should be set with a framework of acceptable limits. Appropriate monitoring should be maintained to enable effective and timely management of the habitat management programme to meet target conditions for the restored fen meadow vegetation.</li></ul> <p>Whilst it is accepted that removal of peat in good condition, or peat still actively forming, would typically be contrary to conservation objectives, removal of peat that has been drained, to reveal fresh peat that would be kept wet by elevated groundwater levels, would not. Removal of degraded surface peat has been undertaken at a number of sites nationally as part of restoration works, including at Parker’s Piece, as reported in Appendix 7H of <a href="#">REP2-110</a>.</p>
CA.2.16	The Applicant	<p><b>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</b></p> <p>The DL2 technical note [REP2-252], including the Fordley Road options, and DL5 submissions made Create Consulting Engineers [REP5-259] raise a number of issues on</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>behalf of the Grant family. The Applicant's DL5 response to their earlier submissions [REP5-119], and in the written submissions arising from ISH3 in relation to Fordley Road [REP5-115] are noted. Please explain further and provide a summary response in relation to:</p> <p>(i) The regard which has been had to severance and the impact upon the existing farming operations when assessing private loss and whether the impact or the powers sought upon this landowner would be proportionate.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide an update upon the assessment of the feasibility of incorporating an underpass beneath the SLR to give access for vehicles to land that would lie to the north of the proposed road.</p> <p>(iii) Notwithstanding the comments made in relation to the Fordley Road options at DL5, please provide a detailed explanation as to why Options A and B as proposed by Create Consulting Engineers has been rejected. For Option B, what would be the extent of the additional land-take required for the embankments and why is this option not regarded as proportionate? For Option A, what would be the extent of the additional land-take required for the embankments, what is the likelihood of further land being required and why is this scheme not regarded as a proportionate option? For both options, what regard has been had to be benefits of including the works such as the proposed new slip road or turning head that would no longer be required.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) The impacts of the severance were assessed in the Volume 6 Sizewell Link Road Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [<a href="#">APP-470</a>]. The assessment identified that some additional use of public highway would be required and confirmed the impact to be Minor Adverse (not significant). From discussions with the Affected Persons SZC Co. understands that the farm contractor accesses the land from the north. The severed parcels will be able to be accessed from public roads utilising the Sizewell link road together with the existing road network.</p> <p>SZC Co. agreed terms for the acquisition of the land required to construct and operate the Sizewell link road on 30 April 2021. SZC Co. continues to explore any accommodation works which would further reduce the impacts on the holding to be included within the private treaty agreement. Where these works cannot be provided, or do not completely alleviate impact, the agreed terms allow the Affected Persons to make a further claim for</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>compensation for the effect on the retained land, such as injurious affection and/or severance, under the Compensation Code.</p> <p>The amount of permanent land take from the holding was identified as being 10% once the Sizewell link road is operational – the characterisation of the impact on the holding as Minor Adverse (not significant), the continued ability to access land from the public highway, the continued engagement to identify further measures to reduce impacts on the holding further, and the payment of compensation (both under the terms of the private treaty agreement and the Compensation Code) mean that private loss has been considered and mitigated, and the powers sought are proportionate and necessary to deliver the public benefits of the Project.</p> <p>Details of the engagement are provided in an update to <b>Appendix B</b> to the <b>SoR</b> (Doc ref.4.1 B (F)) '<i>Status of Negotiations with Owners of the Order Land</i>', submitted at Deadline 7, and in the detailed schedule of engagement with the Grants provided in the <b>Appendix D Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from CAH1 Part 1</b> (Doc. Ref. 9.76) also provided at Deadline 7.</p> <p>SZC Co. has also engaged a drainage expert who has been in correspondence with the affected party to understand and mitigate the interference with drainage and water supplies as a result of the construction of the Sizewell link road.</p> <p>(ii) See the SZC Co.'s response to Question Ag.2.5 and 1.3.28 of the SZC Co.'s Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at CAH1 Part 2 (Doc Ref. 9.75).</p> <p>(iii) The question of the right solution for the SLR at Fordley Road was discussed at the Traffic and Transport ISH Part 2. Mr Humphrey (ExA) requested a response to this point in writing, which was provided along with the written summary of oral responses [REP5-108].</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The proposed highway arrangements at Fordley Road are shown in Drawing 100137 in the SLR drawings set [<a href="#">REP5-025</a>], that shows the northern arm of Fordley Road stopped up, and Fordley Road connected to SLR with a t-junction.</p> <p>The recorded existing two-way traffic flow on Fordley Road is 80 vehicles per day. Fordley Road is not a route promoted for use by any Sizewell C traffic and directional signage will be in place during the construction phase of the Project to guide Sizewell C drivers to use appropriate routes, principally the A12 and the SLR. HGVs will be tracked and monitored along prescribed routes as set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan [<a href="#">REP2-054</a>]. Therefore the proposed design for Fordley Road is to cater for the existing traffic flows on the road (i.e. circa 80 two-way vehicles per day).</p> <p>In order to retain an appropriate provision of connectivity between Middleton Moor and Kelsale, the Project proposals create a connection between Fordley Road south and the SLR via the provision of a priority junction, which would require diversion onto the SLR but retain connectivity between the communities.</p> <p>The three options that were explored to retain Fordley Road as a continuous through route as explained in the written summary are similar to the two options suggested by Create Consulting Engineers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• raise the level of the SLR to cross over Fordley Road on a bridge, and maintain the existing Fordley Road level (similar to Create Consulting Engineers' Option A);</li><li>• lower the level of Fordley Road beneath the SLR (similar to Create Consulting Engineers' Option B); and</li><li>• continue Fordley Road on a bridge structure over the SLR (this third option is not suggested by Create Consulting Engineers).</li></ul> <p><b>Option A</b></p> <p>Create Consulting Engineers' Option A suggestion to provide the SLR crossing over Fordley Road (retained at its current level) with a minimum clearance of 5.3m to the underside of the SLR shows the Project longsection alignment lifted some 3.5m. The SLR is already on</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>a 3.5m high embankment thereby the alignment suggested is over 7m in height at Fordley Road. An increase in embankment height of this magnitude at this location is considered a severe impact on the landscape and an unacceptable detrimental impact on the adjacent Vale Cottage properties.</p> <p>The Create Consulting Engineers' Option A plan layout shows an underpass at SLR chainage 2900 and the longsection shows it at chainage 2850. This is assumed to be an error and the underpass on the longsection should also be at chainage 2900 which would change the vertical alignment suggested as a result. The longsection underpass position would therefore need to move eastwards to match the plan position.</p> <p>The Create Consulting Engineers' suggested vertical road profile is shown to dip either side of the underpass location which would reduce driver visibility and introduce a safety concern with vehicles being partly hidden in the dip. The Suffolk County Council highway design standards vertical curvature and site stopping distances for the dipped sections is below the requirements of a 60 mph speed limit and would therefore not likely be an acceptable safe design to the highway authority. The Create Consulting Engineers' Option A is therefore also rejected on highway design safety considerations.</p> <p>It is expected that the Environment Agency would want to understand the implications for the culverted section of the Middleton Drain watercourse, including ensuring the underpass has sufficient width to enable a mammal passage on one or both banks and whether this needs to be formally provided in a space between the channel and Fordley Road. The underpass structure would need to retain the watercourse in place adjacent to Fordley Road and therefore the width of the underpass would need to increase. As the watercourse is shown as retained in place there is likely to be less of an impact from a flood risk perspective. However, there is a flood risk in the floodplain in this area and there is a chance that the road embankment would act as a barrier across the floodplain. Whilst this is not likely to result in significant flooding it is the responsibility of the Environment Agency who would require modelling to confirm there would be no detrimental impact of retaining the existing watercourse. Therefore the out of bank flooding that was addressed by the diverted channel in the Project might still be required as a flood relief culvert as a precaution. The culvert would be some 8m longer due to the increased height of the road profile and wider embankments. It is expected that Suffolk County Council might request that the road and channel in the underpass be slightly reconfigured so that it would not flood out of bank underneath the SLR, in which case</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>works would then be required to the watercourse in this Option A. A resulting shorter effective length of watercourse would remove the loss of watercourse offset mitigation length elsewhere provided by the Project design and therefore would not provide a benefit when compared to the Project design. The extent of underpass, embankment and culvert would not reduce the land area required compared to the provision of a t-junction and turning head in the Project submission and thereby would provide no benefit to reduce land area.</p> <p>For Option A, a wider underpass to span the watercourse and Fordley Road would therefore be required and as a result increase the size and thickness of structure thereby requiring the road alignment to be raised further and increase the embankment widths. A profile to eliminate the dipped sections, alter the underpass position and level, and provide sufficient longitudinal gradient for surface drainage would require the alignment to be lifted for a longer length to that suggested by the Create Consulting Engineers' Option A. This revised option would increase the Project's SLR alignment levels by approximately 4m to create an over-bridge with sufficient clearance to Fordley Road (5.3m). The SLR would already be on an embankment of up to 3.5m, so this arrangement would require a substantial increase in land area required for embankments at Fordley Road. The engineering required to achieve this would result in a 480m long higher embankment to the east of Fordley Road up to 10m wider to the north and 6m wider to the south. To the west, the embankment would be higher for a length of 400m up to 10m wider to the north and 7m wider to the south before the vertical alignment could tie in to the current design height. The resulting structure and required embankments would be substantial and not in-keeping with the landscape. Although this revised Option A may be deliverable within the Order limits, there would be an increased risk of a further minimal amount of agricultural land being required at the pinch points to the west to provide the access maintenance tracks to the attenuation basins. An increase in embankment height of this magnitude at this location is considered a severe impact on the landscape and an unacceptable detrimental impact on the adjacent Vale Cottage properties.</p> <p>The increased size of structure and extent of embankment heights leading to the severity of the visual landscape impact on adjacent properties is therefore not considered an appropriate or suitable proportionate solution to cater for the 80 vehicles per day compared to the Project solution.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Option B</b></p> <p>The Create Consulting Engineers' Option B suggestion of lowering Fordley Road beneath the SLR with a proposed pumping station was considered but would create a significant localised depression in the landscape which would result in an increased risk of flooding of the road, noting that the Middleton Drain watercourse running alongside Fordley Road is the responsibility of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The clearance from Fordley Road to the underside of the SLR bridge is shown at Option B at a minimum of 5.3m which would cause a significant depression. Fordley Road would also need to be lowered some 3m over a reasonable distance to meet road design standards. To create the required depression for Option B, the lowered Fordley Road would require a cutting embankment in excess of 200m in length and some 7.5m high to the east at a width of up to 22m, and a cutting embankment 3.5m deep to the west at a width of up to 11m. The watercourse would require diverting. The extent of embankment cutting to lower Fordley Road and divert the watercourse would not reduce the land area required compared to the provision of a t-junction and turning head in the Project submission and thereby provides no benefit to reduce land area. The impact of lowering Fordley Road and the surrounding landscape to this extent would increase the required agricultural land area to the north of the SLR Crossing for the reprofiling of Fordley Road and to provide a sufficient grade for the PROW diversion and maintenance access to the attenuation basins to the east. To the south of the Project boundary, the additional land, although minimal to reprofile Fordley Road and create the associated cutting embankments, would severely impact the Vale Cottage residential properties. The extent of embankment cutting, road lowering, and to the severity of the impact on adjacent properties is therefore not considered an appropriate or suitable proportionate solution compared to the Project solution.</p> <p>The surface water mapping, as reported in the FRA [<a href="#">REP2-027</a>] and [<a href="#">REP5-045</a>], shows there is clearly a surface water flood risk / flow route along Fordley Road. Within the FRA it is noted that Fordley Road itself appears to act at least partially as the fluvial flow route in the existing baseline scenario.</p> <p>Fordley Road partially acts as a flow route during extreme storm events – it is hard to apportion the difference between surface water and fluvial flows. However, regardless of this, modifications would be needed to ensure water predominantly flows along the diverted channel and would not follow the path of least resistance under the underpass</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>where it would pond. Even if fluvial flows remain in bank there would still be rainfall / surface water that would flow into this location and become trapped. It is expected that the Environment Agency is unlikely to support the diversion of the watercourse suggested in Option B.</p> <p>Option B indicates flood water would need to be pumped back out of the underpass. However, the sketch shows this being taken to the upstream side of the SLR and discharges upstream to flow through the culverted section of the diverted channel downstream. In addition, it is expected that Suffolk County Council Lead Local Flood Authority may ask that this is restricted and discharged at a greenfield rate, leading to the need to attenuate and store the water temporarily.</p> <p>Therefore, to create a depression and pump the fluvial flows suggested by the Create Consulting Engineers in Option B is considered to be unacceptable and would likely be strongly opposed by the Environment Agency. In addition, as the pumping drainage approach is less sustainable it would be unlikely to receive support from Suffolk County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority.</p> <p>In consideration of the impact to the adjacent properties, risk of flooding, sustainability considerations, extent of embankment cuttings, and unlikely support from the authorities it is therefore not considered an appropriate solution or suitable proportionate solution to cater for the 80 vehicles per day.</p>
CA.2.17	<p>The Applicant</p> <p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p><b>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</b></p> <p>The DL5 submission of FERN [REP5-197,198], refers to additional land which has been offered to be used to provide mitigation measures, but which does not appear to be included within the land proposed to be compulsorily acquired. Please provide an update in relation to the provision of mitigation at this location and whether there are any associated implications for land acquisition?</p> <p>Noise impacts at Farnham Hall have been carefully considered. NPS EN-1 requires the avoidance of significant adverse effects on health and quality of life from noise. The assessment of road traffic noise, which was updated in the <b>Third ES Addendum</b> [<a href="#">REP6-017</a>], has identified the SOAEL is only exceeded at the receptor Pond Barn Cottages. For this receptor, mitigation is proposed in the form of insulation and/or ventilation under the</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p><b>Noise Mitigation Scheme</b> [<a href="#">REP6-015</a>], which would avoid the SOAEL being exceeded. The bypass of course brings lasting noise and other benefits to Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.</p> <p>However, SZC Co. is also aware that NPS EN-1 at paragraph 5.11.9 requires noise effects on health and quality of life to be mitigated and minimised and SZC Co. has been investigating the ability to provide additional screening.</p> <p>SZC Co. met with FERN on 21 July 2021 and SZC Co. presented potential options to provide further screening from the southern boundaries of properties at Farnham Hall. This meeting was a broad discussion of potential additional options, one of which involved land outside of the order limits.</p> <p>Following the meeting, SZC Co. circulated a letter on 20<sup>th</sup> August showing additional landscape mitigation achievable within the order limits as well as responding to a number of concerns raised during the previous meeting. Details of this letter can be found in Appendix J of the SZC Co. responses to earlier submissions document (Doc Ref. 9.73) The additional landscaping demonstrates what is achievable at the detailed design stage when final plans will be determined by the authorities under Requirement 22. Maximising screening within the order limits will ensure that SZC Co. can secure and deliver the additional landscaping screening as part of Requirement 22A of the DCO [<a href="#">REP6-006</a>]. Following circulation of the plan and associated letter, SZC Co. is planning to meet with FERN in early September to discuss the plan and information presented.</p>
CA.2.18	The Applicant	<p><b>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</b></p> <p>The DL5 submission of FERN [<a href="#">REP5-197,198</a>], refers to the only access route for Farnham Manor (to its Walled Garden) and Farnham Hall residents (to their gardens and the back of their properties) being from the lane from Farnham Hall to the end of the Walled Garden. It points out that these access rights are within the Applicants site boundary. Please clarify the position with regard to these rights of access and confirm that they would be maintained throughout the construction and operation of the scheme?</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Drawing SZC-SZ0204-XX-000-DRW-100337 within the Access and Rights of Way Plans, Revision 6, <a href="#">[REP5-008]</a> shows that this private means of access from the lane from Farnham Hall passing south to the end of the Walled Garden will be maintained throughout the construction and operation of the scheme.
CA.2.19	The Applicant	<p><b>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</b></p> <p>The DL5 submissions made by Michael Horton of Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Mr and Mrs J &amp; E Dowley [REP5-265], and by Create Consulting Engineers [REP5-260] raise a number of issues on behalf of their clients. The Dowleys have also made a DL5 submission on their own behalf [REP5-227]. The Applicant's DL5 response [REP5-119] and response to ExQ1 CA.1.76 are noted. Nevertheless, please explain further and provide a response in relation to:</p> <p>(i) Please justify the extent of the land sought to be acquired in relation to the provision of the site entrance roundabout and for the temporary construction area including a borrow pit.</p> <p>(ii) The consideration given to the existing use of the land and the impact on the existing farming system.</p> <p>(iii) The landowner's criticism of the lack of engagement on the part of the Applicant.</p> <p>(iv) The response to CA.1.76 refers to the scope provided by the draft DCO to reduce the area of outright acquisition and rely on the creation and acquisition of new rights instead and also to flexibility to occupy land temporarily. Is that a general response to the scheme as a whole or is there a likelihood that lesser powers could be utilised in relation to the plots in question?</p> <p>(v) The response to CA.1.76 states that the Applicant does not consider that the project would make the arable business unviable, but it is working to further understand the concerns raised by the LJ and EL Dowley Farming Partnership. What further understanding has been reached as regards the impact upon the business?</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i)</p> <p><u>Main Development Site Roundabout</u></p> <p><i>Extent</i></p> <p>The extent of the roundabout in this location reflects the design requirements of a five-arm roundabout and has been the subject of extensive discussions with SCC. Further detail on the requirement and land take implication associated with the 5<sup>th</sup> arm can be seen in SZC Co.'s <b>Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from CAH1 Part 2</b> (Doc Ref. 9.77). This includes two arms into the main development site during construction for resilience.</p> <p>If a collision, breakdown or maintenance work blocks one arm, worker movements (buses and car parking) and freight movements could continue to use the other arm to protect the public highway. The first arm would go to the temporary car parking area and Accommodation Campus. The second arm would go to the HGV security check-in and HGV parking area. Both arms would link up further into the site and therefore could be used interchangeably in the event of an emergency/blockage. The application assumes up to 350 incoming HGV movements per day plus temporary parking for 2,600 cars and vans, and 120 motorbikes. Resilience is therefore very important. A single arm into the site would not provide sufficient resilience.</p> <p><i>Siting</i></p> <p>The siting of the roundabout is north of the B1122/Eastbridge Road junction and east of B1122. It would be built largely offline from the B1122 to minimise impacts on that part of the highway network.</p> <p>Avoiding/reducing the required land in question by constructing the roundabout further east would require either developing on the site of the Accommodation Campus or on the Site Entrance Hub.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The rationale for locating the Accommodation Campus in this location was explained at Issue Specific Hearing 5 [<a href="#">REP5-110</a>]. The Campus location was selected in response to consultation feedback and due to the relative benefits it would bring to the Project and wider community. Locating the roundabout on the Campus site would require a sub-optimal location for the Campus in the AONB and would permanently bring the roundabout closer to Upper Abbey Farm (Grade II Listed).</p> <p>The Site Entrance Hub would be an essential arrival, security and parking area for the construction site and moving it would have a knock-on effect to the rest of the Temporary Construction Area. It would also move the Site Entrance Hub into the AONB. Putting the roundabout on the current site of the Site Entrance Hub would result in significant tree loss south of Abbey Farm Cottage to facilitate site access and require a new dedicated access for that property.</p> <p>Avoiding the land in question by locating the roundabout west of B1122 would not provide the gentle curve into the site that is necessary for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) and would place the roundabout closer to Leiston Abbey (Grade I Listed). Locating the access north of Lover's Lane would conflict with the Green Rail Route, which passes through that field.</p> <p><u>Borrow Pits</u> <i>Extent</i></p> <p>The extent of the borrow pits has been optimised to help balance the earthworks. They have been sized to source construction materials for beneficial use within the development whilst also creating a void of equivalent volume, above the water table, to be backfilled with the approximately 1.1 million m<sup>3</sup> of peat and alluvium that would be excavated.</p> <p>The three borrow pit fields would comprise an area of approximately 165,00m<sup>2</sup>, of which approximately 140,000m<sup>2</sup> is anticipated to become borrow pit. The remainder would comprise retained vegetated boundaries, bunds, fencing and working corridors (including</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>the haul road). At an average depth of approximately 7.5m, this creates the required volume (approximately 1.1M m<sup>3</sup>).</p> <p>The proposed use of borrow pits would reduce the need both to import construction materials from off-site locations and export excavated material for re-use or disposal off-site. It would therefore avoid environmental effects that would otherwise arise from transport. It is sustainable and in accordance with the Waste Framework Directive.</p> <p><u>Siting</u></p> <p>The location of the borrow pits has been selected as it contains sufficient quantity and quality of sands and gravel for use and general fill within the development.</p> <p>The location is elevated above the surrounding Temporary Construction Area and is not near to surrounding watercourses. This helps to ensure sufficient material can be excavated whilst retaining a minimum 2m of undisturbed ground between the lowest formation level of the borrow pits and the groundwater level.</p> <p>Locating the borrow pits outside of the AONB would have caused greater disruption to other landowners, greater disruption to the local road network and moved the borrow pits closer to where people live. An option for a borrow pit west of Eastbridge Road was consulted upon and discounted for the reasons set out in paragraph 6.6.33 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: <b>Alternatives and Design Evolution</b> [<a href="#">APP-190</a>]. Locating the borrow pits elsewhere within the AONB is also not considered suitable as it would either: impact on designated habitats sites; substantially impact the local road network; or require an unfeasibly large footprint due to the reduced headroom between the underlying material and the groundwater level. The latter point would also cause a major knock-on effect to much of the rest of the Temporary Construction Area as this is the area where the larger footprint borrow pit would have had to be placed in that scenario.</p> <p>(ii) SZC Co. has been engaging with the landowners since 2009. The SZC project proposals have evolved through consultation, including consideration of feedback from potentially Affected Persons. SZC Co. has an understanding of the impacts on the landholding and is working with the landowners to further mitigate the impacts of the</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>project. In respect of the anticipated land take from the Theberton Estate, this accounts for approximately 6% of the holding; the proposed land take at earlier stages of the project proposals would have resulted in approximately 20% of the Estate's land being required. The land required is agricultural (primarily arable). The impacts on the holding were assessed in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement Main Development Site Chapter 17 Soils and Agriculture [<a href="#">APP-277</a>] and Volume 6 of the Environmental Statement Sizewell Link Road Chapter 10 Soils and Agriculture [<a href="#">APP-470</a>]. The land take for the Sizewell link road was confirmed as being 0.44% of the estate during construction (reducing to 0.4% permanently), resulting in an impact characterised as Negligible (not significant). The land take required here has been reviewed and it is proposed to be reduced further. The impacts on the holding in respect of the Main Site Development identified land take during construction equating to 5.35%, reducing to 1.83% once temporary land is reinstated. The assessment identified the impacts as Minor Adverse during construction reducing to Negligible during operation. SZC Co. is working with the landowner to agree the return more land (including the land required for the borrow pits) to further mitigate the impacts on the Estate. Financial compensation will be payable, under the 'compensation code', in the absence of a negotiated agreement (which SZC Co. is still pursuing), which will ensure that the landowner is left in an equivalent position in financial terms, as a result of the acquisition of land. SZC Co. recognises that the impacts on private loss are not purely financial, and has proposed a Farm (or Estate) Impact Assessment to provide a further detailed understanding of the Estate businesses and to consider how any impacts arising from the SZC Co. project can be further mitigated, in respect of the particular operations of the Estate.</p> <p>(iii) SZC Co. provided an update to Appendix B of the Statement of Reasons at Deadline 2 – 'Status of negotiations with Owners of the Order Land' [<a href="#">REP2-021</a>], which has been updated for Deadline 3 [<a href="#">REP3-005</a>], Deadline 6 [<a href="#">REP6-011</a>] and Deadline 7 (Doc Ref 4.1B (F)). There has been extensive engagement with the Interested Party over a number of years, which is on-going. SZC Co. also provided detail of its approach to engagement at the Deadline 2 submission: 'Written Submissions in Response to Oral Summaries following Open Floor Hearings 18-21 May 2021' [<a href="#">REP2-130</a>] (Chapter 3 – 'Approach to engagement, including negotiations related to compulsory purchase acquisition and temporary possession'). SZC Co. is currently in discussions with the Interested Party looking at</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>different options in relation to reaching agreement for the land required for the scheme. <b>Appendix C</b> of SZC Co.'s <b>Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from CAH1 Part 2</b> (Doc Ref. 9.77) provides a detailed chronology of engagement with the Dowley family.</p> <p>(iv) The comments contained within CA.1.76 represent SZC Co.'s scheme-wide approach to reduce the area of outright acquisition and rely on the creation and acquisition of new rights instead, and also the flexibility to occupy land temporarily, wherever possible. In relation to plots within which Mr and Mrs J &amp; E Dowley have an interest SZC Co. has sought to lessen the rights required where possible. SZC Co.'s <b>Written Submissions arising from CAH1 Part 1, Appendix A</b> (Doc Ref. 9.74) sets out a proposed reduction to the Order Limits adjacent to the existing B1122 which will reduce the impact on the belt of trees forming a boundary between the highway and the Theberton House. Despite the significant excavation and reinstatement works required on the land identified for use as a borrow pit, SZC Co. is exploring mechanisms to hand the land back to the Affect Persons on completion of the works.</p> <p>(v) SZC Co. is continuing to work with the Interested Party to secure a detailed understanding of the operation of the estate. On 23 July 2021 SZC Co. offered to procure of an independent Farm (or Estate) Impact Assessment to be completed by an appropriately qualified agricultural consultant and would detail the structure of the estate businesses (including the agricultural and recreational elements) to inform further potential mitigation proposals. SZC Co. is awaiting a response from the landowners' agent to the proposed scope of the Impact Assessment and suggestions on the involvement of any other specialists that may be required to complete the assessment.</p>
CA.2.20	<p>The Applicant</p> <p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p><b>Crown Land</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.69 [REP2-100] is noted. Please provide an update in relation to any necessary consents and agreements in respect of Crown land.</p> <p>With regards to the acquisition of the required offshore interests (plots MDS/06/01 and MDS/06/02), the Crown Estate and SZC Co.'s lawyers continue to work towards completing the relevant agreements. SZC Co. expects to complete the agreements before the end of Examination.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>With regards to the consent required under section 135(2) of the Planning Act 2008 (PA08) (consent to include in a DCO a provision applying in relation to Crown land, or rights benefitting the Crown) SZC Co. continues to engage with the Crown Estate and relevant Crown Authorities. SZC Co. will provide updates to the ExA as progress is made. SZC Co. expects consent to be granted imminently and before the end of Examination.</p> <p>With regards to the Department for Transport, as per the response to CA.1.69, SZC Co. received confirmation from the Department of Transport that the plots that previously mentioned the Department of Transport now vest in the Local Highways Authority (SCC) due to the road being de-trunked. Therefore section 135 consent is no longer required from the Department of Transport and the Book of Reference (<a href="#">REP2-023</a>) and Crown Land Plans (<a href="#">REP2-003</a>) were updated at Deadline 2 to reflect this.</p> <p>In relation to the Department for Education land (SF/11/01) the Department for Education confirmed that due to the nature of their interest in land, a restriction on disposal, this does not count as a Crown interest for the purposes of section 227 PA 2008 and section 135 PA 2008 and therefore that consent is not required. SZC Co. agrees with this position and the Crown Land Plans will be updated at Deadline 8.</p> <p>In relation to the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy section 135 consent has not yet been obtained, however SZC Co. is liaising with BEIS with regards to the outstanding consent and further updates will be provided to the ExA as progress is made. SZC Co. expects this to be granted prior to the end of Examination.</p>
CA.2.21	The Applicant	<b>Statutory Undertakers</b> The Applicant's response to Ex1Q CA.1.59 is noted [REP2-100]. Please provide the relevant plot numbers for the land identified within the table submitted in response.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:			
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<b>Project Area</b>	<b>Statutory Undertaker</b>	<b>Apparatus to be Diverted (subject to detailed design this apparatus may remain in situ and be protected)</b>	<b>Plot No(s)</b>
		Main Development Site	UK Power Networks	1 x overhead line and 3 x underground cable	MDS/01/01, MDS/01/02, MDS/01/06, MDS/01/07, MDS/02/01, MDS/02/02, MDS/02/03, MDS/02/04, MDS/02/07, MDS/02/08, MDS/03/08, MDS/03/10
		Main Development Site	BT Openreach	1 x underground cable	MDS/02/07, MDS/02/23, MDS/02/25, MDS/02/28, MDS/02/29, MDS/02/31, MDS/02/33, MDS/02/34, MDS/10/06, MDS/10/08
		Main Development Site	Anglian Water	1 x water pipe (this pipe is abandoned)	MDS/03/08, MDS/03/10, MDS/03/11, MDS/03/13, MDS/03/14, MDS/03/15
		Main Development Site	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Reconfiguration and extension of existing substation and overhead lines.	MDS/01/01, MDS/01/06, MDS/01/07, MDS/02/03, MDS/02/04, MDS/02/05, MDS/02/10, MDS/02/16, MDS/02/26, MDS/02/28, MDS/02/30, MDS/02/39, MDS/02/40, MDS/02/40a, MDS/02/41, MDS/03/03, MDS/03/03a, MDS/03/07, MDS/04/01, MDS/04/02, MDS/04/03, MDS/04/04, MDS/04/05, MDS/04/06, MDS/04/07, MDS/04/09,

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:			
					MDS/04/10, MDS/05/01, MDS/05/02, MDS/05/03, MDS/05/04, MDS/05/05, MDS/05/06, MDS/05/07, MDS/05/08, MDS/05/09, MDS/05/10, MDS/05/11, MDS/05/12, MDS/05/13, MDS/05/14, MDS/05/15, MDS/05/16, MDS/05/17, MDS/05/18, MDS/05/19
		Main Development Site	Cadent Gas Ltd	1 x medium pressure gas pipe	MDS/03/08, MDS/03/10, MDS/03/16, MDS/03/17
		Main Development Site – Ancillary Construction Area / Lovers Lane	Essex and Suffolk Water	1 x 6" water pipe	MDS/03/02, MDS/03/06, MDS/03/07, MDS/03/08, MDS/03/10, MDS/03/15, MDS/03/16, MDS/03/17, MDS/03/19
		Freight Management Facility	BT Openreach	1 x underground cables	FMF/23/01, FMF/23/02, FMF/23/05, FMF/23/08
		Freight Management Facility	Virgin Media	1 x underground cable	FMF/23/01, FMF/23/02, FMF/23/08
		Green Rail Route	Cadent Gas Ltd	1 x medium pressure gas pipe	MDS/10/13, MDS/10/15
		Green Rail Route	UK Power Networks	1 x overhead line	MDS/10/13, MDS/10/15
		Green Rail Route	Virgin Media	1 x underground cable	MDS/02/07, MDS/02/22, MDS/10/04, MDS/10/05, MDS/10/09

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:				
		Green Rail Route/Lovers Lane	Essex and Suffolk Water	1 x 8" water pipe	MDS/02/07, MDS/02/20, MDS/02/21, MDS/02/22, MDS/02/23, MDS/02/24, MDS/02/25, MDS/02/31, MDS/02/33, MDS/10/01, MDS/10/02	
		A1094/B1069 South of Knodishall	UK Power Networks	1 x overhead line	OHI/26/01	
		A12/A144 Junction	BT Openreach	1 x overhead line	OHI/27/08, OHI/27/09	
		A12/A144 Junction	UK Power Networks	1 x underground cable	OHI/27/04, OHI/27/05, OHI/27/09, OHI/27/11	
		Northern Park and Ride	BT Openreach	1 x overhead line	NPR/15/02, NPR/15/05, NPR/15/09	
		Northern Park and Ride	UK Power Networks	3 x overhead lines	NPR/15/02, NPR/15/05, NPR/15/07, NPR/15/11, NPR/15/14, NPR/15/15, NPR/15/16	
		Southern Park and Ride	BT Openreach	1 x underground cable	SPR/16/01, SPR/16/08, SPR/16/10,	
		Southern Park and Ride	UK Power Networks	1 x overhead line	SPR/16/01, SPR/16/08, SPR/16/10	
		Sizewell Link Road	Cadent Gas Ltd	1 x low pressure gas pipe	SLR/19/03, SLR/19/03a, SLR/19/04	
		Sizewell Link Road	Essex and Suffolk Water	1 x 3" water pipe 1 x 4" water pipe 1 x water main	SLR/19/03, SLR/19/04, SLR/19/04a, SLR/19/22, SLR/20/03, SLR/20/03a, SLR/20/03b, SLR/20/04, SLR/21/07, SLR/21/07a, SLR/21/08c, SLR/21/18, SLR/21/19, SLR/21/22,	

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:			
					SLR/21/22a, SLR/21/28, SLR/21/29a, SLR/21/30, SLR/21/31, SLR/21/32,
		Sizewell Link Road	BT Openreach	5 x overhead line 2 x underground cable	SLR/19/01, SLR/19/02, SLR/19/03a, SLR/19/04, SLR/19/04a, SLR/19/16, SLR/19/17, SLR/19/18, SLR/19/22, SLR/19/24, SLR/20/01, SLR/20/01b, SLR/20/01c, SLR/20/02, SLR/20/03, SLR/20/16, SLR/20/18, SLR/20/19, SLR/21/07, SLR/ 21/07a, SLR/21/08, SLR/21/14, SLR/21/15, SLR/21/16, SLR/21/19, SLR/21/28, SLR/21/29a, SLR/21/30, SLR/21/31, SLR/21/32, SLR/22/07, SLR/22/09, SLR/22/10, SLR/22/11, SLR/22/15, SLR/22/16, SLR/22/16a, SLR/22/17, SLR/22/17a, SLR/22/18, SLR/22/20, SLR/22/22
		Sizewell Link Road	UK Power Networks	6 x overhead line 1 x underground cable	SLR/19/01, SLR/19/04, SLR/19/19, SLR/19/22, SLR/19/23, SLR/19/24, SLR/20/03, SLR/20/03a, SLR/20/03b, SLR/20/04, SLR/20/04b, SLR/20/21, SLR/20/22, SLR/21/01, SLR/21/02, SLR/21/03a,

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:			
					SLR/21/08, SLR/21/08a, SLR/21/11, SLR/21/17, SLR/21/18, SLR/21/19, SLR/21/20, SLR/21/21, SLR/21/26, SLR/22/09, SLR/22/10, SLR/22/11, SLR/22/12, SLR/22/13, SLR/22/17
		Sizewell Link Road	Virgin Media	2 x underground cable	SLR/21/28, SLR/21/31, SLR/22/17, SLR/22/20, SLR/22/22
		Two Village Bypass	Essex and Suffolk Water	1 x 8" pipe	2VBP17/05, 2VBP17/08, 2VBP17/09
		Two Village Bypass	BT Openreach	3 x overhead line 3 underground cable	2VBP/17/02, 2VBP/17/03, 2VBP/17/04, 2VBP/17/05, 2VBP/17/06, 2VBP/17/07, 2VBP/17/08, 2VBP/17/14, 2VBP/17/15, 2VBP/17/20, 2VBP/17/21, 2VBP/17/24, 2VBP/17/25, 2VBP/18/01, 2VBP/18/05, 2VBP/18/06, 2VBP/18/10, 2VBP/18/12, 2VBP/18/15, 2VBP/18/16b
		Two Village Bypass	UK Power Networks	3 x overhead line	2VBP/17/01, 2VBP/17/02, 2VBP/17/05, 2VBP/17/06, 2VBP/17/07, 2VBP/17/08, 2VBP/17/14, 2VBP/17/15, 2VBP/18/10, 2VBP/18/13, 2VBP/18/15
		Yoxford Roundabout	Essex and Suffolk Water	1 x 4" pipe	OHI/24/03, OHI/24/05, OHI/24/09

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2		Question to:		Question:	
		Yoxford Roundabout	BT Openreach	1 x overhead line 1 x underground cable	OHI/24/08
CA.2.22	The Applicant	<p><b>Statutory Undertakers</b></p> <p>If agreement with any Statutory Undertakers has not yet been reached, please provide further details specific to each undertaker and plot to show that compliance with section 127 PA 2008 and/ or section 138 PA 2008 could nevertheless be achieved?</p>			
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<b>Statutory Undertaker</b>	<b>Plot No(s)</b>	<b>Compliance with section 127 and/or section 138 PA 2008</b>	
		UK Power Networks	MDS/01/01, MDS/01/02, MDS/01/06, MDS/01/07, MDS/02/01, MDS/02/02, MDS/02/03, MDS/02/04, MDS/02/07, MDS/02/08, MDS/03/08, MDS/03/10, MDS/10/13, MDS/10/15, NPR/15/02, NPR/15/05, NPR/15/07, NPR/15/11, NPR/15/14, NPR/15/15, NPR/15/16, SPR/16/01, SPR/16/08, SPR/16/10, 2VBP/17/01, 2VBP/17/02, 2VBP/17/05, 2VBP/17/06, 2VBP/17/07, 2VBP/17/08, 2VBP/17/14, 2VBP/17/15, 2VBP/18/10, 2VBP/18/13, 2VBP/18/15, SLR/19/01, SLR/19/04, SLR/19/19, SLR/19/22, SLR/19/23, SLR/19/24, SLR/20/03, SLR/20/03a, SLR/20/03b, SLR/20/04, SLR/20/04b, SLR/20/21, SLR/20/22,	UK Power Networks have indicated to SZC Co. that they are content with the protective provisions as they appear in parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 18 although we await confirmation in writing. We assume that UK Power Network have no objection as no relevant or written representations have been made. SZC Co. is of the opinion that the protective provisions as set out in parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 18 ensure that no serious detriment can be caused to the carrying on of the undertaking as a consequence of the acquisition of any right over land which they own or have an interest in. SZC Co. is seeking to apply s127 and s138 to extinguish rights or remove apparatus only where it is deemed absolutely	

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>SLR/21/01, SLR/21/02, SLR/21/03a, SLR/21/08, SLR/21/08a, SLR/21/11, SLR/21/17, SLR/21/18, SLR/21/19, SLR/21/20, SLR/21/21, SLR/21/26, SLR/22/09, SLR/22/10, SLR/22/11, SLR/22/12, SLR/22/13, SLR/22/17, OHI/26/01, OHI/27/04, OHI/27/05, OHI/27/09, OHI/27/11</p>
		<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission</p> <p>MDS/01/01, MDS/01/06, MDS/01/07, MDS/02/03, MDS/02/04, MDS/02/05, MDS/02/10, MDS/02/16, MDS/02/26, MDS/02/28, MDS/02/30, MDS/02/39, MDS/02/40, MDS/02/40a, MDS/02/41, MDS/03/03, MDS/03/03a, MDS/03/07, MDS/04/01, MDS/04/02, MDS/04/03, MDS/04/04, MDS/04/05, MDS/04/06, MDS/04/07, MDS/04/09, MDS/04/10, MDS/05/01, MDS/05/02, MDS/05/03, MDS/05/04, MDS/05/05, MDS/05/06, MDS/05/07, MDS/05/08, MDS/05/09, MDS/05/10, MDS/05/11, MDS/05/12, MDS/05/13, MDS/05/14, MDS/05/15,</p>

necessary. SZC Co. therefore considers that that compliance with section 127 PA 2008 and section 138 PA 2008 is achieved.

Protective provisions have been agreed with NGET in principle, subject to agreeing the terms of a side agreement. SZC Co. considers that the protective provisions currently included in Schedule 18 of the draft DCO for the benefit of NGET ensure that no serious detriment can be caused to the carrying on of the undertaking as a consequence of the acquisition of any right over land which they own or have an interest in. SZC Co. is seeking to apply s127 and s138 to extinguish rights or remove apparatus only where it is deemed absolutely necessary. SZC Co. therefore considers that that compliance with section 127 PA 2008 and



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>		
			MDS/05/16, MDS/05/17, MDS/05/18, MDS/05/19	section 138 PA 2008 is achieved. SZC Co. will update the protective provisions in the dDCO at Deadline 8 to reflect any further agreement reached with NGET and provide further written submissions addressing the areas where agreement has not yet been reached.
		Cadent Gas Ltd	MDS/03/08, MDS/03/10, MDS/03/16, MDS/03/17, MDS/10/13, MDS/10/15, SLR/19/03, SLR/19/03a, SLR/19/04	SZC Co is in negotiations with Cadent to agree appropriate protective provisions and a side agreement. SZC Co. considers that the protective provisions currently included in Schedule 18 of the draft DCO for the benefit of Cadent ensure that no serious detriment can be caused to the carrying on of the undertaking as a consequence of the acquisition of any right over land which they own or have an interest in. SZC Co. is seeking to apply s127 and s138 to extinguish rights or remove apparatus

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p data-bbox="1608 256 2101 831">only where it is deemed absolutely necessary. SZC Co. therefore considers that that compliance with section 127 PA 2008 and section 138 PA 2008 is achieved. SZC Co. will update the protective provisions in the dDCO at Deadline 8 to reflect any further agreement reached with Cadent and provide further written submissions addressing the areas where agreement has not yet been reached.</p> <p data-bbox="824 847 2161 1054">As stated in the <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at CAH1 Part 1</b> (Doc Ref. 9.74) paragraphs 1.6.5 and 1.6.6 those statutory undertakers where bespoke protective provisions are yet to be agreed, SZC Co.'s position is that the Secretary of State will still be able to conclude that the section 127 and 138 PA2008 tests are met, in particular in relation to serious detriment because no Statutory Undertaker is submitting that protective provisions are in principle incapable of adequately protecting its interest.</p> <p data-bbox="824 1114 2161 1465">Agreement has been reached with Anglian Water Services Ltd, BT Group (including Openreach), Northumbrian Water Limited (trading as Essex and Suffolk Water), Network Rail and Virgin Media. Galloper Offshore Windfarm Limited, Greater Gabbard, UKPN and Vodafone have indicated that they are content with the protective provisions as they appear in parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 18 of the draft DCO although we await confirmation in writing. We assume that these parties have no objection as no relevant or written representations have been made. In any case SZC Co. is of the opinion that the protective provisions as set out in parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 18 ensure that the no serious detriment can be caused to the carrying on of the undertaking as a consequence of the acquisition of any right over land which they own or have an interest in SZC Co. is seeking</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		to apply s127 and s138 to extinguish rights or remove apparatus only where it is deemed absolutely necessary. SZC Co. therefore considers that that compliance with section 127 PA 2008 and section 138 PA 2008 is achieved.
CA.2.23	The Applicant	<b>Other Consents, Licenses and Agreements</b> The Applicants response ExQ1 CA.1.70 [REP2-100] refers to the provision of an updated version of the Schedule of Other Consents, Licenses and Agreements to be provided at DL3 [REP3-011]. Please provide a further update and identify the progress made by the Applicant in its discussions with the relevant bodies. Please also indicate whether the latest requested changes, if accepted, would result in any additions to the list?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	An updated Schedule of Other Consents, Licenses and Agreements will be submitted at Deadline 10 to reflect progress on consents, permits and licenses for the Sizewell C Project since the Deadline 3 submission. At present, the following updates can be provided since Deadline 3:

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Ghost” licences have been provided to Natural England during the course of the Examination and with corresponding copies submitted to the Examination, including submissions at Deadline 5 [<a href="#">REP5-049</a> to <a href="#">REP5-055</a>] and Deadline 7 (Doc Refs. 6.4 7A.5(A), 6.7 7A.5(A), 9.92 and 9.93).</li> <li>• A positive outcome has been received in relation to the Article 37 submission (RSR Permit).</li> </ul> <p>To confirm, no changes were required to the Schedule as a result of the Accepted Changes (August 2021).</p> <p>An amended <b>Schedule of Other Consents, Licenses and Agreements</b> (Doc Ref. 5.11(C)Ch) is submitted as part of the Change Request (September 2021). This reflects additional consents, permits and licenses required in respect of the proposed temporary desalination plant.</p>
CA.2.24	The Applicant	<p><b>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR)</b></p> <p>Please provide details of any ongoing data monitoring and updating process for the BoR to maintain the land interest information across the scheme.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. refers to the response provided at deadline 2 in the Responses to the Examining Authority’s First Written Questions (ExQ1) - Volume 1 - SZC Co. Responses [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>], question CA.1.50 where it is stated that: <i>SZC Co. is continuing to engage with affected parties through its land agents in an attempt to acquire the required land and rights by private agreement. Any changes in ownership or occupancy that are identified will be passed through to the land referencing team to update the Book of Reference (Doc Ref. 4.3(A)) accordingly. A number of parties did not return completed Request For Information forms or refused to provide additional information. These extra parties may come to light in the future through ongoing discussions and will be included in the Book of Reference at that time.</i></p> <p>This remains to be the case and any new ownership information which is brought to light through ongoing discussions between SZC Co.’s Land Agents and affected parties is passed to the land referencing team to update the BoR.</p> <p>Further to this, checks are being undertaken on a monthly basis of the land registry system to identify any new title registrations. Also changes to registered ownership information or ownership contact addresses are undertaken periodically through the land registry Edition Date check service (the latest checks were undertaken on the 05 August</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>2021). Where SZC Co. receives any return to sender post, further detailed checks are undertaken through the online facility of TraceIQ to determine any new address details.</p> <p>Throughout the statutory site notice process informing parties of the hearings and change consultations, site notices have been erected on or as close as possible to any plots which contain unregistered or unknown interests, this maximises the possibility that an interested party who is not aware of the project will have sight of the information and have an opportunity to make contact with SZC Co. and engage in the process.</p>
CA.2.25	The Applicant	<p><b>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR)</b></p> <p>Please confirm that the updated BoR, as submitted for DL5 [REP5-038], is now complete and accurately sets out the various plots and interests. If not, please identify any inaccuracies that have since come to light and provide any updates that need to be made.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. has submitted a revised BoR for DL6 [REP6-013], this version picks up further information that has been shared with SZC Co. and updated ownership details. As explained above in the response to <b>Question CA.2.24</b>, there is an ongoing information sharing exercise between the land agents and the land referencing team. This process has brought to light changes in ownership as shown in the BoR for DL6.</p> <p>A further updated version of the BoR has been submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 4.3(E)), containing new information brought to light through Land Registry updates and ongoing diligent inquiry. This version also includes the accepted changes to the application (Changes 16-18) in respect of additional land submitted by SZC Co to the Planning Inspectorate by letter dated 23 July 2021 [REP5-002].</p>
CA.2.26	The Applicant	<p><b>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR)</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to Ex1Q CA.1.55 is noted [REP2-100]. Please provide a further update in relation to those plots where ownership remains unknown including details of the continued inquiries and discussions that have taken place since that response was provided.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. has explained above in the response to <b>Question CA.2.24</b> that periodic checks are being undertaken on a monthly basis of the land registry system to identify any new title registrations, in particular the areas of unregistered land are scrutinised regularly.</p> <p>Further and as detailed above, ongoing discussions and negotiations between SZC Co.'s land agents and affected parties ensure that areas of unregistered land are not owned by</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>interested parties with whom we are in contact and that they do not know the ownership details. To date these discussions have not produced any claims for ownership over the unregistered plots.</p> <p>All site notices that are erected for the purposes of hearings and change consultations, are erected on or as close as practicable to the plots of land which either contain an Unknown reference or are unregistered. This includes the 4 plots of land as detailed in CA.1.55 within the Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) - Volume 1 - SZC Co. Responses [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>], being MDS/01/04, MDS/02/17, MDS/04/08 and SPR/16/04. The site notices contain multiple contact details to allow any party who does have an interest in the land to make themselves known to SZC Co. Further to this, the land referencing team who put up the notices on site speak with any parties they encounter in the vicinity of these plots to attempt to determine ownership.</p> <p>Any parties who SZC Co. feels may potentially have an interest in these plots are included in the BoR. SZC Co. will continue these efforts to try and identify unknown ownership where at all possible.</p>
CA.2.27	The Applicant	<p><b>The Equalities Act</b></p> <p>The Applicant's response to Ex1Q CA.1.42 is noted [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>]. Please provide an update in relation to compliance with any duties under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 and in particular:</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details in relation to the response to CA.1.42 (ii) explaining the type of reasonable adjustments to processes that have been made.</p> <p>(ii) Please indicate whether any Affected Person or additional Affected Person been identified as having protected characteristics since that response was provided?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain further how during engagement with Affected Persons and/or additional Affected Person there has been consideration of and offers to meet any needs or requirements of individuals or groups?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) Within SZC Co.'s <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at CAH1 Part 1</b> (Doc Ref. 9.74) it was confirmed that an updated <b>Equality Statement</b> [<a href="#">APP-158</a>] would be provided for Deadline 9 which would address this question where appropriate to do so based on the personal nature of individual cases.</p> <p>(ii) No additional Affected Persons have been identified as requiring adjustments to processes since the response to ExQ1 CA.1.42 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>].</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(iii) SZC Co.'s approach to consultation (generally) is set out in the Consultation Report [<a href="#">APP-068</a>], with Affected Persons being statutory consultees.</p> <p>SZC Co.'s approach to consultation has been structured to accord with the legal framework and to provide a high quality and meaningful process of consultation with the local community, statutory consultees and the general public.</p> <p>SZC Co. engaged with representative organisations of hard-to-reach groups prior to the commencement of the Stage 1 consultation. The purpose of meeting with these organisations was to understand the actions that SZC Co. should take to make formal public consultation as accessible as possible. Details of the dates and content of these meetings prior to Stage 1 are provided in Appendix A.13 of the Consultation Report [<a href="#">APP-069</a>].</p> <p>These representative organisations of groups with protected characteristics were continually engaged with throughout all formal stages of public consultation. Advertising to members of these groups and specific materials and activities were put in place during public consultation to make the proposals as accessible as possible and provide everyone with the opportunity to respond. An example would be screen reader friendly, audio-recordings and large print versions of documents, and Easy Read versions of the Stage 3 and Stage 4 information for people with learning difficulties.</p> <p>All of this activity is recorded and documented in the Consultation Report [<a href="#">APP-069</a>]. In addition, SZC Co. has also ensured that all Affected Persons have had the opportunity to be professionally represented in respect of their engagement with SZC Co., with the reasonable cost of the professional advice underwritten by SZC Co. Further, SZC Co. has engaged with the NFU who has represented all its representatives in the engagement with SZC Co. SZC Co. will continue to ensure that it remains flexible in its approach and will continue to apply reasonable adjustments to its schemes or processes to avoid disproportionately disadvantaging those with protected characteristics.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>Cu.3</b>	<b>Cumulative impact</b>	
Cu.2.0	The Applicant, SCC	<p><b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b></p> <p>The DL5 response by SCC to additional submissions from the Applicant comments on the response provided to ExQ1 TT.1.133 [REP5-172] states, in relation to the assessment of cumulative transport impacts, that the Applicant has been working with SCC to address its concerns on the environmental assessment of road traffic. Please indicate whether this work has been completed and whether the position in relation to cumulative traffic impact and any additional mitigation that would be required is now agreed?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The updated cumulative transport environmental assessment has been provided within the <b>Fourth ES Addendum</b> (Doc Ref. 6.18) submitted at Deadline 7. The revised assessment addresses all of SCC's comments. The updated transport effects tables have been shared with SCC prior to Deadline 7 to inform the discussions on transport mitigation, which has now been agreed with SCC and is set out in the draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).</p>
Cu.2.1	The Applicant, ESC	<p><b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b></p> <p>The Applicant's comments on response to EXQ1 Cu.1.3 [REP3-046], indicates that discussions are ongoing with SCC, ESC and parish councils with a view to agreeing the proposed scheme of local improvements. Please indicate whether any agreement has been reached and set out the consideration given to the timeline of any works to avoid disruption on a haul route for both the Sizewell C Project and the EA1N and EA2 projects.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The package of proposed transport improvements to be delivered by SZC Co. in addition to the works included in the DCO has now been agreed with ESC and SCC and is set out in the draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)). It has been agreed that the following schemes are to be delivered by SZC Co.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Marlesford and Little Glemham – Pedestrian enhancements, formal pedestrian crossings, village gateways and speed limits</li> <li>2. Yoxford – pedestrian crossing</li> <li>3. B1125 Westleton and Walberswick – village gateways and pedestrian enhancements.</li> <li>4. B1078 corridor – road safety improvements</li> </ol>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>5. B1122 early years - Village gateways at Theberton and Middleton Moor, pedestrian enhancements and formal pedestrian crossing in Theberton, road safety improvements.</p> <p>6. B1122 corridor repurposing – Change in use of B1122 to local access road and cycle / pedestrian route as well as integration and promotion of Quiet Lane scheme.</p> <p>7. Leiston town centre improvement scheme – environmental and safety mitigation</p> <p>8. Wickham Market improvement scheme – environmental and safety mitigation</p> <p>The delivery and timing of these schemes has been agreed with SCC and are proposed to be phased to minimise disruption to the highway network and local communities (refer to the draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F) for details of phasing).</p> <p>In addition, a series of transport related contributions have been agreed with SCC and ESC and are set out in the draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)</p> <p>SZC Co. will continue the close engagement with both the EA1N and EA2 projects to ensure that there is close coordination for the delivery of works in particular where there are proposals for all projects in the same locations, such as at Theberton.</p>
Cu.2.2	The Applicant, EA1N and EA2	<p><b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b></p> <p>The initial SoCG between the Applicant and EA1N and EA2 [REP2-092] records that: “..all projects involve works at Friday Street, Sizwell Gap and Snape Road and will engage regularly with each other during design and construction of their respective projects so that any interface between the projects can be considered at an early stage, recognising it is in the interests of the Applicant and EA1/EA1N as well as the wider community that works at Work No. 35 be coordinated as far as reasonably practicable”. The Applicant’s DL5 response to responses on Ex1 Cu.1.8 [REP5-129] provides further details. Please provide clarification on the following matters:</p> <p>(i) The Applicant’s DL2 response to Cu.1.8 [REP2-100] states that it proposes to “establish clear communications protocols between all three parties, which will be defined by terms of reference of the Transport Review Group (TRG)”. The response by Scottish Power Renewables at DL3 explains that EA1N and EA2 are not members of the TRG. Please explain the role of the TRG in establishing the communications protocols without the involvement of EA1N and EA2?</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(ii) The responses by EA1N and 2 at DL2 [REP2-260,261] and DL3 [REP3-058,59], indicate that reciprocal Protective Provisions will be sought within the SZC draft DCO and a separate side agreement may be required. Please provide an update in relation to the agreement of Protective Provisions and explain how these would ensure early engagement between the parties to prevent conflict in relation to the works at Sizewell Gap and the junction of A1094/A1069 (Snape Road).</p> <p>(iii) Please indicate whether any practical steps have been agreed at this stage in relation to the co-ordination of those works?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) SZC Co. will agree communication protocols direct with EA1N/EA2 that will sit outside of the TRG. SZC Co. is having regular and constructive meetings with EA1N/EA2 and will continue to do so during the lead up to construction and during the phase of the construction periods that overlap. The TRG is able to invite other parties to meetings to discuss agenda items and if considered necessary, EA1N/EA2 can be invited to attend the TRG meetings where required.</p> <p>(ii) Protective Provisions are still under discussion however there are not thought to be any significant issues and agreement with EA1N/EA2 is anticipated to be straightforward.</p> <p>(iii) Both SZC Co. and EA1N and EA2 will continue close engagement and commence discussions in relation to the co-ordination of these works in due course. These commitments are reflected in the protective provisions and side agreement currently being negotiated.</p>
Cu.2.3	The Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b></p> <p>The Applicant has provided its DL5 response to responses on Ex1 Cu.1.9 [REP5-129]. The responses by EA1N and 2 at DL2 [REP2-260,261] and DL3 [REP3-058,59] indicate that the temporal overlap of traffic demand between EA1N, EA2 and Sizewell C is clarified in the Sizewell C Cumulative Impact Assessment Note (Traffic and Transport) Version 2 which has been submitted to that Examination. This clarification note concludes that: <i>“Due to the nature of constructing a nuclear power station, the traffic flows for the Sizewell Projects are considerably higher than those of the Projects. Utilising the Applications’ assessment framework, this large difference in traffic flows results in potentially significant cumulative impacts which are without exception triggered by the traffic demand from the Sizewell Projects”</i>. It also records in relation to cumulative noise impacts, that <i>“a high level quantitative assessment indicates that both CIA Scenario A and CIA Scenario B are</i></p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>likely to result in significant impacts at a small number of links. These impacts would predominantly result from increased traffic flows generated by construction of the Sizewell Projects". The Applicant is requested to respond to the conclusions of this clarification note and indicate how the identified significant impacts could be avoided and/or mitigated. Please also comment on the pedestrian amenity findings of the note and the scope for the provision of additional mitigation in that respect.</i></p>
Cu.2.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b></p> <p>The Applicant has provided its DL5 response to responses on Ex1 Cu.1.11 [REP5-129]. The response by SCC to that Ex1 at DL2 [REP2-192] points out that the assessment referred to in the responses relates to the cumulative impact for the implementation of</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>EA1N, EA2 and SZC. It does not take into account the possible construction of other energy projects in the vicinity. Please indicate whether there are any other energy projects which should be now be taken into account.</p> <p>As stated in paragraph 4.4.3 of <b>Volume 10, Chapter 4</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-587</a>], the traffic modelling that supports the Transport Assessment and assessment of cumulative effects includes committed development and committed highway works, as agreed with Suffolk County Council, as well as background traffic growth. Paragraph 4.4.4 then states the assessment of the cumulative transport effects only assesses non-committed developments to determine the potential cumulative transport effects should such non-committed developments get consent and be implemented.</p> <p><b>Table 4.5</b> of <b>Volume 10, Chapter 4</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-587</a>] provides a summary of the Sizewell C and non-Sizewell C developments that have the potential to result in cumulative effects for transport (i.e. those not in the model and those that have not been scoped out), therefore not assessed in the context of Sizewell C. The likely effects are then summarised in paragraphs 4.4.20 to 4.4.51. The list does not include other energy projects in the vicinity of the Sizewell C Project as there is not sufficient information available for a cumulative transport assessment to be undertaken.</p> <p>In relation to other energy projects in the vicinity of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. prepared <b>Table 1.1</b> of <b>Appendix 13A</b> [<a href="#">REP2-110</a>] to provide an update on the status of NSIPs in close proximity to the Sizewell C Project and an updated assessment based on any new information was presented in <b>Section 1.5</b>. The only new information at that stage was the updated construction programme for EA1N and EA2. SZC Co. has prepared an update to this table in response to <b>Question Cu.2.6</b> below which identifies that all other energy project remain at the pre-application stage and therefore there is still not sufficient information available for a cumulative transport assessment to be undertaken.</p>
Cu.2.5	The Applicant, ESC	<p><b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b></p> <p>The Applicant has provided its DL5 response to responses on Ex1 Cu.1.18 [<a href="#">REP5-129</a>]. The Applicant's DL3 response states that the proposed Friday Street roundabout element of the two village bypass has been prioritised as set out in the Implementation Plan [<a href="#">REP2-044</a>].</p> <p>(i) The measures set out in the Implementation Plan will be secured by a Draft Deed of Obligation which will confirm that SZC Co. shall use reasonable endeavours to carry out</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and complete the mitigation measures in accordance with the Implementation Plan, unless otherwise agreed with the local authority. Is the ESC content that that will provide satisfactory safeguards in relation to the potential for cumulative impacts? If not, what revisions to the wording of the Deed of Obligation and/or other means of securing the early delivery of the Friday Street roundabout are sought?</p> <p>(ii) The DL3 response by FERN draws attention to the potential for cumulative impacts upon homes and businesses along the two village bypass route including during construction and seeks more mitigation such as noise attenuation fencing at the start of construction and beyond, bunds and considerate working hours. In response the Applicant states that there will be opportunity for further noise control measures to be incorporated into the detailed road design [REP3-042]. However, that does not appear to address the specific concerns raised by FERN in this respect. The Applicant is requested to provide a further explanation as to how those potential cumulative impacts upon these residents could be satisfactorily mitigated and how any such mitigation measures and their timing would be secured by the draft DCO.</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>(i) No response from SZC Co. required.</p> <p>(ii) In their Deadline 3 submission [<a href="#">REP3-102</a>] FERN identify the need for '<i>noise attenuation fencing at the start of construction and beyond, bunds, considerate working hours</i>'.</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11(D)), which is secured by Requirement 2 in the <b>draft DCO</b> (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)), provides for the flexible implementation of mitigation, as envisaged by FERN. For example, the facility to implement acoustic screens as part of the construction works, which may take the form of temporary bunds or acoustic fencings/hoarding, is identified in <b>paragraph 3.3.1 in Part C</b> of the <b>CoCP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11(D)). Similarly, the ability to alter working hours in certain circumstances in response to the needs of specific receptors, is recognised in <b>Table 3.1 in Part C</b> of the <b>CoCP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11(D)).</p> <p>As noted in SZC Co.'s response to <b>Question CA.2.17</b>, a meeting with FERN was held on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2021, and SZC Co. committed to review opportunities for additional landscaped</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>bunding on the western side of the two village bypass. As part of that work, SZC Co. agreed to explore the potential for additional attenuation of road traffic noise.</p> <p>As was discussed at ISH8, the findings were reported to FERN on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2021, and can be found in an appendix to SZC Co.'s <b>Comments at Deadline 7 on Submissions from Earlier Deadlines</b> submission (Doc Ref 9.73).</p> <p>In broad terms, it was found that the 2m high bund along the western side of the two village bypass would reduce traffic noise levels by up to 1.5dB, while a quiet road surface was found to be reasonably effective, with the calculations suggesting that the majority of its 2.5 to 3dB reduction (relative to a standard hot rolled asphalt road surface) was likely to be realised at the receptors.</p> <p>Combining the bund and quiet road surface would provide a greater benefit, broadly equal to the cumulative total of each measure in isolation.</p> <p>SZC Co. will continue to seek to maximise screening within the order limits to ensure that any additional landscaping mitigation can be secured and delivered as part of the DCO through Requirement 22A of the DCO. The latest <b>draft DCO</b> is submitted at this Deadline (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).</p> <p>SZC Co. notes that in their Deadline 3 [<a href="#">REP3-102</a>] submission FERN has cited the 360 tracked excavators, and 180 loaders that they state are to be used in the construction of the two village bypass (listed in <b>Table 1.1</b> in <b>Volume 5, Appendix 4B</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-416</a>]), comparing them with the three diggers that excavated a reservoir 500m from Farnham Hall, which they state were disturbing to the local population.</p> <p>To be clear, these are 360° tracked excavators, and 180° loaders, i.e. they rotate in a circle or semi-circle respectively; there are not proposed to be 360 or 180 of them.</p>
Cu.2.6	The Applicant, SCC	<b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Applicant has provided its DL5 response to responses on Ex1 Cu.1.18 [REP5-129]. The Applicant's DL2 response includes Appendix 13A – update to cumulative effects assessment [REP2-110].</p> <p>(i) Since the preparation of Appendix 13A has any further information come to light in relation to the Nautilus Interconnector, the Eurolink Interconnector or other projects that would require the assessment to be updated?</p> <p>(ii) Has any further progress been made in relation to the traffic management necessary to deliver the associated development and how that would be secured?</p> <p>(iii) Please provide an update in relation to the timing of the delivery of the proposed Yoxford roundabout and whether that is agreed?</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>(i) SZC Co. has prepared an updated <b>Table 1.1 of Appendix 13A</b> [REP2-110] to provide an update on the status of NSIPs in close proximity to the Sizewell C Project as of August 2021. This is included in <b>Appendix 3A</b> to these ExQ2 responses. In summary there is no new information and all other energy projects remain in the pre-application stage. SZC Co. has reviewed applications made to East Suffolk Council, Suffolk County Council and to Ipswich Borough Council and Babergh and Mid Suffolk Councils, where parishes are located within the zone of influence, between January 2020 and June 2021. This exercise has been undertaken to provide an update to the long list and short list of non-Sizewell C plans, projects and programmes relevant to the cumulative effects assessment. The updated shortlist is presented in <b>Appendix 3A</b> to these ExQ2 responses. An updated cumulative impact assessment is presented within <b>Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the Fourth ES Addendum</b> (Doc Ref. 6.18).</p> <p>(ii) Necessary traffic management measures will be put in place through the delivery of the associated development sites. Article 22 of the <b>dDCO</b> sets out the process by which the undertaker can implement traffic management measures. This includes advertising the measures and giving notice to the chief officer of the police and the traffic authority.</p> <p>(iii) The current position on the delivery programme for the Yoxford roundabout is stated in SZC Co.'s Deadline 5 response to Cu.1.22.</p>
Cu.2.7	The Applicant, ESC	<b>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</b>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The Applicant has provided its DL3 response to responses to Ex1 Cu.1.19 [REP3-046]. Please provide an update as regards progress in securing additional mitigation for recreational receptors within Receptor Group 19 including securing a PRow Fund of an appropriate size and flexibility.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The scope and scale of the PRow Fund have been agreed, including the commitment to allow some flexibility within the fund to mitigate for any future impacts that have not been predicted. Please refer to Schedule 16 of the <b>draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).
Cu.2.8	The Applicant, Pro Corda, EHT	<p><b>Project wide effects</b></p> <p>The Applicant has provided its DL3 response to responses to Ex1 Cu.1.19 [REP3-046]. The responses of Pro Corda and EHT are noted. Please provide an update to those responses and indicate whether the detailed scope and quantum of mitigation with EHT and Pro Corda has now been agreed?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. assumes that this question refers to Ex1 Cu.1.37 [<a href="#">REP3-046</a>].</p> <p>The detailed scope and quantum of mitigation has been agreed with Pro Corda. This includes a contribution for indoor and outdoor sensory spaces to help address the effect of noise on pupils with autism. These will be secured by the Pro Corda Resilience Fund (Schedule 13, <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F))).</p> <p>In addition, the Noise Mitigation Fund will provide noise insulation measures for Pro Corda's residential accommodation which is located in the Guesten Lodge and the Retreat House, due the presence of pupils with a disability need involving a particular sensitivity to noise (Schedule 12, <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F))).</p> <p>Good progress is also being made on Deed of Obligation discussions with EHT, noting that change to setting considers all perceptual change and that mitigation will be designed to address that change as a whole. Funding will focus predominantly on repair and consolidation of the monument, as well as improved interpretation. SZC Co. and EHT are in agreement that enjoyment of the monument ruins is enhanced by them being well presented and in good repair, with good on site interpretation. This will be secured in Schedule 8 of the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
<b>CG.2 Coastal Geomorphology</b>		
CG.2.0	The Applicant	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The submission of Bill Parker 'Tsunami geohazard – Lack of transparency on the precautions and mitigating actions for the proposed Sizewell C development' [REP2-228] submits that there is a quantifiable risk of a tsunami that the Applicant has not taken into account in the DCO application, and the level of risk is such that it makes the Sizewell C site too vulnerable to be built. The Applicant's response to ExQ1 Al.1.4 [REP2-100] indicates that it has considered Tsunami risk to help inform the design of the Sizewell C sea defences.</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details and explanation as to how the design of the sea defences would provide adequate safeguard against this risk?</p> <p>(ii) In relation to "Storrega-type" Tsunami events, the Applicant indicates that they have an estimated return period of 1 in 10,000 years. Please explain how the design of the sea defences would respond to this risk or has provision been omitted due to the anticipated infrequent occurrence?</p> <p>(iii) Has the potential for climate change to impact upon the frequency and severity of tsunamis been taken into account in the sea defence design?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>i) All external hazards, including those associated with coastal flooding (e.g. tsunami), are being treated as part of the Nuclear Safety Case (required under UK law) in line with the appropriate regulation, standards and relevant good practice including the Nuclear Site Licence Conditions (notably Licence Condition 14). The sea defences form part of the protection against coastal flooding. Their design includes consideration of the associated hazards such that they can be demonstrated as being able to provide the required level of protection in line with the ALARP (as low as reasonably practicable) principle.</p> <p>ii) In regard to the risk of tsunamis, a bespoke analysis carried out for the Sizewell site in order to characterise the hazard based using reports issued by DEFRA. A "Storegga<sup>5</sup>-type" event has been considered within this assessment. As per the response to i), the design of</p>

<sup>5</sup> Storegga is located at the edge of Norway's continental shelf in the Norwegian Sea. In around 6200 BCE, structural failures of the shelf caused three underwater landslides, which triggered very large tsunamis in the North Atlantic Ocean.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>the sea defences includes consideration of all the appropriate hazards such that their design can be demonstrated to provide the required protection in line with the ALARP principle. As with all hazards, tsunami is considered within the safety demonstration and Nuclear Site Licence application.</p> <p>iii) The implications of the latest climate change science and understanding (<a href="#">UKCP18</a>) is being considered on all hazards in line with regulator expectations (see <a href="#">ONR UKCP Position Statement</a>).</p>
CG.2.1	MMO	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>For the permanent BLF, during the construction phase, the Applicant has provided responses to EXQ1 raised in relation to the dredge berth area including ExQ1 CG.1.9 and CG.1.13 [REP2-100]. There are conditions relating to dredging in the DML. Please indicate whether there are any outstanding concerns, or any additional controls required in relation to the impacts of any dredging and use of the barge berthing platform.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No comment from SZC Co. is required.
CG.2.2	MMO	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The DL3 submission of the MMO [REP3-070] indicates that it has not been able to review some areas in the time available. Please provide an update on your position in relation to the information submitted to date by the Applicant in relation to the coastal defences features and the BLFs and indicate what, if any, additional information is needed to complete your assessment of potential coastal impacts?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No comment from SZC Co. is required.
CG.2.3	East Suffolk IDB	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>In the SoCG [REP2-067] with the Applicant, East Suffolk IDB highlights the importance of the Minsmere Sluice in relation to surface water drainage from the catchment and therefore from the proposed development area. The Applicant has provided further details on this topic in response to ExQ1 CG.1.18 [REP2-100]. Please indicate whether the IDB</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>has any outstanding concerns in relation to the potential for the proposed development to cause or affect the discharge from Minsmere Sluice?</p> <p>No comment from SZC Co. is required.</p>
CG.2.4	ESC	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The ESC's DL5 written summary of oral submissions at ISH6 [REP5-144], in relation to Item 3b states that in the light of SMP Policy 13.1, the Applicant should minimise the seaward extent of the coastal defence features as far as possible. The Applicant's DL5 submissions include further details of the reduced seaward extent of the coastal defences at Appendix A to the Applicant's written submissions responding to actions arising from ISH6 and Revision 2 of the Coastal Defence Features Plans [REP5-118].</p> <p>(i) In the light of the additional information and plans provided by the Applicant at DL5, are you satisfied that the HCDF is located as landward as possible?</p> <p>(ii) If not, please explain whether and, if so, why any further changes to the seaward extent of the coastal defences are sought?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>For information: at Deadline 5, SZC Co. provided revised design drawings [REP5-015] that showed the eastern extent of sea defences had been reduced. The eastern extent main (straight) length of the HCDF has been moved 5m landward, and the abutment at the permanent BLF has been removed so that the HCDF in this area aligns with the main length. The sea defence design report [REP2-116] will be updated to reflect and explain this and will be submitted at Deadline 8</p>
CG.2.5	MMO, ESC, EA, MMO	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The Applicant's DL5 written submissions responding to actions arising from ISH6 Appendix A para 1.2.4 [REP5-118] refers to four additional terrestrial piles (above Mean High Water Spring) are required to support the two additional removable deck spans for the permanent BLF that are required now that the HCDF does not extend as far seaward as it did previously. Are there any concerns relating to the provision of these additional piles?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>For information: as shown in <b>Volume 22, Appendix 20A</b> of the <b>ES</b> [APP-312] and <b>BEEMS Technical Report TR543</b> [PDB-010], the BLF piles are transmissive to sediment transport and only have localised effects to the sea bed corresponding to the extents</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>identified by scour (less than 10 m). The additional piles identified will initially be buried in the beach / SCDF sediment beyond reach of the tide. If they are exposed during storms the impacts will be the same as those already assessed for piles in the beach at its current position. That is, the changing position of the beach does not alter the assessments already made. Furthermore, as the SCDF would be maintained, any of the additional piles that do become exposed would be buried again when the SCDF is recharged.</p>
CG.2.6	<p>ESC, MMO, EA, NE, RSPB, National Trust, Alde and Ore Association, Mr Bill Parker</p>	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b>            At DL5 the Applicant submitted a revised version of the CPMMP [REP5-059]. Please indicate whether there are any further concerns:            (i) as regards the wording of that draft plan including in relation to the geographical extent of the proposed monitoring, the means of monitoring and future mitigation to maintain the shingle transport corridor and mitigation triggers? (ii) in relation to the funding of the monitoring and mitigation process by the Applicant and the duration for that to process and funding to be in place?            (iii) the means of securing and enforcing the CPMMP provisions?            (iv) whether this now satisfactorily addresses the details sought of the proposed secondary mitigation in the event that the SCDF-supported sediment pathway across the site frontage is interrupted?            (vi) whether any further changes/provisions are required to safeguard the Coralline Crag from avoidable unnatural deterioration?</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>(i) – (iv) for named IPs SZC Co. has no comment.            (vi) As shown in the assessments detailed in <b>Volume 2, Appendix 20A</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-312</a>] and <b>Section 2.15</b> of the <b>ES Addendum</b> [<a href="#">AS-181</a>], the impacts on coastal geomorphology are localised and do not reach the Coralline Crag ridges at Thorpeness – that is, there is no pathway to impact. Section 1.3 of the <b>Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH6</b> [<a href="#">REP5-118</a>] highlights that anthropogenic ocean acidification would not affect the integrity of the Coralline Crag across the life of the station.</p>
CG.2.7	<p>The Applicant, ESC</p>	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b>            ESC’s DL5 written summary of oral submissions at ISH6 [REP5-144], reasserts that the HCDF should be removed when no longer required to protect nuclear site infrastructure,</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and that the default position should be for the HCDF to be removed subject to assessment at the time of decommissioning. The EA's DL5 submission [REP5-148] also says they would welcome a provision made for removal of the HCDF.</p> <p>(i) Please provide an update in relation to the ongoing discussions on this topic and indicate how this would be secured by the draft DCO.</p> <p>(ii) Is the wording of the new requirement proposed by ESC agreed?</p> <p>(iii) In relation to that wording, is the last sentence relating to 'a proposal to be submitted to ESC for approval' sufficiently precise and enforceable?</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>(i) As set out in the written summary of SZC Co.'s submissions at ISH6 [REP5-111 and REP5-118], whilst the desire to establish a default position requiring removal is understood, SZC Co. is of the view that it would be premature and inappropriate to make provision at this point mandating any particular course of action in the DCO (particularly in circumstances where SZC Co. is not seeking develop consent for such operation under the DCO Application). Instead, it was submitted that any decision as to whether to remove it or not is one for the decommissioning process which will be informed by the specific EIA process for decommissioning undertaken in the future, which will assess the likely significant effects at the time. In view of this, SZC Co. has proposed to record the default position within the Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CPMMP)[REP5-059]. Section 10 of the CPMMP details that default position, but observes that this will be subject to assessment at the relevant time and set out in the Monitoring and Mitigation Cessation Report to be submitted to the MMO and ESC for approval prior to the end of decommissioning. The requirement for the CPMMP to include details of this cessation report is recorded in Requirement 7A(i)(vi) of the DCO and Condition 17(1)(g) of the DML.</p> <p>(ii) As above, SZC Co. does not agree that a Requirement is appropriate and considers the default position is more appropriately recorded under the terms of the CPMMP. Revision 2 of the CPMMP was provided at Deadline 5 [REP5-059] and an updated version (Revision 3), addressing this will be provided at Deadline 10.</p> <p>(iii) It is understood this question refers to the wording proposed by ESC, which for the reasons above is not agreed by SZC Co.</p>
<p>CG.2.8</p>	<p>The Applicant, ESC</p>	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>ESC’s DL5 written summary of oral submissions at ISH6 [REP5-144], proposes that either Thorpeness village frontage should be included in the area of assessment, or alternatively, the Applicant could provide funding to enable ESC to monitor the Thorpeness frontage. Please provide an update in relation to the ongoing discussion on this topic and, if agreed, indicate how this would be secured by the DCO?</p> <p>This matter is addressed in the <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at ISH6: Coastal Geomorphology (14 July 2021)</b> [REP5-111], SZC Co.’s responses to the <b>National Trust</b> [REP6-024, Appendix G] and <b>Local Impact Report LIR</b> Ref. 11.48 (iv) [REP3-044]. In summary, the key points are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the predicted impacts of Sizewell C fall well within the Greater Sizewell Bay and do not extend to, or near, Thorpeness. Therefore, there is no evidence supporting a requirement for Sizewell C to monitor there. The extents set out in the <b>CPMMP</b> [REP5-059] are deliberately larger than the predicted impacts, which allows for a further level of precaution;</li> <li>• however, to the extent that the predicted impacts were identified beyond their anticipated extent, the monitoring proposed in the <b>CPMMP</b> [REP5-059] is adaptive and the monitoring extents would then be extended;</li> <li>• impacts would start to develop at Sizewell C and radiate outwards so that impacts closer to the site would effectively provide an “early warning” of impacts further afield (for example, before impacting on Thorpeness).</li> </ul>
CG.2.9	The Applicant, NE	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>NE’s DL5 comments on the Preliminary Design and Maintenance Requirements for the Sizewell C Coastal Defence Feature [REP5-158], raises a number of issues:</p> <p>(i) In relation to the effect on Minsmere, what level of certainty can the Applicant provide that HCDF exposure would not occur and should the HCDF become exposed, are any further assessments in response to the NE concerns proposed to be carried out and, if so, what is the anticipated timetable for those assessments?</p> <p>(ii) In addition, NE seeks some of the work investigating triggers to deal with the uncertainty in the SCDF to be undertaken up front for the HRA to ascertain no LSE. Please can NE clarify the exact nature of the work that is required to be carried out up front?</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>(iii) Please can the Applicant clarify whether it agrees with NE on this point and at what stage it proposed to undertake the work investigating triggers to deal with the uncertainty in the SCDF?</p> <p>(iv) Does the revised CPMMP [REP5-059] incorporate the clear and precautionary triggers sought for the whole frontage and particularly the area to the north?</p> <p>(v) Does it make satisfactory provision for monitoring and undertaking beach recharge, if required? If not what further amendment would be necessary to deal with this?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) Potential for exposure of the HCDF including its toe is mitigated by the presence of the SCDF which will be "recharged" when required to ensure it is always present. <b>BEEMS Technical Reports TR544 and TR545</b> [<a href="#">REP3-032</a> and <a href="#">REP3-048</a>] show that the SCDF is viable across the operational and early decommissioning phases of Sizewell C (the reports will be updated – see Deadline 7 submissions Doc Ref. 9.12(B) and Doc Ref. 9.31(A) for the full decommissioning phase). The modelling results demonstrate the viability of the SCDF and recharge trigger levels would be set (within the CPMMP; current version 2 [<a href="#">REP5-059</a>] with a large safety buffer volume sufficient to withstand severe storms and sea level rise. However, even allowing for a conservative SCDF buffer volume, a very small risk will remain that a small part of the HCDF could be temporarily exposed for a short period (for example, if an extreme storm or storm sequence occurs in the interval between the trigger being activated and conduction of mitigation being possible). Under that circumstance structural integrity of the HCDF would be unaffected by a temporary exposure along a shorts section of its length like this.</p> <p>(ii) Question for NE; no response required by SZC</p> <p>(iii) The <b>Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) - Volume 3, Appendix 7G, paragraphs 1.2.13 – 1.2.15</b> [<a href="#">REP2-110</a>] detail the nature of the Minsmere frontage during the extreme waves and water levels that would be required to expose the HCDF. Such conditions would cause widespread, natural, geomorphic regime change on the Minsmere frontage and would not support the habitats and conservation designations of the outer Minsmere Levels as they are today due to erosion, breaching of the shingle ridge and saline intrusion. SZC Co looks forward to receiving NE's response at (ii) but no further modelling work is planned.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(iv) Trigger levels are not yet defined in the CPMMP (current version 2 [<a href="#">REP5-059</a>]) while discussions are ongoing with stakeholders on the modelling report outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary design and maintenance requirements for the Sizewell C Coastal Defence Feature (Rev 2) [<a href="#">REP3-032</a> ]; and</li> <li>• Storm Erosion Modelling of the Sizewell C Coastal Defence Feature (Rev 1) [<a href="#">REP3-048</a>])</li> </ul> <p>Updates to both reports, to detail recharge intervals during the decommissioning period, are submitted at Deadline 7 (see Doc Ref. 9.12(B) and Doc Ref. 9.31(A)). The CPMMP will be updated at Deadline 10 taking consideration of stakeholder comments.</p> <p>(v) SZC Co presumes this question is specifically aimed at NE, but for context the CPMMP current version 2 [<a href="#">REP5-059</a>]) includes monitoring of the SCDF along the whole frontage and recharge wherever necessary.</p>
CG.2.10	The Applicant, EA	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The DL5 comments of Nick Scarr on the oral submissions made at ISH6 [<a href="#">REP5-253,254</a>], refers to the suggestion by the Applicant and the EA that they have modelling with 'offshore wave patterns propagated inshore'.</p> <p>(i) Please provide clarification as to whether additional modelling with the Sizewell-Dunwich banks removed for all Flood Risk Assessment epochs and shoreline change modelling is available and/or whether that reference was in fact to the latest beach erosion assessment work in TR545 which uses wave data from a buoy offshore of the SD banks?</p> <p>(ii) If that is the case, please explain why that makes TR545 suitably precautionary including in relation to fluctuations in bank crest elevation for the duration of project?</p> <p>(iii) Please also explain how the CPMMP would, in any case, provide the mechanism to pick up fluctuations in bank topography and the consequential impacts of such a change?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) For clarification, no additional modelling has been undertaken for the Flood Risk Assessment. As discussed in Section 5.3 of Appendix A of the Coastal Modelling Report (Appendix 1 of the <b>MDS FRA</b> [<a href="#">APP-094</a>]), the assessment concluded that the Baseline scenario, i.e. with the Sizewell - Dunwich bank in situ, resulted in more conservative (i.e.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>worst case) nearshore wave conditions than with their removal. As such, the scenario with the bank in place was adopted in the <b>MDS FRA</b> for all scenarios and epochs as a conservative approach. The latest assessment, summarised in <b>BEEMS Technical Report TR545 [REP3-048]</b>, was undertaken to consider beach erosion and viability of the soft coastal defence feature in relation to a specific event, i.e. the Beast from the East storm, and therefore has separate objectives from the <b>MDS FRA</b>.</p> <p>(ii) There is no evidence or mechanism to suggest that the bank would be lost over the life of the station (or indeed over much longer time scales). The assessment of beach erosion and viability of the soft coastal defence feature is summarised in the <b>BEEMS Technical Report TR545 [REP3-048]</b>, which focuses on the Beast from the East storm and does not account for the presence of the Sizewell – Dunwich Bank. The offshore model boundary is inshore of the Sizewell-Dunwich bank meaning any variation in bank morphology does not influence the model results, however, wave conditions recorded by the Sizewell Waverider offshore of the bank are still applied to the model boundary. As such this is considered to be a conservative approach in relation to the feasibility of the soft coastal defence feature.</p> <p>(iii) The <b>CPMMP [REP5-059]</b> includes proposed bathymetric surveys of the Sizewell – Dunwich Bank every 5 years. As the bank is very large and changes slowly, this interval is considered sufficient to track the long-term change of the bank. The Virtual Inshore Wave Buoy (X-band radar) and regular topographic beach surveys will also register changes to inshore storm wave climatology and beach topography/volumes.</p>
CG.2.11	The Applicant	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The DL5 comments of Nick Scarr on the oral submissions made at ISH6 [REP5-253,254], raises a number of issues including in relation to the Expert Geomorphological Assessment (EGA).</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether a new EGA should be conducted in respect of the latest data and modelling and, if not, why not?</p> <p>(ii) Please indicate how (giving paragraph references) the submitted FRA and EGA have considered any change or degradation of the Sizewell-Dunwich banks over the lifetime of the Sizewell C project?</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>(iii) Please explain the variation in the assessment of the importance of the Sizewell-Dunwich banks to Sizewell shoreline stability pre DCO, in the DCO application and post DCO?</p> <p>(iv) Please respond to the criticism that changes or degradation of the Sizewell-Dunwich banks would have the consequence of placing the exposed landward side of the main nuclear platform at increase flood risk and the northern defences could be vulnerable.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) The remit of the EGA was to review the potential for future shoreline change that would lead to exposure of the HCDF without secondary mitigation (beach maintenance). BEEMS Technical Report TR403 (summarised in <b>Volume 2 Appendix 20A of the ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-312</a>]) reports the EGA exercise and identified a window (2053-2087) when it was most likely that the initially terrestrial HCDF would be exposed to marine conditions <u>without mitigation</u> (to prevent such an outcome). The EGA identified that HCDF exposure without mitigation was likely to occur under conditions similar to those currently experienced at the site. BEEMS Technical Report TR403 also identified that uncertainty in the projection of future environmental parameters affecting geomorphic change becomes too great at around this same time for any attempt to project shoreline change any further into the future to be plausible i.e., present conditions are unlikely to hold beyond this window. Having determined that mitigation was required, this work was completed and does not need to be repeated, as the latest modelling and data (<b>BEEMS Technical Reports TR544</b> and <b>TR545</b> [<a href="#">REP3-032</a> and <a href="#">REP3-048</a>]) addresses the performance of the mitigation measures.</p> <p>(ii) <b>FRA:</b> As noted in the response to CG.2.10, SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of the impact of the removal of the Sizewell-Dunwich banks on nearshore wave conditions and subsequently the risk of overtopping of the coastal defences. This is discussed in Section 5.3 of Appendix A of the Coastal Modelling Report (Appendix 1 of the <b>MDS FRA</b> [<a href="#">APP-094</a>]). This assessment concluded that the Baseline scenario with the Sizewell – Dunwich bank in place resulted in more conservative (worst case) nearshore wave conditions than with its removal. As such, the scenario with the bank in place was adopted in the <b>MDS FRA</b> for the assessment of overtopping risk to the coastal defences throughout the development lifetime.</p> <p><b>EGA:</b> The potential nearshore effects of bank change was considered by the EGA and in BEEMS Technical Report TR403 (and synthesized into <b>Volume 2, Appendix 20A</b> of the</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-312</a>]. The EGA did not consider the degradation of the banks over the project lifetime because the scope of the work was limited to defining only the period prior to mitigation being required (and degradation of the banks could not occur within that timeframe).</p> <p>(iii) SZC Co. has always considered that the Sizewell – Dunwich Bank plays a role in reducing the inshore wave energy. This was demonstrated in various BEEMS reports (also synthesized in <b>Volume 2, Appendix 20A</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-312</a>]) on the historical bank variability and in wave modelling. They show that wave energy dissipation is important for larger storms. However, SZC Co.’s view of the linkage between the bank and shoreline response has become more nuanced as data collection and modelling has increased for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The banks crest varies in elevation by over 4 m, which means that some sections will have little effect on waves, even during severe storms.</li><li>• As the bank is far from shore (around one kilometre) wave refraction and diffraction processes even-out the wave energy, spreading it more evening along the shore</li><li>• Closer to the DCO application, and in particular during the EGA, it became clear that the shoreline behaviour is incoherent and shows no clear linkage to the form of the bank.</li></ul> <p>Despite these complexities, the uncertainty around the bank and its role in shoreline change is accounted for by excluding it from the BEEMS Technical Report TR545 ‘Beast from the East’ storm modelling [<a href="#">REP3-048</a>] (by virtue of the model boundary being inshore of the bank but with wave conditions offshore of the bank applied to the boundary), to obtain worst-case storm erosion rates.</p> <p>(iv) Degradation of the Sizewell-Dunwich banks would not have an impact on extreme still water levels and therefore would not increase the risk of inundation to the landward side of the main development platform. Wave overtopping of the existing coastal defences and further wave propagation behind the existing Sizewell A and Sizewell B stations would result in wave energy dissipation, and the wave action at the landward side of the main development platform would therefore not be significant. As discussed in point (ii), the impact of the degradation of the offshore sand banks on the nearshore wave conditions and overtopping of coastal defences has been considered as part of the Coastal Modelling</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Report (Appendix 1 of the <b>MDS FRA</b> [APP-094]) showing that degradation of the banks would not increase the wave height nearshore, south of the Sizewell C frontage.</p> <p>On that basis, SZC Co. concludes that degradation of the Sizewell-Dunwich banks would not increase flood risk to the proposed development.</p>
CG.2.12	TASC, Nick Scarr, Bill Parker	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The EA DL5 comments on TR544 and TR545 [REP5-149] makes reference was to the latest beach erosion assessment work in TR545 which uses wave data from a buoy offshore of the Sizewell-Dunwich banks.</p> <p>(i) Do you agree that this effectively discounts the influence of the banks on wave height?</p> <p>(ii) Does that make it suitably precautionary, and the outputs can therefore accommodate natural dynamics including fluctuations in bank crest elevation for the duration of project?</p> <p>(iii) In any event, would the monitoring and mitigation proposed by the CPMMP provide a suitable mechanism to pick up any other fluctuations in bank topography?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
CG.2.13	Applicant, EA	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>In relation to the EA DL5 comments on TR544 and TR545 [REP5-149]:</p> <p>(i) The EA questions whether the SCDF erosion assessment adequately considers the 'worst case predicted SCDF erosion' scenario and encourages the addition of more severe scenarios in the next stage of modelling. Is it agreed that this modelling should be undertaken and, if so when will it be carried out and be available?</p> <p>(ii) The EA indicates that it welcomes the chance to discuss further the SCDF geometry, in particular crest height, with the Applicant. Is this is a matter for detailed design stage that would be satisfactorily secured by the draft DCO?</p> <p>(iii) The EA recommends modelling more severe scenarios beyond 2099 for the SCDF and that further work is needed to explore the potential for more extreme events to occur more frequently in the future. ESC's DL5 written summary of oral submissions at ISH6 also points out that the assessment currently covers only part of the Project's lifetime. The Applicant's DL5 written summary of oral submissions made at ISH6 [REP5-111], confirms that work is underway for the modelling of the SCDF through the decommissioning phase to 2140 and is due for submission at Deadline 7. However, please clarify the position in</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>relation to the timing and submission of the assessment to 2099, and whether it will include the more severe scenarios and exploration of extreme events mentioned by the EA. In addition, please provide a timeline for the carrying out and submission of this work.</p> <p>(iv) In relation to TR545, the EA comments on the reliance placed upon the currently bimodal wave climate. Please can the Applicant respond as regards the potential for changes to wave bimodality due to the impacts of climate change and whether this will be assessed?</p>
	<p>SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7</p>	<p>(i) SZC Co. considers that the storm scenarios used are appropriate for Coastal Geomorphology and SCDF viability assessment (as explained below), however it is agreed that modelling of higher sea levels to the end of the decommissioning phase (2140) is needed, and this will be submitted as updates to BEEMS Technical Reports TR544 and TR545 at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 9.12(B) and Doc Ref. 9.31(A)). The UKCP18 climate change for waves approaching the Sizewell coast shows that maximum annual wave heights are set to <u>decrease</u> (by up to 12% subject to the RCP climate change scenario used; <b>Volume 2 Appendix 20A</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-312</a>]). SZC Co. considers that the use of the 107-year return-interval Beast from the East storm is appropriate for assessing viability of the SCDF across the station life, especially when considered alongside the several layers of conservatism used to account for uncertainty set out in <b>BEEMS Technical Report TR544</b> [<a href="#">REP3-032</a>]. SZC Co. has committed to maintaining the SCDF as part of the <b>CPMMP</b> [<a href="#">REP5-059</a>] and this would be via the proposed mitigation methods (bypassing, recycling, further recharge). However, modelling is being undertaken for future timelines [i.e. beyond 2099; see response at (iii)] and for engineering purposes more extreme events are also being modelled [see response at (iii)].</p> <p>(ii) This is a matter for the detailed design stage. The detailed design is secured by Requirement 12B and the EA will be consulted on the report in advance of submission.</p> <p>(iii) Please refer to SZC Co.'s response above to CG.2.13 (i) – regarding climate change evidence and the suitability of the 107 year return interval Beast from the East storm with the sand bank removed for SCDF viability assessment.</p> <p>Note however that SCDF modelling for the Reasonably Foreseeable Design Basis as set out in the Coastal Defences Design Report [<a href="#">REP2-116</a>] (1:10,000 joint probability return interval event with 20 m of shoreline retreat and extreme sea level rise (RCP8.5, 95<sup>th</sup> percentile at 2140) will be modelled for engineering purposes in <b>BEEMS Technical</b></p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><b>Report TR553</b> “Modelling of the SCDF under the Reasonable Foreseeable Design Basis” and submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>(iv) The Environment Agency’s comments on bi-modality relate to the direction that SCDF sediments would travel once they have been eroded and transported away from Sizewell C. SZC Co is not aware of any climate change evidence that indicates a change in bi-modality or net direction of longshore shingle transport. SZC Co does not expect a change in the net direction of transport; however, the balance is not constant and phases in which one or other direction dominates are expected. No specific assessment is required for bi-modality because the supply of additional sediment is beneficial and SZC Co. has identified no adverse effects of SCDF sediment supply (<b>Volume 1, Chapter 2, Section 2.15</b> of the <b>ES Addendum</b> [<a href="#">AS-181</a>]). Nonetheless, as noted in <b>CG.2.7(i)</b>, the monitoring proposed in the <b>CPMMP</b> [<a href="#">REP5-059</a>] would detect and mitigate any impacts (using beach recharge, recycling or bypassing; <b>Volume 2, Appendix 20A</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-312</a>]) including any persistent deficit in sediment supply across the Sizewell C frontage caused by the development.</p>
CG.2.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The Alde and Ore Association Written Submission for DL5 providing commentary on ISH 6 [<a href="#">REP5-187</a>], submits that the CPMMP should have a wide geographical coverage going at least as far south as Shingle Street with appropriate time intervals for monitoring. That proposition is supported by other IPs including Mr Bill Parker.</p> <p>(i) If an extension to the monitoring area is not agreed, please explain further why the monitoring is only considered to be necessary within the area proposed;</p> <p>(ii) Without baseline monitoring for the wider neighbouring coastline how would any unusual changes and/or adverse effects resulting from the proposed development in such wider locations be recognised and mitigated?</p> <p>(iii) In any event, should funding be provided and secured in order to mitigate against such an eventuality?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) The rationale for the monitoring extent is covered in CG.2.8 above as well as in the <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at ISH6: Coastal Geomorphology (14 July 2021)</b> [<a href="#">REP5-111</a>], SZC Co’s responses to the <b>National Trust</b> [<a href="#">REP6-024</a>, Appendix G] and <b>Local Impact Report LIR</b> Ref. 11.48 (iv) [<a href="#">REP3-044</a>]. The key points</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>behind this rationale and why it should not be extended to Shingle Street (or indeed Thorpeness, as discussed in CG.2.8) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the predicted impacts of Sizewell C fall well within the Greater Sizewell Bay and do not extend to, or near, Thorpeness. Therefore, there is no rationale for Sizewell C to monitor there. The extents set out in the <b>CPMMP</b> [REP5-059] are always larger than the predicted impacts, to allow for any uncertainty;</li><li>• the Coastal Processes Monitoring Plan (<b>CPMMP</b>; [REP5-059]) is adaptive and monitoring extents would be extended were impacts demonstrated to move beyond their anticipated extents;</li><li>• impacts would start to develop at Sizewell C and radiate outwards so that impacts closer to the site would effectively provide an “early warning” of impacts further afield (no wider regional or systemic impacts could develop without significant local scale impacts being detected first);</li><li>• the Sizewell C development does not remove sediment from the coastal system; on the contrary, it adds sediment (via episodic erosion of the maintained SCDF over the life of the station).</li></ul> <p>(ii) As impacts radiate outward from Sizewell C, the adaptive monitoring proposed in the <b>CPMMP</b> [REP5-059] would extend the monitoring extents if impacts moved beyond their predicted envelope. The baseline East Anglian Monitoring Programme provides a long (30 years), high-quality record that could be drawn upon were this to occur i.e., if the impacts and monitoring extents were exceeded. Further commentary on this matter can be found in the paragraphs 1.4.24 and 1.6.9 of the <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at ISH6: Coastal Geomorphology (14 July 2021)</b> [REP5-111].</p> <p>(iii) As there is no evidence to support the widening of the monitoring area, it is not considered appropriate or necessary to provide and secure funding for this eventuality. As the CPMMP is adaptive, to the extent that its area does require to be extended in the future, this will be agreed pursuant to Requirement 7A of the DCO/Condition 17 of the DML and SZC Co. are then obliged to implement the CPMMP in accordance with its approved details (Requirement 7A(2) and Condition 17(2)). This is an absolute obligation on SZC Co. to carry out the actions required by the CPMMP and in order to discharge that obligation, it would need to ensure that it has sufficient funds to do so. This would be necessary to ensure compliance with the DCO and so avoid the criminal sanction that would exist were it unable to meet its obligations.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CG.2.15	The Applicant	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The DL5 submission of Mr Bill Parker in relation to ISH6 [REP5-191], highlights some areas which he submits have been overlooked in the modelling provided to date and is critical of the assumptions underlying the EGA including the use of 'reasonably foreseeable' conditions.</p> <p>(i) Please respond to those criticisms and summarise why the approach to monitoring utilised by Cefas can be regarded as robust.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide clarification on the methodology on ground strengthening and the foundations for the HCDF as highlighted by Cllr Robin Sanders at ISH6 [REP5-180].</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) The following response is provided as two sections to match the question – (a) Mr Parker's concerns that some areas have been overlooked in the modelling and (b) assumptions regarding the EGA for determining whether SCDF mitigation is needed to avoid disruption to longshore transport by an exposed HCDF.</p> <p>(a) Modelling (as outlined in Mr Parker's point 2 (a) d) All of Mr Parker's concerns are addressed in SZC Co.'s DL7 topic-based response (Doc. Ref. 9.73) to DL2 Written Representations on Coastal Geomorphology (specifically Nick Scarr [REP2-393], Bill Parker [REP2-230], Natural England [REP2-152], SCAR [REP2-509], Stop Sizewell C [REP2-449r], Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group [REP2-377], The National Trust [REP2-150] and The Alde and Ore Association [REP2-204]) and SZC Co.'s separate DL7 response (Doc. Ref. 9.73) to the unaffiliated review of BEEMS Technical Report TR311, written by Derek Jackson and Andrew Cooper and submitted by Stop Sizewell C [REP2-449]. Key responses to Mr Parker's points are summarised here using his numbering.</p> <p>i. Multiple storm scenarios. The modelling conducted is primarily for predicting impacts, and therefore follows the standard EIA worst-case approach. This approach, including model types and conditions, were developed in consultation with the Marine Technical Forum since 2015. BEEMS Technical Report TR545 [REP3-048] also includes multiple design storm scenarios and an extreme storm sequence.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>ii. UKCP18 sea level rise and the lifetime of the station. SZC Co.'s assessment has considered the station lifetime scale (to 2140) – see for example the modelling in the DL5 version of BEEMS Technical Report TR545.</li><li>iii. Shore-face connected ridges. These morphologies have been identified on eastern North Sea Dutch and German shorelines but are not present at Sizewell.</li><li>iv. Sea level rise assumption for EGA. The EGA observed that sea level has been rising throughout the period for which shoreline change data at Sizewell has been collected. The fact that shoreline change in response has not been regionally coherent highlights that the response to SLR is not a linear, predictable outcome and that the system has absorbed this rate of rise. SZC Co. therefore does not consider it unreasonable to project that this manner of response would continue. The EGA nevertheless projected an additional, linear estimate of change (as a worst case, despite there being no evidence that this is how the system will respond) alongside the assumption of an ongoing, non-linear system response. The EGA noted that rates of SLR are projected to increase more quickly beyond 2070 and did not attempt to apply this method to periods for which more rapid rise is expected. Using this method, the EGA determined that unmitigated shoreline change would expose the HCDF between 2053 and 2087 – the earlier dates in the range represent the possibility of faster rates of sea level rise (amongst other factors) contributing to faster shoreline retreat.</li><li>v. Wave climate and sand banks. The UKCP18 climate change predictions for the Sizewell coast shows a decreasing wave climatology (in terms of mean annual and maximum wave height (up to 12% subject to which RCP climate change scenario is considered). Please refer to our response to CG.2.11 regarding the Sizewell – Dunwich Bank and its role for inshore waves. Mr Parker's comparison with adjacent sandbanks neglects the fact that the two do not share similar behavioural properties – there is no evidence of cyclic behaviour in Sizewell – Dunwich Bank, whereas there is evidence of cycles in the Great Yarmouth Banks (a sequence of several interconnected banks extending north from Kessingland).</li><li>vi. Mr Parker (and Derek Jackson and Andrew Cooper in their review submitted as the <b>Written Representation of Stop Sizewell C</b> [<a href="#">REP2-449r</a>]) has incorrectly interpreted the cited papers (Bonaduce et al., 2019 and Grabemann and Weisse, 2018). SZC Co. considers that both submissions refer to Grabemann and Weisse (2008) and that 2018 is an error. This means that the Grabemann and Weisse paper was produced 13 years ago and not with the latest UKCP18 predictions, which SZC</li></ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Co. is required to use and has used. Nevertheless, these papers are, in fact, in agreement with the UKCP18 assessment for the Sizewell area that climate change will lead to a reduction, not an increase, in mean annual and maximum wave height. SZC Co. accepts that historically a hypothesized increase in the dominance of NE waves, importantly combined with virtually no Dunwich Bank, could have driven the observed severe erosion at Dunwich (and accretion in the southern half of the GSB including Sizewell). This case is accepted but was not considered in detail with respect to coastal geomorphology as it does not present a worst case for impacts of Sizewell C nor hazards to the station.</p> <p>vii. Longshore transport. The assumptions to which Mr Parker refers are unclear to the Applicant. The development of the evidence base presented in <b>Volume 2, Appendix 20A</b> of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-312</a>] included examining the scientific literature on longshore transport in the area and the use of longshore transport models to quantify rates of movement and how they vary under changing conditions. The likely increase in transport rates with SLR is recognised. However, whether this leads to erosion or accretion at specific locations is dependent on multiple other factors, including sediment supply. The worst-case assumption that net erosion on, and adjacent to, the development site (at greater or lesser rates) remains valid in any case.</p> <p>(b) EGA: The EGA was an exercise in determining what was reasonably foreseeable with respect to whether (and when) the HCDF without mitigation would be exposed, and at what point change becomes too uncertain to project. The EGA projected change only as far as this 'upper limit to reasonable projection of change' and determined that the HCDF was likely to be exposed within this timeframe. There was no suggestion that change was 'reasonably foreseeable' for the project lifetime and no such assumption has been applied.</p> <p>(ii) In the written summaries of Oral Submissions at ISH6 9.46 [<a href="#">REP5-111</a>], it is stated that the ground treatment would most likely comprise rigid inclusions. We note that the purpose of the ground treatment would be to transfer the load from the sea defence into competent strata below the soft material. In civil engineering these techniques are used widely and have established design codes and guidelines that are applied. The sea defence design report [<a href="#">REP2-116</a>] will be updated to expand on the ground treatment proposals.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CG.2.16	The Applicant, ESC	<p><b>Impacts on coastal processes</b></p> <p>The DL5 submission of Mr Bill Parker in relation to ISH6 [<a href="#">REP5-191</a>], suggests that certain aspects should be built into the structure of the Marine Technical Forum including having meaningful local community membership and being open to public scrutiny. Please indicate whether it is agreed that such inclusion and external scrutiny would be beneficial and should be accommodated?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Local community membership of the Marine Technical Forum would be inappropriate. The MTF is a regulatory forum for regulators and their technical experts only. The MTF's Terms of Reference make it clear that its purpose is to facilitate dialogue between SZC Co. and the regulators to ensure that all monitoring obligations are properly satisfied, stating '<i>The MTF is primarily focussed on... the successful specification, planning, implementation and reporting of all forms of marine and coastal monitoring associated with SZC that are needed for the proper protection of the environment and compliance with UK law</i>'. External scrutiny is already provided by the four regulatory stakeholders and their expert advisors. Once approved, the Annual and Substantive (ten-year review) reports of the CPMMP will be made publicly available. As such, expanding the membership as suggested would not be beneficial, is not necessary and would disrupt important regulatory processes.</p>
<b>CI.2 Community Issues</b>		
CI.2.0	ESC, SCC	<p><b>Clarification</b></p> <p>Within the LIR [<a href="#">REP1-045</a>] on page 399 para 28.26 you refer to CYDS. What is this, it does not appear in the Glossary of Terms?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
CI.2.1	ESC, SCC	<p><b>Accommodation Strategy</b></p> <p>The Applicant in response to the LIR and the concerns raised at ISH4 in respect of the delivery of the accommodation campus and the caravan site at the LEEIE consider that it would not be appropriate to limit worker numbers as a mechanism to ensure timely</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>delivery of the accommodation campus. In [REP3-044] the Applicant sets out their detailed arguments as to why this is considered inappropriate (paras 31.2.5 onwards).</p> <p>(i) Do you agree that the assessment of the gap between the availability of project accommodation and the total amount of accommodation required would not exceed the amount of spare capacity available in the 60-minute area?</p> <p>(ii) Are there particular concerns for a smaller geographical area, reflective of the likely greater pressure on accommodation the nearer to the site you are?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. notes that this question is addressed to ESC and SCC but would like to clarify that:</p> <p>(i) The demand for accommodation in the period before the LEEIE caravan site is on-line is less than a normal Sizewell B outage, which is accommodated by the existing area. The main source of accommodation in this period would be in the tourist sector (primarily caravans) – the Housing Fund’s Tourist Accommodation Market Supply element would be in place to mitigate the effects of e.g. unlicensed sites and support new and re-configured stock. The market will also respond with flexibility to meet demand, and for much of the time there would be substantially more available accommodation than assessed (outside the peak tourist season). The demand for accommodation in the period before the campus is on-line is less than the peak and never exceeds that level. The build-up will be phased, and there will be substantial capacity provided by the Housing Fund in the interim period.</p> <p>(ii) Demand will be for local accommodation both in the early years and at the peak – as above, demand in the early years will not exceed demand at the peak. In any case, a responsive and flexible Housing Fund will be in place to mitigate for effects and target activities locally.</p> <p>Furthermore, as set out in Appendix 3B to these ExQ2 responses, ESC and SZC Co have agreed a programme for the release of Housing Fund contingency payments in the event that phased delivery of the Project Accommodation is not opened relative to the monitored number of NHB workers during the Construction Period, in order to be used for additional Private Housing Market Supply and Tourist Accommodation Market Supply measures deemed appropriate by the Accommodation Working Group and the measures would be set out in Private Housing Supply Plan and Tourist Accommodation Plans in place at that time.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Given the need to provide bedspaces rapidly with this part of the contingent fund, the Private Housing Market Supply measures most likely to be effective are <i>Support rent / deposit guarantee</i> and <i>Loans / Grants / Guaranteed lets</i> – these can be deployed quickly and effectively to increase capacity in the market.</p> <p>For Tourist Accommodation Market Supply Measures, it will be at the discretion of the Accommodation Working Group to determine the most effective use of funds – this may include support for individual providers to amend licenses, reconfigure sites, or develop infrastructure, or for enforcement action for illegal sites, for example.</p> <p>SZC Co’s response to <b>CI.2.3</b> sets out in detail how the Housing Fund will be both pro-active and reactive.</p>
CI.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Accommodation Strategy</b></p> <p>In [REP3-044] you state at the first bullet point under 31.2.19  <i>"The LEEIE caravan site is delivered when the NHB workforce is around 800"</i> and at the subsequent bullet point  <i>"The campus is delivered when the NHB workforce is around 2,500 (of which around 600 would be in the LEEIE caravan site, so translates to 1,900 NHB workers in the private market)"</i></p> <p>(i) In light of the strong arguments made in the preceding paragraphs that there should not be a cap on worker numbers as you do not consider this to be justified, these statements are not ones which the ExA can rely upon as there is nothing which secures the provision at these numbers is there?</p> <p>(ii) In the ES the accommodation provision at the caravan site and accommodation campus is said to be primary mitigation. To be such a thing it needs to be secured and delivered so that it can function as primary mitigation?</p> <p>The ExA notes the response arising from Written Submissions to ISH1 set out in Appendix B, if a full response to the concerns above is better addressed through the intended Deadline 6 submission that would be welcomed.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The reference made to the number of workers predicted at the point of delivery of the project accommodation in [REP3-044] is not a target or a trigger for delivery, it simply contextualises that at the points in time that the <b>Implementation Plan</b> [REP2-044]</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>requires delivery of the accommodation, this is the estimated demand for non-home based (NHB) workers on the Project. An updated position on this is set out in <b>Schedule 9</b> of the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).</p> <p>As explained in response to Question CI.2.1, those measures now include a contingent fund to ensure timely provision of the worker accommodation or to put in place measures that would replicate its effect.</p> <p>At the Issue Specific Hearings (ISH) on the 6th and 9th July (ISH1 and ISH4) the Panel asked a series of questions about how and when the project-provided accommodation (the Land to the East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) Caravan Park and the 2,400 bed Accommodation Campus) would be provided and secured. Following the hearings, details of the approach to phasing, delivery and securing of the Project Accommodation were set out – as specified by the Written Submissions to ISH1 [<a href="#">REP5-113</a>] and ISH4 [<a href="#">REP5-116</a>]. Both the Caravan Park and the Accommodation Campus are an important part of SZC Co.'s workforce management and support the efficient and productive delivery of the Sizewell C Project, as well as being primary mitigation, so it is strongly in the project's interest to deliver them when they are needed early in the construction phase.</p> <p>However, there are limits on how quickly they can be built and the updated <b>Implementation Plan</b> submitted at Deadline 2 [<a href="#">REP2-044</a>] sets out the earliest realistic delivery dates.</p> <p>The <b>Implementation Plan</b> [<a href="#">REP2-044</a>] shows (at Plate 1) the LEEIE Caravan Park being constructed between Q4 2022 and Q4 2023 (Year 1) and the Accommodation Campus between Q3 2023 and Q3 2025 (Year 3).</p> <p>It should also be noted that, as explained in <b>Chapter 31</b> of <b>SZC Co's Response to the Councils' Local Impact Report</b> [<a href="#">REP3-044</a>], the assessment of accommodation impacts is conservative.</p> <p>It is for these reasons that SZC Co. believes that there is no need to provide the accommodation more quickly than has been proposed (even if that was possible) and that a cap on workers pending delivery of the caravan park and accommodation campus would not be appropriate or desirable. However, SZC Co. recognises the concerns raised by the ExA and is therefore proposing a mechanism by which the delivery of the Caravan Park and Accommodation Campus can be given greater certainty and tied to additional</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>mitigation if the delivery is delayed. This is set out in Appendix 3B to these ExQ2 responses.</p> <p>The project accommodation is secured through the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation, Schedule 3</b> and <b>Schedule 9</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), which refer to the <b>Implementation Plan</b>.</p>
CI.2.3	Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p><b>Accommodation Strategy</b></p> <p>(i) The Housing Fund it is understood is intended to support the housing market, adding a degree of resilience and support the provision of additional capacity. Please explain how this is intended to work from the monitoring of the local housing market through to ensuring that capacity is maintained and the most vulnerable are safeguarded.</p> <p>The ExA have read what has been set out in para 31.2.49 onwards of [REP3-044], but it remains unclear how this would be proactive rather than reactive.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co notes that paragraph 31.2.49 onwards (to 31.2.51) of [<a href="#">REP3-044</a>] refers only to one element of the Housing Fund – the <i>Private Housing Market Supply</i> element as described at <b>Schedule 3</b> of the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7(F)).</p> <p>The Housing Fund would be split into three broad elements which together provide the mix of measures and governance to ensure that the right level of funding would be in place at the outset, and then that monitoring can contribute to re-direction and release of contingent funding in a responsive way.</p> <p>The three elements are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Private Housing Market Supply – to boost capacity and quality of private market accommodation in the build up to peak NHB workforce;</li> <li>2) Tourist Accommodation Market Supply – to boost capacity and support resilience, support re-configuration and enforce licence control measures related to use of tourist accommodation by an element of the NHB workforce; and</li> <li>3) Housing and Homelessness Services Resilience Measures – to provide both pro-active, precautionary support for potential demand on housing services (by reducing the risk of homelessness proactively in the community, for example) and responding reactively to indicators of housing market stress. This also includes an element that could be used to re-provide support for residential care accommodation should a SCC-supported care home closure be directly linked to the effects of the Sizewell C Project.</li> </ol>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>SZC Co. and ESC have agreed the approach towards contingent and non-contingent payments from the Housing Fund to ensure that there is a proportionate level of resource to proactively (and with assurance):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) deliver measures related to the identified significant effects;</li><li>b) provide a mechanism for re-directing this mitigation towards different measures in different location depending on observed effects and effectiveness of measures; and</li><li>c) react to any observed, residual housing market stress.</li></ul> <p>If agreed by the Accommodation Working Group – funds may be moved between different elements and measures of the Housing Fund based on monitoring of the effectiveness of measures.</p> <p><b><u>Private Housing Market Supply element</u></b></p> <p>SZC Co. and ESC are broadly aligned on the types of measure and appropriate indicative scale of funding for each measure that would be effective in mitigating against adverse effects on the housing market. The parties have worked together to identify - within the non-contingent contribution that SZC Co. will pay annually to ESC – the number of bedspaces and cost per bedspace that could practically be delivered by this part of the Fund (for example c. 280 rooms in empty homes, 336 rooms from grant and loan funding). Together these measures are agreed to provide at least 1,200 bedspaces in the first seven years of the construction phase. This fund would be released to ensure delivery of these bedspaces commences early in the construction phase to ensure they are made available pro-actively, rather than waiting for an impact to arise.</p> <p>The Private Housing Market Supply element would be subject to regular monitoring and review to ensure that the fund is spent effectively over the first seven years of the construction phase. If agreed by the Accommodation Working Group, and based on the monitoring of effectiveness of spending on different measures year-by-year, the mix of measures can be changed.</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), <b>Schedule 3</b>, the Private Housing Supply Plan will be updated every 12 months setting out previous expenditure and bedspaces delivered by category of initiative and location, and plans for the provision of bedspaces for the following 12 months. SZC Co. will provide the Accommodation Working Group with the location and number of NHB workers by accommodation type.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Using this information, the Fund can be re-distributed spatially and by type of measure each year.</p> <p>In this way, it can be assured that the Housing Fund will respond to any variations from the effectiveness of predicted measures or changes in the distribution of NHB workers and identified housing market stress effects. It is therefore considered to be both pro-active and reactive.</p> <p><b><u>Tourism Accommodation Market Supply element</u></b></p> <p>SZC Co. will provide ESC with non-contingent funding from Commencement during the Construction Phase. Part of this element of the Fund would be released no later than 1 month following the approval of the first <i>Tourist Accommodation Plan</i>.</p> <p>The rest of this funding will be released annually and will be directed towards measures that will be determined by subsequent annual Tourist Accommodation Plans (which will be agreed by the Accommodation Working Group each year).</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), <b>Schedule 3</b>, the Tourist Accommodation Plan will be updated every 12 months setting out previous expenditure and (if applicable) bedspaces delivered by category of initiative and location. Using this information, the Fund can be re-distributed spatially and by type of measure upon review of data and feedback – <b>Schedule 3</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), sets out that the Accommodation Working Group may decide to review the Tourist Accommodation Plan on an on-going basis.</p> <p>In this way, the Accommodation Working Group will be able to monitor the effectiveness of this element of the Fund and re-direct it where appropriate to respond to any variations from the effectiveness of predicted measures or changes in the distribution of NHB workers and identified housing market stress effects. It is considered to be both pro-active and reactive.</p> <p><b><u>Housing and Homelessness Services Resilience element</u></b></p> <p>A non-contingent component of this element of the Housing Fund be provided to ESC on or before the first anniversary of the Commencement Date to support the precautionary and proactive delivery of measures to support the East Suffolk Council’s statutory housing advice and homelessness prevention service including staff resourcing, training and</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>projects, landlord engagement and support, management of HMOs and temporary/emergency accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. will also make available part of this element of the Housing Fund to be considered for release on an annual basis on receipt of evidence of information provided by East Suffolk Council that the Accommodation Working Group agrees (acting reasonably) shows housing market stress relative to pre-commencement levels which may reasonably be related to the effects of the NHB workforce (and any HB Workers moving their single address explicitly to work on the Project) as set out in the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation, Schedule 3</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).</p> <p>In this way, it can be assured that this element of the Housing Fund will proactively help to avoid - and also be able to respond to - any unexpected or observed housing market stress. It is therefore considered to be both pro-active and reactive.</p> <p><b><u>Contingency Payments linked to Project Accommodation</u></b></p> <p>As set out in Appendix 3B to these EXQ2 responses, ESC and SZC Co have agreed a programme for the release of Housing Fund contingency payments in the event that phased delivery of the Project Accommodation is not opened when required relative to the monitored number of NHB workers during the Construction Period, in order to be used for additional Private Housing Market Supply and Tourist Accommodation Market Supply measures deemed appropriate by the Accommodation Working Group and the measures would be set out in Private Housing Supply Plan and Tourist Accommodation Plans in place at that time.</p> <p>Given the need to provide bedspaces rapidly with this part of the contingent fund, the Private Housing Market Supply measures most likely to be effective are <i>Support rent / deposit guarantee</i> and <i>Loans / Grants / Guaranteed lets</i> – these can be deployed quickly and effectively to increase capacity in the market.</p> <p>For Tourist Accommodation Market Supply Measures, it will be at the discretion of the Accommodation Working Group to determine the most effective use of funds – this may include support for individual providers to amend licenses, reconfigure sites, or develop infrastructure, or for enforcement action for illegal sites, for example.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

		<p><b><u>Safeguarding Vulnerable People</u></b></p> <p>Localised effects on the accommodation market will be managed by the Housing Fund which as set out above, contains measures to specifically target hard-to-reach and vulnerable groups that may experience difficulties accessing or retaining housing as a result of the Sizewell C Project's effects on the lower end of the private rented sector. The Private Housing Market Supply element of the Housing Fund will aim to provide bedspace capacity in the market through a range of measures that would be targeted at the area of the market that: a) workers are most likely to seek accommodation in; and b) where people are most at risk of homelessness – this is primarily the lower 30<sup>th</sup> percentile of the rental market where existing residents are in receipt of Local Housing Allowance or other support, or have a housing duty discharged to the private rented sector by the Council.</p> <p>The measures in this part of the Housing Fund will include (for example):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Grants and loans to home-owners to develop habitable spaces in their existing accommodation (for example by funding minor improvements, upgrades and re-configurations) – this will enable people to safely improve the quality of their home and generate an income stream, securing their ownership while reducing the number of workers that would need to seek accommodation elsewhere in the market, reducing competition for those 1-2 bed properties that are important to securing the housing status of vulnerable people.</li><li>- Funding for rent/deposit guarantee schemes for existing residents and equity loans to move from social rented or private rented homes to owner occupation – thereby freeing up capacity in sought after rental and social rent properties and reducing risks of homelessness.</li></ul> <p>The Housing and Homelessness Service Resilience element of the Housing Fund is particularly important to support vulnerable people by helping the resilience of ESC's Housing Advice/Homelessness Prevention service.</p> <p>While this part of the Housing Fund would not generate 'new' bedspaces, it may reduce levels of churn, and reduce the likelihood for people at risk of homelessness/housing need requiring support from ESC (so in effect, reducing pressure on existing supply by reducing risk of demand for housing support in the lower percentiles of private rented sector).</p> <p>SZC Co.'s proposal for the 'resilience' element of the Fund is deliberately broad and flexible. This would be used to fund measures that the Accommodation Working Group</p>
--	--	---

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>agree would be effective in responding to the potential effects of the Sizewell C Project including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- staff resourcing, training and projects including but not limited to floating support, tenancy sustainment, outreach, family liaison and issue-specific projects;</li><li>- temporary and emergency accommodation support;</li><li>- landlord engagement and support; and</li><li>- management of HMOs.</li></ul> <p>This could include measures such as for example, seeking to support programmes like Homefirst Plus, low interest loans for homeowners in financial risk, support for outreach and family liaison to reduce the risk of homelessness in the existing sector. The Council would be able to prioritise funding for those considered most vulnerable.</p> <p>This also includes an element that could be used to re-provide support for residential care accommodation should a SCC-supported care home closure be directly linked to the effects of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>In conclusion, as set out above, the Housing Fund would be capable of delivering additional capacity and providing resilience in the build up to peak demand and during the peak, and may have the potential to leave a lasting legacy in terms of improvements to the existing housing stock.</p> <p>In addition, SZC Co. has agreed with SCC and ESC to provide funding towards public service and community safety measures within <b>Schedule 5</b> of the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) that target the most vulnerable members of the community, bolstering activities of the Housing Fund and other embedded and additional measures. This will include (having been developed through collaboration with SCC and ESC):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) A contribution towards SCC's safeguarding and family support services within Adult Community Services and Children and Young Peoples service, which may be used to support existing vulnerable residents through at-home support.</li><li>b) Contributions towards SCC's domestic abuse and criminal exploitation programmes including:</li></ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Training provision for criminal exploitation;</li> <li>ii) Domestic Abuse Outreach Service including 24/7 helpline;</li> <li>iii) Safe Accommodation (providing safe, temporary, emergency bedspaces for people experiencing domestic abuse); and</li> <li>iv) Sanctuary Scheme (providing home security measures, which are available for high-risk domestic abuse victims and their children to remain safe in their own homes).</li> </ul> <p>c) A contribution towards the extension of existing community safety programmes currently run by East Suffolk Council and Community Safety Partnerships including resource to deliver programmes related to criminal exploitation, vulnerability to abuse, families at risk of crisis, community liaison and training.</p>
CI.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Fly Parking</b></p> <p>It is suggested that limiting worker numbers is not necessary or appropriate for a series of reasons throughout [REP3-044] and in responses made at the ISHs.</p> <p>Please explain how limiting parking spaces on the main development site and having parking permits would address the problem of fly parking in the event that there was a delay in the provision of the park and ride facilities or the other proposed parking sites.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The limitation of parking spaces on the main development site, and parking permits does not address the potential for fly parking. The measures which will be employed to control fly parking are described in SZC Co.'s response to TT.1.36 and are secured through the <b>Construction Worker Travel Plan</b> [REP2-055]. SZC Co. will employ a fly parking patrol team to carry out daily patrols to identify possible cases of fly parking. They will be both proactive and reactive, following up reports from local residents to the Sizewell C community help line who believe Sizewell C construction workers may be fly parking. In addition, buses will be fitted with an electronic reader to scan workers' security badges when boarding the Sizewell C buses. The data will be compared against the data for workers entering the main development site in order to enforce the policy that workers assigned to a bus service should not drive closer to the main development site and change onto another mode of transport. Workers who enter the site but did not board their allocated bus would be deemed to have contravened that policy, and appropriate action would be taken and the TRG notified. Workers will be provided with Driver Rules that must be adhered to. The Worker Code of Conduct will set out a disciplinary process relating to</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>fly-parking. Where a worker's vehicle is proven to be fly-parking, SZC Co. will adopt a "Just and Fair" culture with regards to disciplinary proceedings with escalation to higher levels of management at each stage. Ultimately this process could lead to the removal of an individual worker from the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>As stated by the Applicant in the ISH3, and stated in summary of oral submissions [<a href="#">REP5-108</a>] the mode share targets defined in the <b>Construction Worker Travel Plan</b> [<a href="#">REP2-055</a>], and secured by the <b>Deed of Obligation</b>, cannot be met without the delivery of supporting infrastructure such as the park and ride sites. The Transport Review Group (TRG) would have powers to require remedial measures to be funded in order to meet those targets. This means that there is both control on the part of the TRG to ensure that sufficient measures are in place and also a significant incentive for SZC Co. to deliver the infrastructure in accordance with the <b>Implementation Plan</b> [<a href="#">REP2-044</a>].</p>