



The Planning Act 2008

Sizewell C (SZC)

Planning Inspectorate Reference EN010012

Deadline 8: *24 September 2021*

Written Summary of Oral Case

Issue Specific Hearing 13 Landscape, Visual Impact, Design and Terrestrial Heritage

Issue Specific Hearing 13 (ISH13) on Landscape, Visual Impact, Design and Terrestrial Heritage	
Agenda Item	East Suffolk Council Submissions
1. Introductions	<p>Speakers on behalf of East Suffolk Council:</p> <p>Andrew Tait QC Nicholas Newton, Arboricultural and Landscape Manager, ESC Robert Scrimgeour, Principal Design and Conservation Officer, ESC</p>
<p>2. Sizewell Link Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape and visual impacts of the link road. To include, but not limited to: ▪ night-time lighting effects ▪ suitability of proposed landscaping scheme Additional monitoring and mitigation suggestions 	<p>Landscape and visual impacts of the link road. To include, but not limited to: ▪ night-time lighting effects ▪ suitability of proposed landscaping scheme</p> <p>There is now agreement between ESC and SCC that ESC should be responsible for discharging requirement 22A (highway landscape works), subject to prior consultation by the Applicant with SCC. The drafting of requirement 22A is to be adapted to reflect that agreed position.</p> <p>Requirement 22A provides for details of the landscape works are to be approved by ESC. Pursuant to that requirement, ESC will expect to secure lighting options which ensure the minimum amount of upward and lateral light spill in order to address the concerns raised by ESC at LI.1.88 [REP2-176].</p> <p>In the context of Requirement 20 (Associated Development sites), the relevant tables in the Associated Development Design Principles document need to be amended so that at the time of discharging that requirement, ESC is able to ensure that the lighting option secures the least amount of upward and lateral lighting spill.</p>
<p>3. Southern Park and Ride</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape and visual impacts of the park and ride facility. To include, but not limited to: ▪ night-time lighting effects ▪ legacy planting 	<p>Landscape and visual impacts of the park and ride facility. To include, but not limited to: ▪ night-time lighting effects ▪ legacy planting and landscaping provision ▪ cumulative effects</p> <p>ESC has no significant outstanding concerns with the design aspect of this AD site. The design of the Southern Park and Ride facilities is subject to Requirement 22, which requires detailed design to be in accordance with the Associated Development Design Principles, to be approved by SCC, in consultation with the EA.</p>

<p>and landscaping provision ▪ cumulative effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional monitoring and mitigation suggestions 	<p>ESC expects that the detailed designs in general accordance with the Design Principles will ensure that legacy planting benefits are delivered and that light spill is minimised. The principles need to be amended to ensure that they can achieve that.</p> <hr/> <p>Additional monitoring and mitigation suggestions</p> <p>ESC expects that at discharge of requirements stage, lighting options that ensure the least amount of upward and lateral light spill are proposed and agreed. Planting options to address lateral light spill should also be considered (LI.1.83 [REP2-176]). The Design Principles should be amended to ensure this.</p> <p>ESC accepts that the described tree and hedge planting would generally be successful in minimising the visual impact of the Southern Park and Ride in views from the surrounding landscape and would integrate with the surrounding landscape (LI.1.120 [REP2-176]).</p> <p>Screening mounds and new planting have been described in the ES and full details can be agreed at discharge of requirements stage, as necessary, along with lighting strategies. It is anticipated that as much new planting as possible can be left as legacy planting after completion and therefore its nature and location will need to be suited to the prevailing local landscape character.</p>
<p>4. Two Village Bypass</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and visual impact of the link road. To include, but not limited to: ▪ night-time lighting effects ▪ suitability of proposed landscaping scheme ▪ update by Applicant in respect of more 	<p>Landscape and visual impact of the link road. To include, but not limited to: ▪ night-time lighting effects ▪ suitability of proposed landscaping scheme ▪ update by Applicant in respect of more detailed landscaping scheme</p> <p>ESC’s primary concerns with the Two Village Bypass relate to its impacts on the historical environment (see ESC’s answers to ExA Questions LI.1.99 and HE.1.48 [REP2-176]). The particular concern relates to the visual impact of the Two Village Bypass southern roundabout on the significance of St Mary’s Parish Church.</p> <p>ESC remains of the opinion that additional work is required as set out in the LIR at 12.47, the table on p.155 and Annex K [REP1-056]. The proposed landscape measures within the oLEMP [APP-588] would be inadequate to minimise the impact of the proposed new roundabout adjacent to Parkgate Farm on the wider setting and significance of St Mary’s parish church. The Two Village Bypass LEMP [REP5-077] is indicative and does not show any planting in the area to</p>

<p>detailed landscaping scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional monitoring and mitigation suggestions 	<p>mitigate the heritage impacts on the Church. There appears to be scope within the Order Limits to accommodate landscape mitigation planting. The LEMP should be updated to reflect a commitment to deliver that mitigation.</p> <p>The Associated Development Design Principles should also reflect the obligation to minimise upward and lateral light spill.</p> <hr/> <p>Additional monitoring and mitigation suggestions</p> <p>The Two Village Bypass LEMP should be updated to include a commitment to deliver mitigation planting within the Order Limits around the southern roundabout to minimise the heritage impacts on St Mary’s Parish Church.</p>
<p>5. Terrestrial Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heveningham Hall Estate Impacts: Impact on assets and any remaining areas of disagreement, any additional monitoring and additional mitigation suggestions • National Trust Coastguard Cottage Impacts: Remaining areas of disagreement o Additional monitoring and mitigation suggestions 	<p>Heveningham Hall Estate Impacts: Impact on assets and any remaining areas of disagreement, any additional monitoring and additional mitigation suggestions</p> <p>ESC has no specific comment to make on these specific matters.</p> <hr/> <p>National Trust Coastguard Cottage Impacts: Remaining areas of disagreement - Additional monitoring and mitigation suggestions</p> <p>ESC and the Applicant disagree about the magnitude of effect on the Coastguard Cottage as a matter of professional judgment.</p> <p>The National Trust’s position [EV-142h] concurs with ESC’s view, as expressed in the LIR [REP1-045] that the development would give rise to a medium magnitude of impact leading to a moderate adverse effect on the Coastguard Cottages. ESC’s position is that there is a moderate adverse and therefore significant effect. However, ESC notes that the National Trust is minded to agree a contribution from the Applicant to deliver enhancement and interpretation in relation to the Coastguard Cottages. Notwithstanding the disagreement as to the magnitude of impacts, ESC is satisfied that the contribution proposed by the Applicant would provide appropriate mitigation to address the impacts on the Coastguard Cottages.</p>

<p>6. Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Cumulative Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of assessment - Has sufficient weight been given to all of the defined qualities of the AONB? • Assessment of other plans and projects. Will appropriate and proportional mitigation be secured within the project in respect of cumulative impacts? 	<p>Adequacy of assessment - Has sufficient weight been given to all of the defined qualities of the AONB?</p> <p>ESC does not agree with all aspects of the Applicant’s assessment of impacts on the AONB (see, for example, paragraph 6.27 of the LIR [REP1-045]). However, ESC is satisfied that the embedded mitigation together with the obligations secured through Schedule 11 of the Deed of Obligation provide appropriate mitigation to address the cumulative impacts on the AONB.</p> <hr/> <p>Assessment of other plans and projects - Will appropriate and proportional mitigation be secured within the project in respect of cumulative impacts?</p> <p>As set out above, ESC is satisfied that the embedded mitigation combined with the obligations secured in Schedule 11 of the draft Deed of Obligation are sufficient to address cumulative impacts on the AONB.</p>
<p>7. Monitoring and Controls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant schedules within the draft Deed of Obligation. Schedule 17 Governance – Suffolk Design Review Panel 	<p>Relevant schedules within the draft Deed of Obligation. Schedule 17 Governance – Suffolk Design Review Panel [REP7-040]</p> <p>In respect of the Suffolk Design Review Panel, ESC has had a productive meeting with the Applicant to discuss how the Panel can be utilised in assisting future design review of non-nuclear critical buildings, as discussed in ISH5. The role of the Suffolk Design Review Panel has been incorporated into the draft Deed of Obligation (at paragraph 7.1 of Schedule 17) but the monetary sums to be attributed to the process are yet to be included.</p> <p>The constitution of the Panel is yet to be fully resolved but discussions with the Applicant are ongoing. The existing panel consists of a mix of landscape, architects, heritage specialists. Discussions with the Applicant have indicated other specialist areas may be needed (for example, engineering), but this is yet to be agreed.</p>
<p>8. Any other matters relevant to the agenda</p>	
<p>9. Close of hearing</p>	