

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

| <b>ExQ2</b>  | <b>Question to:</b>                           | <b>Question:</b>  |
|--|---|---|
| <b>DCO.2 Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) – comments on the Applicants’ responses to ExQs1 (all para numbers are prefixed DCO.)</b> |   |   |
| DCO.2.0  | The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Natural England, MMO | Attention is drawn to the Commentary on the DCO which includes commentary on the Deed of Obligation   |
| DCO.2.1  | Applicant, Environment Agency                 | 1.35; “The reason for the inclusion of the specific exemption is that the Applicant proposes to divert an existing main river, Middleton Watercourse, as part of the construction of the Sizewell link road. Such a diversion will involve interference with the bed or banks of a main river”. Should the article not therefore be limited to the Middleton Watercourse? |
| DCO.2.2  | Applicant                                     | 1.36. It would be helpful to warn that silence is deemed to be consent in that case.  |
| DCO.2.3  | Applicant, Maritime and Coastguard Agency     | 1.43 – please provide an update on the position. The SoCG indicated much work had yet to be done.   |
| DCO.2.4  | MMO   | 1.44 – please will the MMO consider and confirm whether the coordinates are correct.  |
| DCO.2.5  | Applicant                                     | 1.49 – noted. But as the Applicants’ counsel pointed out during ISH7 the system is not bound by precedent. Please will the Applicant consider and respond to the substantive points in this question.   |
| DCO.2.6  | Applicant, ESC, SCC                           | 1.54 – Please update the ExA on the position. In particular what are the views of the councils on fees?   |
| DCO.2.7  | Applicant, SCC                                | 1.56(iv). Noted, but what about the status of the road being altered, i.e. the A12. Is the SofS or a strategic highway authority the highway authority (s.22(3)(b)? Does this affect the approach?  |
| DCO.2.8  | Applicant                                     | 1.66 - The clarificatory drafting did not appear to be in Revision 4. Is it in the latest version?  |
| DCO.2.9  | Applicant, ESC                                | 1.75 – The ExA will consider this response further and in the light of ISH1.  |
| DCO.2.10   | Applicant, ESC                                | 1.97 – what is the position if notice of end is not given?  |
| DCO.2.11   | Applicant, MMO                                | 1.106 – should not s.72(7) then be disapplied?  |
| DCO.2.12<br>p  | Applicant, MMO                                | 1.112 – can wording be added to explain what is meant by rock material from a recognised source?  |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>                            | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|--|--|
| DCO.2.13    | MMO  | 1.117 – is the MMO satisfied the coordinates are right?  |
| DCO.2.14    | Applicant, ESC                                 | 1.128 – “In the Applicant's view, the proposed Natural Environment Improvement Fund in its final form is likely to meet the policy tests for obligations set out in National Policy Statement”. “Likely” sounds rather tentative.  |
| DCO.2.15    | Applicant, ESC, SCC                            | <p>(i) Please include the TEMMPP in the documents to be certified by the SofS.</p> <p>(ii) There are some concerns about including the entire ES as one certified document given its size. Evidence of that is the length of the ES Signposting Document [REP2-025] at 108 pages. Should it be broken down in the certification provisions?</p> <p>(iii) Additionally, given its complexity, the ExA would welcome views from the Applicant, ESC and SCC on the inclusion and certification of a guide if a suitable document exists in the examination documentation.</p>   |
| <b>FR.2</b> | <b>Flood risk, ground water, surface water</b> |  |
| FR.2.0      | The Applicant                                  | <p><b>Northumbrian Water Limited (NWL) – Potable Water Supply [REP5-257]</b></p> <p>In its representation, Walker Morris LLP, on behalf of NWL state that the Water Industry National Environment Programme (WINEP) abstraction sustainability investigations, has not yet concluded, so it is unable to confirm that the water requirements of Sizewell C can be met. Even assuming the provision of the required amount of water was possible the additional infrastructure required to supply Sizewell C would likely take until 2026 at the earliest to deliver</p> <p>Explain:</p> <p>(i) How will water supply be delivered until such a time NWL supply can be delivered; and</p> <p>(ii) How water requirements will be delivered if NWL supply is not possible in part or in total.</p> |
| FR.2.1      | The Applicant                                  | <b>Water Supply – Non Potable Water</b>  |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>   | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|---|--|
|             |   | Set out the non-potable water requirements for Sizewell C and explain how this demand will be met.   |
| FR.2.2      | The Applicant   | <b>Water Supply</b><br>Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) [REP2-481i] set out their concerns with respect to the ability of the project to have a sustainable water supply for both potable and non-potable water. Their concerns focus on the ability of the water supply solution not to impact on the water supply for the residents and other users within the region. Explain how the proposed water supply solutions will not adversely impact on other users. |
| FR.2.3      | The Applicant   | <b>Main Platform – Temporary Coastal Defence Construction</b><br>Explain how the risk to construction workers installing the temporary sheet pile wall sea defences will be mitigated utilising the measures set out in the Flood Risk Emergency Plan.   |
| FR.2.4      | Environment Agency  | <b>SSSI Crossing – Adaptive Design</b><br>Appendix J [REP5-120] This document sets out a change to the height of the future adaptive design required for the SSSI crossing from the initially proposed height of 10.5m AOD to a height of 8.6m AOD. It also provides an initial design solution. Are you satisfied that this is an acceptable change to the adaptive design?   |
| FR.2.5      | Suffolk County Council,<br>Environment Agency, East<br>Suffolk Internal Drainage<br>Board | <b>Main Development Site (MDS) – Water Management Zone (WMZ) Summary</b><br>Appendix D [REP5-120] provides details of the WMZ infiltration basins for the site. Provide any relevant comments including any areas where the information provided needs further clarification.  |
| FR.2.6      | Environment Agency  | <b>Main Development Site FRA- Additional Hydrological Review.</b><br>Appendix I [REP5-120] this document is submitted in response to issues raised by the Environment Agency with respect to hydrology comments on the MDS FRA. Does the submitted information address your concerns?  |
| FR.2.7      | Suffolk County Council,<br>Environment Agency   | <b>Main Development Site – Temporary Marine Outfall (TMO)</b><br>The Applicant has submitted a technical note (Appendix E) [REP5-120] concerning the Temporary Marine Surface Water Outfall. Provide any relevant comments on the justification for and operation of the TMO.  |
| FR.2.8      | The Applicant   | <b>Water Monitoring and Response Strategy (WMRS) [AS-236]</b>  |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>  | <b>Question:</b>  |
|-------------|--|---|
|             |  | The EA [REP2-136] comments that the WMRS would benefit from inclusion of the rationale for the groundwater monitoring locations selected and how these will be used to ensure effective ongoing monitoring. In addition, they also suggest additional detail is given on how the monitoring plan can be used to assess water level on specific ecology. Provide a response on these points.   |
| FR.2.9      | The Applicant  | <b>Water Levels Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (WLMMP)</b><br>In response to Suffolk Friends of the Earth [REP2-463] in Table 15.2 [REP3-042] a WLMMP was stated to be submitted at Deadline 5. When will this be submitted?  |
| FR.2.10     | Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board, East Suffolk Council | <b>Ancillary Construction Area (ACA) (or LEEIE) Drainage Strategy Technical Note.</b><br>Appendix B [REP5-120] sets out the drainage design for the ACA. Provide any comments you have in relation to the strategy set out in this document.  |
| FR.2.11     | The Applicant, Environment Agency  | <b>Sizewell Marshes SSSI - Soil Water Monitoring</b><br>Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth during ISH7 and in their submission [REP5-271] questioned the suitability of the soil water level monitoring undertaken in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. Provide a response to their expressed concerns and also comment on the suitability of the assessments undertaken for the Project.          |
| FR.2.12     | Environment Agency, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board   | <b>Sizewell Drain Water Management Control Structure</b><br>Appendix C [REP5-120] does the submitted document provide the degree of certainty that the outline design options for the proposed control structure on the realigned Sizewell Drain, demonstrates the ability to enable fine tuning of water levels in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, subject to the required Land Drainage Consent? |
| FR.2.13     | Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency   | <b>Sizewell Link Road Flood Risk Assessment Addendum Revision 2.0 [REP5-045]</b><br>Please provide comments of acceptability and coverage following the submission of this revision.  |
| FR.2.14     | Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency   | <b>Sizewell Link Road Preliminary Drainage Design Note</b><br>Appendix F [REP5-120] provides an initial assessment of the drainage design for the Sizewell Link Road. Provide any comments you have on this note.   |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>                                | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|--|--|
| FR.2.15     | Suffolk County Council,<br>Environment Agency      | <b>Two Village Bypass Preliminary Drainage Design Note</b><br>Appendix G [REP5-120] provides an initial assessment of the drainage design for the Two Village Bypass. Provide any comments you have on this note.  |
| FR.2.16     | Suffolk County Council,<br>Environment Agency      | <b>Yoxford Roundabout Updated Drainage Strategy</b><br>Appendix H [REP5-120] provides an updated assessment of the drainage strategy for Yoxford roundabout. Provide any comments you have on this updated strategy.   |
| FR.2.17     | The Applicant                                      | <b>Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [REP2-033]</b><br>Written Representation [REP2-384] NJ Bacon Farms, asked about the impact of drainage of inland water. In response in Paragraph 20.4.15 [REP3-042] states that a drainage and irrigation specialist has been instructed to understand existing drainage/irrigation infrastructure, and to agree a mitigation/reinstatement strategy for irrigation and drainage infrastructure. Explain:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Given the links to the wider drainage strategy contained in the ODS should this role and development of any required mitigation/reinstatement strategy for irrigation and drainage infrastructure not be part of the ODS? and</li> <li>(ii) Is the mitigation /strategy something the Applicant intends to submit into the Examination and if so at what Deadline?</li> </ul> |
| FR.2.18     | The Applicant, Environment Agency, Natural England | <b>Flooding – Landowner Consents</b><br>In response to ExQ1 FR.1.14 the EA [REP2-136] raised a concern over flood risk to land. They requested that the landowners should be consulted, and their legal easements sought for increase flood depths. Please provide an update on the progress with respect to EA guidance on thresholds and what action has been taken negotiating with relevant landowners and Natural England.  |
| FR.2.19     | The Applicant                                      | <b>Northern Park and Ride Flood Risk</b><br>Darsham Parish Council [REP2-051] express concern that the Applicant have proposed a storage basin with overflow to existing watercourses running under the railway. The underlying geology prevents natural drainage within the site and is likely to lead to existing water courses being overwhelmed in heavy rain. They state that the Applicant does not appear to acknowledge the potential flood risk to the railway (due to run-off from   |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b>                      | <b>Question to:</b> | <b>Question:</b>   |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|--|
|                                  |                     | the NPR). Has this been considered in the Flood Risk Assessment of the Northern Park and Ride?   |
| FR.2.20                          | The Applicant       | <p><b>Extreme Storm Surges</b></p> <p>Mr. Jones [REP2-489] questions whether enough consideration has been given the possibility of extreme storm surges in the flood risk assessment of the Main Development Site. Explain what consideration has been given to the possibility of such extreme weather events in the flood risk assessments.</p>   |
| FR.2.21                          | The Applicant       | <p><b>Pakenham (Additional Land) – Changes to Hydrology</b></p> <p>Clarke &amp; Simpson, on behalf of their clients [REP3-118], set out that any hydrological changes will have adverse impact on farming in the immediate area. How will creation of fen meadow habitat at Pakenham be managed to minimise any impact on the hydrology?</p>   |
| <b>HW.2 Health and wellbeing</b> |                     |  |
| HW.2.0                           | The Applicant, SCC  | <p><b>Severance Fear and Intimidation</b></p> <p>In light of the concern expressed at the ISH for Transport regarding the approach taken to the assessment on severance and Fear and Intimidation and the Question raised at TT.2.27.</p> <p>(i) Please advise whether it is regarded that the guidance has been properly used in understanding the implications for severance and the potential for fear and intimidation.</p> <p>(ii) If the ExA concludes that the Guidance has not been properly followed what the implications could be for the assessment and the weight the ExA should apply to the evidence presented to date.</p> |
| HW.2.1                           | The Applicant, SCC  | <p><b>Severance</b></p> <p>(i) In light of the concerns expressed by a number of Parish Councils please advise of the progress of the work that has developed on the schemes at Wickham Market, Little Glemham and Marlesford and elsewhere along the proposed transport corridor.</p> <p>(ii) Are any of the schemes likely to be presented to the Examination setting out the details of proposed mitigation?</p>  |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>  | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|--|--|
|             |  | (iii) It is noted that a number are referred to in the draft obligation, but this does not include precise detail of what mitigation might be forthcoming,   |
| HW.2.2      | Applicant, ESC, SCC  | <p><b>Dust Monitoring and Particulate Matter</b></p> <p>(i) In light of the advice from Public Health England in responses to FWQ AQ.1.35 and AQ.1.42 can you confirm that the Dust Management Plans will include sources of dust emissions; the location of sensitive health receptors; monitoring standards and guidelines; and a reporting schedule which allows for timely intervention if elevated concentrations are recorded.</p>   |
| HW.2.3      | Applicant, Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG, West Suffolk CCG            | <p><b>Health and Wellbeing Working Group</b></p> <p>Please advise on the progress in respect of</p> <p>(i) Availability and calculation of a contingency fund to support mitigation and monitoring of affects which materialise above the levels identified as referred to by the CCG in [REP5-214] further response to HW.1.1</p> <p>(ii) Whether a method has been agreed to monitor journey times and if this were to identify increases a contingency fund has been agreed?</p> <p>(iii) The latest in respect of governance arrangements for the Health and Wellbeing Working Group</p> |
| HW.2.4      | Applicant ((i) only), Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG, West Suffolk CCG | <p><b>Onsite Occupational Health facility</b></p> <p>(i) Has agreement been reached regarding the specification and procurement of the Occupational Health Facility?</p> <p>(ii) Are you content with the mechanisms to secure the provision and timing of delivery of the onsite OH facility?</p>   |
| HW.2.5      | Applicant, Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG, West Suffolk CCG            | <p><b>Quality of Data</b></p> <p>In response to HW.1.11 and subsequent WR can you advise of the latest position in respect of whether the data used to support the assessment has now been fully agreed, or whether work is ongoing. In the event work is ongoing what timeframe do you anticipate coming to a conclusion on this matter?</p>  |
| <b>HE.2</b> | <b>Historic environment (terrestrial and marine)</b>                 |  |
| HE.2.0      | ESC, SCC, Historic England   | <b>MDS: Requirement 3: Archaeology and Peat</b>  |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>             | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|---------------------------------|--|
|             |                                 | Noting discussions at ISH1 on 6 July 2021 and the subsequent submission by the Applicant [REP5-106], are you content with the inclusion of the term 'general accordance' in Requirement 3 [REP5-029]?  |
| HE.2.1      | Historic England                | <b>MDS: Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation</b><br>Please review and comment on amendments made at [REP3-022]. Are you satisfied that your comments made in December 2020 and in WR [REP2-138] have been adequately addressed?  |
| HE.2.2      | The Applicant, SCCAS            | <b>MDS: Lower Abbey Farm</b><br>Have site specific mitigation proposals been agreed with SCCAS in respect of Lower Abbey Farm?   |
| HE.2.3      | SCC                             | <b>MDS: SSSI Crossing</b><br>Confirmation was provided at ExQ1 HE.1.10 [REP5-120] that the SSSI crossing site will be subject to a site-specific Written Scheme of Investigation. Does this allay the concerns raised at [REP3-084]?   |
| HE.2.4      | The Applicant, Historic England | <b>MDS: Evaluation Trenching</b><br>Historic England - Noting the response made by the Applicant to ExQ1 HE.1.5 [REP5-120], are you satisfied with the proposed approach for when pre-determination investigation has not been possible?<br>Applicant – Please confirm the securing mechanism for this approach?       |
| HE.2.5      | National Trust                  | <b>MDS: Coastguard Cottages</b><br>Noting the response of the Applicant to ExQ1 HE.1.16 [REP2-100], are you in agreement that important views from the observation tower will remain unaffected and that the proposed development will not prevent the appreciation of the historic interest of the observation tower? |
| HE.2.6      | The Applicant, SCCAS            | <b>MDS: Peat Strategy</b><br>Please confirm where differences remain in terms of the proposed Peat Strategy (Appendix 16G of [APP-275]).   |
| HE.2.7      | The Applicant                   | <b>Two Village Bypass: Farnham Manor</b>   |



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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>                                | <b>Question:</b>  |
|-------------|--|---|
|             |  | Please expand on the statement that the primary architectural interest is inherent in the standing building and does not relate to the wider landscape (paragraph 9.4.59 of [APP-432]).   |
| HE.2.8      | SCC, ESC   | <b>Sizewell Link Road: Hill Farmhouse</b><br>Noting the response made at [REP3-044], do you concur that in respect of the historic interest the construction and operation of the SLR would result in a minor adverse effect which would not be significant?  |
| HE.2.9      | SCCAS  | <b>Sizewell B Relocated Facilities: Pillbox Field</b><br>Please provide a response to ExQ1 HE.1.18 [REP3-046].  |
| HE.2.10     | The Applicant, SCC, ESC, Historic England          | <b>Enhancement to Proposed Mitigation Schemes</b><br>Please provide an update on discussions regarding potential enhancement of mitigation schemes for the below assets:<br>(i) Theberton Hall<br>(ii) Abbey Cottage<br>(iii) Farnham Hall<br>(iv) Hill Farmhouse<br>(v) Barrow Cemetery Group (FMF site)   |
| <b>LI.2</b> | <b>Landscape impact, visual effects and design</b> |   |
| LI.2.0      | The Applicant                                      | <b>Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</b><br>On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised NPPF. In respect of design, the thrust of the changes sees the inclusion of policies to achieve high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places. The wording for conserving and enhancing Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty has been modified to ensure specifically development within their settings should be limited and sensitively located, where permitted, which avoids or minimises adverse impacts on designated areas.<br>Please provide comment on amended paragraph 176 of the NPPF and confirm how the complies. |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>  | <b>Question:</b>  |
|-------------|--|---|
|             | TASC response  | In TASC's opinion the new para.176 NPPF strengthens the weight to attach to the conflict with policy SCLP6.3 Suffolk Local Plan which TASC identified at para.28 of their written summary for the Landscape ISH [REP5-296].   |
| LI.2.1      | SCC, ESC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, National Trust, Stop Sizewell C, TASC | <b>Additional Construction Visualisations</b><br>Additional illustrative day and night-time construction photomontage visualisations are to be produced from four Representative Viewpoints [REP5-117]. Please comment on the suitability of the selected locations.  |
|             | TASC response  | In TASC's opinion the provision of visualisations are useful but are limited in scope given the difficulty in trying to convey the full impact of such a huge development. For this reason, TASC were pleased that the ExA decided to visit the HPC site during construction to get a far better appreciation of how such a development would sit in an AONB setting and the impact on the AONB's designated features of scenic beauty, landscape quality and tranquillity.<br><br>In terms of the adequacy of the locations selected, we defer to the AONB Partnership in their assessment. However, we would like to see additional visualisations from:-<br>The beach at the mid-point of the SZC development; RSPB Minsmere's Whin Hill; The tank traps at the northern end of the site and the Sizewell Walks from the northern end of Thorpeness golf course. |
| LI.2.2      | The Applicant  | <b>Design Council – Additional Design Review</b><br>The importance of the nationally designated landscape is fully acknowledged by the ExA. As such, it is not unreasonable to expect thorough and detailed reviews of the proposed design to have occurred during both pre-application and examination phases. If further reviews are to be undertaken consideration should be given to whether a wider review, rather than just the accommodation campus, would be beneficial.  |
| LI.2.3      | The Applicant, SCC, ESC  | <b>Design Review Panel</b><br>Please provide an update regarding discussions on the proposed role of a design review panel.   |
| LI.2.4      | ESC, SCC   | <b>Design Review Panel</b>  |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>  | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|--|--|
|             |  | Paragraph 1.4.18 of [REP5-110] confirms that the design review panel would be used to provide independent support for the processing of design submissions defined by the requirements. Are you content with the proposed timing of the role?  |
| LI.2.5      | The Applicant  | <p><b>Design Guardianship Role</b></p> <p>The proposed retention of key members of the design team in a 'design guardianship' role is noted [REP5-110]. Please confirm what consultation on this role has been and what the securing mechanism for the role would be?</p>  |
| LI.2.6      | The Applicant, Pro Corda, English Heritage Trust                       | <p><b>Leiston Abbey – Landscape Strategy/Masterplan</b></p> <p>Noting the responses made in respect of ExQ1 LI.1.124 [REP3-046], please provide an update of discussions regarding a proposed whole site landscape strategy/masterplan.</p>  |
| LI.2.7      | ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, Stop Sizewell C, TASC | <p><b>SSSI Crossing – Design Amendment</b></p> <p>Please review the amended SSSI crossing design [REP5-010] and provide comment.</p>   |
|             | TASC response  | <p>TASC preface our comments on the SSSI crossing with our overriding opinion that the access road planned, results in too great a loss of AONB and SSSI. TASC remind the ExA that while Sizewell was listed within EN6 as a potentially suitable site, we draw attention to TASC's ISH 5 Landscape submission [REP5-296] para 15d) which says, in respect of EN6 Annex C [para C.8.69]: "The assessment expressly excluded consideration of the access road impact, indeed it says: "there is no presumption that development will take place in the area of the access road". It is the access road that results in the need for the SSSI crossing and the loss of SSSI within the AONB. Loss of SSSI cannot be said to enhance the purpose of the AONB's designation nor help with wildlife recovery.</p> <p>Regarding the SSSI crossing design in REP5-010, whilst little information is provided, the illustrations reinforce TASC's opinion that the structure is totally at odds with the setting and attributes of the AONB. The embankments have a man-made appearance so do not accord with the natural beauty of the landscape. TASC refer to EN1 para 5.9.9 which states "AONBs have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty." This is confirmed in the NPPF at para 176.</p> |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>  | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|--|--|
|             |  | TASC's view is that there should be a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment so that the damage to the special features that resulted in the AONB's designation can be fully examined.   |
| LI.2.8      | The Applicant  | <p><b>SSSI Crossing – Design Amendment</b></p> <p>Please confirm what assessment has been undertaken in respect of potential landscape and visual impact(s) due to the amended design of the SSSI crossing [REP5-010]. In addition, please provide visualisations which clearly depict the proposed sheet pile barrier.</p>  |
| LI.2.9      | The Applicant, ESC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, Stop Sizewell C, TASC | <p><b>Alternative Outage Car Park Note</b></p> <p>Please review and comment on the content of the SCC submission [REP5-171].</p>   |
|             | TASC response  | <p>TASC preface our comments on the outage car park note with our overriding opinion that the planned access road results in too great a loss of AONB. TASC remind the ExA that while Sizewell was listed within EN6 as a potentially suitable site, we draw attention to TASC's ISH 5 Landscape submission [REP5-296] para 15d) which says, in respect of EN6 Annex C [para C.8.69]: "The assessment expressly excluded consideration of the access road impact", indeed it says: "there is no presumption that development will take place in the area of the access road." It is the route of the access road that makes it possible for the car park to be located in its proposed location within the AONB. Loss of land within the AONB for a car park cannot be said to enhance the purpose of the AONB's designation nor contribute to wildlife recovery.</p> <p>TASC refer to EN1 para 5.9.9 which states, "AONBs have been confirmed by the Government as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty." This is confirmed in the NPPF at para 176.</p> <p>TASC are of the opinion that both the outage and the operational car parks should not be sited on Goose Hill. The fact that car parks are proposed for Goose Hill, demonstrates the Applicant's proposed SZC development is too big for the site available.</p> <p>TASC's comments regarding SCC's document should not be considered as an endorsement of the SZC project to which TASC remain totally opposed. TASC consider that SCC have presented a good case for why the outage car park does not need to be, and should not be, in the AONB. Indeed, TASC consider the same alternatives should be applied to the</p> |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b> | <b>Question:</b>  |
|-------------|---------------------|---|
|             |                     | operational car park on Goose Hill- a further alternative siting for the operational car park is to consider building the new training centre and visitor centre in Leiston, thus freeing up the land that those buildings are currently planned to occupy as part of the Sizewell B relocation of facilities.  |
| LI.2.10     | The Applicant       | <b>Outage Car Park</b><br>Noting the content of paragraph 4 of SCC's Alternative Outage Car Park note [REP5-171], please provide further detail as to why, if an outage clash occurs, clashes would continue until another forced or unplanned outage.  |
| LI.2.11     | The Applicant       | <b>Outage Car Park</b><br>Please explain why a softer palette of surface finish materials is proposed for the outage car park (paragraph 8.8.18 of REP5-073)?   |
| LI.2.12     | The Applicant       | <b>Power Export Connection</b><br>Please provide a response on the suggestion by SCC for an additional Requirement to enable the final form of the power export connection to be subject to post-consent approval [REP5-176].   |
| LI.2.13     | The Applicant       | <b>Turbine Halls and Operational Service Centre</b><br>The amendment to Detailed Built Development Principle 56 [REP5-070] in respect of the discussion and agreement of the colour palette with ESC is noted. However, as commented on by SCC [REP5-172], please explain on how this Principle fulfils the statement made at paragraph 6.17.9 of [REP5-070] in respect of the identification and range of colours and hues for the turbine halls. Is it intended to submit these details into Examination? |
| LI.2.14     | The Applicant       | <b>Interim Fuel Store</b><br>The parameters of the Interim Fuel Store, content of Requirement 12 [REP5-029] and the response to ExQ1 LI.1.12 [REP3-046] are noted. Nonetheless, given the prominence, scale and longevity of this structure the submission of additional detail into examination, including colour and finish, would be beneficial. Please provide a response.<br>Please also confirm whether the design of the Interim Fuel Store at Hinkley Point C has been finalised?                   |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>    | <b>Question:</b>  |
|-------------|------------------------|---|
| LI.2.15     | Emma and Justin Dowley | <b>Borrow Pits</b><br>Appendix D of [REP5-117] provides information regarding construction and post-constriction activities. Please confirm if the supplementary information provides the additional detail requested at [REP2-344]?  |
| LI.2.16     | The Applicant          | <b>Borrow Pits</b><br>Please respond to the query raised by Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council at [REP5-286] regarding the removal of the bunds, acoustic fencing and perimeter fencing.   |
| LI.2.17     | The Applicant          | <b>Dome Design</b><br>Paragraph 2.11.10 of the Design and Access Statement [REP5-070] refers to the discolouration and aging of Sizewell A structure. Paragraph C.3.3 of the Concrete Note (Appendix C of [REP5-117]) states that the concrete for the proposed domes would be inert and stable with regards to natural weathering and weathering effects would be minimal. Does this mean that the concrete domes would not be subject to a similar aging and weathering process evident at Sizewell A?  |
| LI.2.18     | The Applicant          | <b>Dome Information</b><br>As requested at the ISH5 on 13 July 2021, please provide photographic examples of concrete domes in-situ.  |
| LI.2.19     | The Applicant          | <b>Leiston Sports Facility</b><br>Appendix 13G [APP-217] states that the proposed sports facility at Leiston was scoped out of the assessment as only minor changes to the character and fabric of the site would occur. Noting the need for construction lighting and the long-term use of flood lighting, please signpost where in the Lighting Management Plan [APP-182] and/or the Technical Note on Indicative Lighting Modelling [REP3-057] specific regard is given to this proposed development.<br>In addition, please confirm the following details:<br>(vi) Proposed height of flood lighting<br>(vii) Proposed lighting provision and illuminance<br>(viii) Height of surrounding trees |
| LI.2.20     | The Applicant          | <b>Navigation and Aviation Lighting</b>   |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>   | <b>Question:</b>  |
|-------------|---|---|
|             |   | Please confirm whether it is intended to submit full details of navigation and aviation lighting into the examination? Is it necessary to consult with the Civil Aviation Authority in respect of the wording of Requirement 5B [REP5-029]?   |
| LI.2.21     | Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council   | <p><b>Dark Skies</b></p> <p>Please advise when the Dark Skies report, as discussed in [REP3-138], is to be submitted into examination.</p>  |
| LI.2.22     | ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, National Trust   | <p><b>Design and Access Statement –Overarching Design Principles and Detailed Built Development Principles</b></p> <p>Several amendments and additions have been made to Tables 5.1 and 5.3 of the DAS [REP5-070]. Please review and comment on the amendments and additions.</p>   |
| LI.2.23     | ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, National Trust   | <p><b>Design and Access Statement –Overarching Design Principles</b></p> <p>In respect of Overarching Design Principles 17-21 [REP5-070], are you satisfied that the proposed design of the MDS meets the objectives of these principles?</p>   |
| LI.2.24     | ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council, Stop Sizewell C, TASC | <p><b>Design and Access Statement – Accommodation Campus Design Principles</b></p> <p>Please review and comment on the revised design principles contained within Table A.1 [REP5-075].</p>   |
|             | TASC response   | <p>The accommodation campus is situated in the setting of the AONB. In TASC’s opinion the 4/3 storey accommodation blocks, set out over a large area, a two storey car park, staff canteen, gym, community hub, CHP plant etc all conflict with the July 2021 NPPF para 176, which states in respect of AONBs; <i>“The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.”</i> In TASC’s view, the revised design principles have done little to reduce the adverse impacts of this scheme on the AONB.</p> <p>Bridleway 19 is an important, historic and much-used link between Sizewell Gap and Minsmere/Dunwich from which users can appreciate the special features of the AONB. TASC consider that the realignment of Bridleway 19 will diminish the enjoyment of those using the PROW, adversely impacting the ‘AONB experience’.</p> |

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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>     | <b>Question:</b>  |
|-------------|-------------------------|---|
|             |                         | For the above reasons the ExA should give great weight to the adverse impacts on the AONB due to the accommodation campus.  |
| LI.2.25     | The Applicant           | <b>Design and Access Statement – Accommodation Campus Design Principles</b><br>Please comment on the suggested amendments to the design principles in Table A.1 of [REP5-075] made by ESC at [REP5-143].  |
| LI.2.26     | The Applicant, ESC      | <b>Design and Access Statement – Accommodation Campus Design Principles</b><br>Principle 13 in Table A.1 [REP5-075] refers to the colour of buildings and the consideration to be given to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Guidance on the Selection and Use of Colour in Development document. In contrast, Detailed Built Development Principle 56 in Table 5.3 [REP5-070] includes the need for the agreement of ESC in respect of cladding colours for the turbine halls. Whilst noting the content of Requirement 17 [REP5-029], what consideration has been given to a similar level of involvement of ESC in respect of the colour finish of the accommodation campus buildings? |
| LI.2.27     | The Applicant           | <b>Design and Access Statement – Emergency Equipment Store</b><br>Please confirm why reference to the emergency equipment store has been removed from paragraph A.31.5 [REP5-075]?  |
| LI.2.28     | The Applicant           | <b>Associated Development Sites – Reinstatement</b><br>Paragraph 6.70 [REP1-045] refers to former Associated Development Sites being reinstated to a higher quality or enhanced manner. Please provide a response.  |
| LI.2.29     | The Applicant           | <b>Associated Development Sites – Requirement 22A</b><br>Requirement 22A [REP5-029] includes Work Nos.11 and 12. Should Work Nos. 9,10 and 13 also be included within Requirement 22A?  |
| LI.2.30     | The Applicant, SCC, ESC | <b>Associated Development Sites – Requirement 22A</b><br>SCC [REP5-176] considers they should be the discharging authority for Requirement 22A as the proposed landscaping is on highway land. Are discussions regarding this matter underway?  |
| LI.2.31     | The Applicant           | <b>Two Village Bypass – Mollett’s Partnership</b><br>Mollett’s Partnership have requested the following additional mitigation measures:   |



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

| <b>ExQ2</b> | <b>Question to:</b>       | <b>Question:</b>   |
|-------------|---------------------------|--|
|             |                           | (ix) A bund parallel to the route of the proposed Two Village Bypass to screen their business and parts of property<br>(x) Visual and screening noise attenuation fencing around the eastern construction compound<br>(xi) Additional soft and hard landscaping to absorb the bypass into its setting<br>Are these requests considered necessary in terms of mitigation? |
| LI.2.32     | The Applicant             | <b>Two Village Bypass – Landscape Design and Mitigation</b><br>Noting the responses to ExQ1 LI.1.106 [REP3-046], please provide an update regarding discussions relating to offsite planting and habitat creation.   |
| LI.2.33     | The Applicant             | <b>Two Village Bypass – Additional Landscaping</b><br>FERN included a plan illustrating possible additional bunds and planting [REP5-197]. Please provide an update in respect of any additional landscaping proposed for the Two Village Bypass.  |
| LI.2.34     | The Applicant             | <b>Southern Park and Ride – Lighting</b><br>Several of the initial concerns expressed by Marlesford Parish Council in respect of light spill remain [REP5-237]. Please comment on the suitability of the proposed use of low-level down lit lighting.  |
| LI.2.35     | Marlesford Parish Council | <b>Southern Park and Ride – Landscaping</b><br>Please provide further detail as to why the proposed planting growth rates is over optimistic [REP5-237].   |
| LI.2.36     | The Applicant             | <b>Freight Management Facility– Landscape Design and Mitigation</b><br>Noting the responses to ExQ1 LI.1.106 [REP3-046], please provide an update regarding discussions relating to offsite planting and habitat creation.   |
| LI.2.37     | The Applicant             | <b>Sizewell Link Road – Pretty Road Bridge Design</b><br>In the event that Change 18 [REP5-002] is accepted into examination, please provide additional visualisations of the proposed Pretty Road overbridge, ensuring that it is at a larger scale than that included at [REP5-041].   |