



The Sizewell C Project

8.4 Planning Statement Appendix 8.4J Addendum Update on Section 106 Agreement

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

November 2020

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



Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
STATUS OF THIS PLANNING STATEMENT APPENDIX 8.4J ADDENDUM: UPDATE ON SECTION 106 AGREEMENT (INCLUDING ITS APPENDICES) ..	4
1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 OBLIGATIONS	4

Tables

Table 2.1: Location of further details of draft substantive obligations by topic

Plates

None provided.

Figures

None provided.

Appendices

Appendix A: S.106 Summary - Housing Fund - DRAFT

Appendix B: Community Safety Summary

Appendix C: S.106 Summary - Economic Development (Employment, Skills, Education and Supply Chain)

Appendix D: S.106 Summary - Health and Wellbeing

Appendix E: S.106 Summary - Historic Environment

Appendix F: S.106 Summary - Public Rights of Way Fund - DRAFT

Appendix G: S.106 Summary Note – Leiston Sports Facilities - DRAFT

Appendix H: S.106 Summary Note - Natural Environment

Appendix I: Summary - Community Fund

Appendix J: S.106 Summary - Tourism Fund - DRAFT

Planning Statement Appendix 8.4J Addendum: Update on Section 106 Agreement

Executive Summary

The purpose of this **Planning Statement Appendix 8.4J Addendum: Update on Section 106 Agreement** (the **Section 106 Agreement Update**) is to provide further details of the substantive obligations which NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited (**SZC Co.**) is proposing to enter into in order to mitigate impacts of the proposed Sizewell C nuclear power station which is the subject of the Development Consent Order (**DCO**) Application.

Details of the development consent obligations which SZC Co. considers to be appropriate in the context of the proposals presented in the Application have been set out in the **Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms** [[APP-600](#)]. It is intended that these development consent obligations would be secured through an agreement pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the **Section 106 Agreement**).

Further details of the substantive planning obligations which have been developed following the submission of the Application are provided in **Section 2** of this **Section 106 Agreement Update** and in further technical papers appended to this **Section 106 Agreement Update** in **Appendices A – J**. The contents of these technical papers have been prepared by SZC Co. for the purpose of progressing ongoing discussions with East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council on the proposed draft substantive development consent obligations. The papers have been shared with the Councils. **Table 2.1** identifies the location of further details relating to each substantive topic.

Note: This document provides an update on the progress of the position reached with the SZC Section 106 agreement, as requested by the Planning Inspectorate in its Rule 9 letter of 23 October, 2020. The document has been drafted by SZC Co. and its content has not been agreed with stakeholders. SZC Co., East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council wish the Planning Inspectorate to be aware that they are engaged in constructive dialogue on the scope and the terms of the Section 106 obligations. Each principal topic area within the Section 106 is the subject of active joint working, through a series of specialist working groups. SZC Co. is also engaging with other parties with whom a fund and protocols would be agreed, for example the emergency services.

Status of this Planning Statement Appendix 8.4J Addendum: Update on Section 106 Agreement (including its Appendices)

Note: This document provides an update on the progress of the position reached with the SZC Section 106 agreement, as requested by the Planning Inspectorate in its Rule 9 letter of 23 October, 2020. The document has been drafted by SZC Co. and its content has not been agreed with stakeholders. SZC Co., East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council wish the Planning Inspectorate to be aware that they are engaged in constructive dialogue on the scope and the terms of the Section 106 obligations. Each principal topic area within the Section 106 is the subject of active joint working, through a series of specialist working groups. SZC Co. is also engaging with other parties with whom a fund and protocols would be agreed, for example the emergency services.

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 On 27 May 2020, SZC Co. submitted an application for development consent to the Planning Inspectorate under the Planning Act 2008 for a DCO to construct, operate and maintain a nuclear power station in Sizewell, known as Sizewell C, together with associated development.
- 1.1.2 It is anticipated that (irrespective of other planning considerations) in order for the proposals to be acceptable in planning terms, a development consent obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 will be required to mitigate the impacts of the proposed development.
- 1.1.3 SZC Co. expects to enter into a bilateral agreement to secure these development consent obligations. However, if this is not possible, then SZC Co. will secure the necessary obligations through a unilateral undertaking.
- 1.1.4 SZC Co. provided details of the proposed substantive development consent obligations in the **Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms** [APP-600]. Further technical details of these substantive obligations is presented in **Section 2** of this **Planning Statement Appendix 8.4J Addendum: Update on Section 106 Agreement (the Section 106 Agreement Update)**.
- 1.1.5 This **Section 106 Agreement Update** and its appendices should be read in conjunction with the draft requirements set out in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO** [APP-059].

2 Obligations

- 2.1.1 The details of the substantive obligations that SZC Co. considers appropriate were set out in draft in **section 6** of the **Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms** [APP-600].
- 2.1.2 Following the submission of the Application, SZC Co has continued to develop the details of these obligations and has consulted East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council in respect of the draft proposals. **Appendices A-J** of this **Section 106 Agreement Update** contain further details in respect of the draft proposed development consent obligations. **Table 2.1** below identifies the location of further details relating to each substantive topic.
- 2.1.3 SZC Co. has had regard to the policy in the National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) in the preparation of this **Section 106 Agreement Update**. All of the obligations contained in this **section 2** are considered to comply with the policy relating to planning obligations.
- 2.1.4 As indicated above, these obligations should be considered alongside the DCO requirements to give a complete picture of how the implementation of the DCO will be governed.

Table 2.1: Location of further details of draft substantive obligations by topic.

Topic	Obligations
Accommodation and Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.106 Summary - Housing Fund - DRAFT as provided in Appendix A • Section 6.2 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]
Community Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Safety Summary as provided in Appendix B¹ • Section 6.3 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] <p>As mentioned in Appendix B, SZC Co. considers that the proposed Public Services mitigation set out in the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] is complementary to the proposed consent obligations in respect of Community Safety.</p> <p>Therefore, SZC Co. intends to combine the Community Safety and Public Services topics in its engagement with stakeholders and in the Section 106 Agreement in order to provide a cohesive mitigation package in respect of these effects</p>
Employment, Skills and Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.106 Summary - Economic Development (Employment, Skills, Education and Supply Chain) as provided in Appendix C • Section 6.4 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] <p>As mentioned in Appendix C, SZC Co. considers that the proposed Supply Chain mitigation set out in the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] is complementary to the proposed development consent obligations in respect of Employment, Skills and Education.</p> <p>Therefore, SZC Co. intends to combine the Employment, Skills and Education and Supply Chain topics in its engagement with stakeholders and in the Section 106 Agreement in order to provide a cohesive mitigation package of Economic Development Measures.</p>

¹ The Public Services Resilience Fund referenced in **Appendix B** represents a proposed change in the name of the Public Services Contingency Fund referred to in the **Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms** [APP-600].

Topic	Obligations
Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.106 Summary - Health and Wellbeing as provided in Appendix D • Section 6.5 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.106 Summary - Historic Environment as provided in Appendix E • Section 6.6 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]
Implementation Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.7 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] <p>The position remains unchanged from that reported in the Application.</p> <p>SZC Co. will use reasonable endeavours to deliver the key environmental mitigations measures in accordance with the Implementation Plan [APP-599].</p>
Leisure, Public Rights of Way and Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.106 Summary - Public Rights of Way Fund - DRAFT as provided in Appendix F • S.106 Summary Note – Leiston Sports Facilities - DRAFT as provided in Appendix G • Section 6.8 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]
Monitoring (Workforce and Socio-economic Impacts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.9 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] <p>The position remains unchanged from that reported in the Application.</p> <p>SZC Co. commits to ensuring that monitoring is undertaken in support of delivering the Project.</p> <p>The form of this monitoring will be discussed with both authorities, having regard to the final agreed position on the proposed funds to be included in the Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>The detail of the monitoring, including matters relating to governance, will be included within the Section 106 Agreement.</p>
Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.106 Summary Note - Natural Environment as provided in Appendix H

Topic	Obligations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 6.10 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 6.11 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] Draft Noise Mitigation Scheme [APP-210] <p>Further modelling work is being undertaken by SZC Co., which will inform the details of the Noise Mitigation Scheme. Therefore, it is intended that discussions will be held between the parties on Noise Mitigation Scheme in early 2021.</p>
Property Price Support Scheme	<p>Following the submission of the Application, a review of the current Property Price Support Scheme was undertaken. This review considered whether the Property Price Support Scheme should form part of the development consent obligations secured through the Section 106 Agreement or should be a standalone document which does not form part of the secondary mitigation measures.</p> <p>As property values are not a material planning consideration and the Property Price Support Scheme, which was issued in November 2019 and went live on 8 July 2020, is a discretionary scheme, SZC Co.'s view is that no development consent obligations should be included in the Section 106 Agreement in respect of property price support.</p> <p>Under the scheme which has been launched, where an eligible property within the scheme boundary sells at a value which has been reduced as a consequence of Sizewell C, SZC Co. will offer the owner the difference in value, as determined by a surveyor.</p> <p>This supersedes the position as explained in Section 6.12 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600].</p>
Public Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Safety Summary as provided in Appendix B Section 6.13 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]

Topic	Obligations
	<p>As mentioned in Appendix B, SZC Co. considers that the proposed Public Services mitigation set out in the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] is complementary to the proposed consent obligations in respect of Community Safety.</p> <p>Therefore, SZC Co. intends to combine the Community Safety and Public Services topics in its engagement with stakeholders and in the Section 106 Agreement in order to provide a cohesive mitigation package in respect of these effects.</p>
Resilience Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 6.14 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] <p>The position remains unchanged from that reported in the Application.</p> <p>SZC Co. will provide separate resilience funds to the Pro Corda Music School, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, and the National Trust Dunwich Heath and Coastguard Cottages.</p> <p>SZC Co. continues to engage with these organisations and the form and scale of these funds will be developed through discussions on a Statement of Common Ground.</p>
Sizewell C Community Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary - Community Fund as provided in Appendix I Section 6.15 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]
Supply Chain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> S.106 Summary - Economic Development (Employment, Skills, Education and Supply Chain) as provided in Appendix C Section 6.16 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] <p>As mentioned in Appendix C, SZC Co. considers that the proposed Supply Chain mitigation set out in the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] is complementary to the proposed development consent obligations in respect of Employment, Skills and Education.</p> <p>Therefore, SZC Co. intends to combine the Employment, Skills and Education and Supply Chain topics in its engagement with stakeholders and in the Section 106</p>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Topic	Obligations
	Agreement in order to provide a cohesive mitigation package of Economic Development Measures.
Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.106 Summary - Tourism Fund - DRAFT as provided in Appendix J • Section 6.17 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600]
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6.18 of the Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms [APP-600] <p>As set out in the Notification of Proposed Project Changes [AS-005], SZC Co. has identified changes to the freight management strategy which it considers should be made to the Project, subject to consultation. If accepted by the Examining Authority, these changes, along with the output of further modelling work which is currently being undertaken, will inform the details of the transport measures to be secured through the proposed Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>Therefore, it is intended that discussions will be held between the parties on the proposed transport obligations following receipt of the Examining Authority's decision on whether to accept the proposed change application.</p>

APPENDIX A: S.106 SUMMARY - HOUSING FUND - DRAFT

S. 106 Summary – Housing Fund - DRAFT

The Environmental Statement (ES) identifies significant effects on housing need at the local scale, requiring mitigation. The scale of these effects has been discussed with the local authorities, as has the principle that they can be mitigated by a Housing Fund modelled on the similar one at HPC.

The Housing Fund will **increase the effective supply** of accommodation and **increase the resilience of the housing market** and local authority housing services – thereby reducing pressure on capacity caused by workers.

1 Structure / Scope of the Housing Fund

1.1.1 The Housing Fund is indicatively split into these elements:

- a) Measures to **boost the supply** of existing accommodation
 - i. In the **private housing sector** through bringing property, rooms and bedspaces to the market, and making more efficient and effective use of existing supply; and
 - ii. in the **tourist sector** – through supporting providers to increase capacity and make more effective use of existing sites through re-design, facilities and licencing.
- b) **Providing resilience** during the construction phase when demand from construction workers may be greatest, reducing pressure on the delivery of housing support and homelessness prevention services in East Suffolk and fundamentally reducing demand on housing market capacity.

1.1.2 Each element will be broadly allocated funding, through retaining the flexibility to move funds between elements should parties agree.

2 Lessons from Hinkley Point and Wylfa

2.1.1 HPC and Wylfa's Housing Funds had similar purposes, and both had a core fund and a contingency to be released if monitoring showed that there were additional impacts.

2.1.2 **Table 1** compares HPC and Wylfa with the proposed SZC Housing Fund.

TABLE 1	Hinkley Point C	Wylfa Newydd	Sizewell C
Overall Scale	£7.5m (£4m SPW; £3.5m DCO)	c. £15m	
Scope	Staffing; Delivery of private stock; Limited housing initiatives (non-bedspace)	Staffing, resilience for service delivery, initiatives, bedspaces (focus on empty homes and new build)	Boosting supply in private and tourist sector; Providing resilience to service to reduce risk of demand
Split of Funding	Not split – but has ended up being used for many different purposes	£5.1m for bedspaces in empty homes £0.5m for minor grants £0.55m for market efficiency (rental deposits, downsizing) £7.35m for New Build (PRS or owner-occupied) £0.9m Accommodation Officer contribution (staffing) £0.6m annual contribution for service delivery and initiatives (non-bedspace)	Boosting supply in private housing Boosting supply in tourist sector Service resilience and initiatives
Contingency?	Up to £5m based purely on exceedance of thresholds from 2011	Up to £2.25m based on housing market stress indicators, under-occupancy of campus and worker uptake of private accommodation	

Key Learnings for SZC:

- a) **Cost effectiveness:** Substantial new capacity can be delivered - Hinkley Point C's Housing Fund has been extremely effective in delivering new bedspaces, with more bedspaces at a cheaper rate than anticipated at DCO (around 2,400 bedspaces for £4.5m).
- b) **Boosting Supply:** Successful initiatives for boosting supply have three categories – bringing empty homes back into use, minor improvements to stock, and making more efficient use of stock.
- c) **Release:** Early release led to momentum being gained early on, with successful implementation of initiatives and provision of bedspaces – but some should be held back, linked to workforce build-up (rather than purely annual release) to make sure there is enough mitigation for the peak.
- d) **Contingency:** If required, any contingency element should be linked to evidence of housing market stress, rather than solely to concentrations of demand.
- e) **Split of Fund:** HPC's Housing Fund was too simplistic in its breakdown - it is proposed that SZC's Housing Fund has a clear delineation of funds for specific purposes as described above (boosting supply (private and tourist) and resilience).

3 Scope/Scale of the Housing Fund

Core Elements

3.1.1 For SZC, three 'core' elements/pots are proposed – details are set out in **Table 2**:

- a) A fund for boosting supply in the private housing sector and managing governance and monitoring – including:
 - i. £X could be provided up-front to provide supply in early years and supporting peak effects. This would be managed by a business plan set at the outset, and held accountable by regular reporting and an agreed spend per year in the first three years;
 - ii. The remaining £X could be provided following the expenditure above, allocated in the years up to and over the peak of construction activity but fixed to the anticipated build-up of workforce and released on a cost per additional bedspace basis;
 - iii. £X would be used for monitoring, governance and operation of the SEAG Accommodation Working Group, released equally on an annual basis.
- b) A fund for providing support for supply and reconfiguration, licencing and planning for supply in the tourist sector; and
- c) A fund for providing resilience for ESC's housing and homelessness services over the peak including emergency accommodation, temporary accommodation, outreach and service delivery.

Contingency

3.1.2 Similar to HPC, a contingency fund for the 'boosting supply' element could be made available, if there is evidence that:

- a) Overall PRS demand is greater than anticipated – or projected to be greater than anticipated at the peak due to any revisions to the workforce profile; and is more concentrated in the PRS than other accommodation sectors; and
- b) Workers are not sufficiently occupying Project Accommodation which might result in a higher than anticipated demand for PRS; and
- c) There is evidence of housing market stress based on e.g. homelessness and service demand above national averages.

4 Governance

- 4.1.1 The effectiveness of the Housing Fund and the Accommodation Strategy would be subject to **monitoring, reporting and governance**.
- 4.1.2 As at HPC, the District Council (East Suffolk) would be the main recipient of the Fund as the statutory body responsible for housing and homelessness, and the District where local significant effects (as reported in the EIA) are predicted to occur.
- 4.1.3 The Housing Fund would be managed and monitored by an Accommodation Working Group reporting to SEAG, including SZC Co and East Suffolk District. The Group would:
 - a) Report on and consider evidence of workforce size, location and accommodation type – actuals based on monitoring, and forecast (SZC Co)
 - b) Report on housing market stress indicators (ESC)
 - c) Develop plans for spending of Housing Fund Monies and review effectiveness of the Housing Fund initiatives
 - d) Consider release of contingency subject to evidence.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

TABLE 2	Costs	Purpose / Initiatives	HPC Information	Justification
Boosting Supply		Helping to bring empty homes back into use; Grants for property improvements and standards; Help make more efficient use of existing properties.	HPC has been very effective in delivering bedspaces with cost-effective initiatives – particularly small grants for improving and bringing forward small rented units. This has boosted supply in areas with most housing market need and where workers have tended to concentrate so far.	The Accommodation Strategy set an initial breakdown of types of initiatives and the bedspaces they could provide using an indicative mix. A mix of measures is proposed to achieve a central case of c. 1,200 bedspaces (equal to the total number of PRS bedspaces likely to be taken by workers at peak)
Tourist Sector		Developing a strategy Licensing support Pre-application support Enforcement action Reconfiguration grants	600 caravan bedspaces have been developed through a detailed and proactive strategy of enforcement and management, and support with sustainable licencing and expansion arrangements. This has made it substantially easier to accommodate workers in a managed way.	Experience from HPC has suggested that providing clarity on the number and location of caravan bedspaces for civils workers in particular is an important part of reducing demand on private housing. This reduces issues of enforcement and allows the Local Authority to better regulate use of caravan accommodation in a way that would not result in significant demands on resourcing. It is proposed that a fund is set aside for this – for ESC to initially undertake a review of providers and develop a strategy and planning principles to deliver bedspaces, and then cover the cost of planning advice and support, licencing amendments, and provide grants for providers to bring forward or reconfigure accommodation for workers' use: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research and Strategy: Year 1 for pre-peak planning; and in year 7 for post-peak planning• Planning advice, licencing and support: for 10 years• Grants to providers: available for providers to bid into on the basis that funds would be used to provide additional supply for workers
Service Resilience / Support		Temp accommodation (self-contained and B&B) Training and recruitment Outreach, floating support and tenancy sustainment Landlord engagement and support Issue-specific resourcing e.g. Single Homelessness / Family liaison Management of HMOs	Initiatives and staff resourcing at HPC has resulted in a reduction of demand on capacity through sustainment of tenancies, reducing local housing need and risk of homelessness. Tenancy sustainment officers and activities have been particularly important – including provision of furniture, support for family liaison etc. This reduces the underlying housing market stress on which the workers might otherwise have an exacerbated effect.	ESC spends an average of c/ £195k p/a on temporary accommodation and £600k p/a on housing and homelessness services, and up to £430k on discretionary housing payments. There is an opportunity to fund initiatives that help to reduce demand on services and costs of homelessness, in turn reducing the effect workers would have on a tightened supply of PRS in the lower quartile. This needs to be linked to evidence of effects – so would be released related to annual tracking of housing market stress indicators against a national and regional benchmark. The fund would provide flexibility for measures across a range of activities sufficient to help reduce additional pressure on the housing market across the Sizewell C Project's construction phase.
TOTAL		Based on HPC effectiveness and long-term engagement with ESC on housing need and risk of homelessness, a suite of measures has been identified split across three areas that would sufficiently increase supply, and reduce the risk of exacerbating demand.		
Contingency		<i>There may be a case for a contingency for the 'boosting supply' element (1). This would need to be determined by a combination of Project assumptions on the workforce location, size and accommodation choices being different to anticipated AND stresses on the housing market being observed.</i> <i>This would be based on an average cost per bedspace from the 'boosting supply' element above, applied to 876 more worker bedspaces being used in PRS than anticipated at peak (1,200) – this is based on evidenced % of workers using PRS at Hinkley Point C, but assuming NO latent accommodation is used – a severe worst case.</i>		

APPENDIX B: COMMUNITY SAFETY SUMMARY

Community Safety - Summary

1 Introduction / Principles

1.1 Identification of Effects

1.1.1 Engagement with local stakeholders, and relevant representations, has identified potential risks and concerns related to community safety that may need mitigation (some are also noted in the **Community Safety Management Plan** (CSMP) and **Volume 2, Chapter 9** of the **Environmental Statement** (ES) within the DCO application where the Project considers them to be significant in EIA terms or potential risks):

- **Policing, crime and anti-social behaviour:** Potential moderate adverse effects on recorded crime rates¹ in the Leiston Neighbourhood Area (see Paragraph 9.7.225 of **Vol 2, Ch 9** of **ES**). This part of the ES recognises particular concern raised at Hinkley Point C relating to night-time economy and the disproportionate influence of a predominantly male workforce, and specific issues raised as a concern by Suffolk Constabulary such as domestic violence, drugs and 'county lines', safeguarding and prostitution.
- **Housing and vulnerability to homelessness,** which disproportionately affects vulnerable groups, and safety in homes where spare rooms may be rented to workforce.
- **Response times:** Concern that road traffic incidents, infrastructure works, HGV and LGV movements and AILs may cause congestion and delays, influencing response times of police, fire, and ambulance to incidents in the community and may adversely affect the number of people social care and community health teams are able to reach per day.
- **Fire and Rescue:** Demand for home safety checks and other public safety initiatives, and response to incidents at the site, and effects on staffing of retained firefighters who may seek work on the Project.
- **Ambulance:** Demand for response to incidents at the site.
- **Community cohesion and integration:** challenges in integrating a workforce with specific characteristics and needs into an existing community, and perceptions of community safety.
- Concerns, primarily related to **changes in the population profile** – particularly in Leiston – due to the number and narrow demographic of construction workers (see Paragraph 9.7.192 of **Vol 2, Ch 9** of **ES**):
 - Potential risks to vulnerable young people and care leavers, particularly in Leiston, and particularly those who are in housing need or vulnerable to homelessness;
 - Potential risks related to cultural differences between NHB construction workers and residents;
 - Potential risks related to drugs, alcohol and prostitution including exploitation of young people by a predominantly older male workforce, and potential for related increase in trafficking;

¹ As set out at paragraph 9.7.229 of **Volume 2, Chapter 9** of the ES: "SZC Co. recognises through engagement with Suffolk Constabulary, that recorded crimes (the metric used in this assessment) are only one contributor towards police resourcing, and that information on response to non-reported incidents and dealing with crimes not categorised by the Home Office definitions can lead to greater demand for police resourcing"

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- Potential risks related to access to and delivery of sexual health services and increase in youth pregnancy;
- Potential risks on the delivery of services, particularly to vulnerable older people who wish to remain in their homes but require care; and
- Potential demand for social services and mental wellbeing services from construction workers and their families, and welfare in schools such as English as an Additional Language.
- **Economic-based risks to service provision** as an indirect result of job creation on the Sizewell C Project, which may lead to workforce churn that means some positions in care roles become harder to fill.

1.2 Complementary Mitigation within the DCO

1.2.1 There are a number of complementary embedded and additional mitigation activities that are to be secured by the S.106 and which would contribute to the reduction in risks of the Project on community safety and reduce the risks for vulnerable groups and temporary NHB workers and their families alike.

1.2.2 These are not covered in detail in this note, but are set out in the **CSMP** and elsewhere throughout the DCO. They include, for example, the proposed shared sports facilities and their management, the Housing Fund and **Accommodation Strategy** including Accommodation Management System, Employment, Skills and Education initiatives, Transport measures, Community Fund, **Code of Construction Practice** and Worker Code of Conduct, security vetting of employees, Occupational Healthcare Service and Residual Healthcare Contribution, provision of community engagement and Welcome Packs for workers as part of induction, and on-site commitments such as the 24/7 security team, emergency coordinator and contractor fire/safety capability.

b) Additional Community Safety Measures

1.2.3 This note therefore refers to measures additional to the above, specific to community safety issues that have been assessed and engaged on with stakeholders - specifically:

- 1) Financial contributions to **Emergency Services** and **Strategic Relationship Protocols** (SRPs)
- 2) Relevant elements of the **Public Services Resilience Fund** (with regard to community safety and particularly vulnerable groups).

2 Comparison with Hinkley Point C

2.1.1 The following table lists Community Safety contributions set out in the s.106 agreement for Hinkley Point C by amount and recipient:

Purpose and Recipient	Amount
Hinkley Point C	
Up-front Community Safety Contributions for District and County Councils . Note - some of this would be passed on to Emergency Services , but the amount is not defined by the S. 106 agreement. Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parish Liaison and Community Safety Officer and Joint Community Safety Officers - Joint Community Safety Project Officer - Costs of undertaking a CCTV Feasibility Study - Costs related to any repairs/cleaning needed after protests - Street Cleaning Feasibility Study 	£1,997,649

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Purpose and Recipient	Amount
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs related to evacuation of businesses and residents - CCU Officer - Police – Cost of Police Community Beat Team and marked police vehicle, procurement of security equipment, provision of additional Sergeant and Constable positions – for the duration of <u>site preparation works</u> - Ambulance Service – Cost of Operations Manager - for the duration of <u>site preparation works</u> - Fire Service – Cost of Community Safety Officer, Maritime Fire Fighting Training, Site Familiarisation, Group Manager and administration support - for the duration of <u>site preparation works</u> 	
Community Safety Contingency for District and County Councils – including costs related to any repairs/cleaning needed after protests, costs related to evacuation of businesses and residents, and costs of public safety initiatives to be undertaken by Emergency Services	£575,904
Contribution to the costs of a Community Safety Beat Team, procuring and operating a marked police vehicle, and planning for responding to security incidents in relation to the Project for Avon and Somerset Constabulary	£2,864,940
Contribution to cost of Community Safety Officer and Group Manager, site familiarisation visits, reviewing and updating plans for responding to incidents in relation to the Project, attendance at meetings of the Emergency Services and Local Authorities Group, and Maritime Fire Fighting training (contingency) for Devon and Somerset Fire and Rescue Service	£881,581
Contribution to reviewing and updating plans for responding to incidents in relation to the Project and funding for attendance at meetings of the Emergency Services and Local Authorities Group for South West England Ambulance Service	£111,200
TOTAL LIABILITY	£6,431,274

3 Public Services Resilience Fund

3.1 East Suffolk Council (ESC) Community Safety

- 3.1.1 ESC's Communities service refers to – among other things – support for protecting vulnerable people, through (for example) raising awareness about domestic abuse, safeguarding and exploitation (e.g. trafficking and modern slavery).
- 3.1.2 The East Suffolk Community Safety Partnership coordinates stakeholders and provides public services to “*promote and raise awareness in partnership to effectively help, enable, develop and co-ordinate activity to encourage resilient communities across East Suffolk*”²
- 3.1.3 Several elements of the Partnership's existing Plan could be influenced by Sizewell C's effect on local population profile and risks set out in the **ES** and **CSMP**, and as such, it may be appropriate for SZC Co to contribute to or extend/magnify resources for specific actions outlined in that Plan such as:
- Promote Neighbourhood Watch/Crime Reduction initiatives through road show events and promotion / communication;
 - Promote key messages/initiatives about drink/drugs to raise awareness and promote safe use;

² East Suffolk Community Safety Partnership Plan 2017-2020

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- c) Support delivery of diversionary activities for young people related ASB and raise awareness of ASB through education and training;
- d) Promote road safety initiatives through local campaigns;
- e) Address issues that may require a short-term or immediate response, including gang violence (across county lines), Modern Day Slavery, Radicalisation and Domestic Abuse by raising awareness through training sessions, and linking and liaising with local and wider-scale DV groups.

3.1.4 Mitigation may be in the form of contributions to officer resource or funding for specific activities, outreach, campaigns, or marketing.

3.2 Suffolk County Council (SCC) – Health and Social Care (Adult Social Care and Children and Young Peoples Services)

3.2.1 Engagement with Health and Social Care stakeholders – through separate working groups – has led to the conclusion that an integrated fund may be the most effective way of responding to community safety issues where SCC's Public Health and Social Care services are the statutory provider.

3.2.2 Engagement with SCC has led to the following draft position in terms of contributions towards the protection of vulnerable groups, safeguarding, and service resilience resulting from the risks associated with the Sizewell C Project's NHB workforce (scale, demographic and location):

- a) **Social Care Workforce Planning** – Part of the Employment, Skills and Education package could be used to ensure that SCC's social care departments are able to recruit, retain and train its workforce to avoid any unintended consequences of vacancies becoming harder to fill, or staff being less willing to work in / travel to Leiston to provide at-home care and community services
- b) **Social Care Resilience Element** - Responding to concerns related to the scale, distribution and demographic of the workforce and its potential effect on the ability to deliver social care and public health services to both adults and children including safeguarding as a priority:
 - i. Safeguarding activities within the SCC Adult Social Care and Children's Services.
 - ii. Training for existing staff; and commissioning additional services related to specific risks such as research projects and third sector support for issues specific to the Sizewell C construction workforce's potential effects.
 - iii. Community and worker outreach activity to support SCC Adult Social Care and Children's Services.

3.2.3 This position is subject to further review and refinement.

3.2.4 A significant benefit can be gained from multi-agency working, particularly across part (b) above – predominantly between social care and public health services within SCC, who already co-commission activities aimed at promoting community wellbeing and health, and particularly issues of safeguarding, mental health, sexual health and potential exploitation of vulnerable groups.

3.2.5 As such, SZC Co and SCC agree that this element of the PSRF should be provided jointly to SCC's social care and public health functions and integrated with funding for health mitigation, potentially with a joint post with the ability to provide multi-agency response.

3.3 Support for Safeguarding and PHSE in Schools

- 3.3.1 Engagement with SCC's Schools and Early Years officers has identified that a portion of the PSRF would be appropriately spent on supporting local schools with issues relating to safeguarding, personal health and social education (PHSE) and general issues of integration within schools. This approach is common across other DCOs with similar workforce effects.
- 3.3.2 Subject to on-going engagement, this contribution may provide funding towards a floating safeguarding resource between schools in the area.

4 Financial Contributions and SRPs with Emergency Services

- 4.1.1 The SRPs will set out the roles and responsibilities of SZC Co and each Emergency Service provider, and will include details on financial remuneration for additional costs likely to be incurred by those providers as a result of the Project. These SRPs will be private agreements between SZC Co and the Emergency Services.

- 4.1.2 These SRPs are still in development, but are likely to include the following elements per Emergency Service:

4.2 Suffolk Constabulary (SC)

- Reasonable additional resourcing (staff and equipment) related to potential temporary uplift in local policing (responding to incidents, investigations and wider community safety issues), command and control (responding to 999 and 101 calls, incident response, co-ordination and emergency preparedness), custody (arrest and custody suite demand);
- Reasonable additional resourcing for roads policing (escorting AILs, road safety, traffic management and incident response);
- Reasonable additional resourcing for incident planning, public order response and intelligence;
- Site familiarisation, briefings and attendance at and proactive contribution to the Community Safety Working Group (including provision of monitoring data, and reviewing and assisting with management plans referenced within the Community Safety Management Plan, where this is considered additional to statutory responsibilities).

4.3 Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS)

- Awareness raising activities in the local community on fire and road safety issues, including home safety checks;
- Site familiarisation, briefings and attendance at and proactive contribution to the Community Safety Working Group (including provision of monitoring data, and reviewing and assisting with management plans referenced within the Community Safety Management Plan, where this is considered additional to statutory responsibilities);
- Reasonable resources for updating or adapting procedures and methods based on construction activities.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

4.4 East of England Ambulance Service Trust (EEAST)

- Reasonable funding for anticipated additional call-outs to the Main Development Site;
- Site familiarisation, briefings and attendance at and proactive contribution to the Community Safety Working Group (including provision of monitoring data, and reviewing and assisting with management plans referenced within the Community Safety Management **Plan**, where this is considered additional to statutory responsibilities).

5 Governance

5.1 SEAG Community Safety Working Group

5.1.1 A detailed Terms of Reference for the Community Safety Working Group has been drafted by SZC Co based on the structure set out in the Community Safety Management Plan and is appended to this note. This ToR is subject to agreement with proposed members, but includes the following key elements:

- 1) **Membership** including District and County Councils, Emergency Services and SZC Co;
- 2) **Cross-group sight lines** by including the Project's Transport Coordinator, and SCC Social Care and Public Health – who would also sit on the Transport Review Group and Health Group respectively;
- 3) **Monitoring and Reporting** responsibilities linked to effectiveness of measures in **CSMP** and SRPs;

Ability to **review the detail of SRPs** as the Project changes over time.

APPENDIX C: S.106 SUMMARY - ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (EMPLOYMENT, SKILLS, EDUCATION AND SUPPLY CHAIN)

S. 106 Summary – Economic Development (Employment, Skills, Education and Supply Chain)

The Environmental Statement (ES) identifies significant beneficial effects on the local and regional economy through employment and skills development, particularly in terms of effects on unemployment and economic inactivity. There are also significant beneficial effects for the business community in terms of supply chain.

Stakeholders are concerned about adverse effects – namely ‘displacement’ of staff from some companies leaving hard-to-fill vacancies, and legacy effects on demobilisation.

The Employment, Skills and Education (ESE) and Supply Chain Measures will enhance the local and regional retention of Project value, help the Project to achieve home-based (HB) recruitment (the Environmental Statement estimates 2,410 workers at peak) and optimise local procurement, and critically will work within and complement the existing system of skills and business infrastructure / planning to ensure sustainable benefits in the context of objectives for the Energy Coast now and beyond Sizewell C’s construction.

1 Lessons from Hinkley Point and Wylfa

1.1.1 The approach to economic development mitigation / enhancement at HPC was driven by local characteristics and was heavily influenced by the agreement at site preparation stage with Local Authorities. Feedback from HPC’s Employment Affairs Unit has led to several lessons that influence the proposed SZC package:

- a) **Capital Investment** – Investment in capital and fixed assets is not difficult to find for most colleges and institutions. Revenue and funding for curriculum development creates a much greater challenge, as does the working capital required to support specific interventions. Future investments should therefore focus more on these elements, as opposed to fixed capital for buildings, land and training equipment.
- b) **Employment** – The HPC Jobs Service has been very successful and its structure and operations should be used at SZC, implemented/supported by on-the-ground existing structures in the region.
- c) **Skills and Outreach** – Outreach is better funded through working with local partners in the third sector than through funding of officer roles in Councils.
- d) **Education** – Generic education programmes which are focussed on STEM, such as Inspire at HPC, are difficult to measure in terms of impact and their ability to pipeline young people into actual opportunities.
- e) **Supply Chain** – The measures at HPC have been very effective and will largely be replicated wherever practicable in terms of supply chain engagement, and monitoring of benefits. It is important to link supply chain into ESE initiatives – promoting local businesses to win work is the best way of ensuring local employment is generated.

1.1.2 **Table 1** shows HPC categories for Economic Development Measures and SZC proposed measures – figures for SZC are yet to be determined.

TABLE 1	Hinkley Point C	Sizewell C
Overall Scale	£16.46m	
Scope	Economic Development:	Economic Development / Supply Chain:

TABLE 1	Hinkley Point C	Sizewell C
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly funding supply chain engagement activity including through funding of officer positions in Councils. A proportion was also used to offset the business effects of congestion in Bridgwater. Contribution towards developing a 'low carbon cluster'. Commitment to a Supply Chain Engagement Strategy. <p>Education Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educational resources and to inspire general interest in STEM, and to enhance and support learning <p>Employment, Skills and Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly capital investment in facilities like the Energy Skills Centre and Construction Skills Centre. Funding for officer positions (employment outreach), funding for local colleges to implement 'ready skills' projects Funding of Workforce Development initiatives e.g. Jobs Service, Apprenticeship Programme, employment and skills charter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive partnership with Suffolk Chamber of Commerce and commitment to a Local Supply Chain Engagement Strategy <p>Employment, Skills and Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employment Outreach Fund and Asset Skills Enhancement and Capability (ASEC) Fund rather than capital investment or officer funding Student Bursary Scheme Suite of education initiatives focused on enhancing existing programmes for SZC Jobs Service (similar to HPC – using same overall structure) Support for workforce planning in social care sector Funding for a Regional Skills Coordinator (not employed by SZC Co. Independent Project Impact Analysis and monitoring (University of Suffolk)
Split of Funding	<p>Economic Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £0.62m Site Prep £3.97m DCO <p>Education Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £0.3m Site Prep £0.2m DCO <p>Employment, Skills and Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> £4.18m Site Prep £7.19m DCO 	<p>Economic Development / Supply Chain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A – commitment to Local Supply Chain Engagement Strategy <p>Employment, Skills and Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phased and implemented based on Workforce Development Strategies and Annual Implementation Plans, linked to the key construction phases of the Project (Start, Civils, MEH, Demobilisation etc)

2 Proposed Scope & Structure of the Measures

2.1.1 The proposed measures for Sizewell C will be in addition to the costs of implementing a Supply Chain Engagement Strategy (which would be committed to in the S. 106 but not costed). The breakdown of proposed measures and their implementation is set out in **Table 2**.

2.1.2 Proposals for early release measures are shown in the table below, where a longer/earlier lead-in is needed and there is a need to fill a 'gap' in some initiatives between now and consent/implementation of the DCO. This includes:

- Support the mobilisation of a Supply Chain Consortium and creation of a Local Supply Chain Skills Programme;
- Early launch and promotion of a SZC Careers and Opportunities Prospectus;
- Launch of Young SZC; and
- Creation of the infrastructure to support the Sizewell C Jobs Service.

TABLE 2	Overall Cost	Scope	Structure / Implementation	HPC Equivalent
SZC Employment Outreach Fund		Supports the delivery of 'Work Ready' to 'Job Ready' programmes within successful 3rd Sector organisations, such as Inspire Suffolk	Annual release, aligned with the future SZC Workforce Development Strategy, which supports the main stages of the SZC Build (Civil Construction, MEH, Commissioning and Pre-Operations)	Employment of 3x Outreach workers @ £2.4m
Asset Skills Enhancement		Enhance the skills and training provision within the region's existing further education, training provider and higher	Released in phases to align with the future SZC Workforce Development Strategy, which supports the main stages of the SZC Build (Civil	Energy Skills Centre @ £3m

TABLE 2	Overall Cost	Scope	Structure / Implementation	HPC Equivalent
and Capability Fund		education sectors to ensure that the regional supply system can meet the training and skills demand at Sizewell C	Construction, MEH, Commissioning and Pre-Operations)	
Student Bursary Scheme		Supporting the creation of alternative employment pathways into the Sizewell C Project by providing financial support	Managed by an independent Board/Trust and released on an annual basis through application	N/A – New for SZC
Jobs Service		Build, maintain and manage a talent pool of local people. All vacancies created by SZC supply chain would be offered, including apprenticeships. Linked to Young Sizewell C for school-leavers. Open to all local businesses for re-brokerage and backfilling.	Use existing national structure set up for HPC, though likely to be implemented on the ground in Suffolk through existing services e.g. JCP. Starts pre-FID, runs throughout the construction phase particularly important for de-mobilisation.	Existing Jobs Service on which SZC / National version would be based @ £5m
Education and Inspiration Programme		Suite of measures to support the creation of clearer pathways into jobs, building on and enhancing existing measures in the region. Start from early education onwards. Aim to inspire and develop a better understanding of Sizewell C roles and relevant signposting to associated, sustainable careers	Some elements of this package would be rolled out early, with long-lead in times essential to get the most out of the fund (ensuring that those in education now are best placed to work on the Sizewell C Project towards the peak of construction, when MEH roles in particular will be in demand). Starts pre-FID, front-loading critical.	Inspire Programme @ £1m (not in S. 106)
Funding of Regional Skills Coordinator Post		Funding of an External/Regional post (i.e. embedded in the system, not employed by EDF Energy) to provide a focal point of coordination and skills planning and legacy - acting as the main link between the Sizewell C Project, providers and broader regional demand for skills	Similar role already exists, but only until December 2020. Would continue in its existing form, be hosted externally (i.e. not employed by EDF Energy), and operate for the duration of the construction phase.	Construction Skills Centre @ £1.5m
Impact Evaluation Programme		Three streams will be created around social, community and backfill and displacement topics.	Delivered with the University of Suffolk and with links to mentors at the University of Bath	Bath University programme
Social Care – Workforce Planning		A contribution to workforce planning at the outset of the Sizewell C Project may help to improve Suffolk County Councils capacity to retain staff in this sector, plan for recruitment and training and provide resilience	Funding provided on implementation of the Sizewell C Project directly from SZC Co to Suffolk County Council, for the purposes of measures that provide resilience to workforce planning for the social care sector in Suffolk. Suffolk County Council would submit and agree with SZC Co a detailed business plan for use of this fund prior to its release, and provide regular feedback monitoring its effectiveness.	N/A – New for SZC
Local Supply Chain Engagement Strategy	N/A	Similar to HPC – events, outreach, business support and engagement, Supply Chain Portal and Tier 1 brokering. Support for developing JV/consortia for known packages with local potential. Detailed monitoring including local business capability maps and information provision. Development and implementation of a SZC Local and Regional Supply Chain Management Structure	Activities of the Local Supply Chain Engagement Strategy are planned for implementation prior to DCO start and would continue for the duration of the construction phase.	Local Supply Chain Engagement Strategy
Funding for Governance and Performance Management		To cover the management of the mitigation and enhancement proposals by the Economic Development Working Group	Structured to support the activities of the working group, as outlined in section 3.	Hinkley Ready @ £1.6m
TOTAL		N/A	N/A	N/A

3 Governance

a) Working Groups, Planning and Release/Review

- 3.1.1 Similar to the structure at HPC, the above mitigation / enhancement proposals would be managed by an **Economic Development Working Group (EDWG)** under the **Socio-economic Advisory Group (SEAG)** for the Sizewell C Project. The EDWG would comprise: SZC Co and its Tier 1 Contractors, the Civils Alliance, Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk District Council, New Anglia LEP, and Suffolk Chamber of Commerce (which will operate the Supply Chain Strategy on the ground, with scope set and reviewed by SZC Co.), Regional Skills Coordinator (S. 106). The EDWG's overall remit would be to:

- Consider the effectiveness of measures implemented for education, employment, skills and training;
- Review / implement measures – including the distribution of Employment Outreach Fund and ASEC Fund – using Workforce Development Strategies for each phase and Annual Implementation Plans;
- Report in to SEAG (and publish for the community) outcomes such as the number of apprenticeships, and work starts for local residents; and
- Work directly with regional boards / groups including other large construction and infrastructure projects to identify opportunities for collaboration and investment.

b) Reporting and Monitoring

3.1.2 A similar structure to the (new) reporting and planning mechanism at HPC would be implemented:

- SZC Co. will produce a **Workforce Development Strategy** for each phase of the Sizewell C construction phase (Civil Construction, MEH, Commissioning and Pre-Operations). These will be informed by Tier 1 Contractors and reviewed and scrutinised by the EDWG before being adopted for each phase. The Workforce Development Strategies would:
 - Provide a look-ahead per phase, planning for potential vacancies and skills gaps/opportunities;
 - Interact with labour market intelligence (LMI) and supply chain data to develop a programme for delivery of the Funds and Programmes to meet the key needs of the Sizewell C Project and making funds available at the right time to meet the ‘training windows’ required per phase.
 - Set overarching monitoring measures and identify realistic practicable outcomes for specific indicators for each phase of construction.
- The content, approach and success of these Workforce Development Strategies will be reviewed annually, and within this structure, SZC Co. will also produce **Annual Implementation Plans** that will require sign-off by stakeholders through the EDWG. The Annual Implementation Plans will be submitted annually by SZC Co to the SEAG Workforce Development Working Group, considered and agreed by the Group, and its KPIs/Outcomes monitored over the course of the 12 month period to test the effectiveness of the Plans/Programmes/Funds;
- The **Local Supply Chain Engagement Strategy** will be reviewed annually alongside the structure for Workforce Development and Annual Implementation set out above, in order to provide seamless interaction between workforce planning at the key phases of construction, and respond to the demands of work packages.

APPENDIX D: S.106 SUMMARY - HEALTH AND WELLBEING

S.106 Summary – Health and Wellbeing

Overview

- a) The Health and Wellbeing assessment set out in **Book 6, Volume 2, Chapter 28** of the **Environmental Statement** (ES) presents a project-wide assessment of activities which have the potential to impact on health and wellbeing. Due to the multidisciplinary factors that could affect health, it draws upon the socio-economics, transport, noise and vibration, air quality and radiological assessments and relies on any mitigation proposed in these.
- b) Health-specific mitigation is embedded in the project in the form of an **Occupational Health** service. This is intended to internalise potential impacts on local healthcare demand associated with the non-home-based construction workforce, while also being available to home-based workers. While termed an occupational healthcare service, provision will also cover health protection and promotion aspects of public health.
- c) The occupational health service is structured around managing the health of the construction workforce by addressing the workplace; the worker; and well-being. The scope is provided in **Appendix 28A** of the ES chapter but this would be flexible throughout the construction phase. A key feature of the occupational health provision will be ongoing engagement with local public health teams to align local health initiatives/campaigns and ensure a unified response to any collective public health challenges, as they arise.
- d) Following the implementation of the occupational health service and taking into account services that non-home based workers would continue to access at their home location, the change in healthcare demand directly attributable to the non-home-based workers would be minor. Furthermore, the use of the occupational health service by home-based workers would be likely to reduce demand on local health care demand on public services.
- e) The potential change in healthcare demand attributable to any dependants or family members that non-homebased workers might bring with them would also be minor. In addition, it is anticipated that workers who bring families are most likely to be on long-term contracts and would buy properties or take private rented sector accommodation during this time. As such, they would not represent a net addition to the existing number of council tax paying households/population, and there would be little to no material change in net healthcare demand.
- f) While the potential residual effect is considered minor adverse, public health is a high value asset, and continues to work to significant austerity measures, while further addressing the challenges associated with a growing and ageing population. On this basis, SZC Co. is proposing additional mitigation in the form of a **residual healthcare contribution**. This would be secured through the Section 106 (S106) Agreement. **Appendix 28B** of the ES sets out an approach to calculating this contribution.
- g) Effectiveness of the occupational health service and any potential change in provision required, along with governance of the residual healthcare contribution would be managed via a **Health Working Group** (CCGs, Public Health Suffolk).
- h) SZC Co. would also provide a Community Fund to ensure that residual in-combination effects of the Sizewell C Project on quality of life may be addressed and to enable communities to maximise the opportunities offered by the Sizewell C Project, whilst other funds will address issues such as housing impacts, employment, education and skills, community safety, leisure and recreation.

Mitigation

- i) Mitigation is summarised in the table below with new additions / additional detail since the DCO submission, as a result of discussions with the CCGs and Public Health Suffolk provided in red text.

Impact	Securing mechanism	Scope	Structure / Implementation
Impact on local healthcare capacity from non-home based workers	S106	<u>Occupational Health Service</u> Set out in Appendix 28A . Draft S106 (Doc Ref 8.4, Appendix J) states: "SZC Co. will provide an on-site (main development site), 24/7 comprehensive occupational health service, to workers on the construction of the Sizewell C Project. The effectiveness of the occupational health service will be monitored by SZC Co. and reported to the Sizewell C Health Working Group."	This will be procured and funded internally with a commitment to reporting and consultation set out in the Health Working Group Terms of Reference.
Residual impact on local healthcare capacity from non-home based workers (anything not covered by occupational health / home provision and impact from workers' families)	S106	<u>Residual Healthcare Contribution</u> Set out in Appendix 28B . Draft S106 (Doc Ref 8.4, Appendix J) states: "SZC Co. will make a residual healthcare planning contribution to mitigate the effects of the additional population from non-home-based workers and their dependants on the local NHS Services for the time that public funding takes to adjust".	Quantum / phasing to be agreed and set out within the S106. Contribution to be made to the NHS. Governance through Health Working Group. Numbers requested from CCG to quantify the residual healthcare contribution. Public Health Suffolk / CCGs / SCC social care have proposed further S106 mitigation for community health in the form of a multi-agency fund. Public Health Suffolk have proposed further S106 support for local mental and sexual health services. CCGs have raised concerns about journey time delays.
Impact on local healthcare capacity from non-home based workers and their families	S106	<u>Health Working Group</u> Draft S106 (Doc Ref 8.4, Appendix J) states: "SZC Co. will establish a Sizewell C Health Working Group to monitor specific health metrics, discuss the effectiveness of health mitigation, and allocate the healthcare planning contribution appropriately. "	Terms of Reference will set out membership and governance. To be issued to existing Health Working Group for approval..

Issues to agree

- j) The following key issues are being worked on with stakeholders in terms of the S106:
- Quantum of residual healthcare contribution.
 - Terms of reference for the Health Working Group.
 - Parties to discuss request for multi-agency fund that social care and health could draw down upon for community health promotion / protection.
 - Parties to discuss request for S106 support for local mental and sexual health services. This is on the basis that while the sexual and mental health needs of the workforce will be addressed through the occupational health service provision, that this will not cover the wider host community and as such, there could be an element of sink and source interaction regarding sexual health and residual disruption/concern for existing local residents that may impact their mental health and wellbeing.

- Journey time concerns to be considered with transport workstream. These relate to ability to maintain current provision of home-care visits.

Lessons from Hinkley Point C

- k) The proposed **occupational health** scope for Sizewell C draws from and builds upon the experience, success, lessons learned, and best practice set during the construction of the London Olympic Park, and currently underway at Hinkley Point C. The lessons learned will continue to refine the provision, which constitutes an adaptive service geared to accommodating the health needs of the workforce and responding to the dynamic nature of public health.
- l) **Appendix 28B** of the ES sets out that the occupational health provision has proven an effective means of maintaining a healthy workforce on comparable projects, and in managing the occupational health needs, such that there is a minor impact on local healthcare capacity.
- m) The **residual health care contribution** will also draw on experience at Hinkley Point C, as follows:
 - The NHS currently makes a recurring revenue allocation directly to Clinical Commissioning Groups on the basis of the relative needs of their populations. This is apportioned relative to the population on a three-year rolling basis. Although all Sizewell C construction workers based in the UK would contribute towards the revenue allocation, there would be a delay and some discrepancy at the local level due to the rapid and temporary change in population from non-home-based workers and their families.
 - The calculation of the likely residual impact stems from experience on Hinkley Point C, a uniquely comparable infrastructure project due to the similarities in type, scale, workforce profile and mitigation strategy. Using data from Hinkley Point C, a 'residual referral rate' has been calculated based on the number of visits to external healthcare facilities (e.g. GP surgeries, hospitals and Minor Injury Units) from the workforce. The rate is then applied to the workforce profile for Sizewell C to calculate the actual number of visits per year. The final step is to multiply the number of visits to external healthcare facilities by the cost of each health intervention.
 - A similar approach has been taken for families whereby the predicted number of adults and children who move to the local area per year is calculated using survey data from Hinkley Point C. Using data on the average healthcare cost for varying demographics, a monetary output per year is derived. While families can only move into existing housing stock and as a result would result in no material net change to local healthcare demand, a voluntary contribution is being progressed to further support local healthcare capacity and services.

APPENDIX E: S.106 SUMMARY - HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

S.106 Summary – Historic Environment

Assessment

- a) The **Environmental Statement (ES)** identifies significant adverse effects on the terrestrial historic environment, following the application of primary and tertiary mitigation, which require additional mitigation. These comprise:
- **Direct effects on buried archaeology** across all sites comprising loss of archaeological interest through material disturbance.
 - **Direct effects on deposits of geoarchaeological interest** beneath the main platform area on the main development site.
 - Indirect effects on the **setting of Upper Abbey Farm** (Grade II listed) and the **first and second Leiston Abbey** sites (Scheduled Monuments and associated Grade I and II listed buildings).
- b) The **ES** also identifies adverse effects on the marine historic environment, which require additional mitigation, as follows:
- **Disturbance of archaeological remains** (if present) and of **deposits of paleoenvironmental and geoarchaeological interest** by construction of the offshore infrastructure and localised dredging (direct effect).
- c) Mitigation required is set out within the ES and will be secured by requirement, marine licence condition (MLC) or in the Section 106 (S106) agreement.

Mitigation

- d) Mitigation is summarised in the table below with new additions / additional detail since the DCO submission, as a result of discussions with SCCAS, ESC Conservation Officer, Historic England and English Heritage provided in red text.

Impact	Securing mechanism	Scope	Structure / Implementation
Direct effects on buried archaeology (terrestrial)	Requirement	Set out in Overarching WSI (Book 6, Vol 2, Appendix 16H) and site-specific WSIs (not included in application). Update to Overarching WSI (to reflect stakeholder comments including how outreach will be provided) and some site specific WSIs to be provided as supplementary submission. Other site-specific WSIs will be provided to SCCAS for approval when ready.	Requirement will require work to be undertaken in accordance with Overarching and site-specific WSIs. Will require any site-specific WSIs not included in supplementary submission to be agreed with SCCAS. SCCAS will monitor fieldwork and post-excavation reporting. SCCAS have requested a S106 contribution for this which is not set out in the draft S106 appended to the Planning Statement, but which is considered appropriate.
Direct effects on deposits of geoarchaeological interest beneath the main platform area (main development site)	Requirement	Set out in Peat Strategy (Book 6, Vol 2, Appendix 16G). Will require a further WSI to be submitted providing additional detail once contractor has been appointed. This is because peat deposits are at depth so will require contractor / archaeologists to work together on this.	Requirement will require work to be undertaken in accordance with the WSI. Will require the WSIs to be agreed with SCCAS and Historic England. SCCAS will monitor work and have requested a S106 contribution for this which is not set out in the draft S106 appended to the Planning Statement, but which is considered appropriate.
Settings impact on Upper Abbey Farm	Requirement	Draft S106 Heads of Terms (Doc Ref 8.4, Appendix J) states: "SZC Co. will undertake repairs to the listed barn at Upper Abbey Farm to conserve and enhance the historic significance of the asset, as well as to the wider farmyard to stabilise or remove unstable structures and to remove intrusive vegetation." SZC Co.'s aim is to identify a sustainable use for the buildings so will define exact scope once the campus contractor is on-board.	SZC Co. will fund and undertake the works, utilising an appropriate contractor with historic building expertise where required e.g. listed barn. Requirement to specify that scope of works to be agreed with the ESC Conservation Officer in advance and that they should be completed in line with the opening of the campus.

Impact	Securing mechanism	Scope	Structure / Implementation
Settings impact on Leiston Abbey	S106	Draft S106 Heads of Terms (Doc Ref 8.4, Appendix J) states: "SZC Co. will contribute to enhancements to the visitor experience of the designated heritage assets at the two Leiston Abbey sites."	Contribution to be made directly to English Heritage for second site – first site TBC as this is on RSPB's land. It may be appropriate for SZC Co. to directly fund this element of the work. Details of what the "enhancements" should include are currently being developed but are likely to comprise repairs to the physical ruins at the second site, enhanced interpretation at the first site and promotion of the links between the two, including the new off-road footpath link. Quantum to depend on what is proposed and subject to negotiation.
Disturbance of offshore archaeological remains (if present)	MLC	Finds reporting protocol to permit the identification of any encountered material of archaeological interest within the site to allow it to be appropriately investigated, recorded and disseminated.	Protocol will be drafted once contractor is on board and details of construction methodology / vessel type etc. has been specified. Protocol will be agreed with Historic England.
Disturbance of offshore deposits of paleoenvironmental and geoarchaeological interest	MLC	Analysis of stratified sediment samples that have already been collected from this area during geotechnical site investigation. Recommendations for the analysis of these deposits are identified in Book 6, Volume 2, Appendix 23C. Dissemination of these results would be through the production of a scientific journal publication.	Recommendations agreed with Historic England and work is underway (as also have a condition to complete this under the marine licences for the geotechnical site investigations).

- e) SZC Co. will also provide a Pro Corda resilience fund to the Pro Corda Music School who own the majority of the Leiston Abbey site (minus the ruins). This resilience fund is not intended to address historic environment impacts or effects on visitors to the heritage assets, its purpose is to address issues on the music school and its visitors, including noise impacts, risks of change to visitor (music school) behaviour and security concerns. Ensuring that Pro Corda can continue to operate from the site during the construction period will however have benefits to the heritage asset as Pro Corda are the site manager for English Heritage (5 year contract from 2020) so provide a sustainable use for the listed buildings and maintain a 24 hour presence on site.

Issues to agree

- f) The following key issues are being worked on with stakeholders in terms of the S106:
- Principle of monitoring contribution for SCCAS agreed - quantum to be negotiated. To cover terrestrial archaeology and peat strategy monitoring, at fieldwork and post-excavation stage.
 - Scope / quantum / recipients of historic environment fund for Leiston Abbey is being considered with English Heritage (second site), Historic England (suitability and sufficiency of mitigation for both sites) and RSPB Minsmere (first site but English Heritage may undertake the interpretation work).
 - S106 wording for works to Upper Abbey Farm to be refined to reflect the need for ESC Conservation Officer sign off proposals and to ensure delivery of the works in a timely manner.

Lessons from Hinkley Point C

- g) The approach to evaluation and mitigation for buried archaeology and to marine archaeological mitigation is consistent with Hinkley Point and is a standard approach to archaeological mitigation.
- h) Due to the nature of the site, the peat strategy is bespoke but builds on learning from other projects as informed by the University of Southampton Coastal and Offshore Archaeological Research Service (COARS), building on work they have undertaken elsewhere e.g. outer Thames estuary.
- i) Mitigation for settings is also necessarily bespoke due to the individual nature of heritage assets but the principle of the project undertaking works to enhance assets within their ownership and providing a S106 contribution for assets outside their ownership is consistent with Hinkley Point C (Pixies Mound / Castle House, respectively).

APPENDIX F: S.106 SUMMARY - PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY FUND - DRAFT

S. 106 Summary - Public Rights of Way Fund – DRAFT

1 Potential Effects

- 1.1.1 The Sizewell C Project would have some impacts upon the surrounding public rights of way network and amenity. The majority of the effects will be mitigated through primary and tertiary mitigation listed within the DCO application. However, there will be some wider effects that cannot be directly mitigated through the Project proposals. This is mainly because Public Right of Way improvements are proposed to land outside the DCO Order limits. These wider improvements will be realised through the Public Rights of Way Fund.
- 1.1.2 The Section 106 will provide an opportunity to leave a legacy for the surrounding area through local improvements to access and recreation.
- 1.1.3 This paper summarises the proposed approach to a Public Rights of Way Fund and notes its scope, scale, structure, and governance.
- 1.1.4 The Rights of Way and Access plans and Articles 14-15 of the **draft DCO** application detail the footpaths which will be stopped up and re-provided within the Order limits and their substitutes as well as any newly created or improved public rights of way.
- 1.1.5 The **Rights of Way Strategy** (Appendix 15I of Volume 2 of the **ES**) sets out more detail on the public rights of way closures and diversions surrounding the main development site, which have been carefully incorporated into the design and construction planning of the proposed development. The Rights of Way Strategy therefore forms part of the primary (i.e. embedded) mitigation of the project. The Strategy also provides information on permissive footpaths that do not feature within the **draft DCO**.
- 1.1.6 In addition to the proposals noted in the draft DCO application, a change request is proposed to be submitted in January which will commit the project to further network improvements around the main development site by incorporating a Bridleway link from Aldhurst Farm to Kenton Hills. This link will substantially improve connectivity within the area including the AONB.
- 1.1.7 It should be noted that there are a number of other section 106 funds listed within the DCO heads of terms document that seek to improve some aspect of recreation and amenity.
- 1.1.8 **The scope of this fund will be agreed with Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council.**

2 Scope of the Public Rights of Way Fund

- 2.1.1 The fund will be drawn upon for:
- a) Physical improvements for surrounding rights of way where adverse effects caused by the Project are not directly mitigated within the DCO application. The fund will focus on route repairs, wayfinding, and improved connectivity of existing PRow networks.
 - b) Improvements to accessibility, including new or upgraded gates around the permanent development schemes.
 - c) New signage to promote local environmental education or to highlight access arrangements.
 - d) Communication of closures, diversions and new access points in local papers or radio.

- e) Any legal changes to designation.

- 2.1.2 The Public Rights of Way Fund needs to have a well-defined scope due to interactions with other funds as well as other embedded mitigation and measures defined elsewhere in the DCO that also benefit recreation and amenity.

3 Scale of the Public Rights of Way Fund

- 3.1.1 HPC provided a Public Rights of Way Fund of £539,279.00 in response to closures of public rights of way and wider impacts on amenity caused by the Project. This funded new local pedestrian routes, network improvements and local communications regarding diversions and closures.
- 3.1.2 The level of use of rights of way around Sizewell C in Suffolk differs substantially from around Hinkley Point C in Somerset. The surrounding network and coast path are used significantly more in Suffolk; this has been validated through local visitor counts and demonstrated through high levels of local interest in rights of way.
- 3.1.3 The fund will be scaled having regard to the circumstances in Suffolk, but importantly it will be proportionate to the impacts felt within Sizewell and its locality from the impact of the DCO proposals.
- 3.1.4 The fund will be quantified based on an agreed set of PROW improvements settled between SZC Co. and the Local Planning Authorities.
- 3.1.5 SZC Co. acknowledges that there are likely to be significant residual adverse effects during both construction and operation, as specified within the **Environmental Statement**. The assessment indicates that significant effects will be felt during construction at Receptor 5 (Westleton Walks and Dunwich Heath); Receptor 7 (RSPB Minsmere); Receptor 8 (Dunwich to Minsmere Coast); Receptor 10 (Eastbridge and Leiston Abbey); Receptor 11 (Minsmere South); Receptor 12 (Minsmere to Sizewell Coast); Receptor 13 (Northeast Site); Receptor 14 (Northwest Site); Receptor 15 (Sizewell Belts); Receptor 16 (North of Leiston); as well as on long distance recreation routes including Suffolk Coast Path and Sandlings Walk.
- 3.1.6 The fund will be structured to ensure that additional improvements and proposals reduce the significance of effects at the locations noted above, where reasonably practicable. An example improvement that would be considered within the fund would be to improve surfacing and signage on PROW E-363/020/0 between Eastbridge and Minsmere sluice. This would directly improve linkages and baseline conditions at receptors close to this location including Receptor 7, 8, 11 and 12.
- 3.1.7 There will also be residual significant effects during construction and operation at Sizewell link road on Footpaths E-344/013/0, E-344/014/0 and E-584/016/A; Footpaths E-396/014/0 and E-584/016/0; Footpaths E-396/017/0, E-396/020/0 and E-396/023/0; Footpaths E-396/015/0, E-515/003/0, E-515/004/0, E-515/005/0 and E-515/007/0. Improvements sought within the fund will seek to reduce the significance of effects on these receptors.
- 3.1.8 In addition, there will be residual significant effects during construction and operation at the two village bypass on Footpaths E-243/003/0 and E-243/004/0; Footpaths E-137/028/0, E-137/029/0 and E-243/001/0. Improvements sought within the fund will seek to reduce the significance of effects on these receptors.

4 Structure of the Public Rights of Way Fund

- 4.1.1 As noted above, the fund will be drawn upon to reduce residual effects on recreation and amenity near the main development site, Sizewell link road and two village bypass through a series of targeted PROW and access improvements, to be agreed between SZC Co. and the Local Planning Authorities.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- 4.1.2 The operation of the Fund would be managed by the Amenity and Recreation sub-group (part of the Transport Working Group), but it would be likely be most beneficial if:
- a) An agreement can be reached on the specific PROW improvements to be funded, between SZC Co. and the Local Authorities.
 - b) A portion of the fund is set aside for physical improvements including repairs, wayfinding and improving connectivity.
 - c) A portion of the fund is for wider 'soft' improvements including signage, communication tools and education.
 - d) A portion of the fund is set aside for legal process, including re-designation of rights, where relevant.
- 4.1.3 A portion of the fund is set aside for landowner compensation. In addition to overseeing the effective spending of the Fund, the Recreation and Amenity sub-group would:
- a) Engage with other such plans, programmes, measures, or funds secured by the section 106 agreement and the implementation of other mitigation – such as the Sizewell C AONB fund and transport measures – so as not to complement rather than duplicate their work.
 - b) It is anticipated that the Fund would be spent during the relatively early years of construction, following which the work of the Recreation and Amenity sub-group would be reviewed and potentially closed.
- 4.1.4 Set out a communications plan for the public rights of way network in the surrounding area. This will include newspaper advertisements for closures and identifying any local concerns/community issues.

APPENDIX G: S.106 SUMMARY NOTE – LEISTON SPORTS FACILITIES - DRAFT

S.106 Summary Note – Leiston Sports Facilities – DRAFT

1 Heads of terms

- 1.1.1 As part of its application for a development consent order in relation to the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has submitted the **Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms** as Appendix 8.4J to the Planning Statement. This document sets out the proposed planning obligations which SZC Co. considers necessary to mitigate the assessed impacts of the Sizewell C Project.
- 1.1.2 In relation to the provision of sports facilities in Leiston, the **Draft Section 106 Heads of Terms** set out the following substantive obligation:

“SZC Co. will construct or provide a contribution to fund the construction of a 3G pitch and two multi-use games areas in Leiston. These sports facilities will be managed by ESC. The funding would include a contribution for the maintenance of the pitches and provision of a sinking fund during the construction phase when the facilities would be used by the Sizewell C construction workforce.”

2 Assessed Impacts

2.1 Principles

- 2.1.1 The public service impacts of increased demand generated by the construction workforce for sports and leisure facilities are assessed in the Socio-economic Assessment provided as part of the Sizewell C DCO Application (see **Volume 2, Chapter 9 (Socio Economics)** of the **Environmental Statement**).
- 2.1.2 SZC Co. has recognised that:
- *“the workforce would likely raise demand for specific types of activity – such as football – of which there is a local deficiency in provision (of all-weather pitches); and*
 - *investment in facilities would be likely to make a positive contribution to integration and the experience of the workforce and local community.”* [Paragraph 9.6.12 of **Volume 2 Chapter 9 (Socio Economics)** of the **Environmental Statement**]
- 2.1.3 Therefore, SZC Co. has committed to provide sports and leisure facilities as part of the Sizewell C Project. This would include gym and informal recreation facilities at the accommodation campus, and formal recreation facilities including a full-size 3G pitch and MUGAs located off-site at Alde Valley School. The off-site facilities would be made available for shared used by the school and the local community and would remain as a legacy post-construction.

3 Proposed mechanism for Delivery of the Leiston Sports Facilities

- 3.1.1 Following the submission of the Sizewell C DCO Application, SZC Co. has developed the following suggested mechanism for the design and delivery of the Leiston Sports Facilities which it proposes would form the basis of the development consent obligation to be included in the Section 106 Agreement to be entered into between SZC Co., East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council.
- 3.1.2 SZC Co. wishes to discuss the below proposals with East Suffolk Council to gain an understanding of the likely timings of the stages of design and construction, and any implications for timings of contributions. SZC Co. recognises that the Leiston Sports Facilities would provide a legacy benefit for the local community as well as contributing to integration and providing necessary facilities for the Construction Workforce. Therefore, SZC Co. intends to continue to discuss and develop the mechanism through which the Leiston Sports Facilities are provided.

3.2 Definitions

3.2.1 In this section:

- a) “**Leiston Sports Facilities**” means a 3G pitch and two multi-use games areas in Leiston to be provided and managed by East Suffolk Council and which are to be available for use by the Sizewell C Construction Workforce during the Construction Period. The Tourism Working Group (see below) would agree a set of headline categories for the Tourism Fund to be consistent over the duration of the construction phase – these could include (but would not be limited to) Research, Promotion and Marketing, Capital Projects, Strategy, Small Grants.
- b) “**Leiston Sports Facilities Works**” means the works to be undertaken by East Suffolk Council to construct the Leiston Sports Facilities.

3.3 Design of the Leiston Sports Facilities

- 3.3.1 In order to facilitate the design of the Leiston Sports Facilities, it is proposed that:
- 3.3.2 SZC Co. shall pay a ‘Sports Facilities Design Payment’ to East Suffolk Council on or before the commencement of the Sizewell C Project. The Sports Facilities Design Payment shall comprise East Suffolk Council’s reasonable and proper costs associated with the design of the Leiston Sports Facilities Works.
- 3.3.3 East Suffolk Council shall prepare or procure the preparation of the design of the Leiston Sports Facilities Works in consultation with Alde Valley School and SCC and shall provide to SZC Co. for approval a costed proposal for the Leiston Sports Facilities Works. The costed proposal shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a) a timetable demonstrating that completion of the Sports Facilities Works shall take place prior to the date for occupation of the Accommodation Campus as set out in the Implementation Plan;
- b) detailed drawings and specifications for the Leiston Sports Facilities Works. The proposed design shall ensure that there is physical separation between school and community / worker access; and
- c) confirmation that Alde Valley School has been fully involved in the preparation of the scheme.

Note: To discuss likely timings for ground investigation, design and construction works for the Leiston Sports Facilities. It is understood that intrusive works should not take place at times likely to have undue impact upon Alde Valley School (e.g during public exams). Therefore SZC Co. wish to understand whether this design element of the process needs to take place prior to commencement of the Project.

Note: To discuss the role of Alde Valley School in preparation of the design proposals and the management plan (see paragraph 3.6 to 3.8 below). As it is intended that East Suffolk Council will be the party responsible for design and the operator of the Leiston Sports Facilities, SZC Co. wishes to understand East Suffolk Council's views on what, if any, governance of its decision making and ongoing relationship with Alde Valley School should be controlled through the Section 106 Agreement.

3.4 Construction of the Leiston Sports Facilities

3.4.1 It is proposed that the construction of the Leiston Sports Facilities shall be progressed as follows:

- a) Within [•] weeks of approval of the costed proposal by SZC Co., SZC Co. shall pay to East Suffolk Council the 'Sports Facilities Works Payment'. The Sports Facilities Works Payment shall comprise East Suffolk Council's reasonable and proper costs associated with carrying out the Leiston Sports Facilities Works.
- b) Subject to obtaining all requisite consents, East Suffolk Council shall provide and make available the Leiston Sports Facilities in accordance with the timetable in the proposal.
- c) East Suffolk Council shall notify SZC Co. in advance of completion of the Leiston Sports Facilities.

3.5 Management of the Leiston Sports Facilities

- 3.5.1 East Suffolk Council shall be responsible for the management of the Leiston Sports Facilities, including bookings.
- 3.5.2 Prior to the occupation of the Sports Facilities, East Suffolk Council shall produce a management plan setting out the proposed hours of use for Alde Valley School, the construction workforce, and the local community. The management plan shall include a confirmation that Alde Valley School has been fully involved in the preparation of the management plan. This management plan shall be agreed with SZC Co. prior to occupation.
- 3.5.3 During the construction of the Sizewell C Project, the construction workforce shall be given free access to the Leiston Sports Facilities for the use of the bathrooms and changing room facilities.

3.6 Maintenance of the Leiston Sports Facilities

- 3.6.1 SZC Co. proposes to provide funding towards the maintenance of the Leiston Sports Facilities.
- 3.6.2 During the Construction Period (while the Leiston Sports Facilities are used by the Sizewell C Construction Workforce), SZC Co. shall pay to East Suffolk Council an annual maintenance payment on the anniversary of the date of occupation.
- 3.6.3 [•]% of the maintenance payments shall be applied by East Suffolk Council towards the costs of maintaining the Leiston Sports Facilities.
- 3.6.4 The remainder of the maintenance payments shall be placed in a sinking fund to be used towards any repairs to the Leiston Sports Facilities required at the end of the Construction Period.

APPENDIX H: S.106 SUMMARY NOTE - NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

S.106 Summary Note: Natural Environment

1 Topic headings

1.1.1 The Natural Environment heading in the submitted DCO **Heads of Terms** referred to the following potential commitments:

- a. A SZC AONB fund to support measures to mitigate impacts in the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast.
- b. A European Sites Access Contingency Fund to mitigate effects where monitoring shows a potential risk of harm occurring as a result of recreational displacement increasing the use of those areas;
- c. The establishment of new Fen Meadow habitats and a contingency fund to support alternative habitat creation in the event that the proposed habitats are unsuccessful; and
- d. A temporary Marsh Harrier habitat improvement area, if required;

1.1.2 These matters continue to be the subject of engagement with stakeholders, but this note provides an update on SZC Co.'s current understanding.

2 Approach to the AONB Fund

2.1.1 There is more engagement required with relevant stakeholders before a preferred form of commitment is settled but the SZC Co.'s current thinking is as follows:

- a. The geography of the Fund is to be agreed. It may be appropriate, however, to think of the Fund having an important role in relation to the AONB but perhaps not to the full extent of the AONB, the recently extended area of which, for instance, is remote from SZC;
- b. Landscape and visual impacts are not limited to the AONB and some impacts are identified from the Associated Developments. An element of the Fund, therefore, also has a wider application to a geography based on the administrative area of East Suffolk;
- c. It may be appropriate to rename the Fund, the **Landscape Fund**, which would also help to focus its purpose and to distinguish the Fund from other mitigation – such as that to be committed in relation to Tourism, Ecology or Rights of Way.

2.1.2 Related to this, SZC Co. proposes to extend the scope of its oLEMP (outline Landscape and Environment Management Plan) to cover the whole of the c.600 ha Sizewell Estate. The oLEMP commits to the approval of detailed proposals for environmental enhancement and management of the landscape (the LEMP) with objectives which are similar to several of the objectives presented in the current iteration of the Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Management Plan. SZC Co. proposes to establish an independent **Environmental Trust** to take forward ecologically focussed land management and enhanced habitats and biodiversity of the estate, and to contribute annually to the Trust during the operational life of Sizewell C for that purpose.

2.1.3 The Landscape Fund needs to be shaped taking into account this context. Governance arrangements also need to be discussed to ensure the optimum synergy between any different initiatives, or to consider whether a combined governance structure is preferable. Precedents have been established through previous consents for the Dry Fuel Store and the Relocated Facilities planning permissions with differing structures. To take these issues forward, SZC Co. recognises:

- a) that a number of stakeholders have a direct interest in these issues;
- b) that there is an important role for the AONB Partnership in helping to direct at least that proportion of the Fund that would be ring-fenced for the AONB;
- c) that the scale of the Fund needs to be proportionate to the impacts of the project but that the scale may also be guided by objectives for the AONB, including particularly those set out in the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Management Plan 2018-2023 (and future iterations);
- d) that the Fund should include early expenditure as well as a continuing commitment to longer term spending; and
- e) that the selected governance structure should be able to draw down spending from the Fund for projects or resources which meet defined objectives.

2.1.4 The Fund will be drawn upon for:

- physical improvements to the landscape surrounding Sizewell C, including land within and within the setting of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and coastal and offshore areas within the Suffolk Heritage Coast. Physical improvements could include the provision of new planting and maintenance of new and existing vegetation for example to screen views towards the Project;
- measures to conserve and enhance landscape character, including to improve the condition of existing landscape elements and features and restore elements and features that are damaged or declining;
- measures to enhance the public's enjoyment of the AONB and wider landscape and that facilitate/support engagement and involvement in activities related to the conservation and enhancement of the AONB and landscape generally;
- promote short and long-term resilience measures, for example to address the effects of a changing climate. This may include measures to improve the quality or extent of existing habitats, create additional new habitats and establish or enhance habitat connections;
- landscape initiatives which deliver a range of ecosystem goods and services.

2.1.5 A proportion of the Fund may also be ring-fenced to pay for officer resources to assist with its implementation.

3 European sites access contingency fund

3.1.1 The Sizewell C Shadow HRA conclusion of “no adverse effect on integrity” on European sites in relation to the impact of recreational displacement (impacts to heathland birds in particular) requires a Monitoring and Mitigation plan to be in place for the RSPB Minsmere Outer Zone, which is to be extended to include the National Trust site at Dunwich Heath and a commitment to a Contingency Fund for (other) European sites being in place as a back stop for similar purposes.

3.1.2 Engagement is taking place with Natural England, RSPB, the National Trust, and the local authorities in order to develop the **Heads of Terms** into a draft Section 106 obligation.

3.1.3 The obligation would commit to:

- the monitoring of (any) increase in footfall at the European sites;

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- if necessary, measures to manage public access including the wardening of the sites, public education, signage and leaflets.

3.1.4 It is anticipated that these measures would reduce impacts of additional disturbance and encourage responsible behaviour from visitors.

3.1.5 The detail of these proposals continues to be developed.

3.1.6 This obligation would be separate from Resilience Funds, which are being discussed directly with the RSPB, the National Trust and Pro Corda.

4 Fen Meadow

4.1.1 The draft DCO requirements will include a requirement for a Fen Meadow Plan to be submitted to East Suffolk Council, West Suffolk Council and Natural England and, once approved, for the creation of new Fen Meadow to be implemented in accordance with that Plan. The Plan will include an implementation timetable. Compliance with the Plan will be monitored and reported to those stakeholders and to the Environment Review Group established under the DCO.

4.1.2 It is anticipated that the Plan will be successful. Three sites have been carefully selected for their suitability and the Plan will capture and enforce best practice in habitat creation. Monitoring will allow for adaptive measures to be taken to optimise the prospects of success.

4.1.3 However, it is proposed that a Fen Meadow Contingency Fund will be established in the S.106 agreement as a safeguard against the unexpected eventuality that all or part of the habitat creation is unsuccessful. The S.106 agreement will commit to that fund and set out the circumstances and explain how the Environment Review Group will determine whether there is a need to draw on it in whole or part. That mechanism is the subject of discussion with stakeholders.

5 Marsh Harriers

5.1.1 Habitat on the northern part of the Sizewell Estate is proposed for marsh harrier mitigation. Part of that land is not included within the DCO application but a marsh harrier masterplan and management regime is being prepared. It is proposed that that plan will be secured within the S.106 agreement.

5.1.2 A reserve site for marsh harrier mitigation is included within the DCO application on land west of Westleton. SZC Co. does not believe that it is necessary to require that land to be used and managed additionally for marsh harrier mitigation but Natural England disagree. The Secretary of State will determine through the DCO decision whether that additional mitigation is necessary. The s.106 agreement will contain contingent provisions for its enhancement and management.

APPENDIX I: SUMMARY - COMMUNITY FUND

Summary - Community Fund

1 Principle of Community Fund

- 1.1.1 Community funds are a typical feature of NSIPs, notably nuclear and wind energy projects including Hinkley Point C (HPC). **They are commonly set up to compensate local communities for a range of project effects which are not possible to effectively mitigate through other measures.**
- 1.1.2 The **Environmental Statement (ES)** explains that a SZC Community Fund would seek to **mitigate the intangible, residual effects on the general quality of life in the local community**, from the presence of the major construction project and the potentially significant change this would have in the local area. SZC considers the provision of a Community Fund a fair and reasonable response to the effects of construction locally.

2 Lessons Learnt for SZC

- 2.1.1 HPC's fund is considered effective by stakeholders, and HPC is the most recent, relevant and comparable to SZC, not least in matters such as the in principle, nature and extent of possible intangible and residual effects. It is, therefore, a helpful template for the design of the SZC fund. The HPC example provides lessons learnt which SZC can build on – though in general the scale, distribution and governance are considered appropriate.
- 2.1.2 **Administration:** the HPC fund is run by the Somerset Community Foundation (SCF). This was prescribed in the s106. The Foundation has been critical to the success of the fund, being well-placed to interact with public bodies as well as donors and fund recipients, and to actively seek out projects and organisations which can deliver benefits to local communities. Its independence and outreach makes it a strong candidate for the type of governance structure to also use for SZC. The site preparation works (SPW) consent at HPC was subject to a similar fund run by the local authorities. Experience of both approaches reinforces the view that the independence of the SCF is appropriate for a fund which is intended to be run on behalf of the community.
- 2.1.3 **Project Eligibility:** it is important for applicants to demonstrate how the proposed project relates to addressing the residual or intangible effects of the project on the local community. These may be social, economic or environmental issues.
- 2.1.4 **Themes and Ring Fencing:** the HPC fund was initially structured by theme, in order to streamline bidding, and comprised of open, small and strategic grants. Some of the HPC fund was ring-fenced for certain areas / communities with concentrations of effects or physical changes. SZC's fund proposes to use this as a foundation for its Community Fund.
- 2.1.5 **Appetite and Quality:** feedback shows that there has been a good response from the HPC fund for each round, with a high level of quality and a range of projects applied for and implemented effectively. At SZC, it is intended to manage the fund in a similar way, with annual release for bidding for open and small grants, and strategic projects. Experience at HPC has been that it is the small grants that often create the best value for money.
- 2.1.6 **Grant Programmes:** the HPC fund is split into three grants programmes, largely distinguished by size and complexity of beneficiary project:
- The most effective of the three programmes has been for 'small grants' (£5-10k), which has benefitted from a strong outreach function.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- b) A second programme, for 'open grants', has also been successful in allowing ideas to come forward without constraint.
- c) The third, for 'strategic grants', has to date received few bidders with the requisite level of strategy and project scale to qualify.

2.1.7 It is proposed for the SZC fund to proceed with small grants and open grants within the primary structure. The fund should also make efforts to promote strategic grants, and this may be best coordinated by public bodies such as District and County Councils, which have statutory responsibility for more strategic services. The SZC fund, however, is not intended to relace public expenditure.

3 Size of the Community Fund

3.1.1 As the most relevant comparator in terms of the scale of effects, their spatial distribution and temporal distribution, it is valuable to look at the HPC s106, which provided a total community fund of £20m (across two S. 106 Agreements – SPW and DCO). The size of the SZC fund is yet to be determined.

4 Scope of the Community Fund

4.1.1 The SZC fund would address effects arising during the construction of SZC. The Community Impact Report sets out the location and scale of the residual significant effects of the Project and has been used to suggest a 'ring-fence' approach to part of the SZC fund – to make sure that the local communities most affected have the secured ability to benefit.

4.1.2 It is likely the most (in number) and most significant effects would be found in Leiston ward area, which includes the settlements of Leiston, Sizewell Village, Knodishall, and Coldfair Green. Other wards such as Yoxford, Aldeburgh, Snape and Saxmundham would also be expected to be affected. The following table summarises the proposed distribution principles of ring-fencing.

Table 1: Proposed Distribution of Ring-Fencing

Area	Summary of Effects	Summary of Physical Changes
Aldeburgh & Leiston; and Saxmundham 2019 Wards This will include specific reference to Eastbridge and Theberton.	Pedestrian and cycle amenity on the B1122 (early years only); Recreation and amenity effects, and landscape and visual effects, such as to users of coastal paths; General increase in traffic on HGV routes in early years of project and on local roads throughout construction period, and increase in traffic on non-bypassed parts of A12 and local roads Noise effects from localised construction, including effects on equalities; Project-wide cumulative effects, such as from construction and the green rail route; Community impacts possible from accommodation of workers; Cumulative effects from other plans and projects; Severance and pedestrian delay effects on local footpaths; Health and wellbeing effects of noise from construction and operation due to the Two Village Bypass; Increase in night time trains	Main development area; Offshore works area; Temporary construction area; LEEIE (including caravan park); Parts of green rail route. Northern park and ride at Darsham; Parts of Sizewell link road; Yoxford Roundabout; Two village bypass
Rest of East Suffolk District	Road and Rail-related noise effects; Health and wellbeing, landscape and visual, equality, and inter-relationship effects as above. General increase in traffic on A12 and local roads throughout construction period Community impacts possible from accommodation of workers	Southern park and ride at Wickham Market; Freight Management Facility at Seven Hills; Highways and junction improvements

5 Eligibility to the Community Fund

5.1.1 It is proposed that eligibility to the SZC fund will be similar to that for the HPC fund, as follows:

- Applicants must be a registered charity, voluntary organisation, social enterprise or public body;
- Projects must be consistent with a not for profit purpose;
- Any bid must articulate what it is trying to change, how it is going to achieve this, why the approach has been chosen, how effectiveness will be measured;
- Projects must:

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- Have a positive effect on the local communities, economy and environment, in order to mitigate / compensate for the residual social, environmental, and economic impacts of Sizewell C, and , as appropriate, maximise the environmental, economic and social benefits of the SZC Project;
- be in areas where they can be accessed by people affected by the SZC Project;
- not be inconsistent with local planning policy or community/social infrastructure delivery plans;
- deliver value-for-money;
- promote social cohesion or community sustainability and long-term benefits;
- not be contradictory to or duplicating agreed mitigation measures set out in the EIA or S. 106; and
- be inclusive and non-discriminatory, fostering equality in-line with the 2010 Equality Act.

5.1.2 Applicants and project design can be guided by a clear set of guidelines, against which the Awarding Panel can evaluate bids.

6 Operation of the Community Fund

6.1.1 It is proposed for the SZC fund to operate largely in the way the HPC fund does, as follows:

- a) **Grant programmes:** the fund will contain distinct pots or programmes, split by type of proposal and with part ring-fenced for projects in specific spatial areas;
- b) **Timeframe Distribution:** funding will be released annually and proportionately through the course of the construction of SZC;
- c) **Spatial Distribution:** the amount available will be ring-fenced in part to ensure a minimum spend on interventions in areas most likely to be affected by SZC, to ensure fairness and provide effective mitigation;
- d) **Administration:** the fund will be managed by the independent Suffolk Community Foundation (akin to the Somerset Community Foundation). This could be prescribed in the s106 agreement. SZC would enter into a Deed of Transfer with the Foundation, which would transfer a sum to be governed and distributed;
- e) **Awarding Panel:** grant awards will be decided by a panel comprising in equal parts representatives from the SCF, EDF, local authorities, and the general public. An independent chair would ensure strong, independent, community-focused distribution of funds;
- f) **Governance:** The Suffolk Community Foundation will report into the Delivery Steering Group (DSG).
- g) **Engagement:** The Suffolk Community Foundation will report to the Community Forum on the findings of the Delivery Steering Group.

APPENDIX J: S.106 SUMMARY - TOURISM FUND - DRAFT

S106 Summary - Tourism Fund – DRAFT

1 Potential Effects

1.1 SZC Co. (ES Vol 2, Ch 9)

1.1.1 The DCO (ES - Book 6, Vol 2, Ch 9) identifies that in terms of tourism, without mitigation there is potential for:

- a) Very local effects on businesses and activities where there is a combination of significant residual environmental effects; and
- b) Perception-related effects leading to a change in visitor behaviour as a result of sensitivities to different aspects of the Sizewell C Project (the “Project”) (the potential for perception of changes to for example traffic, where this is already an influencer on propensity to visit).

1.1.2 There is inherent uncertainty about the extent to which this may occur, and there is an opportunity to provide resilience and reduce the sensitivity of tourism to Project impacts. This is mainly by seeking to address potential perceived changes that existing and potential visitors to the area may be concerned about, and ensure that the residual effect of the Project on tourism is not significant.

1.2 Stakeholders

1.2.1 Suffolk County (SCC) and East Suffolk (ESC) Councils, together with representatives of the tourism industry, including the Suffolk Coast DMO, report concerns about the Project's impacts on tourism, primarily around risks of deterring potential visitors due to traffic congestion, noise, impacts on visual and landscape amenity, worker use of tourist accommodation, and general perception of impacts, particularly return visitors and those who value the area's tranquillity, natural environment and ease/speed of access from London and the South East.

1.2.2 Relevant Representations submitted to PINS by SCC/ESC note that a **Tourism Fund** has been agreed in principle by SZC Co. to help mitigate negative impacts. Stakeholders support this but require further agreement in relation to its principles, robustness, scale, scope and governance arrangements.

2 Scope of the Tourism Fund

2.1 Principles

2.1.1 SZC Co. and stakeholders agree that the Tourism Fund should (based on draft Terms of Reference prepared by the Tourism Working Group in August 2020):

- a) Mitigate for the construction effects of the Sizewell C Project on the tourism economy by supporting the maintenance, development and enhancement of the visitor economy within the area.
- b) Enable effective, long-term mitigation for the visitor economy effects of the construction of Sizewell C by promoting a sustainable visitor economy; and
- c) Relate to measures and activities that would innovate destination marketing (e.g. media relations integrated with leading edge websites, effective and innovative use of digital and social media channels), ‘conserve and enhance’ activities (e.g. destination marketing that builds on the special natural environment, unique characteristics and communities), develop the area(s) unique and varied visitor offer (e.g. by mapping and developing key assets, ensuring destinations understand how to make a clear offer to visitors, ensure high quality public realm, events, services and

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

facilities, and mitigating negative impacts from increased traffic) and enable a joined-up approach (e.g. by working with local partners/stakeholders to develop initiatives and access available funding; and provide business support and skills support).

2.1.2 SZC Co. has engaged and consulted with the Tourism Working Group (see 4.2 for membership) to identify broad principles and measures that the Tourism Fund could be used for, initially set out in **Volume 2, Chapter 9** of the **ES**. Since then, engagement has helped to focus and expand this list of principles to include:

- a) Marketing and promotion activities for the Suffolk Coast and specific attractions and events within it, which can demonstrate a strong return on investment.
- b) Supporting local projects including capital and revenue investment.
- c) Supporting existing tourist initiatives and activities run/operated by local stakeholders.
- d) Initiatives focused on particularly sensitive attractions/locations within the AONB.
- e) Projects and local initiatives that enhance, complement, or promote rights of way and cycleways. (NB SZC Co is engaging with SCC on the provision of new cycle routes – the Tourism Fund could be used to promote these routes, or provide capital infrastructure to complement them (e.g. cycle hire)).

2.1.3 These are high-level, overarching principles for the Tourism Fund. SZC Co. recognise the knowledge and skills for delivering effective economic development and tourism measures sit with local stakeholders, and are keen for them to be able to use the Tourism Fund flexibly to ensure it is used in the best way to avoid effects.

2.1.4 In addition, SZC Co. suggest that the Tourism Fund could be used to:

- d) Develop bespoke Tourism Strategies and Action Plans for different phases and effects of the construction phase of the Sizewell C Project.
- e) Develop monitoring and market research for the prosperity of the tourist sector and the effects of the Sizewell C Project.
- f) Provide information on issues/perceived effects that potential visitors may be concerned about and that could deter them from visiting, for example about disturbance and travel delays.

2.2 Relationship to Other Funds

2.2.1 SZC Co. and stakeholders agree that the Tourism Fund needs to be explicit about exactly what it is not to be used for, based on the scope of other mitigation proposed/agreed. It should be clear that it will not duplicate or obviate any other agreed plan, programme, measure or fund secured by the DCO or the S106 Agreement.

2.2.2 A Fund Manager (see below) will need to monitor the use of other such plans, programmes, measures or funds secured by the S106 Agreement with the aim to avoid overlaps and dovetail in with any complementary measures.

3 Structure of the Tourism Fund

3.1 Overall Structure

3.1.1 SZC Co. propose that:

- a) The scale of the Tourism Fund would be agreed and secured in the S106 Agreement.
- b) The Tourism Working Group (see below) would agree a set of headline categories for the Tourism Fund to be consistent over the duration of the construction phase – these could include (but would not be limited to) Research, Promotion and Marketing, Capital Projects, Strategy, Small Grants.
- c) SZC Co. would release monies from the Tourism Fund to the Tourism Working Group/Fund Manager on inception of the Project and then each year during the construction phase (see following table for indicative breakdown).
- d) The Fund Manager – in consultation with the Tourism Working Group - would identify a business plan for each year of funding that included a set of scoped and costed plans, programmes and projects under each category. These would be agreed by the Tourism Working Group to ensure they are proportionate, relevant to effects and deliverable.
- e) These plans, programmes and projects would then be commissioned by the Fund Manager using an agreed procurement process to ensure that partners who deliver them are selected with transparency and robustness.
- f) The tourist sector bodies within the Tourism Working Group and their relevant policies and strategies are best placed to influence the terms of reference and criteria for plans and projects that draw on the Tourism Fund.

3.1.2 The following table summarises categories and projects, plans and programmes:

Categories	Projects, Plans and Programmes
<p>Each annual release of the Tourism Fund would be split between broad categories of funding – for example research, promotion and marketing, capital investment, events/sponsorship.</p> <p>These categories would be agreed at the outset, but the proportion of annual release within each category would be flexible depending on the stage of the Project's construction and the priority activities needed to respond to potential effects of the Project on tourism.</p> <p>The proportional split of annual release of the Tourism Fund for each category would be agreed by the Tourism Working Group based on business and community outreach activities undertaken by the Fund Manager, and consideration of Project effects and look-ahead/monitoring data</p>	<p>Within each category, the Fund Manager will propose – based on engagement with the Tourism Working Group – a set of defined programmes, plans and projects to be implemented under each Tourism Fund category.</p> <p>The Tourism Working Group would scrutinise these against a defined set of criteria and ensure they are fit for purpose, meeting the principles of the Tourism Fund.</p> <p>The Fund Manager would then procure or deliver these through an open tender process which would be audited by the Tourism Working Group. Any organisation could bid to provide the services identified.</p>

3.1.3 The definition of *categories* for funding would be subject to agreement through the Tourism Working Group, but is likely to be most beneficial if:

- a) A portion of the Tourism Fund, particularly in the first annual release, is ring-fenced for developing a specific strategy for delivering measures, setting up longitudinal monitoring and setting administrative requirements.
- b) A significant portion of the Tourism Fund each year is made available for marketing and promotional activities.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

- c) A portion of the Tourism Fund each year is made available for small grants for local events, projects and initiatives, administration of the Tourism Fund and the Tourism Working Group, including the funding of the Fund Manager post.

3.2 Programme / Release

3.2.1 As the provider of the Tourism Fund, SZC Co. propose – subject to agreement – that they would release the Tourism Fund to the Tourism Working Group / Fund Manager on an annual basis, and that annual fund would be used to commission plans, projects and programmes that are in line with the principles of the Fund and respond to specific activities required in that year / phase of the Sizewell C Project.

3.2.2 The annual or phased review would be agreed before implementation and would not prejudice the release of the totality of the Tourism Fund over the construction phase. The following table sets an indicative allocation of funding, by purpose and based on project milestones:

Years	Project milestones / activities	Tourism Fund activities (indicative)
Implementation Date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SZC granted consent and investment decision made – gains national and regional media attention which could influence perceptions of potential visitors Associated development construction and civils works Workforce build-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruit and fund the Fund Manager – to be funded throughout the construction phase Start to create a Tourism Strategy/Action Plan for the construction phase Develop monitoring framework Promotion and marketing – pre-peak Providing information about the Project Market research Projects, grants and events Physical infrastructure e.g. small grants etc.
+1		
+2		
+3		
+4		
+5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AD operational e.g. transport improvements in place Workforce at and around peak HGV movements could peak 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotional and marketing – over peak Business support Market research Outreach activities Projects, grants and events
+6		
+7 (PEAK)		
+8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workforce ramp-down (using less tourist accommodation) But adjusting to permanent change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotional and marketing – post-peak Develop 'post construction' strategy/Re-base Tourism Strategy for post-construction
+9		
+10*		
+11*		
+12*		

* Payable only up to the end of construction

3.2.3 Planning tests will require that the Tourism Fund should be used to mitigate effects during the period when effects are likely to arise. If any element in a given year is unspent (e.g. if a Project, Plan or Programme cannot be commissioned), that allocated funding can be rolled into the next year for up to two years, but must be spent before the end of construction.

3.3 Spatial Considerations

3.3.1 Plans, programmes and projects delivered by the Tourism Fund should:

- a) Be located in the district of East Suffolk and demonstrate how they will deliver the purpose of the Tourism Fund; OR

- b) If located outside of East Suffolk demonstrate how they will deliver the purpose of the Tourism Fund.

4 Governance of the Tourism Fund

- 4.1.1 Clear governance and well-defined terms of reference are important to demonstrate effectiveness of use, responsiveness and robustness with regard to other elements of mitigation that may also support tourism outcomes

4.2 Tourism Working Group & SEAG

- 4.2.1 During the pre-application consultation period, SZC Co. formed a Tourism Working Group comprising SCC (Economic Development; Planning), ESC (Economic Development; Major Projects); Suffolk Coast DMO, Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, Visit East of England, NALP, RSPB Minsmere and National Trust Dunwich Heath in order to develop an understanding of the potential effects of the Sizewell C Project and begin to shape mitigation.

- 4.2.2 It is anticipated that the Tourism Working Group would:

- a) Agree the categories under which annual plans, projects and programmes would be defined to address potential effects on tourism;
- b) Consider and agree plans, projects and programmes put forward by members of the Tourism Working Group and the Fund Manager under each category on an annual basis, to ensure scrutiny and effectiveness against the Terms of Reference for the Tourism Fund.
- c) Draw on Sizewell C Project monitoring and look-ahead information across socio-economic, environmental and transport indicators that may be relevant to potential effects on tourism;
- d) Draw on information provided by the Fund Manager regarding outcomes of plans, programmes and projects delivered or commissioned through the Tourism Fund including long-term longitudinal monitoring of the visitor economy and visitor behaviour;
- e) Review and consider information provided by the Fund Manager on the use of other such plans, programmes, measures or funds secured by the S106 Agreement and the implementation of other mitigation – such as the Community Fund and transport measures – so as not to duplicate
- f) Consider, review and provide advice on award of contracts/tenders for annually agreed plans, projects and programmes;

- 4.2.3 It is proposed that any dispute resolution would be settled by the overarching Socio-economic Advisory Group and/or the Delivery Steering Group as deemed appropriate.

4.3 Fund Manager Position

- 4.3.1 The Tourism Fund will require a Fund Manager, embedded in one of the public sector partners in the Tourism Working Group. Any reasonable administrative costs of the Tourism Fund's governance should be covered by SZC Co. subject to agreement of governance roles and responsibilities, and that the Fund Manager – subject to agreement on the roles and responsibilities of that post – should be embedded into one of the public sector partners
- 4.3.2 The Fund Manager would focus on commissioning and delivering plans, projects and programmes from annual releases of the Tourism Fund, and ensure strategic oversight of complementary funds to ensure

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

the Tourism Fund could be applied in the most effective way to support and not overlap with other measures.

4.3.3 The Fund Manager's roles and responsibilities would be to:

- a) Manage the Tourism Fund's annual releases and scope, cost, collate and publish prospective plans, projects and programmes under defined categories of the Tourism Fund each year and present them to the Tourism Working Group for consideration against Terms of Reference of the Tourism Fund;
- b) Once agreed – to facilitate the tendering process for procurement / commissioning and/or delivery of those plans, programmes and projects;
- c) Audit, manage and scrutinise the delivery of plans, programmes and projects and report back to the Tourism Working Group on their effectiveness;
- d) Draw on information from tourism bodies – including but not limited to the Suffolk Coast DMO; Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB; New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership; RSPB (Minsmere); and National Trust (Dunwich Heath) and present the Tourism Working Group with:
 - i. Reports on effects of the SZC Project's construction activity on the tourist economy via research commissioned using the Tourism Fund and other reporting from tourist bodies;
 - ii. Reports on expenditure of previous annual contributions from the Tourism Fund and review on effectiveness.
- e) Provide outreach and liaison with local tourism stakeholders and organisations with regard to accessing tender opportunities and promoting the function of the Tourism Fund;
- f) Monitor the use of other such plans, programmes, measures or funds secured by the S106 Agreement and the implementation of other mitigation – such as the Community Fund and transport measures – so as not to duplicate. This will include oversight, liaison and reporting between the Tourism Working Group, SEAG, and relevant sub-groups of Tourism and Natural Environment with regards to AONB and Landscape funds and Public Rights of Way and Cycle Funds.
- g) Consider and report on potential synergy with similar funds from other developments in the area.
- h) Work with the Accommodation Working Group to help to implement and manage the Tourism Element of Housing Fund.