



Gareth Leigh
Head of Energy Infrastructure Planning
Department for Business, Energy, &
Industrial Strategy
Sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Your ref: EN010012
Our ref: 20026200
Date: 14 April 2022
Please ask for: Naomi Goold

Direct dial: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

Dear Gareth Leigh,

Information/update request – Planning Act 2008 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Planning Act 2008 and The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited (“the Applicant”) for an Order granting Development Consent for the proposed Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station (“the proposed Development”)

I am writing in response to the letter published 31 March 2022 in relation to the Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station project. The letter sought additional information and/or updates as appropriate from Interested Parties including East Suffolk Council, in relation to point 5 (Statement of Common Ground) and point 8.12 (Habitats Regulations Assessment, Biodiversity, and Ecology). The other matters identified within the letter make specific requests of other statutory consultees or the Applicant and therefore East Suffolk Council will not be providing comments on these.

Please accept this letter and the responses provided within Appendix 1 of this document as East Suffolk Council’s response to the requests published 31 March 2022 for the Sizewell C project.

If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Naomi Goold | Energy Projects Manager
East Suffolk Council

LEGAL ADDRESS East Suffolk House, Station Road, Melton, Woodbridge IP12 1RT

POSTAL ADDRESS Riverside, 4 Canning Road, Lowestoft NR33 0EQ

Appendix 1 - Table providing East Suffolk Council's comments in response to Secretary of States letter of 31 March 2022

Secretary of State's Letter 31 March 2022	East Suffolk Council's (ESC) Comments
Point 5 – Statement of Common Ground	
<p>5.1. For the purposes of the Secretary of State's considerations, confirmation is required from the DfT [REP2-099]; the MCA [REP7-100]; the Office for Nuclear Regulation [REP2-078]; the UK Health Security Agency (formerly Public Health England) [REP2-086]; East Suffolk Council ("ESC"); Suffolk County Council [REP10-102; REP3-031; REP7-093; REP10-101] and Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership [REP10-108] that the relevant unsigned statement of common ground has been agreed.</p>	<p>ESC confirms the Statement of Common Ground has been agreed.</p>
Point 8 - Habitats Regulations Assessment, Biodiversity, and Ecology	
<p>8.12. In relation to changes to coastal processes/sediment transfer impacts on the Minsmere to Walberswick Heaths and Marshes SAC and the Minsmere - Walberswick SPA and Ramsar site, Natural England, the MMO, the EA, the RSPB and the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and ESC are invited to comment on the Applicant's updated submissions in relation to changes to coastal process and sediment transport made at the final examination deadline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deadline 10 Submission – 9.12 Preliminary Design and Maintenance Requirements for the Sizewell C Coastal Defence Feature [REP10- 124]; and • Deadline 10 Submission – 6.14/10.5: Environmental Statement Addendum, Volume 3, Chapter 2, Appendix 2.15.A: Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [REP10-041]. 	<p><u>Report 9.12 (TR544 V4)</u> provides updated estimates of the forecast Soft Coastal Defence Feature (SCDF) Recharge Interval (RI) and SCDF viability under more onerous erosion conditions than previously tested. It concludes that the risks of Hard Coastal Defence Feature (HCDF) exposure with the SCDF are very low during the operation phase and rise slightly throughout the decommissioning phase and that the risk of HCDF exposure can be mitigated using a fine cobble layer to increase erosion resistance if the fronting SCDF pebbles were fully removed.</p> <p>ESC considers that the SCDF is a necessary mitigation feature that should be maintained whilst the HCDF exists, and that the Applicant should not withdraw maintenance if it becomes expensive. The Council is encouraged by the output of report TR544 however SCDF effectiveness is, in part, linked to the form and position of the HCDF; the design of which is not finalised. ESC has concerns with several aspects of the HCDF design submitted at deadline 10. These will be resolved with the Applicant under the discharge of Requirement 12B requiring ESC's approval of the HCDF design. This report does not alter ESC's position as stated in the SoCG REP 10-102.</p>

	<p><u>Report 6.14/10.5</u> is the draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (CPMMP), the purpose of which is to:</p> <p><i>'Detect and report impacts of Sizewell C's marine components and activities on coastal geomorphology receptors, both inside and outside of designated conservation sites, and monitor and, where necessary, implement future mitigation. The principal requirements of mitigation are: (i) to minimise the local impacts of development components on nearshore geomorphology and (ii) maintain the longshore sand and shingle transport corridors thereby avoiding transmission of impacts to the wider coastal system.'</i></p> <p>Under Requirement 7A the CPMMP must be completed and approved before construction of the HCDF and SCDF. The version submitted at Deadline 10 included updates but is not complete. ESC's position on it therefore remains as stated in the Statement of Common Ground at Deadline 10 [REP 10-102].</p>
--	---