

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|--|--|--|
| R.2 Radiological considerations | | |
| R.2.0 | The Applicant, ONR | Nuclear Site Licence (i) Please advise on the latest position in respect of the application for the nuclear site licence. (ii) Are you aware of any impediment that may exist that would prevent or delay the granting of the licence? (iii) What is the current timetable that you would anticipate for the conclusions upon the license application being reached? |
| R.2.1 | The Applicant, Environment Agency | Site Licences and Permits (i) Please advise on the latest position in respect of the application for the site licences and permits being considered by the EA. (ii) Are you aware of any impediment that may exist that would prevent or delay the granting of the licence or permit? (iii) What is the current timetable that you would anticipate for the conclusions upon the license/ permit application being reached? |
| SA.2 Section 106 | | |
| SA.2.0 | The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Natural England, MMO, Trinity House | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attention is drawn to the Commentary on the DCO which includes commentary on the Deed of Obligation |
| SE.2 Socio-economic | | |
| SE.2.0 | The Applicant, SCC, ESC, Network Rail | Rail Services In trying to understand the socio-economic and community effects which may result from the development. Can you assist the ExA in understanding the status of the Rail Prospectus referred to within the LIR [REP1-045]. This appears to indicate that in order to support economic growth in the region upgrading of the rail line to improve both passenger and freight capacity during the construction period for the development is sought. |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | (i) What status in planning terms does this document have? (ii) Would operating the night time rail freight service as proposed prevent the delivery of rail improvements during this period? (iii) Had the Council's or Network rail developed a mechanism to fund the rail improvements envisaged within the prospectus, by for example requiring developer contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy or other mechanism? (iv) Did the socio economic assessment consider the implications of effects of the DCO scheme on the potential delivery of rail improvements during the proposed construction programme? |
| TT.2 Traffic and Transport | | |
| TT.2.0 | The Applicant | <p>Transport Review Group (TRG)</p> <p>The TRG has a pivotal role in overseeing the transport control mechanisms (CTMP, CWTP and TIMP) for the Proposed Development. In response to ExQ1 TT1.1.23 the Hinkley Point C experience is referenced. Understanding that this structure may work well at Hinkley Point C, there are some outstanding concerns not addressed by the response [REP3-046].</p> <p>(i) Constitution – In what looks like a balanced voting membership there is potential for any disputes to be passed up to the Delivery Steering Group (DSG) for resolution. Consequently, further delays over any dispute resolution are likely. Why create voting members and not provide a casting vote method of resolving disputes without onward reference to another group?</p> <p>(ii) During the construction period some issues of local traffic management concern are likely to require rapid remedial response. Explain how the TRG can approve additional interventions and mitigation where a rapid response is needed.</p> |
| TT.2.1 | Suffolk County Council | <p>Streetworks Permit Scheme</p> <p>The Applicant provided a response [REP3-046] stating that "The permit schemes implemented by SCC are authorised pursuant to Part 3 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 (the "TMA 2004"). The TMA 2004 is not disapplied by the draft DCO [REP2-015] and therefore the Applicant is of the view that the permit schemes would still apply to the</p> |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | <p>highway works comprised in the authorised development. However, should SCC be of the view that specific drafting is required to provide for the application of the relevant permit schemes to the works authorised by the DCO then the Applicant would be willing to consider including such drafting in a future revision of the draft DCO.”</p> <p>Do you still consider revised drafting is required and are you progressing this with the Applicant?</p> |
| TT.2.2 | Suffolk County Council | <p>Suffolk County Council - A12 improvements: A14 'Seven Hills' to A1152 Woods Lane</p> <p>Please clarify the position with respect to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Status of the A12 major route network project; (ii) Whether the modelling work for this project included the modelling of Sizewell C impacts /mitigations; (iii) Does this modelling identify improvements in network performance for all traffic including Sizewell C traffic; (iv) Review paper in Appendix A [REP5-115] and provide any comments; and (v) Are you seeking a local contribution to this scheme proportionate to the impact of Sizewell C traffic on network traffic levels and performance? |
| TT.2.3 | The Applicant | <p>Suffolk County Council - A12 improvements: A14 'Seven Hills' to A1152 Woods Lane</p> <p>Please clarify the position with respect to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Does your modelling examine the effect of the proposed scheme if constructed? (ii) Do you consider that the scheme as currently proposed would provide a benefit along the A12 corridor for Sizewell C traffic? |
| TT.2.4 | The Applicant | <p>Associated Development Sites – HGV Movements</p> <p>SCC [REP3-084] in their comments on responses to ExQ1 TT.1.15 tabulate the differences between the HGV levels set out in paragraph 3.3.6 the CTMP [REP2-054] and the levels provided in response to ExQ1. Clarify which are the correct numbers.</p> |
| TT.2.5 | The Applicant, Network Rail | Darsham Level Crossing – Safety Concerns |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|---|--|
| | | Following ExQ1, TT.1.102 both parties were reviewing the situation with regard to the safe operation of this crossing. Provide an update on the progress of these reviews and whether any intervention is required as the result of the Proposed Development. |
| | TASC Comment at D7 | <p>TASC are very concerned about the safe operation of the Darsham crossing. Following our review of the “Statement of Common Ground-Network Rail” dated July 2021 PINS ref. REP5-095, we note it is confirmed that the level crossing at Darsham will be upgraded to a full barrier crossing. The matters TASC believe that the Applicant/Network Rail should confirm are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. That Darsham Park and Ride will not be brought into use until the safety benefits conferred by the Darsham Level Crossing upgrade have been completed.2. The position of the fixed signal on the down East Suffolk line that will protect Darsham level crossing.3. That the railway signal protection in the up direction will remain unchanged.4. The estimated road closed times following the introduction of a full barrier crossing.5. Whether obstacle detection technology will be used on the crossing. |
| TT.2.6 | Suffolk County Council, Suffolk Constabulary | <p>Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) Management [REP5-114]</p> <p>Provide comment on whether the position with respect to AIL set out by the applicant is acceptable on the following routes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(i) A14;(ii) A12, Lowestoft to Leiston;(iii) A12, Woodbridge to Leiston; and(iv) B1122. |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|------------------------|--|
| TT.2.7 | Suffolk County Council | Peak Hour HGV Caps In paragraph 1.6.16 [REP5-114] the peak hour HGV movement caps are set out. Provide any comment on the peak hours chosen and the levels set. |
| TT.2.8 | The Applicant | Early Years – Definition in DCO In the summary of the oral submissions for ISH3 [REP5-108] the Early Years was said to be defined as the period up to the completion of both the SLR and the TVB. In the Actions from ISH2 [REP5-114] and the proposed alteration to Requirement 8 of the DCO [REP5-028], it is said that controls would be in place until after the completion of the Park and Ride sites. The Early Years is an important period in terms of analysing and identifying the transport impacts of the Proposed Development. Clarify how this period is defined and controlled within the draft DCO. |
| TT.2.9 | The Applicant | Main Development Site - Parking Controls Given the reliance on mode share targets to control workforce traffic and travel it is important that consideration is being given to limiting the parking available for construction workers on site. Clarify the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) Within the DCO the provision of parking on the Main Development Site will be controlled to ensure mode share targets are not exceeded;(ii) Within the DCO how the use of the temporary park and ride site on the LEEIE is controlled, throughout the whole construction period;(iii) Does the DCO prevent the creation of additional parking areas on site during the construction period; and(iv) Does the DCO prevent the use of any of the permanent parking areas being used during the construction period for construction workers? |
| TT.2.10 | The Applicant | Sizewell Link Road - Vehicle Distance Travelled Comparison In paragraph 1.9.18 [REP5-114] Table 6 on electronic page 498 of [REP2-108] is referred to. Please explain why in the Assessment Table in Appendix A of that document why Alignment W results in 11% more mileage than Alignment Z, which is said to give the least route mileage of all options, given Table 5 [REP5-114] of the latest submission clearly shows the contrary? |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|---------------------|---|
| TT.2.11 | The Applicant | Sizewell Link Road - Route W Route – Vehicle Routeing Paragraph 1.9.18 [REP5-114] The first bullet point refers to additional HGV and bus traffic through Yoxford. Given the Early Years limit on the B1122 is proposed to be 600 HDV /day two way, if both the HGV and buses from the north were to use the B1122 it would be a total of 329 HDV two way /day, why it would not be a reasonable scenario for either HGVs or buses (or both) from the north to use the B1122. Explain why this was not considered in the assessment of route choices given that it is considered acceptable during the early years? |
| TT.2.12 | The Applicant | Sizewell Link Road - Vehicle Distance Travelled Comparison As stated in Table 6 on electronic page 498 of [REP2-108] minimising route mileage is an important sustainability factor. Table 4 [REP5-114] shows only 2 peak hours and Table 5 shows the vehicle kms savings per day. Provide a calculation of how both of these translate to the whole construction period so comparison can be made for the whole of construction for cars, LGV and HGV. |
| TT.2.13 | The Applicant | Sizewell Link Road - Journey Time Comparisons Appendix 10 [REP2-108] also states that the modelling undertaken considered journey times and some limited information is provided in the Appendix. Can the outputs of the model be used to calculate relative journey time differences for Route W and the SLR, if so provide the daily and total construction period outputs for the modelled journey times. |
| TT.2.14 | The Applicant | Sizewell Link Road – Temporary Haul Road. At ISH 2 there was mention of the route of the Sizewell Link Road being used as a temporary haul road to move cut and fill around the SLR site and the temporary construction areas stockpiles. If this is correct it could lead to additional HGV movements on the section of the B1122 between the end of the SLR and the site entrance. Explain further: <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) How the haul road route would be used and whether such HGV movements have been assessed; and(ii) Any implications for HGV numbers on the B1122. |
| TT.2.15 | The Applicant | Sizewell Link Road / B1122 – Traffic Corridor Analysis |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | In the written summary of oral submissions at paragraph 1.3.24 [REP5-107] it was stated that a response to the ExA question on this matter would be provided in the written submissions responding to actions at ISH2. Please signpost this response or provide the response. |
| TT.2.16 | The Applicant, Suffolk County Council | B1125 / B1122 – Junction Priorities Create Consulting [REP5-258] on behalf of the Bacon Family express concern that the new arrangement with the link from the B1125 to the SLR alters the priorities where it meets the B1122. They suggest that the priority arrangements with the B1122 would make the B1125 a direct link and thus they consider it would serve to encourage the use of the B1125. It is understood discussions are ongoing with respect to the impact on the B1125. Could the issue of the junction priority for both legs of the B1122 from the new B1125 link be examined in this context? |
| TT.2.17 | The Applicant, Suffolk County Council | Yoxford Roundabout - Size of Roundabout The Heveningham Hall Estate (HHE)'s representation [REP5-278] maintains their view that a smaller diameter roundabout would serve the predicted traffic flows. Previous responses on this issue have focused on whether the proposed roundabout is acceptable. The point being made relates to whether a smaller roundabout with less land take could be operationally acceptable. Respond to this specific suggestion. |
| TT.2.18 | The Applicant, Suffolk County Council | Highway / Traffic Management / Public Realm Schemes – Implementation Set out the expected implementation dates of the highway / traffic management / public realm schemes identified in the Deed of Obligation or the DCO that are not already shown in the Implementation Plan. |
| TT.2.19 | The Applicant, Network Rail | Rail Delivery – Timescales. In the Network Rail Update [AS-296] it is stated that "the Parties have signed a legal frameworks agreement and have agreed to work together with the aim of delivering 2 tpd by December 2022 and 4 tpd per day by August 2023 (i.e. to be operational)". Set out in paragraph 1.2.1 of the oral submissions from ISH2 [REP5-107] is that four trains per day is expected from March 2024. In addition, in the Material Imports and Modal Split paper, Appendix A [REP5-114] at the top of Page 7 it states that "It is necessary for the rail capacity to be provided by October 2023 (two trains per day) and March 2024 (four trains |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|---------------------|---|
| | | <p>per day), otherwise the HGV limits would constrain the ability to bring material to the Main Development Site in sufficient quantities to support the construction programme.”</p> <p>Please confirm the agreed implementation dates and comment on the deliverability of these dates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Two trains / day; and (ii) Four trains / day |
| TT.2.20 | The Applicant | <p>Material Imports and Modal Split Paper Appendix A [REP5-114] – HGV payload</p> <p>The footnote at the bottom of Page 6 states “1 train = 1,250t payload. 1 bulk HGV = 27t payload. Therefore 1,250 / 27 = 46 deliveries or 92 movements “. Explain why this differs from the original payload assessment of 18.5t per HGV?</p> |
| TT.2.21 | The Applicant | <p>Material Imports and Modal Split Paper Appendix A [REP5-114] – Enabling Works.</p> <p>Are these the works now proposed to take place in Year 0 of the Implementation Plan?</p> |
| TT.2.22 | The Applicant | <p>Material Imports and Modal Split paper Appendix A [REP5-114] – Enabling Works Backfill.</p> <p>Section 4.2.1 suggests changes to export materials levels. Is this something that has changed or are these quantities already included in the assessments undertaken. If so, signpost where such materials movement has been assessed.</p> |
| TT.2.23 | The Applicant | <p>Material Imports and Modal Split Paper Appendix A [REP5-114] – Material Quantities.</p> <p>The Table on page 22 shows the bulk materials and on 24 the non-bulk materials. Provide explanation why the total amount of freight shown at the bottom of the Table on page 24 is 13,247,555t, is greater than the stated 12.1Mt stated in Table 2.1.</p> |
| TT.2.24 | The Applicant | <p>Material Imports and Modal Split Paper Appendix A [REP5-114] – HGV sizes</p> <p>It is assumed that the analysis provided has made some assumptions off HGV sizes to move the required freight. What size of HGV has been assumed for;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Bulk materials; and (ii) Non bulk materials. |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|---------------------|--|
| TT.2.25 | The Applicant | <p>Material Imports and Modal Split Paper Appendix A [REP5-114] – HGV numbers</p> <p>The profile charts provide graphical representation of HGV numbers but not in a way they can be easily equated to the weight of material transported as HGV is such a wide classification. Provide a tabulated assessment quarter by quarter of the numbers of HGVs, the weight of materials carried, and the percentage of HGV's over the 7.5t for each quarter.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt the ExA is seeking to establish a clear relationship between the HGV caps proposed and the required material quantities that would be delivered by road, considering the commitment of not more than 40% by road. As discussed at ISH2 using the average 18.5t capacity for HGV the caps as currently set out would in theory allow for most if not all freight required to be carried by road.</p> |
| TT.2.26 | The Applicant | <p>Assessment of Fear and Intimidation – Vehicle Speeds</p> <p>In paragraph 1.10.7 [REP5 -115] it is stated that change in magnitude of average vehicular speed has been scoped out of the assessment. Signpost where this scoping exercise was undertaken in Chapter 10 [APP-198].</p> |
| TT.2.27 | The Applicant | <p>Assessment of Fear and Intimidation – Vehicle Speeds</p> <p>Table 10.2 [APP-198] sets out the assessment of magnitude of impacts for transport. The Fear and Intimidation Impact is based on the Table on Page 37 of the IMEA Guidance. The Table in the IMEA guidance has a footnote to say, "The traffic components can be weighed to give an overall score of fear and intimidation corresponding to particular combinations of traffic flow speed and composition." This suggests that it is the overall combination of these factors that needs to be taken into account and not each factor in isolation. It is stated in paragraph 1.10.4 [REP5-115] only if increases in speed occurred would speed be considered an important factor in the consideration of fear and intimidation. On the basis of what is stated in 1.10.4 explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) The circumstances any development being considered could be predicted to increase vehicle speeds to the magnitudes set out in Table 10.2; and(ii) Where in the IMEA Guidance the change in vehicle speed is referenced as what should be taken into account rather than as it states the average speed of traffic. |

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

| ExQ2 | Question to: | Question: |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| | | (iii) Where in the Guidance or Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-198] it is stated that the three assessments factors listed under the Fear and Intimidation are to be considered individually and not in overall combination as suggested by the IMEA Guidelines |
| TT.2.28 | The Applicant, Suffolk County Council | Environmental Statement (ES) – Assessment of Impacts Paragraph 1.10.8 [REP5-115] sets out that there are ongoing discussions with respect to the assessment of transport impacts set out in the ES. Set out the areas of disagreement and also what progress has been made in resolution. |
| TT.2.29 | The Applicant | Outage Car Parking – Transport Assessment There was discussion at ISH5 about the permanent provision of two outage car parks, one each for Sizewell B and C. Following that discussion and taking into account comments made by Suffolk County Council [REP5-171], explain why it is considered that a double outage is considered so likely that it meets the criteria for exceptional circumstances in paragraph 5.9.10 in NPS EN-1, but it has not been assessed in the operational stage within the Transport Assessment. A double outage could have significant effect on operational traffic generation and the assessment of impacts undertaken. Should such a scenario not be considered by way of a sensitivity test of the assessments? |