

ExQ3	Question to:	Question:	East Suffolk Council Response:
DCO.3 Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)			
DCO.3.0	The Applicant	In the redrafting of the CoCP for D7, has the substance of any of the commitments been changed? To take an example, in Part C, section 8 (Historic Environment) the whole of section 8.2 has been deleted and a new para 8.1.4 inserted. It seems to the ExA that the effect of 8.2 is now contained in para 8.1.4. Is this the intention and effect?	
DCO.3.1	The Applicant	(a) At para 1(4) of Sch 2 (reqts) of the dDCO Revision 8 the Applicant has deleted the word “substantively” from “substantively consistent” and also deleted the words “and in a manner that does not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those assessed in the environmental information”. Please will the Applicant explain the reason for the latter deletion. Is it inevitable that works to be carried out in general accordance with details etc will, if they are simply consistent with those details etc not give rise to materially new / different effects? (b) However, the ExA is finding it more difficult to understand the Applicant’s reluctance to abandon the use of “in general accordance” and to replace it with the straightforward “in accordance”. Please will the Applicant reconsider.	
DCO.3.2	The Applicant	The intake heads for the two cooling water intake tunnels are not described in Sch 1 so as to link them to the relevant tunnel (at least not without checking the plans of the works). This is important for the DML Condition 45. Could it be made clear in Sch 1 that Work 2B is for Work 2A and Work 2D is for Work 2C (which the ExA surmises is the case)?	
DCO.3.3	MMO and Applicant	Please see MMO’s REP6-039, paras 1.1.7 -22 (a) Please will the Applicant explain why it must have Sch 23 for	

		DML conditions refusals / deemed refusals? Why is this case different from Hornsea 3 and Norfolk Vanguard? (b) MMO – are the considerations which apply to wind farms really the same for a single phase, time critical project with little flexibility over siting?	
DCO.3.4	The Applicant	Please will the Applicant supply a track changes version of the Sched of Other Consents, Doc 5.11 Ch Revision 2.0.	
Please answer the following questions in the event the change request for the desalination plant is accepted			
DCO.3.5	MMO, Natural England, Environment Agency	Are the MMO, Natural England and Environment Agency satisfied that the co-ordinates for the location of the works and their construction are given correctly in the ninth revision of the dDCO?	
DCO.3.6	Applicant	Please will the Applicant supply a track changes version of the Sched of Other Consents, Doc 5.11 Ch Revision 3.0.	
FR.3 Flood risk, ground water, surface water			
FR.3.0	The Applicant		
FR.3.1			
HW.3 Health and wellbeing			
HW.3.0	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, CCG	Health Impact Assessment Should a Health Impact Assessment have been carried out to fully understand the implications of impacts on human health of the proposed development both during construction and subsequent operation? Can the Exa be assured that all potential health impacts have been properly understood, assessed and mitigated where appropriate	The Applicant has carried out a Health Impact Assessment for the construction and operation phase of the Sizewell C project [APP-346]. It is included in the Health and Wellbeing chapter of the ES and not as a stand-alone document. ESC is not the competent authority to advise the ExA as to whether all the potential health impacts have been properly understood, assessed and mitigated. We defer to the CCG to advise on that.
HW.3.1	Applicant, NE,	Displacement of Visitors	(i) It is ESC's understanding that the Natural England recommendation for provision of SANG relates to the need to

	RSPB/SWT, ESC, SCC, AONB Partnership, National Trust	Doc 9.94 submitted at D7 is a helpful summary of the different positions in respect of the potential for the displacement of visitors during the construction period. NE are continuing to recommend that SANG would be necessary and appropriate and this appears to be endorsed by RSPB/SWT. (i) In light of the continuing difference of view, please advise how you consider the effects on recreational amenity and whether the difference in figures which appears to remain, would lead to a different conclusion of effects on amenity and recreation issues. (ii) What do you consider would be necessary to overcome the possible adverse effects (if there are any) and how could this mitigation be secured?	provide additional mitigation for recreational disturbance impacts on European designated sites. So, the SANG mitigates impacts on particular designated habitats and species, rather than mitigating any outstanding impacts on recreational amenity. ESC defers detailed comment on the differences between the presented recreational displacement figures to Natural England and the other Interested Parties who have previously raised this concern.  (ii) ESC defers comment on any additional required mitigation to Natural England and the other Interested Parties who have previously raised this concern.
HW.3.2	Applicant, CCG	Health and Wellbeing Working Group Has there now been resolution in respect of the governance, scope and funding for the Health and Wellbeing Working Group?	
HW.3.3	Applicant, CCG	First Written Questions - Please provide an update in respect of the review of the approach identified in FWQ HW.1.0 (i) Has the data now been shared, and reviewed? (ii) What is the outcome and is there now an agreed position?	
HW.3.4	Applicant, CCG	First Written Questions - severance Please provide an update following the response to HW1.2 and the respective positions with regard to understanding severance and the affect on local communities.	
HW.3.5	Applicant, CCG	Care Homes The CCG indicated concerns with regard to the potential impact upon care homes and their residents and staff. Please provide an update on whether this concern has now been overcome	

HE.3 Historic environment (terrestrial and marine)			
HE.3.0	Applicant	Enhancement to Proposed Mitigation Schemes Noting the response made by East Suffolk Council in respect of FWQ HE.2.10 at Deadline 7, it is understood that the initial meeting held with IPs was a scoping meeting. Please confirm whether any further meetings are proposed to discuss additional mitigation? If additional mitigation is proposed, please confirm when/if details will be submitted?	
HE.3.1	Applicant	Barrow Cemetery Group (FMF) In respect of the response provided by Historic England to FWQ HE.2.10 at Deadline 7, please provide further detail regarding any proposed enhanced mitigation and what the outcome of the mitigation is likely to be? In addition, please confirm the proposed mechanism for securing the mitigation?	
HE.3.2	National Trust	First Written questions – Temporary and Permanent Beach Landing Facilities In response to second written questions HE.1.19 and HE.1.20 at Deadline 7, the Applicant stated the National Trust has: (i) overstated the nature and effects of the enhancement of the permanent beach landing facility; and (ii) overstated the potential visibility of the temporary beach landing facility and associated infrastructure. Please provide a response to the above.	
HE.3.3	English Heritage	Sustainable Conservation and Management Strategy Please provide a copy of the Sustainable Management Strategy as detailed in introductory paragraph 1.5 of Response to The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information (ExQ2) on behalf of The England Heritage Trust submitted at Deadline 7.	
LI.3 Landscape impact, visual effects and design			

LI.3.0	Applicant, ESC	<p>Design and Access Statement – Detailed Built Development Principles</p> <p>In response to FWQ LI.2.22 the National Trust has request involvement in the following:</p> <p>(i) discussions in relation to the colour palette for the cladding of the turbine halls – Principle 56 of Table 5.3 [REP5-070]; and</p> <p>(ii) notification and consultation of the Reserved Matters applications in relation to Principles 57 and 80 of Table 5.3 [REP5-070]. Please respond to the request made by the National Trust and where relevant, amend relevant documentation.</p>	<p>(i) ESC would not object to others such as National Trust being involved in the discussions regarding the colour palette for the turbine hall cladding, and we have previously suggested that the AONB should be involved in those discussions. However, ESC should remain the authority with whom the final colour palette is agreed, following consultation with others.</p> <p>(ii) ESC would expect to consult on reserved matters applications in the same manner as we would for town and country planning applications. We have no objection to NT being consulted on reserved matters applications along with others such as AONB, NE, EA, SWT, etc.</p>
LI.3.1	ESC, SCC, AONB Partnership, National Trust, Natural England	<p>Design and Access Statement – Detailed Built Development Principles</p> <p>In response to FWQ LI.2.13 and LI.2.14 the Applicant has detailed amendments to Principles 56 and 57. Please review and provide a response to the appropriateness of the additional text.</p>	<p>Principle 56 – Turbine Halls and Operational Service Centre. We support the proposed inclusion of additional wording to Design Principle 56 in the Design and Access Statement in respect of the cladding to the Turbine Halls as set out in the Applicant’s response to FWQ LI.2.13 [REP7-053] and consider it appropriate. The additional wording could be clearer: the wording currently states the panel profile will be agreed with ESC but it is not clear that the material is also to be agreed with ESC.</p> <p>Principle 57 – Interim Fuel Store. ESC supports the proposed inclusion of additional wording to Design Principle 57 in the Design and Access Statement in respect of the design of the Interim Fuel Store, as set out in the Applicant’s response to FWQ LI.2.14 [REP7-053].</p>
LI.3.2	ESC, SCC, AONB Partnership, National Trust,	<p>Estate Wide Management Plan for the EDF Energy Estate</p> <p>At Deadline 7 the Applicant submitted an Estate Wide Management Plan for the EDF Energy Estate (Doc 9.88). Please review and comment on the content and likely effectiveness of the plan. Are you content with the</p>	<p>ESC is satisfied with the objectives and principles of the Estate Wide Management Plan in respect of landscape restoration and management matters. Subject to submission of further details through subsequent requirements, it is considered to be a highly effective approach to the restoration of land affected by the development and adjacent areas.</p>

	Natural England	wording of Requirement 5C within the draft DCO (Doc 3.1 Revision 8.0)?	<p>A more detailed commentary on the EWMP from an ecological perspective have been submitted as part of ESC's Deadline 8 submissions. They have not been included here due to their length.</p> <p>ESC is content with the wording of Requirement 5C within the draft DCO [REP7-007] but has some concerns as to whether the Requirement is the appropriate means of securing adherence to the EWMP in relation to land outside of the DCO Order Limits.</p> <p>ESC also notes that proposals for the future of some of the historic buildings at the Upper Abbey Farm site that does fall within the EDF Energy Estate are under separate discussion with the Applicant.</p>
LI.3.3	ESC, SCC, AONB Partnership, Natural England	Associated Development Design Principles Please comment on the amendments made to the Associated Development Design Principles (Doc 8.3, Revision 3.0) submitted at Deadline 7, in respect of planting and hedgerows.	<p>ESC notes the amendments to the planting provisions within this document [REP7-035] including those in respect of hedgerows. The inclusion of species-rich hedgerow mixes and the removal of elm planting is noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Ecology comments on the Design Principles are included in ESC's Deadline 8 submission. They are not repeated here due to the technical nature of the comments and their length.</p>
LI.3.4	Applicant	SSSI Crossing The content of Principle 79 of the Detailed Built Development Principles [REP5-070] is noted. However please further expand on how the colour selection of the hard elements of the SSSI crossing, visible from public viewpoints, has taken into consideration the advice contained in 'Guidance on the Selection and use of Colour in Development' published by the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB?	
LI.3.5	Applicant	Main Development Site –	

		Potter's Farm and Eastridge Farm Noting the proximity of Potter's Farm and Eastbridge Farm to the proposed borrow pits, stockpiles and accommodation campus, please confirm any difference in significance of effects in respect of lighting through the different seasons.	
LI.3.6	ESC, Applicant	Requirement 14 - Advanced Planting ESC – Following the Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on 17 August 2021, Requirement 14 – Main development site: Landscape works (Doc 3.1 Revision 8.0) has been amended to include wording in relation to an advanced landscape scheme. Please review and provided comment. Applicant – It is noted that detail of the advanced landscaping scheme is to be submitted to and approved by ESC. It would however be helpful to be provided with high level information including, but not limited to, proposed location of planting, timing of planting and scale. In addition, please advise why advanced planting is only proposed at Work 1A? Please consider the extension of advanced planting both within the main development site and the associated development sites.	ESC is content with the advanced planting provision contained in Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO <a href="#">[REP7-007]</a> .
LI.3.7	Applicant	Change 19 – Temporary Desalination Plant In the event that Change 19 is accepted, please confirm any lighting requirements. Please provide a response in respect of both possible locations of the desalination plant and associated infrastructure	