



# The Sizewell C Project

## 5.1 Ch Consultation Report Fourth Addendum

---

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

---

September 2021

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



## CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
1 INTRODUCTION .....	2
2 PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION REPORT FOURTH ADDENDUM .....	3
PART 1: DESALINATION PLANT (PROPOSED CHANGE 19) .....	5
3 CONSULTATION CONTEXT .....	5
4 CONSULTATION PROCESS .....	7
4.1 Overview of consultation .....	7
4.2 Who was consulted and how? .....	7
4.3 Consultation material .....	9
4.4 Ways that feedback could be received .....	10
5 FEEDBACK RECEIVED AND HOW SZC CO. HAD REGARD TO IT .....	11
5.1 Analysis of the responses to the consultation .....	11
6 PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE SIZEWELL C PROJECT .....	13
7 CONCLUSION ON PROPOSED CHANGE 19 CONSULTATION ....	15
PART 2: NOISE MITIGATION AT WHITEARCHPARK .....	16
8 CONSULTATION CONTEXT .....	16
9 CONSULTATION PROCESS .....	17
9.1 Overview .....	17
9.2 Who was consulted and how? .....	17
9.3 Consultation material .....	17
9.4 Ways that feedback was received .....	17
10 FEEDBACK RECEIVED AND HOW SZC CO. HAD REGARD TO IT .....	19
10.1 Analysis of the responses to the consultation .....	19



10.2	How SZC Co. has had regard to feedback.....	19
11	CONCLUSION ON NOISE MITIGATION CONSULTATION.....	22
	REFERENCES.....	23

## TABLES

Table 5-1: Response received by method.....	11
Table 6-1: Summary of change .....	14
Table 10.1: Responses received by method .....	19
Table 10.2: Consultation feedback and SZC Co. response.....	19

## PLATES

None provided.

## FIGURES

None provided.

## APPENDICES

Appendix A: Parties consulted under section 42(1)(a) – (d), including affected persons (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix B: Consultation sample letter (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix C: Sample Newspaper notice (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix D: Site notice (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix E: Consultation Document and Response Form (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix F: Newsletter (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix G: Press Adverts (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix H: Presentation slide pack (Proposed Change 19)
Appendix I: Consultation on Proposed Change 19 – Issues Tables
Appendix J: List of consultees (noise consultation)
Appendix K: Consultation sample letter (noise consultation)
Appendix L: Update Noise Consultation Document

---

## **ANNEX**

Annex A: Copies of all Proposed Change 19 consultation responses

Annex B: Copies of all noise consultation responses

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') submitted an application to the Planning Inspectorate under the Planning Act 2008 (the 'Act') for a Development Consent Order for the Sizewell C Project ('Project') on 27 May 2020 ('Application'). The Application was accepted for examination on 24 June 2020.

Between 3 August and 27 August 2021, SZC Co. carried out non-statutory consultation in respect of a proposed change to the Application, known as Proposed Change 19.

Between 5 August and 31 August 2021, SZC Co. carried out non-statutory targeted consultation regarding rail noise mitigation at Whitearch Park with a limited number of parties potentially affected by rail noise as identified in further detailed noise assessments.

This **Consultation Report Fourth Addendum** explains how SZC Co. has carried out consultation on Proposed Change 19 and on rail noise mitigation at Whitearch Park, including how it has engaged with the consultees, provides details of the consultation material used, summarises the responses received and details how SZC Co. has had regard to those responses.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1.1 SZC Co. submitted the Application for the Project on 27 May 2020. The Application was accepted for examination on 24 June 2020.
- 1.1.2 A **Consultation Report** [[APP-068](#)] was submitted as part of the Application to provide details on the pre-application consultation.
- 1.1.3 A **Consultation Report Addendum** [[AS-153](#)] was submitted in January 2021 detailing the non-statutory consultation that was carried out in November to December 2020 regarding a number of proposed changes to the Application. Fifteen changes were accepted for examination by the Examining Authority on 21 April 2021 [[PD-013](#)].
- 1.1.4 A **Consultation Report Second Addendum** [[REP3-010](#)] was submitted in June 2021 detailing the non-statutory targeted consultation carried out in May to June 2021 with a limited number of parties potentially affected by rail noise.
- 1.1.5 A **Consultation Report Third Addendum** [[REP5-044](#)] was submitted in July 2021 detailing the non-statutory consultation carried out in June and July 2021 regarding Changes 16, 17 and 18. These changes were accepted for examination by the Examining Authority on 10 August 2021 [[PD-039](#)].
- 1.1.6 As Changes 1 to 18 have been accepted for examination by the Examining Authority, they are collectively referred to throughout this document as the 'Accepted Changes'.
- 1.1.7 This **Consultation Report Fourth Addendum** has been prepared in respect of:
- non-statutory consultation carried out between 3 August and 27 August 2021 regarding a further proposed change to the Application known as Proposed Change 19 (Part 1 of this document); and
  - non-statutory targeted consultation carried out between 5 August and 31 August 2021 regarding rail noise mitigation at Whitearch Park (Part 2 of this document).

## 2 PURPOSE OF THE CONSULTATION REPORT FOURTH ADDENDUM

2.1.1 The focus of this **Consultation Report Fourth Addendum** is to set out the consultation carried out in relation to Proposed Change 19 to the Application (Part 1 of this document), which is the subject of a change request submitted at Deadline 7, and the consultation carried out in relation to rail noise mitigation at Whitearch Park (Part 2 of this document).

2.1.2 Part 1 of this **Consultation Report Fourth Addendum** has been prepared in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1). Figure 3, paragraph g. of Advice Note 16 states that a request to make a material change to an application after it has been accepted for examination should include the following:

*“Where (proportionate) additional non-statutory consultation has been carried out (either voluntarily or at the direction of the ExA) a Consultation Statement confirming who has been consulted in relation to the proposed change should be submitted. Copies of any consultation responses received by an applicant should also be included with any request, as an annex.”*

2.1.3 This document sets out:

### **Part 1: Desalination Plant (Proposed Change 19)**

- The consultation context and why the process has been undertaken (**Section 4**).
- How the consultation has been undertaken to ensure compliance with Advice Note 16 (**Section 5.1**).
- A description of the consultation undertaken and who has been consulted (**Section 5.2**).
- A description of the consultation materials used as part of the consultation (**Section 5.3**).
- The ways that feedback to the consultation could be received (**Section 5.4**).
- The consultation responses received and how SZC Co. has analysed and had regard to them to inform the change request (**Section 6**).
- The change that SZC Co. is proposing to the Application (**Section 7**).

- A conclusion on the Proposed Change 19 consultation (**Section 8**).

## **Part 2: Rail noise mitigation at Whitearch Park**

- The consultation context and why the process has been undertaken (**Section 9**).
- A description of the consultation undertaken and who has been consulted (**Section 10.2**).
- A description of the consultation materials used as part of the consultation (**Section 10.3**).
- The ways that feedback to the consultation could be received (**Section 10.4**).
- The consultation responses received and how SZC Co. has analysed and had regard to them (**Section 11**).
- A conclusion on the rail noise consultation (**Section 12**).



## PART 1: DESALINATION PLANT (PROPOSED CHANGE 19)

### 3 CONSULTATION CONTEXT

- 3.1.1 The Examining Authority accepted for examination Changes 1 to 15 on 21 April 2021 [[PD-013](#)] and Changes 16 to 18 on 10 August 2021 [[PD-039](#)]. These are referred to as the Accepted Changes.
- 3.1.2 As part of its Deadline 5 submission, SZC Co. notified the Examining Authority of its intention to submit a request to make a further change to the Application to include provision for a temporary desalination plant. The notification was set out in a letter dated 23 July 2021 [Section 6 'Water Supply' of [REP5-001](#)]. Following on from the numbering of the Accepted Changes, this further proposed change is numbered Proposed Change 19. Details of the proposed consultation on Proposed Change 19 were set out in that letter.
- 3.1.3 On 5 August 2021, the Examining Authority issued a letter in response to SZC Co.'s notification of the intention to request a further change [[PD-039](#)]. This provided the Examining Authority's comments on the consultation to be carried out and the information that should subsequently be submitted in support of the change request.
- 3.1.4 Whilst there is no statutory requirement to carry out consultation on the proposed change to the Application, SZC Co. carried out non-statutory consultation between 3 August 2021 and 27 August 2021 on the following proposed change:

#### ***Proposed Change 19: Temporary Desalination Plant***

*A change to the Water Supply Strategy to propose new temporary infrastructure for the desalination and treatment of seawater to produce potable water suitable for construction-related activities until the Sizewell transfer main is delivered and operational.*

- 3.1.5 As this was non-statutory consultation, there were no statutory requirements in respect of the nature and scale of consultation to be carried out. SZC Co. therefore designed a consultation strategy that it considered to be most appropriate in the circumstances, having regard to the non-statutory guidance in Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1).
- 3.1.6 Advice Note 16 (Ref 1.1) states that before making a written request for a change to be made to an application, it is "*recommended*" that applicants consult section 42 consultees who would be affected by the proposed change giving a minimum of 28 days.

- 3.1.7 When deciding the appropriate consultation period for the consultation on Proposed Change 19, SZC Co. took into account a number of key factors, including:
- the importance of ensuring that the change request could be submitted as early as possible within the remaining Examination period (which closes on 14 October 2021) to allow Interested Parties the maximum opportunity to consider the change request material and submit any comments on the proposed change to the Examining Authority;
  - the nature of the proposed change, which is minor in the context of the Project as a whole and would result in no new or materially different likely significant effects on the environment;
  - the extensive consultation that has been carried out to date, meaning that consultees are already familiar with the Project; and
  - the desire to avoid consultation fatigue and to minimise confusion about what constitutes the Project that is being examined.
- 3.1.8 Taking into account the above, it was considered that a shorter period of 24 days would be appropriate and proportionate in these circumstances and would still provide consultees with a fair and reasonable opportunity to consider and respond to the proposal. If the change is accepted for examination, the Examining Authority's 5 August 2021 letter [\[PD-039\]](#) confirms that Interested Parties will also have an opportunity to make representations on the changed application during the examination.
- 3.1.9 Following the consultation, SZC Co. had regard to all relevant responses to the consultation in finalising the change and is now making a formal request to the Examining Authority to make Proposed Change 19 to the Application, as described in further detail in Section 7.
- 3.1.10 As explained in the **Part 1 Change Report**, SZC Co. considers that Proposed Change 19 is a non-material change to the Application.

## 4 CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 4.1 Overview of consultation

4.1.1 This section sets out SZC Co.'s approach to the consultation on Proposed Change 19. It explains how the consultation was undertaken to ensure compliance with Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1) and the Examining Authority's letter dated 5 August 2021 [[PD-039](#)] giving details of:

- who was consulted and how (Section 5.2);
- the consultation material (Section 5.3); and
- ways that feedback was received (Section 5.4).

4.1.2 SZC Co. carried out non-statutory consultation between 3 August 2021 and 27 August 2021. This consultation sought views on the proposed change to the Application set out in **Section 4**.

### 4.2 Who was consulted and how?

4.2.1 SZC Co.'s approach to consultation has been structured to provide a high quality and meaningful process of consultation with statutory consultees, the local community and the general public.

#### a) Section 42(1)(a)-(d) consultees

4.2.2 Paragraph 3.3 of Advice Note 16 (Ref 1.1) states *'it is recommended that applicants consult all those persons prescribed in the [Act] under section 42 (a) to (d) who would be affected by the proposed change'*.

4.2.3 Section 42 of the Act lists prescribed consultees (section 42(1)(a)), the Marine Management Organisation (section 42(1)(aa)), local authorities (section 42(1)(b)), and persons within one or more categories in section 44 (section 42(1)(d)).

4.2.4 The Examining Authority's letter dated 5 August 2021 [[PD-039](#)] stated that this should include 'any section 42 persons not originally consulted on the application but who may now be affected by the proposed changes'.

4.2.5 SZC Co. chose to consult even more widely than the approach set out in Advice Note 16 (Ref 1.1), by consulting all those persons identified in section 42(1)(a) to (d) of the Act, whether or not they would be affected by Proposed Change 19. In accordance with the 5 August 2021 letter [[PD-039](#)], this included any section 42 persons not originally consulted on the Application but who may now be affected by Proposed Change 19.

4.2.6 A full list of section 42 consultees is provided in **Appendix A**. This list clearly identifies in orange those persons who are “affected persons”, meaning those persons over whose land compulsory acquisition powers are proposed to be exercised. There were no persons who were consulted in relation to Proposed Change 19 but not in relation to the Application as updated by the Accepted Changes.

4.2.7 SZC Co. wrote to the section 42 consultees on 3 August 2021 telling them about the consultation and how they could access the Consultation Document and Response Form (see **Section 5.3** below). The consultation ran from 3 August 2021 to 27 August 2021. **Appendix B** contains a sample consultation letter.

b) The local community

4.2.8 Whilst Advice Note 16 (Ref. 1.1) only refers to consultation with those persons identified in section 42(1)(a) to (d) of the Act, SZC Co. also consulted the local community about the proposed change.

4.2.9 SZC Co. sent a newsletter containing information about the consultation (see **Appendix F**) to 41,205 homes and businesses within a ten-mile radius of Sizewell, and in parishes neighbouring associated development sites further away, such as the freight management facility site. Those who are subscribed to receive email updates on the Sizewell C Project also received an online copy of the newsletter.

4.2.10 SZC Co. displayed site notices summarising Proposed Change 19 and setting out details of the consultation, including the deadline for the receipt of responses, at or as close as reasonably practicable to the proposed development sites. A copy of the site notice is in **Appendix D**.

c) The general public

4.2.11 SZC Co. published a notice summarising the proposed change and setting out details of the consultation, including the deadline for the receipt of responses, in local and national newspapers. **Appendix C** contains a sample copy of the newspaper notice, which was published on the following dates:

- East Anglian Daily Times: 3 and 10 August 2021
- Ipswich Star: 3 and 10 August 2021
- Lowestoft Journal: 6 and 13 August 2021
- The Times: 3 August 2021

- The London Gazette: 3 August 2021
- Lloyd's List: 3 August 2021
- Fishing News: 5 August 2021

4.2.12 In addition, the launch of the consultation was publicised through press adverts published on the following dates. Copies of the adverts are in **Appendix G**.

- East Anglian Daily Press: 3 and 10 August 2021
- Ipswich Star: 3 and 10 August 2021
- Lowestoft Journal: 6 and 13 August 2021

4.2.13 SZC Co. has a Twitter account and followers were updated on the latest events and news during the public consultation (@edfesizewellc).

d) Other

4.2.14 An email was sent by SZC Co. on 3 August 2021 at the start of the consultation to the relevant parish councils to offer them the opportunity to participate in meetings with SZC Co. to discuss Proposed Change 19.

4.2.15 In accordance with the procedural decision letter of 5 August 2021 [[PD-039](#)], SZC Co. considered whether or not persons not already registered to participate in the Examination might need an opportunity to comment (such as persons living, or commercial entities operating, outside the Order Limits). SZC Co. is satisfied that the wide range of consultation activities carried out, as explained in this **Consultation Report Fourth Addendum**, captured any such persons.

## 4.3 Consultation material

4.3.1 The consultation material comprised a Consultation Document and Response Form, see **Appendix E**.

4.3.2 During the consultation period, copies of the Consultation Document, Response Form and newsletter were made available on the Sizewell C Project website ([www.sizewellc.co.uk](http://www.sizewellc.co.uk)).

4.3.3 Consultees were able to request the consultation materials in a different format for accessibility reasons and could request an electronic copy (on a USB stick) or a hard copy by calling Freephone 0800 197 6102 between 09:00 and 17:00 Monday to Friday or emailing [info@sizewellc.co.uk](mailto:info@sizewellc.co.uk).



4.3.4 Consultees were able to book an appointment to view the Application and Consultation Document at:

- the Sizewell C Information Office at 48-50 High Street, Leiston IP16 4EW; and
- the Council Offices of the Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council at Council Offices, Main Street, Leiston IP16 4ER.

4.3.5 On 12 August 2021, a meeting was held with Snape Parish Council to discuss Proposed Change 19. SZC Co. conducted a presentation on the proposed change. A copy of the slide pack can be found in **Appendix H**.

4.3.6 Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, SZC Co. was not able to host any public exhibitions.

#### 4.4 Ways that feedback could be received

4.4.1 To optimise the response rate from consultees, those consulted were able to respond to the proposed change consultation in a variety of ways, including by:

- completing the Response Form online ([www.sizewellc.co.uk](http://www.sizewellc.co.uk)), which contained a series of questions about Proposed Change 19;
- emailing comments on Proposed Change 19 to [info@sizewellc.co.uk](mailto:info@sizewellc.co.uk);
- posting comments on Proposed Change 19 to FREEPOST SZC CONSULTATION; or
- if shielding and unable to use the above methods, calling Freephone 0800 197 6102 to arrange for the comments on Proposed Change 19 to be collected.

## 5 FEEDBACK RECEIVED AND HOW SZC CO. HAD REGARD TO IT

### 5.1 Analysis of the responses to the consultation

5.1.1 This section provides an overview of the responses received to the proposed change consultation.

5.1.2 The consultation ended at midnight on 27 August 2021. However, due to a typographical error, the section 42 consultation letter, newspaper notices and site notices stated that it ended at midday. All relevant responses received by SZC Co. up to midnight on 27 August 2021 were accepted and it is not considered that any consultee was prejudiced by this minor error.

5.1.3 A total of 148 responses were received by SZC Co. **Annex A** contains copies of all responses.

5.1.4 **Table 5.1** shows the number of responses received via each of the possible methods of providing feedback:

**Table 5-1: Response received by method**

Response Type	Count
Online response form	51
Email	96
Post	1
Collection	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>148</b>

5.1.5 The Response Form (**Appendix E**) asked consultees to answer one question about Proposed Change 19.

5.1.6 A set of 'issues tables' is provided at **Appendix I**. These set out an 'issues-led' review of the comments received, and how SZC Co. has had regard to these comments, under the following titles:

- Section 42 consultees
- Local community or general public consultees

5.1.7 The tables are organised under themed headings.

5.1.8 The following process was adopted in the preparation of the tables.

- A systematic methodology was used to analyse responses to the consultation, through which responses were analysed at a sentence level, using themes to group together comments on similar topics.
- A coding framework was developed by senior analysts with codes being applied to each response by an analysis team which regularly discussed their work and suggested amendments to the coding framework as and when it may be needed.
- An individual response was coded in as many layers as required to ensure the whole sentiment of the comment was captured.
- The coding process enabled all responses to be indexed according to the issues raised by respondents and allowed a summary to be prepared of the content by themes and topics raised.

5.1.9 SZC Co. has had regard to all of the consultation responses, in the manner explained in **Appendix I**. Few if any respondents questioned the need for the change or the means by which a continuous supply of water is proposed to be secured. The majority of consultation responses were concerned either with the impact of water trucks, bringing water to the site prior to the operation of the proposed plant or expressed concern for the localised environmental effects of the proposed plant.

5.1.10 In response, SZC Co. has been careful to ensure that the water trucks can be accommodated within the HGV caps already assessed. The availability of the proposed plant, of course, would obviate the need to continue the use of water trucks. In other words, the concerns expressed underline the need for the proposed change.

5.1.11 SZC Co. has paid very close attention to the concerns raised in relation to localised environmental effects. Detailed assessments have been undertaken on all relevant environmental topics and the results are reported as part of the Change Request. No significant environmental effects have been identified but SZC Co. recognises that this is partly a function of the careful approach proposed to the installation and operation of the plant. The Change Request commits to controls over these matters to ensure that any effects are limited.

5.1.12 SZC Co. has also responded to concerns on localised effects by extending the intake and outfalls further offshore and into deeper water. This approach improves dispersion of the brine water discharge within the water column whilst also minimising recirculation between the two pipes.

## 6 PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE SIZEWELL C PROJECT

- 6.1.1 SZC Co. has had regard to the consultation responses, as explained in detail within the issues tables at **Appendix I**, in finalising the change request that this **Consultation Report Fourth Addendum** is submitted in support of.
- 6.1.2 SZC Co. is formally requesting that the proposed change to the Application set out in **Table 6.1** is accepted into the Examination.

Table 6-1: Summary of change

Proposed Change Number	Proposed Change Description	Environment Effects and Habitats and Protected Species	Order Limit Changes	New Compulsory Acquisition or Temporary Possession	Impact on Businesses or Residents
<b>Proposed Change 19 (Temporary Desalination Plant)</b>	A change to the Water Supply Strategy to propose new temporary infrastructure for the desalination and treatment of seawater to produce potable water suitable for construction-related activities until the Sizewell transfer main is delivered and operational.	<p>No new or materially different likely significant effects on the environment from that reported in the <b>ES</b> [APP-159 to APP-582], as updated by the subsequent <b>ES Addenda</b> [AS-179 to AS-292], [REP5-062 to REP5-069], [REP6-017].</p> <p>No change to assessment conclusions presented within <b>Shadow HRA Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.10 [APP-145]) and <b>first Shadow HRA Addendum</b> [AS-178], or new European Protected Species licence required.</p> <p>No change to conclusions presented within <b>Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.14) [APP-620, APP-621, APP-622 and APP-623] and the first WFD Compliance Assessment Addendum [AS-277 to AS-279].</p> <p>No change to findings presented within <b>Eels Regs Compliance Assessment</b> [<a href="#">APP-332</a>].</p>	None	None	No new or materially different significant effects on businesses or residents.



## 7 CONCLUSION ON PROPOSED CHANGE 19 CONSULTATION

- 7.1.1 SZC Co. has reviewed and considered all relevant responses to the consultation as explained in detail within the tables at **Appendix I**.
- 7.1.2 The consultation process has been effective and productive, and the content of the change request has been informed and improved as a result. It is considered that the documents provided with this change request provide the detail required to satisfy concerns and requests raised during the consultation period.
- 7.1.3 Overall, the proposed change received mixed reactions, however, no fundamental issues were raised that would lead SZC Co. to conclude that the change would not improve the Project or that it should not be taken forward.
- 7.1.4 SZC Co. is very grateful to all parties who have responded to the consultation or engaged with the evolving development of the Sizewell C Project. SZC Co. will continue to work with respondents to provide responses to queries.

## PART 2: NOISE MITIGATION AT WHITEARCHPARK

### 8 CONSULTATION CONTEXT

- 8.1.1 As part of the Application, an Environmental Statement ([APP-159](#) to [APP-582](#)) was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in May 2020, which included an assessment of rail noise arising from the transport of construction materials by train on the East Suffolk line. An Environmental Statement Addendum ([AS-179](#) to [AS-260](#)) was subsequently submitted in January 2021, which included an updated assessment of rail noise.
- 8.1.2 SZC Co. undertook a targeted consultation exercise in May to June 2021 to seek views from the residents and owners of Whitearch Park, located south of Saxmundham, and other parties potentially affected by rail noise, on the potential noise effects from the use of the East Suffolk line by SZC Co. as part of its freight management strategy to bring construction materials to the Sizewell C site.
- 8.1.3 A copy of the targeted consultation materials, including a supplemental noise assessment (dated May 2021), a summary of the noise assessment, and covering letter, can be found at Volume 3, Appendix 21C of SZC Co.'s responses to the Examining Authority's first written questions [[REP2-112](#)]. Consultee responses to the consultation were collated and SZC Co. provided its responses in the Consultation Report Second Addendum [[REP3-009](#)].
- 8.1.4 SZC Co. has been considering further, including in light of consultation feedback, the potential acoustic benefit that a barrier would have in mitigating rail noise at Whitearch Park. Site visits and engagement caused SZC Co. to reflect that its engagement could be more informed and more informative. Accordingly, SZC Co. prepared and consulted on an update on the supplemental noise assessment. The update included a clarification to the assessment previously made available regarding the effect of a particular alignment of an acoustic barrier. The principle remains the same; that a fence or barrier on the eastern boundary would be an option to reduce the noise from trains, if it could be agreed with Network Rail and the local planning authority, but SZC Co. has more accurate information now on its necessary likely height and location if it is to have best effect.

## 9 CONSULTATION PROCESS

### 9.1 Overview

9.1.1 This section sets out SZC Co.'s approach to the non-statutory targeted consultation. It explains how the consultation was undertaken, giving details of:

- who was consulted and how (**Section 10.2**);
- the consultation material (**Section 10.3**); and
- ways that feedback was received (**Section 10.4**).

### 9.2 Who was consulted and how?

9.2.1 SZC Co. consulted the parties who were identified through the further rail noise assessment as potentially being affected by rail noise from the use of rail infrastructure on park homes located at Whitearch Park, south of Saxmundham.

9.2.2 A full list of the consultees is provided in **Appendix J**.

9.2.3 SZC Co. wrote to the consultees, including East Suffolk Council, Suffolk County Council and the relevant Parish Councils<sup>1</sup>, on 5 August 2021 telling them about the consultation and how to provide feedback (see **Section 10.4**). The consultation ran from 5 August 2021 to 31 August 2021 (inclusive), a period of 26 days. Given the extent of the details provided in the previous consultation, and the limited and targeted nature of this consultation, this was considered to be an appropriate length of consultation in these circumstances.

9.2.4 **Appendix K** contains a sample consultation letter.

### 9.3 Consultation material

9.3.1 The consultation material comprised a Consultation Document Update on Noise Assessment at Whitearch Park (**Appendix L**).

### 9.4 Ways that feedback was received

9.4.1 To optimise the response rate from consultees, those consulted were able to respond to the consultation in a variety of ways, including by:

---

<sup>1</sup> Woodbridge Town Council, Melton Parish Council, Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council.

- emailing comments to [info@sizewellc.co.uk](mailto:info@sizewellc.co.uk);
- posting comments to the free post address (FREEPOST SZC CONSULTATION); and
- for people who were shielding and unable to use the above methods, calling Freephone 0800 197 6102 (09:00 – 17:00 Monday to Friday) to arrange for their response to be collected.

## 10 FEEDBACK RECEIVED AND HOW SZC CO. HAD REGARD TO IT

### 10.1 Analysis of the responses to the consultation

10.1.1 This section provides an overview of the responses received as a result of consultation.

10.1.2 A total of 4 responses were received by SZC Co. **Annex B** contains copies of all responses.

10.1.3 **Table 10.1** shows the number of responses received via each of the possible methods of providing feedback:

**Table 10.1: Responses received by method**

Response Type	Count
Email	4
Post	0
Collection	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>4</b>

### 10.2 How SZC Co. has had regard to feedback

10.2.1 **Table 10.2** below sets out the consultation feedback received and SZC Co.'s responses to it.

**Table 10.2: Consultation feedback and SZC Co. response**

Consultee response	SZC Co. response
The original assessment on the noise levels to the park were carried out without the knowledge of the parks undulating nature and varying land types, therefore there assessment was incorrect, the latest consultation carried out between the 12 May and June 11 is based on visual evidence as no acoustic trials were carried out or any practical test involving actual trains hauling 2000 tons. Little consideration is being given to vibration levels. The minimum	The assessments that underpinned both the original targeted consultation, and the updated consultation, were based on appropriate and robust information on the amount of noise generated by a passing train, informed by test measurements of the proposed train types during August 2020. The assessments used appropriate and traceable calculation methods. There is no need for a practical test at the site since the site-dependent variables



Consultee response	SZC Co. response
<p>requirement to offset the noise levels of night trains is to construct an effective acoustic barrier, this would give due respect and consideration to the residents.</p> <p>The future development of holiday units is no longer viable, and owners are obliged both morally and possibly legally to inform potential holiday makers of pending disruption.</p> <p>3.1.7 States that the resulting noise levels will be below 70 db sound engineers must install equipment at various locations to take readings and to pursue what ever options are available.</p>	<p>are known and have been included in the noise calculations.</p> <p>Despite Network Rail's recent confirmation that they will not permit acoustic barriers on their land, which will preclude an acoustic barrier on top of the embankment, an acoustic barrier along the eastern side of Whitearch Park remains a possibility from approximately the mid-point of that boundary northwards. At the approximate mid-point, the height of the railway line drops below the ground level at Whitearch Park, and a barrier on the eastern edge of Whitearch Park is likely to be acoustically effective, without encroaching on Network Rail's land.</p> <p>SZC Co. is willing to hold further discussions with the owners of the park to explore this possibility.</p>
<p>Request for the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firm and detailed proposal for the Stopping Up of Fordley Roadboth North and South as discussed.</li> <li>• Provide Fordley Road/Oakfield House/SLR existing Noise AssessmentReport, as discussed.</li> <li>• Provide Fordley Road/Oakfield House/SLR Noise mitigation measures toinclude acoustic fencing and bund, including full and detailed plans, asdiscussed.</li> <li>• Provide Fordley Road/Oakfield House/SLR Increased landscape plantingmitigation</li> </ul>	<p>This comment does not relate to the updated consultation on railway noise at Whitearch Park, but to road traffic noise from the proposed Sizewell link road.</p> <p>SZC Co. held discussions with a number of landowners and homeowners in July 2021 and agreed to consider detailed landscaping points to seek to maximise the amount of visual and acoustic screening that might be possible within the Order Limits.</p> <p>The findings of those considerations were reported back to thelandowners and homeowners on 20 August 2021, and are appended to SZC Co.'s <b>Deadline 7 Comments on</b></p>

Consultee response	SZC Co. response
measures, including full and detailed plans.	<p><b>Submissions from Earlier Deadlines</b> report (Doc Ref 9.73).</p> <p>The information sent to the landowners and homeowners included details of the potential acoustic benefits of the landscaping proposals, and of potential benefits from a quiet road surface, should this be agreed with Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>SZC Co. does not consider it possible or appropriate to stop up Fordley Road to the south of the Sizewell Link Road.</p>
Supportive of the overall project, highlighting that the benefits outweigh the negatives.	The support is noted and welcomed.

## 11 CONCLUSION ON NOISE MITIGATION CONSULTATION

- 11.1.1 SZC Co. has reviewed and considered all consultation responses as explained in detail within **Table 10.2**.
- 11.1.2 The consultation process has been effective and productive. SZC Co. is very grateful to all parties who have responded to the consultation or engaged with the evolving development of the Project. SZC Co. will continue to work with respondents to provide responses to queries.

---

## REFERENCES

1. Planning Inspectorate (2018). Advice Note Sixteen: How to request a change which may be material (Online). Available at:  
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Advice-note-16.pdf> (Accessed July 2021)