



Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Pro

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 21 April 2021

Responses are due by Deadline 2: Wednesday 2 June 2021

PART 1 OF 6

G. 1 [General and Cross-topic Questions](#)

Ag.1 [Agriculture and soils](#)

AQ.1 [Air Quality](#)

Al.1 [Alternatives](#)

AR.1 [Amenity and recreation](#)

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1	General and Cross-topic Questions	
G.1.0	The Applicant	<p>Limits of deviation</p> <p>As drafted the DCO has no limitation on the depth to which works could be undertaken. Please explain how this aligns with the assessment carried out within the ES.</p> <p>In order to reflect the assessment within the ES does the DCO not require a maximum depth of excavation – with a potential for a limit of deviation? If this is not considered to be necessary, please explain how the ES has assessed the potential effects of unlimited excavation.</p>
	Response	
G.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Plans</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Plate 3.2, identifies the nominated site area for Sizewell C from NPS EN-6. Please provide a set of the Figures from the original Government Appraisal of Sustainability for the site, and an overlay of the DCO Application site highlighting any additional land included or excluded from that assessed including identification of the temporary construction area.</p>
	Response	
G.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Plans</p> <p>On an appropriately scaled ordnance survey plan show the land within the DCO for the main development site and the lines of latitude and longitude referred to in paragraph C.8.88 of NPS-6 Vol II.</p>
	Response	
G.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Local and Parish Council Boundaries</p> <p>A number of local and parish councils have made Relevant Representations. To assist in a full understanding of their relationship to the sites, provide a plan showing the</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		geographical boundaries of County, District, Town and Parish Councils that have made Relevant Representations.
	Response	
G.1.4	The Applicant	Policy approach The Planning Statement, section 1.7, provides a summary of the Applicant's approach to legislation and policy. Section 3 sets out those matters in more detail. Please provide an update to and/or expansion of that approach including reference to any subsequent Government responses or publications and the changes made to the original application.
	Response	
G.1.5	The Applicant	Policy approach The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.9.11, identifies matters identified in the NPSs as not relevant for the decision-maker, principally because they have already been considered by the Government or because they are subject to control through other regimes. Please explain further why those matters should not be regarded as relevant considerations?
	Response	
G.1.6	The Applicant	Policy approach The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.9.13, states that: " <i>The principle of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell, therefore, has been accepted and that acceptance is important and relevant and continues to carry significant weight.</i> " Please explain further why that 'in principle' acceptance and the overall policy approach of the NPSs should continue to carry significant weight?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.7	The Applicant	Policy approach The Planning Statement, paragraph 11.1.5, makes reference to the consideration of alternative energy sources and sites by Government in developing national policy and states that they do not need to be considered again in the determination of this application. Please provide an update to include reference to the National Infrastructure Strategy (NIS) and National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) Government response statements.
	Response	
G.1.8	The Applicant	Policy approach The CCC's 6 th Carbon Budget December 2020, recommended pathway requires a 78% reduction in UK territorial emissions between 1990 and 2035 and sets out a number of key recommendations including for electricity generation and in relation for uncertainties that need to be resolved. Please comment on the implications of that report for the proposed development and the role of nuclear in electricity generation generally.
	Response	
G.1.9	The Applicant	Policy approach The Government recently provided a Response to the CCC's 2020 Progress Report to Parliament and also announced a 10 point plan for a 'Green Industrial Revolution'. Please comment on that response and announcement with particular reference to the role of nuclear power generation of the type proposed by the scheme as part of that plan?
	Response	
G.1.10	The Applicant	Policy approach The Planning Statement, section 3.8, considers whether there has been a change in circumstances since the EN-6 site specific assessment. Please identify and list all changes

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		to the site area/circumstances for the Sizewell C Project application compared to what was considered by EN-6.
	Response	
G.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.6.4, draws support from the Secretary of State's decision in respect of a DCO application for a new gas-fired power station at Drax:</p> <p>(i) Please provide an update in the light of the Court of Appeal judgment dated 21 January 2021 in the case of R (oao) Client Earth and Secretary of State BEIS (1) and Drax Power Ltd (2)?</p> <p>(ii) Please comment on what represents a realistic, and not an exaggerated, view of the weight to be given to 'considerations of need' in this particular case?</p>
	Response	
G.1.12	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph, 3.9.2, states that it is appropriate to treat EN-1 and EN-6 as providing the primary policies relevant to the determination of the application. Likewise, section 3(10)(b), paragraph 3.10.2, refers to EN-1 (paragraph 4.1.6) as stating that other matters which the decision-maker may consider both important and relevant to its decision making include development plan documents or other documents in the local development framework. However, it goes on to say that in the event of a conflict between the NPS and local policy, the NPS prevails for the purposes of decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure:</p> <p>(i) Does that correctly reflect the position where both the NPS and the development plan fall within the scope of s105(2)(c)?</p> <p>(ii) Alternatively, in such a case, do NPS policies not "<i>sit alongside</i>" other national and local planning policies?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) How should the weight to be attributed to those matters and the question of primacy be assessed by the decision-maker in each case?
	Response	
G.1.13	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	Policy approach The Applicant's Planning Statement, paragraph 3.10.13, sets out a number of regional or other policy documents which are relevant to the Sizewell C Project and have been considered within the ES technical assessments. The Applicant indicates that this is not a complete list. Are there any other policy documents that should be drawn to the ExA's attention to at this stage?
	Response	
G.1.14	SCC, ESC	Policy approach If not already provided, please submit complete copies of all relevant development plan and emerging policies and indicate in LIRs whether the status of any of those plans has changed.
	Response	
G.1.15	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	Policy Approach The ESC Local Plan was adopted towards the end of 2020, please advise on the current position in respect of the policies that should now be considered and whether this change affects the assessment of policies set out by the Applicant.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.16	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Applicant's Planning Statement section 3.10(b), paragraph 3.10.8, states that where the strategies of the Local Plan relate to generic issues such as the protection of the environment, the relevant policy tests are those set out in the NPS. Likewise, paragraph 3.10.11 states that for Policy SP13 of the emerging local plan, which sets out a series of matters against which the Council believes that major infrastructure proposals should be considered, the NPSs would prevail in the event of any conflict with local and national policy:</p> <p>(i) Does that reflect the correct position and is the primacy of the NPSs agreed between ESC and the Applicant?</p> <p>(ii) If not, please identify and explain any areas of disagreement?</p>
	Response	
G.1.17	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, section 3(10)(c), paragraph 3.10.19, refers to EN-1 (paragraph 4.1.6) which states that <i>"The IPC must have regard to the MPS and applicable marine plans in taking any decision which relates to the exercise of any function capable of affecting the whole or any part of the UK marine area. In the event of a conflict between any of these marine planning documents and an NPS, the NPS prevails for purposes of IPC decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure."</i> Given that the decision in this case would be made pursuant to s105 PA 2008 and not s104 PA 2008, should the NPS still prevail in the event of a conflict or is the weight to be attributed to those matters a question for the decision-maker to assess in the light of the particular circumstances of each case?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Policy approach</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.9.15, and Tables 3.2 and 3.3 provide an NPS tracker. The Applicant is requested to provide a more comprehensive NPS Accordance Table (NPS Tracker) for both EN-1 and EN-6 setting out the relevant NPS paragraph number, the requirement of the NPS, the compliance with the NPS by way of reference to submitted documentation and summary explanation, together with any subsequent update. The updated tracker to be submitted at each Examination deadline as specified in the Examination Timetable. This should record any changes and supplements to the Applicant's position on NPS compliance demonstrated by submissions during the Examination.</p>
	Response	
G.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Need</p> <p>The Planning Statement, section 3.5, sets out why the Applicant considers that EN-1 and EN-6 establish an urgent need for new nuclear power generation in the UK. This is disputed by a number of IPs. For example, the relevant representations of Leiston Labour Party [RR-0678], Mark Hoare [RR-0752], Friends of the Earth Grassroots Nuclear Network [RR-0400], Stowarzyszenie 'Wspólna Ziemia' (Association Common Earth) [RR-1163], Swilland and Witnesham Grouped Parish Council [RR-1198], and Stop Sizewell C (Theberton & Eastbridge Action Group) [RR-1162] advocate the use of other technologies as being preferable. Likewise, Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) [RR-1231], contends that there is no NPS which establishes the "need" for a new nuclear power station post 2025, or the appropriateness of SZC for that purpose, when judged against the reasonable alternatives. The Applicant is requested to provide further justification and explanation in the light of these comments for its stance that the principle for the need for new nuclear plants such as Sizewell C is established in EN-1 and that significant weight should be attached to the statements of need set out in EN-1 and EN-6.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
G.1.20	The Applicant	Need The Planning Statement, section 3.7, considers the EN-1, EN-6 site specific assessment and amongst other things, asserts that, in principle, Sizewell C is identified as a site suitable for the development of a new nuclear power station. The relevant representation of Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257] submits that this potential suitability is no longer valid since it was based on an ability to use a sea-based transport strategy. Please provide a specific response to that matter in the light of the changes to the original application.
	Response	
G.1.21	The Applicant	Need The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.11, states that based on current grid intensity the operation of Sizewell C would displace the equivalent of its construction emissions within the first 6 years of operation. The representation of Ian Marshall [RR-0490], states that <i>"the carbon footprint of Sizewell C's construction will have an adverse impact on carbon targets; it cannot positively contribute to UK's carbon neutral timetable until 2040 at the earliest"</i> . Please comment on that assertion and set out the anticipated timetable for the displacement of construction emissions and the achievement of a positive contribution to the UK carbon neutral timetable.
	Response	
G.1.22	The Applicant	Need The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.12, compares the lifecycle GHG emissions with lifecycle emissions from other sources. The representations of IPs such as East Suffolk Council on behalf of Green, Lib Dem & Independent Group [RR-034], assert that nuclear

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		power compares unfavourably, in terms of GHG emissions, to wind power. Please explain further the derivation of the figure of 4.5g CO ₂ e/kWh for lifecycle GHG emissions for the scheme.
	Response	
G.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Need</p> <p>The Institute for Resource and Security Studies [RR-0499] states that it is untrue that Sizewell C 's CO₂ equivalent emissions would be "<i>similar to wind and lower than solar</i>". When the carbon footprint of its full uranium 'fuel chain' is considered - from uranium mining, milling, enrichment (which is highly energy intensive), fuel fabrication, irradiation, radioactive waste conditioning, storage, packaging to final disposal – nuclear power's CO₂ emissions are between 10 to 18 times greater than those from renewable energy technologies. Please comment on the criticisms made and indicate whether the comparisons made by the Applicant take account of the factors mentioned and, if not, why not?</p>
	Response	
G.1.24	The Applicant, Relevant local planning authorities	<p>Benefits - Economic</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.18, states that home-based jobs generated by the project would equate to around 1% of all employment in Suffolk. This is regarded by the Applicant as a significant increase in employment and a major beneficial change to employment in the area:</p> <p>(i) What reliance can be placed upon the estimate that around 2,000 home based workers would be employed on the main development site at peak?</p> <p>(ii) What weight can be placed upon such relatively temporary employment benefits in the overall balancing exercise?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
G.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Benefits - Economic</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.20, states that the project would also create extensive supply chain opportunities:</p> <p>(i) What reliance can be placed upon the experience of development at Hinkley Point C by way of a comparator for such opportunities given the different location and circumstances of the Sizewell site?</p> <p>(ii) What is the likelihood of a similar level of spending on the regional supply chain at Sizewell C taking place and how would that be secured?</p>
	Response	
G.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Benefits - Education, Jobs and skills</p> <p>Please provide further explanation and details to support the claim set out in the Planning Statement, paragraph 7.2.33, that the economic effects of Sizewell C Project on skills, employment and the labour market would be substantial given the relatively short-term nature of many of those economic effects.</p>
	Response	
G.1.27	The Applicant, Relevant local planning authorities	<p>Benefits – Tourism</p> <p>The Planning Statement, section 7.2 (e), explains the provision of the proposed Tourism Fund and what that is anticipated to achieve:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further why the provision of such a fund could be relied upon to mitigate the potential for adverse impacts on tourism as anticipated by the ES distinguishing between construction and operational impacts?</p> <p>(ii) Please list the locations of particular concern and explain how the provision of a Tourism Fund would specifically assist those particular aspects of the tourist economy most likely to suffer an adverse impact?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
G.1.28	The Applicant	Indicative Construction Programme [APP-599] The early years assessment of traffic is done for an assumed year of 2023. On the indicative programme the years are not referenced. Annotate the years on the programme so it can be easily referenced to other submission documents.
	Response	
G.1.29	The Applicant	Construction Phases Figures 2.2.34 to 2.2.38 in [AS-191] show Construction Phases 1 to 5. They do not appear to relate to the Implementation Plan provided in [APP-599]. Provide: (i) Information on other construction phases, given temporary access and haul roads are still in place in Phase 5; and (ii) Cross reference these documents so that the construction phases can be identified in the Implementation Plan.
	Response	
G.1.30	The Applicant	Main Platform - Underground Construction Provide long and cross sections of the main development platform showing the cut-off wall extent and also any deep excavations proposed, including marine tunnelling shafts.
	Response	
G.1.31	The Applicant	Main Platform - Underground Construction Explain how dewatering will be undertaken for the revised marine tunnelling area outside of the cut off wall.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>In paragraphs 2.2.135 and 2.2.136 of [AS-181] the crossing bridge is said to be 30m long and 45m wide, in paragraphs 2.7.7 and 2.7.9 of [AS-202] the crossing bridge is said to be approximately 40m long and 40m wide and in paragraph 3.2.3 of the FRA Addendum [AS-157] the bridge is said to be 30m wide. In the plan SZC-SZ0100-XX-000-DRW-100205 [PDA-005] it is 40m long and 30m wide. Confirm the following:</p> <p>(i) The length of the proposed bridge (north /south); and</p> <p>(ii) The width of the proposed bridge at soffit level (east/west).</p> <p>Please update the plans to record the conclusion.</p>
	Response	
G.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>Explain in detail why the width of the crossing needs to be around 40m at crest level given only the permanent access road will remain at operation.</p>
	Response	
G.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>A number of IP's have referred to a crossing option of a three span bridge, that was considered at Stage 2 consultation. This is outlined in Appendix D7 [APP-072]. In Table 7.2 of that document it sets out the relative merits of a number of options including a three span bridge. This three span bridge option is stated to have the least land take from the SSSI and also has the least width of 35.5m, which includes the temporary bridge that would be ultimately removed. The current proposal has a final footprint width of 70m. This width is greater than any option in that previous consultation and presumably has a higher land take from the SSSI especially as there would be no removal of temporary incursion into the SSSI. Provide:</p> <p>(i) Explanation in detail why the three span bridge approach in the Stage 2 consultation is no longer being proposed, given the implications for the SSSI set out in Table 7.2 and Table 7.3; and</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) The estimated land take of the current single span bridge proposal.
	Response	
G.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>Paragraph 2.7.8 of [AS-202] states "<i>The carriageway would have an approximate width of 12m and require approximately 3m high safety barriers on either side.</i>" Explain the following:</p> <p>(i) Whether the carriageway width of 12m is in its usual meaning the vehicle running width or includes the width of the footways on either side; and</p> <p>(ii) Why there is a requirement for a safety barrier of 3m high on either side of the carriageway.</p>
	Response	
G.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing</p> <p>Figure 2.2.16 in [AS-190] seems to show that the carriageway and the top of the embankment crossfall towards the sea. The road level in paragraph 3.3.4 is stated to be 7.3m AOD. Is this proposed level at the lowest point of the road, which in the plate would be the seaward side? Is this interpretation correct?</p>
	Response	
G.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Permanent SSSI Crossing – Adaptive Sea Defence</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.134 of [AS-181] states that by 2090 the maximum crest height of the SSSI crossing is likely to need to be increased to 10.5m AOD. Provide:</p> <p>(i) A section similar to the adaptive design shown in Figure 2.2.25 in [AS-190] showing how the adaptive design may be constructed on the SSSI crossing;</p> <p>(ii) An explanation of the monitoring process to ensure the adaptive defence is delivered when required and how this process is secured within the DCO;</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) A description of how the works required to deliver the adaptive defences are secured within the DCO; and (iv) An explanation as to whether consideration has been given to construct the SSSI crossing at the 10.5m AOD height at the start of the project.
	Response	
G.1.38	The Applicant	Permanent BLF Paragraph 3.4.66 of Appendix 2.2B [AS-202]. Provide: (i) The approximate size of the ground beams; and (ii) The approximate size of the cross beams;
	Response	
G.1.39	The Applicant	Permanent BLF Paragraph 3.4.68 of Appendix 2.2B [AS-202] states that the platform may require reinstallation following storm events or at the beginning of each summer period during construction use. In this scenario is it assumed that platform elements could be lost to the sea?
	Response	
G.1.40	The Applicant	Permanent and Temporary BLF – Diversion of Coastal Paths Paragraph 15.5.11 to 15.5.20 [APP-267] sets out the potential implications for the Suffolk Coast Path, Sandlings Walk and the future route of the England Coast Path. Diversions are explained and shown in The Access and Rights of Way Strategy, Appendix 15I [APP-270]. The introduction of the new temporary beach landing facility is likely to affect the periods for which diversions would be in place. Set out the approximate length and frequency of closures associated with: (i) Construction of the permanent beach landing facility; (ii) Construction of the temporary beach landing facility;

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Operation of the permanent beach landing facility during construction; (iv) Operation of the temporary beach landing facility when conveyor belt is in use, if closure of path beneath is required; and (v) Operation of the permanent beach landing facility during operation.
	Response	
G.1.41	The Applicant, Essex & Suffolk Water Company	Water Supply In [AS 189] you indicate that the provision of the preferred pipeline may have adverse effects in respect of noise, air quality and terrestrial ecology. Please explain how mitigation could be secured for these operations when the pipeline would not appear to be part of the DCO application.
	Response	
G.1.42	The Applicant	Draft DCO In [AS148] Table 2 refers to how Article 3 and 4(1)(a) set vertical limits to control the parameters of development. (i) Please explain how this would be achieved for each of the associated development sites where there are no parameters plans and are not specifically covered by these articles except for Work No. 4C, Work No. 11 and Work No. 12. (ii) Is it not fairer to say that there are no vertical limits of deviation in these locations as parameter plans have not been provided and as the DCO is currently drafted? As this document is intended to be a signposting document to aid the public's understanding of the DCO, is this a fair representation to them?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.43	The Applicant	Vertical Limits of Deviation In [APP 451] SLR, Noise and Vibration para 4.6.40 the ES seeks to explain that a parameters approach has been adopted, and this is duplicated in para 4.6.37 of [APP 415] (TVB Noise and Vibration) . Both Chapters appear to rely on a limitation of vertical deviation of 1m. Please show where this is set out and secured in the DCO.
	Response	
G.1.44	The Applicant	Park and Ride Sites (Parameters) In [APP 384 and APP 354] for the Southern and Northern Park and Rides respectively there appears to be no reference to any form of vertical limit of deviation or what parameters the development would be undertaken within. Are these two elements of the scheme to be treated differently from other aspects of the proposed development?
	Response	
G.1.45	The Applicant, All relevant local authorities, EA	Code of Construction Practice The CoCP [AS 273] sub heading m) indicates SZC Co. would hope to lead on complaints. Please explain how this would be undertaken to respect privacy and comply with the GDPR as well as enforcing authorities' responsibilities to investigate complaints.
	Response	
G.1.46	The Applicant, Network Rail	Green Rail Route and Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) (i) In the event the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line is modified as proposed and both the LEEIE and Green Rail Route are established could they both be operational at the same time? (ii) Please explain whether this is possible and if not what would be in place to prevent it? (iii) Has the ES assessed the possibility of both operating together? -
	Response	
G.1.47	The Applicant	Main Development Site

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please will the Applicant confirm that the Main Development Site as defined in the ES glossary [APP-005] is exactly the same as the Main Development Site as defined in the dDCO (both the original [APP-059] and the current version). The wording is different. If there are differences, please supply plans setting them out and an explanation.
	Response	
G.1.48	The Applicant	Main Development Site Please will the Applicant state whether or not the Works numbers 2, 3 and 4 are wholly located on the Main Development Site as defined in the dDCO and that the only works to be carried out on the Main Development Site as defined in the dDCO are Works No.s 1-4.
	Response	
G.1.49	The Applicant	Plans The Main Development Site Temporary Construction Area – General Arrangement Sheet 4 of 4 indicates the eastern extent of the proposed green rail route, this however, extends beyond the area defined in the Works Plans as Work No. 4B. Please clarify the position or provide corrected plans.
	Response	
G.1.50	The Applicant	Flood Defences In Table 2.3 Parameters for other development on the main platform. You specify the maximum height of the sea defence as 14.2m AOD. This is explained in the subsequent paragraphs 2.4.6 and 2.4.7. (i) Is the intention to construct the flood defence to the greater height from the outset? (ii) If not, when would you anticipate this would be done and how would this be secured?
	Response	
G.1.51	The Applicant, Network Rail	Freight Trains

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Please advise of the stages to go through to confirm that freight trains could begin to deliver materials to both Land East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) and the Main Development Site (MDS) using the Green Rail Route.</p> <p>(ii) Please set out what you consider to be a realistic time frame for the delivery and facilitation of both options in the event the DCO were to be granted.</p>
	Response	
G.1.52	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>(i) Please provide a plan showing how the site would be laid out within the Land to the East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate which demonstrates that the 400 caravans you propose can be accommodated and facilitate appropriate separation and circulation spaces as required.</p> <p>(ii) Please advise what within the DCO triggers the delivery of and secures the provision of the caravan site.</p>
	Response	
G.1.53	ESC, SCC, EA, Natural England	<p>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</p> <p>The CoCP would be an important part of the mitigation strategy for dealing with and controlling potentially adverse effects from the various construction activities. Do you consider that as drafted it is sufficiently robust and precise and consequently enforceable?</p>
	Response	
G.1.54	The Applicant	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>Draft DCO Requirement 8 says that the work to be undertaken should be in general accord with the Construction Method Statement (CMS) - but this document is not referenced in the Mitigation Route Map - so it is not clear where the CMS fits in respect of the mitigation or the Code of Construction Practice.</p> <p>Please explain how the various documents are intended to operate together and how the different controls within them are secured.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In addition the ExA notes that [APP-184] is updated by appendix 2.2.B of [AS-202]. Should the CMS as defined in the dDCO refer to [AS-202] section 3.4 and not [APP-184] if the change request is accepted?
	Response	
G.1.55	The Applicant	<p>Construction Shift Patterns</p> <p>(i) Please provide a breakdown of the numbers of staff anticipated to be arriving and leaving the site during each of the construction phases of the project. Linking this information to the indicative working patterns identified in Table 3.1[APP-184] would assist in the understanding of movements on and off the site.</p> <p>(ii) Please include the mode of travel you have assumed for them to arrive and leave by with assumed numbers by each mode.</p> <p>(iii) How does the DCO secure the shift pattern assumed?</p>
	Response	
G.1.56	The Applicant	<p>EQS</p> <p>There are many references, notably in the ecology parts of the ES, to EQSs. "EQS" is defined in the Glossary [APP-005] as "<i>Concentration of a specified contaminant considered to be none harmful to the environment, agreed at a European level under the Environmental Quality Standards Directive</i>". Please will the Applicant explain the legal and policy consequences of a breach of an EQS. Does it vary depending on the directive / law in which the EQS is being used? Please will the Applicant also clarify the definition. Should "none harmful" be "non-harmful"?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.57	The Applicant	<p>Legislation</p> <p>Section 3 of the Planning Statement [APP-590] entitled Legislative and Policy Context after a description of policy and some parts of the Planning Act 2008, then, in a paragraph entitled "Other legislative requirements", refers the reader to the Legislation and policy context sections of the ES at Chapter 1 of each volume for the relevant law, and to the Schedule of Other Licences, Consents and Agreements [APP-153]. In fact the ExA has found the lists near the opening of the chapters of the volumes, for example in section 7.2 of the main site terrestrial ecology chapter [APP-461]. They in turn refer the reader to Volume 1 Appendix 6 [APP-171].</p> <p>Whilst this is helpful to a point, the documentation does not spell out how the legislation applies and the steps the Secretary of State and the ExA are expected to take. For example, the ExA has been unable to find any reference to ss.28G and 28I of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the duties they contain. In contrast, there is a mention of the approach to ss.40 and 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, though the relevant parts of the Convention on Biodiversity 1992 are not referred to. Nor does, for example, Appendix 6J state how the various international conventions and treaties have been incorporated into the laws of England and Wales. Appendix 6R, whilst it refers to the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009, does not deal with the duties under ss.125 and 126.</p> <p>Returning to the topic chapters of the ES, having once listed the legislation they do not refer to it again.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant prepare a statement of the legislation and international obligations which apply, explaining the actions and steps which the ExA and SoS should take to comply with them.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
G.1.58	The Applicant	<p>The ES contains many statements and promises at various places that certain steps or actions or mitigation will be delivered. For example, at paragraph 14.7.46 of [APP-224] there is a reference to a Recreation and Amenity Strategy. The conclusion at para 14.7.67 relies on the delivery of embedded mitigation. Para 14.7.79 states that if monitoring indicates exceedance of a threshold, then additional mitigation measures would be adopted. At para 14.7.136 funding for alternative fen meadow compensation is referred to. At para 14.7.276 a management strategy is stated to be in place. There are many other examples in other chapters of the ES.</p> <p>However, the ES does not appear to the ExA to set out where these things are secured in the dDCO, by which Requirement, or under other documents regulating the development.</p> <p>How does the Applicant propose that the ExA can be assured that all these matters will have been secured properly in the dDCO and other documentation regulating the development, should the SoS decide to grant the Application?</p>
	Response	
Ag.1	Agriculture and Soils	
Ag.1.0	ESC, Natural England	<p>Approach</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the overall assessment approach and findings in respect of Agriculture and Soils?</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>In chapters [APP-277], [APP-371], [APP-402], [APP-435], [APP-470], [APP-502], [APP-531] and [APP-563] a table is included titled 'Assessment of magnitude of impact on soils and agriculture' which defines high, medium, low and very low magnitudes of impact:</p> <p>(i) Please confirm whether each of the criteria listed in the table is to be met for the magnitude to be allocated?</p> <p>(ii) Please provide detailed justification for how the magnitude of impact of the loss of Best and Most Versatile land is determined. How is severance, whether temporary or</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>permanent, taken into consideration, particularly associated with smaller agricultural holdings?</p> <p>(iii) How does the methodology assess smaller agricultural or other holdings for which a permanent or long-term loss or degradation of <10ha of BMV land, and/or loss of <5% of farmed land and/or no severance would be seen by the owners and/or occupiers as having more than a very low impact?</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>The following areas have not been surveyed due to lack of access:</p> <p>(i) 14.5ha of the SLR</p> <p>(ii) 3.15ha of the TVB</p> <p>(iii) 14.4ha of the MDS</p> <p>Please explain why access was not possible.</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>Please provide an update as to whether questionnaires have been completed with landowners at Theberton Hall Farm, Yew Tree Farm and Theberton House Estate [APP-470]. What assumptions were made to ensure that the lack of information did not affect the conclusions of the assessment?</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.4	ESC, Natural England	<p>Impact Assessment</p> <p>The temporary compounds associated with the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line rail improvement works have not been included in the agriculture and soils assessment [APP-563]. Please confirm if you are satisfied with this approach?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ag.1.5	The Applicant	Impact Assessment Paragraph 10.6.7 of [APP-563] states that the effect on two of the four land holdings would be significant. Paragraph 10.7.5 later states that three farm business would experience a significant effect. Please clarify the number of land holdings which would experience a significant effect.
	Response	
Ag.1.6	Mollett's Partnership [RR-0812] Finn Dowley [RR-0382] LJ and EJ Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] Justin Dowley [RR-0638] Myles Dowley [RR-0866] Miss Frances Paul on behalf of Mrs J F Flick [RR-0806] NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] Ward Farming Business [RR-1259]	Effect on Business Operations Please provide more detail in respect of your concern on the impact that the Proposed Development may have on your business.
	Response	
Ag.1.7	CLA County Land [RR-0029]	Effect on Business Operations Please explain in greater detail your concern that the Proposed Development would result in the fragmentation of farms and other rural businesses due to new infrastructure and the overall impact.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ag.1.8	The Applicant	Effect on Business Operations What consideration has been given to the effect on the health and wellbeing of animals housed or grazing close to the Proposed Development including through noise and dust? What measures could be put in place to mitigate any impacts and how could this be secured through the DCO?
	Response	
Ag.1.9	The Applicant	Mitigation Paragraphs 17.7.5 of [APP-277], 10.7.5 of [APP-531], 10.7.3 of [APP-371] and [APP-402, 10.7.5 of [APP-563] and 10.4.59 of [APP-502] state that the impact on the landholding(s) would not be significant. However, further consultation with the landowner(s) is proposed to reduce impact on the farm business. Please expand on what the consultation will consist of, when this will occur and what specific measures are to be implemented to reduce impact? How will such measures reduce the level of impact?
	Response	
Ag.1.10	ESC, Natural England	Outline Soil Management Plan Are you satisfied with the approach and content of the outline Soil Management Plan [APP-278]? Please provide specific comment regarding whether soils would be suitable for the required end use and the proposed soil restoration methods?
	Response	
Ag.1.11	The Applicant	Outline Soil Management Plan [APP-278] (i) Please provide confirmation as to which stakeholders would be consulted with regarding possible cessation of works due to wet weather working. (ii) Please confirm how the Soil Management Plan and the review/approval role by relevant consultation bodies would be secured through the DCO?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(iii) How will soils that are to be re-used for landscape restoration to be kept free of foreign matter or other materials which would render the soils unsuitable for re-use?</p> <p>A list of general principles relating to stockpile location and stability are detailed in paragraph 6.6.3:</p> <p>(iv) What measures would be employed to manage topsoil and subsoil stockpiles throughout their lifetime to maintain stability and integrity?</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Soil Management</p> <p>In [RR-0304] ESC comment that the modelling of emissions from stockpiled materials, as set out in the Environmental Statement, is subject to significant uncertainty and should not be considered as providing definitive results. Please provide a response to this concern.</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Soil Management</p> <p>ESC note that dust nuisance is likely to be minimal with the proposed mitigation in place [RR-0304]. ESC has however requested that stockpiles and earth bunds are turfed and fenced/screened in locations which are within 350m of sensitive human health and ecological receptors to minimise wind whipping of loose bund or stockpile material. Please provide a response to this request including confirmation of how any such commitments would be secured.</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Soil Management</p> <p>Paragraph 1.2.3 of Appendix 12A [APP-213] states that surface strip material from Zone A is anticipated to have low organic content and therefore would not be separated into top/sub soil. Paragraph 6.3.2 of Appendix 17C [APP-278] states that separate stockpiles will be created for different types of topsoil and subsoil. Please confirm if soils are to be separated?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Ag.1.15	The Applicant	Dust Management Please provide a response to the issues raised regarding dust management for spoil heaps and stockpiles [RR-0960, RR-0181, RR-1230, RR-0636, RR-577, RR-1162, RR-319].
	Response	
Ag.1.16	The Applicant	Drainage How has the size and locations for the drainage treatment areas/other drainage infrastructure been considered to minimise the effect on operational agricultural land?
	Response	
Ag.1.17	The Applicant	Drainage How will any affected field drainage on agricultural land be reinstated post construction phase? How will this be secured as part of the DCO?
	Response	
Ag.1.18	The Applicant	Drainage Paragraph 10.4.8 of [APP-531] states that as the site is quite low lying, adequate fall for field drainage may be problematic. Please confirm how this issue has been addressed.
	Response	
Ag.1.19	The Applicant	Consultation Paragraph 17.3.30 [APP-277] refers to landowner interviews. Please confirm how many landowners were not interviewed (Paragraph 17.3.30 [APP-277])? Please confirm why it wasn't possible to interview all landowners?
	Response	
Ag.1.20	The Applicant	Consultation In response to [RR-0878], please confirm how NE advice and consultation responses, relating to soils and agriculture, has been considered in the drafting of the dDCO?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Ag.1.21	ESC, Natural England	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>The below issues may increase effects on soils and agricultural land required for reinstatement of land, landscape planting areas, land outside the site boundary and soils required for reinstatement of land required temporarily:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) ground contamination, soil erosion and silt-laden runoff; (ii) hydrological or hydrogeological changes; and (iii) noise and dust <p>Are you satisfied with the measures detailed within the CoCP [AS-273] to manage/reduce the risk of the above occurring?</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>In [RR-0304] ESC requested that the CoCP should specify that dust deposition monitoring is required when soil stripping is undertaken within proximity of sensitive receptors. Please provide a response.</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>[RR-1099], [RR-1101], [RR-1100], [RR-1098] request that a record of condition and soil statement is included within the CoCP. Additional requests have also been made for more detail regarding the measures to be put in place to bring soil back to its original condition and quality, the need for a pre-construction soil statement and an aftercare plan. Please provide a response.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Ag.1.24	The Applicant	Water Supply [RR-0215], [RR-0366], [RR-0424], [RR-0437],[RR-0891], [RR-0937], [RR-1122], [RR-1098], [RR-1099], [RR-1100], [RR-1122] commented on the provision of water supplies for agricultural businesses. Please provide a response to the below: (i) What measures would be put in place to ensure that private water supplies for agricultural businesses are not adversely affected by the Proposed Development (ii) What measures would be put in place to monitor any effects during the construction phase? (iii) What measures would be put in place to monitor any effects post construction? (iv) How would any remedial action (such as an alternative supply) be provided if private supplies are adversely affected, including through supply levels and contamination?
	Response	
Ag.1.25	Catherine Bacon [RR-0184] NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] NFU [RR-0885] Clarke & Simpson on behalf of Family Mellen [RR-0241] Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] Mollett's Partnership [RR-0812] Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of David and Belinda Grant [RR-1098] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Nat & India Bacon [RR-1100] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Trustees of AW Bacon Will Trust	Water Supply Please provide information, including annotated maps, confirming whether your agricultural business(es) rely on private boreholes for water supply. Please also indicate whether you rely partly or solely on such supplies.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Myles Dowley [RR-0866] Justin Dowley [RR-0638] Emma Dowley [RR-0367] Finn Dowley [RR-0382] LJ & EJ Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] Dowley Family Business [RR-0319] Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Justin & Emma Dowley [RR-1099]	
	Response	
Ag.1.26	The Applicant	Water Supply Has Parkgate Farm constructed the large irrigation pond detailed in paragraph 10.4.31 of [APP-435]? If so, have alternative crops been grown other than those considered in the assessment and has the land remained in arable production? If changes have been made, do they have an impact on the findings of the assessment?
	Response	
Ag.1.27	Catherine Bacon [RR-0184] NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] NFU [RR-0885] Clarke & Simpson on behalf of Family Mellen [RR-0241] Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] Mollett's Partnership [RR-0812] Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of David and Belinda Grant [RR-1098]	Land Ownership and Severance Please provide information, including annotated maps if possible, to illustrate where agricultural land may be severed by the Proposed Development.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	<p>Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Nat & India Bacon [RR-1100]</p> <p>Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Trustees of AW Bacon Will Trust [RR-0003]</p> <p>Myles Dowley [RR-0866]</p> <p>Justin Dowley [RR-0638]</p> <p>Emma Dowley [RR-0367] Finn Dowley [RR-0382]</p> <p>LJ & EJ Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] Dowley Family Business [RR-0319]</p> <p>Savills UK (Ltd) on behalf of Justin & Emma Dowley [RR-1099]</p>	
	Response	
Ag.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Best and Most Versatile land</p> <p>NPS EN1 (paragraph 5.1.080) states that "<i>Applicants should seek to minimise impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defines as land in grades 1,2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5)...</i>".</p> <p>Please explain how the test in paragraph 5.10.8 of the NPS is satisfied in the respect of the location of the Northern Park and Ride, the SLR and the TVB.</p>
	Response	
Ag.1.29	The Applicant, ESC, Natural England	<p>Best and Most Versatile land</p> <p>Paragraph 17.6.6 of [APP-277] confirms that an area of 14.4ha has not been surveyed. Please can the Applicant detail why the area was unable to be surveyed.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Do ESC and NE agree with the assumption that the un-surveyed area is unlikely to be Best and Most Versatile land?
	Response	
Ag.1.30	The Applicant	Agricultural Liaison Officer Please provide a response regarding the need for the appointment of an Agricultural Liaison Officer [RR-1099].
	Response	
Ag.1.31	The Applicant	Grazing land In relation to the proposed sites for fen meadow habitat Table 1.1 of Appendix 17B [APP-278] states that following completion of the works, it is anticipated that grazing would continue, albeit with a possible reduction in density. Please confirm whether grazing would continue and specify if grazing density would be lost? If a loss is to occur, please confirm by how much.
	Response	
Ag.1.32	The Applicant	Grazing land Please comment regarding the concern over potential damage to Minsmere Sluice and subsequent damage to grazing land [RR-0319].
	Response	
Ag.1.33	The Applicant	Access Table 10.9 of [APP-470] confirms that Fordley Hall Farm, Old Abbey Farm, Trust Farm, Hawthorn Farm, Dove House Farm and Theberton Hall Farm will be required to use the public highway. Please provide specific information relating to the location and anticipated level of use of the public highway.
	Response	
Ag.1.34	The Applicant	Access

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In respect of Farnham Hall [APP-435], how much longer would journey times to the fields within the landholding east of the new road be?
	Response	
Ag.1.35	The Applicant	Access Table 10.9 of [APP-470] confirms that Kelsale Manor will experience severance in the area to the north of the Sizewell Link Road. Please detail what restricted access would be experienced by the landowner?
	Response	
Ag.1.36	ESC, Natural England	Materials Management Strategy Are you satisfied with the approach and content of the Material Management Strategy regarding soils and agriculture [AS-202]?
	Response	
Ag.1.37	The Applicant	Committed Developments Please confirm what are the two committed developments within 700m of the Freight Management Facility, as detailed in paragraph 10.4.26 of [APP-531]. Please confirm why they do not have the potential to materially alter baseline conditions.
	Response	
Ag.1.38	The Applicant	Land to East of Abbey Lane Mr John Poll has confirmed [AS-307] that he rents approximately 20 acres of land to the east of Abbey Lane which would be lost to the proposed rail line. Mr Poll contends that this area has not been identified as agricultural land which he farms. Please confirm whether this land has been included within the assessment?
	Response	
AQ.1	Air Quality	
AQ.1.0	The Applicant	Methodology/Construction Traffic and Air Quality

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Please confirm that the emissions from traffic operating within the site during construction has been included in the assessment of air quality affects arising from the main development site and the associated sites.</p> <p>Please set out where this information can be found within each chapter.</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.1	ESC, EA, Natural England	<p>Air quality receptors</p> <p>Are you satisfied that all potential sensitive receptors have been taken into account in the Air Quality Assessment (AQA), and with the Applicant's identification of worst-case locations for air quality?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.2	ESC, EA	<p>PM 2.5</p> <p>(i) Are you satisfied that potential impacts of PM_{2.5} concentrations have been fully taken into account in the ES and appropriately assessed as a fraction of PM₁₀ particulate concentrations?</p> <p>(ii) Do you consider using PM₁₀ as a surrogate for PM_{2.5} an acceptable methodology?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.3	ESC	<p>Dust emissions</p> <p>Do you agree with the findings of the ES that the only potential source of significant air pollution would arise from construction dust?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Dust Emissions</p> <p>It is recognised within the Air Quality chapters that the development activities could give rise to dust emissions:</p> <p>(i) Please explain where in the Air Quality chapter or elsewhere there is an assessment of the potential impacts upon agriculture as implied by the Agriculture Chapter.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain where the potential effects in terms of crops and animals have been considered and where any necessary mitigation has been set out.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Please explain where any mitigation, should it be necessary, is delivered through the DCO.
	Response	
AQ.1.5	The Applicant	Dust Emissions In light of the concern raised by the NFU [RR-805] please respond setting out how the effects on agriculture, and crops has been assessed and mitigated to acceptable levels
AQ.1.6	The Applicant	Dust emissions (Baseline) (i) Please advise how you selected the sites for measuring the current dust levels. (ii) Please explain the reasoning behind there being no monitoring being undertaken at Land East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate, Valley Road or Bucklewood Road.
	Response	
AQ.1.7	ESC	Dust emissions Are you confident the baseline monitoring locations chosen for assessing the significance of dust emissions arising from the main development site would satisfactorily provide sufficient information such that appropriate standards can be monitored managed and mitigated to safeguard health and amenity for local receptors?
	Response	
AQ.1.8	The Applicant	Dust emissions In section 12.5.3 [APP-212] in seeking to minimise construction dust effects on sensitive receptors, iii suggests access points into sites are located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. Explain how this correlates with the junction/access into Land East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate and the proximity to LE7 Common Farm Cottages.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.9	The Applicant	Dust emissions Please provide a plan identifying the location and extent of the bunds referred to in 12.5.4 [APP-212] or advise where this can be found.
	Response	
AQ.1.10	The Applicant	Dust Monitoring Please explain the approach to determining the location of dust monitoring stations, and in particular how during the different construction phases how ongoing monitoring would ensure dust emissions remain below the predicted thresholds and sensitive receptors are protected.
	Response	
AQ.1.11	The Applicant, ESC	Dust Monitoring (i) A High Risk of dust spoiling and medium risk to human health is identified from activities undertaken on Site E yet no dust monitoring stations are identified in close proximity – please explain why this is the case? (ii) How will sensitive receptors be safeguarded; and (iii) the work monitored; and (iv) standards enforced?
	Response	
AQ.1.12	The Applicant, ESC	Dust Monitoring (i) As no monitoring has been carried out to understand base levels of dust particles in the vicinity of construction site C – what confidence do you have that the effects of the construction activities on this site would remain at acceptable levels? (ii) How can this be demonstrated when the base line is an important part of the initial consideration?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.13	The Applicant, ESC, PHE	Temporary Accommodation (i) In light of the close proximity of the accommodation campus to both the active working site but also the stockpiles of materials, what safeguards are in place to ensure appropriate levels are monitored and maintained for the future occupiers of the campus. (ii) Are the Council/PHE satisfied the relationship between the accommodation campus and the stockpiles/working areas can achieve an appropriate living environment to protect human health?
	Response	
AQ.1.14	The Applicant, ESC, EA, PHE	Air Quality Assessment Please respond to each of the concerns expressed by Laurence Moss [RR 673] and in light of them whether there are any outstanding concerns in this regard.
	Response	
AQ.1.15	The Applicant	Air Quality Assessment Please respond in light of the concerns raised by ESC [RR 342] regarding the potential release of carbon monoxide and formaldehyde from the diesel generators. If these are to be scoped out of the assessment, please provide a full justification for this approach.
	Response	
AQ.1.16	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Air Quality [RR 804 and RR 820] both express concern that the increased emissions from increased traffic along the A12 could have a disproportionate effect on the health of students at Farlingaye High School. Please respond to this concern.
	Response	
AQ.1.17	ESC, EA	Air Quality Do you agree that paragraph 5.2.9 of EN-1 does not apply as the Applicant suggests in the Planning Statement as "there would be no substantial changes in air quality levels"?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AQ.1.18	ESC, EA, PHE	Air Quality Receptors Are you satisfied that all potential sensitive receptors have been taken into account in the Air Quality Assessment and with the Applicant's identification of worst case locations for Air Quality?
	Response	
AQ.1.19	ESC	Approach (i) Is the Council satisfied with the overall approach of the Applicant to dealing with Air Quality? (ii) Do the Council have any specific criticisms it would like to make?
	Response	
AQ.1.20	PHE	Approach Are you satisfied that the Air Quality Assessment has responded fully and addressed all matters raised by PHE at the scoping stage?
	Response	
AQ.1.21	ESC, The Applicant	Additional Information Additional information was requested by ESC as referred to in ESC RR at paras 1.84 and 1.87: (i) Has this information been provided to the Examination? (ii) If so where can it be found?
	Response	
AQ.1.22	ESC, SCC	Air Quality Can the relevant public health authorities confirm that they consider the effects on air quality from the additional traffic along the A12 have been adequately assessed and confirm that they would not result in significant adverse effects along this transport corridor as suggested by RRs 804, 820 amongst others.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AQ.1.23	ESC	Air Quality (i) Are you concerned that the scheme may result in the failure to comply to any statutory air quality limit? (ii) If this is the case please provide details of the concerns, the limits that apply and the area(s) this would cover. (iii) If answering the above in the affirmative do you consider additional mitigation could be offered that might resolve these issues, what would this entail and how could it be delivered?
	Response	
AQ.1.24	The Applicant	Combined Heat and Power Plant (Accommodation Campus) The ES does not fully explain what type of plant has been assessed within the ES. It refers in various paragraphs to different elements. Paragraph 12.3.14 indicates it to be a gas fuelled plant, with Table 12.11 indicating location, flue height and emissions. Paragraph 12.5.3 ii refers to an optimised stack height while Table 12.3.14 appears to set the height? (i) Please clarify the situation. (ii) Please provide the details of the type of plant assessed within the ES and how this would be delivered through the DCO to ensure it fell within those parameters.
	Response	
AQ.1.25	The Applicant	Combined Heat and Power Plant/back up energy centre In the event this plant was to be retained as a backup power supply for emergencies during operation of the power station as referred to in the ES. (i) Would all or some of the diesel generators still be required?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Has the ES assessed the effects of the diesel generators running as well as the CHP and or energy centre/back up such that the potential cumulative effects have been fully set out? Please advise where the alternative assessments can be found.
	Response	
AQ.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>Paragraph 12.5.8 refers to the campus energy centre:</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that this is the combined heat and power plant, if not please provide details of where this has been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>(ii) What effect does 'designed, maintained and operated within the Medium Combustion Plant Directive' requirements have, please clarify whether this would be covered by the other licence requirements set out in Table 1.1 of the Other Licences and Consents Document?</p> <p>(iii) Has this operation regime been assumed within the ES assessment? How would this be delivered through the DCO?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>Following receipt of the explanation of the assessment of the CHP/back-up generator in correspondence dated 12.01.21 in response to PD 05 there remains some uncertainty as to what has been assessed.</p> <p>It is understood that the CHP may not be utilised, however an appropriate assessment of the CHP and the alternative still needs to be clearly described so assessment of likely effects is contained within the ES if it is to be delivered through the DCO.</p> <p>In response [APP 184] Description of Construction and [APP-180] Description of Permanent Development were referred to.</p> <p>In Table 2.7 of Vol 2 Chapter 2 [APP-180] Description of Permanent Development it states the parameter for the back-up power generation plant in Zone 1M as a maximum height of 36m (plus 3.5m tall stack). This would appear to exceed the construction parameter</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>plans as listed in Schedule 6 of the dDCO (drwg no. 10092) which specifies a maximum height of 35m, it also exceeds the height of the stack as set out in Table 12.11. The height of the back-up generator and stack appear to exceed the construction parameter plans [APP-022] which indicate a maximum height of 35m.</p> <p>The operation parameter plans for this area appear to be higher as defined in Table 2.7 linked to the dDCO. Please clarify how something could be operationally higher than the limit for construction?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Back Up Generator</p> <p>In the event the CHP is not utilised and a back up generator is subsequently provided for the operational period:</p> <p>(i) What form of generator would it be and where are the details for this set out within the ES chapters for noise, air quality, and landscape?</p> <p>(ii) Explain why it would be appropriate and necessary to site a permanent building potentially up to 35m in height (plus 3.5m stack) within the AONB, when you advise a stack height of just over 12m results in adequate emissions.</p> <p>(iii) How would this sit with the aims and purposes of the AONB?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>Appendix 12F provides an assessment of the CHP emissions. It does not however specify what form of plant was utilised to generate the data.</p> <p>(i) What type of plant does this assess, running what fuel and with what assumed flue height/location?</p> <p>(ii) How would this be delivered through the DCO?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>It is understood that alternative forms of power plant are still being considered to support the accommodation campus as reference is also made to air source heat pumps.</p> <p>(i) As alternatives are being sought what process would prevent more than one alternative being provided?</p> <p>(ii) Has a cumulative assessment been carried out in the event that more than one power source were to be provided?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>The position is further complicated by the information set out in the Noise Chapter of the ES which states "<i>The final designs for the proposed CHP, electrical sub-station and back-up generator (including component parts and sound power data) are not available at this time.</i>" [APP156] para 11.6.165. This suggests the CHP and back-up generator may be different things and it makes it more difficult to understand what has actually been assessed.</p> <p>If the CHP is not utilised what back up energy system has been assessed and where can the details of this be found?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Combined Heat and Power Plant</p> <p>It is important to understand how the concerns highlighted in Q 1.17-1.24 knock on, if at all, to the assessment within the other chapters of the ES in particular, Noise and Vibration, Heritage, Landscape, Ecology, Agriculture.</p> <p>In answering the above questions please address any knock on effects which may be relevant to these aspects of the scheme.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation campus</p> <p>As can be seen from the previous questions there is a great deal of uncertainty over what has been assessed in respect of the power source for the accommodation campus during construction and what would be in place post construction to support operation:</p> <p>(i) Please provide a clear explanation of the alternatives considered and set out clearly where they have been assessed within the ES.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain how the alternatives would be delivered, monitored and controlled through the DCO such that they remain within the assessment parameters covered by the ES.</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.34	ESC, SCC, PHE, EA	<p>Dust Soiling</p> <p>(i) Are you satisfied with the suggested mitigation to control the levels of dust arising from the development?</p> <p>(ii) If not what additional mitigation would you wish to see supplementing the Dust Management Plan, Outline Dust Management Plan or Code of Construction Practice?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.35	ESC, SCC, PHE, EA, Natural England	<p>Dust Soiling</p> <p>(i) Are you satisfied with the suggested monitoring of dust emissions from the development?</p> <p>(ii) If not what additional mitigation would you wish to see and how do you consider this should be secured?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Dust Soiling</p> <p>In light of the comments from ESC in [RR-0342] can you confirm that the CoCP will address the need for dust monitoring during soil stripping to protect sensitive receptors?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		If you don't agree with this approach, please explain why.
	Response	
AQ.1.37	The Applicant	Dust Soiling Please explain how the monitoring referred to in paragraph 12.6.8 [APP 212] would be secured.
	Response	
AQ.1.38	The Applicant	Dust Emissions Minsmere Levels Stakeholders Group [RR-803] consider that fugitive dust from the borrowpits and spoil heaps would have the great potential to adversely affect both ground water and surface water run-off. Please respond to these specific concerns.
	Response	
AQ.1.39	The Applicant	Dust Emissions Estimates of quantities of material extracted from the main development site during construction are provided within the Air Quality Chapter: (i) Please explain how these quantities have been determined with cross reference to relevant sections of the ES or other application documents as appropriate. (ii) Does the dDCO not need to specify a maximum depth of excavation to ensure that these quantities are a fair reflection of the activities proposed for which consent is sought? And to safely link back to the assessment of effects assessed by the ES.
	Response	
AQ.1.40	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Mitigation (i) The Applicant suggests in paragraph 14.7.79 [APP-224] that if exceeded of dust levels occurs additional mitigation would be adopted – please explain what this might entail – particularly in light of the commitment within the CoCP to best practice? (ii) How would this additional mitigation be secured?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) In the event the threshold of 0.5g/m ² /day had been exceeded – what would the consequence be? E.g. would work need to cease until the threshold level had fallen below the agreed level? Please explain the practicalities of what would occur on the ground and how this would be monitored, and the agreed level reached.
	Response	
AQ.1.41	The Applicant, ESC	Dust Emissions (Rail) (i) ESC in the [RR-0342] at paragraph 2.207 – please clarify if you are seeking screens/fences in relation to general earthworks across the main development site and associated development sites. (ii) Have further discussions progressed identifying the areas of concern? Please advise the ExA where these are and whether an agreed approach to protecting these receptors has now been reached?
	Response	
AQ.1.42	The Applicant, ESC, PHE	Human Health (particulate matter) Paragraph 12.6.11 of [APP-212] suggests that there could be a risk to human health if long term dust generating activities increase the baseline level within a receptor area. Do you consider the mitigation identified would be sufficient to avoid adverse effects to human health?
	Response	
AQ.1.43	The Applicant, Natural England, ESC	Ammonia Deposition It has been suggested that the ES fails to deal with ammonia deposition [RR-908] as would appear to be advocated by the Institute of Air Quality Management's 2020 Guidance and would also need to be carried out to comply with Natural England Guidance. Please respond to these specific concerns.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.44	The Applicant	<p>Darsham Parish Council</p> <p>The Parish Council have indicated concern about the effects of the closure of the level crossings and the diversion of traffic this causes, with the resultant increase in air pollution particularly from HGVs.</p> <p>Please advise where the consideration for effects on NO_x, CO₂, and PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ levels from diversions is set out.</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.45	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Stratford St Andrew AQMA</p> <p>Please advise on the latest position in respect of the assessment of air quality in the Stratford St Andrew AQMA and whether the assessment is now considered robust indicating whether there remain concerns on the assessment undertaken or whether the additional sensitivity testing has now resolved any concerns in this area.</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.46	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Stratford St Andrew AQMA</p> <p>In paragraph 2.153 of the Council RR concern was expressed in respect of the speed of traffic continuing to exceed the speed limit and accelerating such that there remained concerns about the level of NO_x. Does this concern remain?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.47	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Stratford St Andrew and Woodbridge AQMA</p> <p>(i) In light of the proposed development do you agree that both AQMAs would remain within legal limits assuming the worst-case scenarios for traffic movements?</p> <p>(ii) Is there an agreed management and monitoring approach through the lifetime of the project?</p> <p>(iii) How will traffic from other projects be taken into account to ensure that air quality standards will be maintained?</p> <p>(iv) In the event there is congestion on the A12 what would be in place to monitor this, and ensure air quality remained within acceptable levels within Woodbridge and Stratford St Andrew AQMAs but also would not adversely affect other areas?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iv) What would be in place to secure appropriate mitigation?
	Response	
AQ.1.48	The Applicant	Air Quality Monitoring (i) Please confirm the commitment to undertake air quality monitoring and the timing of when this would commence for the main development site and all the associated development sites both prior to, and during construction and subsequent operation. (ii) In light of the concerns raised by ESC over NO ₂ levels in Stratford St Andrew AQMA, please advise how you would propose to monitor the air quality levels in this area and elsewhere to ensure standards were maintained and no breaches of standards occurred.
	Response	
AQ.1.49	The Applicant	Non Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) ESC have requested the adoption of low emitting plant and an assessment both alone and in combination of impacts on both human health and ecology from NRMM and other sources. (i) Please advise whether there is a commitment to low emitting plant and if so how this would be delivered. (ii) Has an assessment now been undertaken of the potential effects of NRMM and other sources as requested by the Council?
	Response	
AQ.1.50	EA	Concrete Batching Plants Are the EA satisfied with the level of information on concrete batching plants and are you satisfied sufficient dust controls are/would be in place to meet appropriate safety standards to protect both human and ecological receptors?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AQ.1.51	ESC, EA, Natural England	Haul Routes (i) The applicant has indicated that haul routes would be hard surfaced 'where practicable' – do you consider this approach to be adequate to safeguard sensitive receptors? (ii) Are there specific locations you consider that a more robust approach should be required, or should a more robust approach be provided across the main development site and associated development sites?
	Response	
AQ.1.52	The Applicant	NO₂ Emissions A resident of Leiston [RR-204] expresses concern that the development would lead to adverse NO ₂ emissions from HDVs, please respond to this specific concern.
	Response	
AQ.1.53	The Applicant	Traffic emissions at Yoxford Dr David Perry [RR-0323] expresses concern that idling traffic particularly HGVs at the Yoxford Roundabout would result in adverse effects in the locality and result in adverse effects at the local hotel. Please respond to this specific concern.
	Response	
AQ.1.54	The Applicant	Mitigation Please explain how the various elements of mitigation relate to each other, and how they are secured by the dDCO. In particular how the Outline Dust Management Plan (oDMP), Dust Management Plan (DMP) relates to the Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP) and the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). Please also set out which document would have precedence in the event of a conflict.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
AQ.1.55	The Applicant	Mitigation Table 12.17 of [APP-212] Refers to LE25 – The Round House: (i) How would any specific mitigation be delivered to protect the amenity and living standards of this property such that appropriate air quality standards were maintained? (ii) How would this be enforced?
	Response	
AQ.1.56	The Applicant	Early Years B1122 Action Group [RR-0124] express concern that the level of traffic generated during the early years creates an unreasonable burden on the local community in terms of traffic, noise and air quality. Please address this particular concern and explain how the effects during early years could be considered reasonable in light of the recognised need to mitigate for similar levels of traffic later.
	Response	
AQ.1.57	The Applicant	Southern Park and Ride Campsea Ashe Parish Council [RR-0170] express concern that the assessment of effects from the Southern Park and Ride have not been adequately addressed. Please respond to these specific concerns
	Response	
AQ.1.58	The Applicant	Rail Emissions (i) Please advise on any likely effects of trains that are waiting to move onto or off site, or waiting on the line and what impact if any this may have on sensitive receptors. (ii) How might this be controlled, should it be necessary?
	Response	
AQ.1.59	The Applicant	Back Up Generators Whilst it is understood that these are an essential part of the safety systems which would be in place to support the overall safe operation of the site, please explain:

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Whether a cleaner alternative to diesel generators has been considered, and if so why this has been discounted.</p> <p>(ii) What mechanisms would be in place to ensure that the generators would operate as cleanly as possible and therefore be as sustainable as possible in the long term.</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.60	Natural England, ESC, EA	<p>Back Up Generators</p> <p>[APP 212] Paragraph 12.6.65 indicates that the NO_x level would be 428% of the critical level at Sizewell Marshes SSSI and that daily exceedances would also occur at other sensitive ecological receptors:</p> <p>(i) Do you agree that the short term exposure is less important?</p> <p>(ii) Is the level at 428%, albeit likely to be for a short period, tolerable such that any sensitive receptor exposed to these levels of NO_x would be expected to recover?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.61	Natural England, ESC, EA	<p>Back Up Generators</p> <p>[APP 212] Paragraph 12.8.3 indicates that there could be significant adverse effects from NO₂ concentrations, and this could exceed air quality strategy objectives:</p> <p>(i) Please comment on this assessment and whether you regard this as reasonable in light of the likelihood of these circumstances occurring as being 'once in the lifetime of a fleet of nuclear sites'.</p> <p>(ii) Even in accepting this is an unlikely scenario would it lead to an exceedance of any statutory limits?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.62	The Applicant	<p>Back Up Generators</p> <p>It is indicated that the back-up generators would operate a maximum of 720 hours in any one year (paragraph 14.7.245) [APP-244]. Whilst this might be regarded as a</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		conservative estimate it is not something that could be limited. In these circumstances where you have already identified exceedances of NO _x is it justifiable to say the addition generated by this development is 'not significant'? Please also explain what guidance or precedents you rely upon to support this position.
	Response	
AQ.1.63	The Applicant	Background Levels The data provided suggests that in future years there will be reductions in NO ₂ , NO ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} figures - because of overall falls in emissions more generally - is there an assessment that shows the relative effects of this scheme and what the levels might be without it taking place?
	Response	
AQ.1.64	The Applicant	Two Village Bypass - Foxburrow Wood It is suggested by The Woodland Trust [RR 1213] that a buffer zone of at least 30m would be required to ensure that the woodland would be adequately protected in line with standing advice from Natural England: (i) Please advise whether the design and layout of the road accommodates such a buffer; and (ii) If it does how this would be secured; and (iii) If it does not, why it does not.
	Response	
AQ.1.65	The Applicant	The Round House The Round House (Receptor LE25) is indicated to be subject to activity specific mitigation to protect air quality during construction, but it is also indicated to be subject to compulsory acquisition. The property is in close proximity to both construction works and large areas for storing spoil, please advise how you anticipate ensuring the property and it's occupiers could be

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		adequately protected from the onsite construction activities when in such close proximity to this residence or do you anticipate that it would not be occupied throughout the duration of the works? If so, how would that be secured?
	Response	
AQ.1.66	The Applicant, ONR, Environment Agency, Natural England, PHE	Tritium Gas Please comment on the concerns raised in [RR-785] in respect of the potential release of tritium gas and any controls that would be in place to safeguard human health and ecology.
	Response	
AQ.1.67	The Applicant, SCC	Mitigation In the Air Quality Chapter [APP-212] you refer to primary mitigation as 'minimising' freight movements on roads in light of the other delivery methods envisaged via rail and sea. (i) Is it really fair to say these movements would be minimised when to date neither the rail nor sea alternatives are confirmed, or to what degree they could operate?
	Response	
AQ.1.68	The Applicant	Mitigation In terms of tertiary mitigation please advise what is meant by the following terms: (i) 'as far as practicable' (first bullet point para 12.5.4 [APP-212]) and how you would expect this to be secured? (ii) 'additional mitigation as necessary' (third bullet point of para 12.5.4 [APP-212]) and how you would expect this to be secured? It seems that to be enforceable and to ensure the mitigation to be appropriate a standard needs to be defined against which the construction activities can be assessed, please

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		explain where this standard can be found and how it is secured and would subsequently be monitored.
	Response	
AQ.1.69	ESC, SCC	Mitigation The Outline Dust Management Plan [APP-213] would be an essential part of the mitigation required to control construction activities on site. Do you consider it sufficiently precise that it would be enforceable?
	Response	
AQ.1.70	The Applicant	Mitigation – Earth Bunds A 5m high bund is proposed along the southern boundary of the temporary construction area: (i) Is this indicated on any of the plans to be approved? – if so please provide the number. (ii) The ES relies on this as tertiary mitigation and it is assumed it would be secured through the CoCP – is this correct? (iii) What mechanism ensures it is provided in a timely manner to achieve the mitigation it would offer?
	Response	
AQ.1.71	The Applicant	Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Is there a definition of 'plant with significant dust rising potential'? Should there be a threshold specified so this term is fully understood?
	Response	
AQ.1.72	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Code of Construction Practice The CoCP contains general phrases such as 'where possible' and 'will seek to ensure'. In such circumstances how would the local authorities be able to enforce compliance?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AQ.1.73	The Applicant	Northern Park and Ride – Air Quality/Noise Within the Equality Statement [APP-158] a high potential for adverse effects from the Northern Park and Ride is indicated. Please advise where these concerns are set out in the corresponding air quality and noise chapters and how they might be mitigated to ensure there would not be a significant effect.
	Response	
AQ.1.74	The Applicant	Bus Fleet (i) Is the bus fleet proposed to operate to and from the main development site and associated sites intended to be electric, zero emission or ultra low emission? (ii) Please advise on the types of bus to be employed and the effect on emissions/air quality. (iii) How might any commitment to electric, zero emission or ultra low emission be secured?
	Response	
AQ.1.75	The Applicant	Conveyor on BLF It is not clear from the information provided how the conveyor system on the BLF would be powered. Please explain where this is set out in the ES. If it is to run via a non mains generator please explain how this would be delivered through the DCO and the mechanism for ensuring any environmental effects were not significant.
	Response	
AQ.1.76	The Applicant, ESC (part ii), SCC (part ii)	Mitigation The revised Mitigation Route Map [AS 276] has added for the Main Development Site

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>" Use of contractor vehicles as far as practicable that meet the Euro VI emissions standards and Euro V standards (98/69/EC) as a minimum, unless otherwise agreed with the local authority.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Use of non-road mobile machines as far as practicable and available that meet the Stage IV engine standards of the NRMM Emission Standards Directive to minimise NOx and particulate emissions on site."</i> <p>(i) This wording is not consistent across the main development site and other associated sites – is there a reason for this?</p> <p>(ii) Do the Councils consider that as reworded this is sufficiently robust?</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.77	The Applicant	<p>CoCP</p> <p>Table 4.1 [AS 273] requires an adequate water supply to be made available to suppress dust/particulate matter.</p> <p>The latest information provided with the ES Addendum appears to prefer the provision of a water supply which does not form part of the dDCO.</p> <p>Please explain the rationale for this approach and how the ExA can be assured adequate water supplies would be available in a timely manner to ensure dust and particulate matter is limited to agreed levels.</p>
	Response	
AQ.1.78	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>CoCP</p> <p>Table 4.2 refers to regular inspection and monitoring and this terminology is used in several places. Regular could ostensibly be once a year, While, it is assumed this is not the intention is there a more precise term that could be used to ensure maintenance and monitoring is undertaken expeditiously?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Al.1	Alternatives	
Al.1.0	The Applicant	General assessment principles Having regard to NPS EN-1, Section 4.4: (i) Please identify all legal and policy requirements relating to the assessment of alternatives applicable to this project and summarise the Applicant's compliance with those requirements; (ii) Please identify any such legal or policy requirements where compliance has not yet been agreed with the relevant statutory regulator? For example, in relation to the Habitats Directive, the Water Framework Directive or flood risk.
	Response	
Al.1.1	The Applicant	General assessment principles The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.35, explains that SZC Co. has not considered any alternatives for elements of the Sizewell C Project which have been determined through other processes, policies or legislation, including the proposed siting of Sizewell C. Please identify all elements including any associated development for which alternatives have not been considered, providing reasons for each element in that category.
	Response	
Al.1.2	The Applicant	General assessment principles The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.33, states that EN-6 clarifies how alternatives should be considered in the context of applications for new nuclear power stations. EN-6, paragraph 2.4.5, explains that in addition to the consideration of alternative sites, an assessment was undertaken as part of the Nuclear Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) to consider whether the objectives of this NPS could be delivered using alternative options. It concludes that: <i>"It is the Government's view that none of the alternative options looked at can be relied upon to deliver the objectives of this NPS by the end of 2025"</i> :

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Given that it is accepted those objectives cannot be delivered by the current scheme within that timescale, what reliance can be placed upon the EN-6 approach to alternative options?
	Response	
Al.1.3	The Applicant	General assessment principles The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.34, refers to EN-6, section 2.4, which outlines how alternatives were considered through the nomination process that led to confirmation in EN-6 of the eight sites for new nuclear power stations. It states that there is nothing in the consultation on the new NPS or the Government's July 2018 response which suggests that the Government's position on this has changed. The representations of Ian Marshall [RR-0490] and Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257], submit that this conclusion is out of date. Please comment on the criticisms made in those representations and provide further justification to support the view that the proposed siting of Sizewell C should not have been reconsidered for this application?
	Response	
Al.1.4	The Applicant	General assessment principles The Government response: consultation on the siting criteria and process for a new national policy statement for nuclear power with single reactor capacity over 1 gigawatt beyond 2025 July 2018 Annex II, paragraph II.4 states that : <i>"Government's approach therefore is to carry the list of potentially suitable sites in EN-6 through to the new NPS. This will be subject to confirmation from the current developers associated with each potentially suitable site that they wish it to remain listed in future and subject to those sites meeting the strategic criteria as well as demonstrating they are credible for deployment by 2035. The finalised strategic siting criteria at Annex I are based on the original Strategic Siting Assessment (updated to be consistent with current law and policy</i>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>and to take account of the views received as part of this consultation)</i>". Please explain further:</p> <p>(i) How the scheme would comply with the strategic siting criteria set out in Annex I, paragraph 1.14, in relation to the flooding, tsunami, storm surge and coastal processes aspects of nuclear safety and security; and</p> <p>(ii) the credibility of this particular scheme for deployment by 2035.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Site specific assessment – change in circumstances</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 3.8.9, indicates that further details of the evolution of the main development site boundary and the alternatives considered by SCZ Co. are provided at Volume 2, Chapter 6 of the ES:</p> <p>(i) Please provide a separate summary of those changes and the justification for them.</p> <p>(ii) Explain further why the changes to the nominated site area and the siting of the temporary construction area in close proximity to the main construction area do not represent a change in circumstances?</p>
	Response	
Al.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Reactor design</p> <p>The NPS EN-6 Vol I, Section 2.6, considers the Regulatory Justification process and the planning regime. It explains that in October 2010 the Secretary of State published his decisions that two nuclear reactor designs, Westinghouse's AP1000 and Areva's EPR, are justified and that Justification is a separate regulatory process. However, given the period that has elapsed since the Regulatory Justification decision and the criticisms raised by IPs in relation to reactor design, should requirements be attached to draft DCO to the effect that the order is conditional on the existence of a valid Regulatory Justification decision?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.7	ONR	Reactor design The Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) [RR-0911] explains that in June 2020, NNB Generation Company (SZC) Ltd applied for a nuclear site licence to allow it to install and operate two EPR™ reactors at the Sizewell C site. The design of the proposed twin reactor development at Sizewell C is closely based on that for the power station that is currently under construction at Hinkley Point C. ONR carried out an assessment of the generic EPR design in 2012 and concluded that it could be safely constructed and operated in the United Kingdom. Whilst the ExA appreciates that the ONR is currently assessing the nuclear site licence application, does it have any concerns at this stage in the light of experience and development of the EPR reactor since 2012 at Hinkley Point C?
	Response	
Al.1.8	The Applicant	Strategic alternatives for accommodation infrastructure The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report sets out SZCs approach to site selection. Section 2.2 considers the strategic alternatives for accommodation infrastructure. This is further explained in the Accommodation Strategy. Please explain in detail: (i) Why it was considered that an off-site campus would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community or environmental impacts around the main development site; and (ii) Why the delivery of permanent housing was not considered as a reasonable alternative to the on-site campus?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for accommodation infrastructure</p> <p>The Planning Statement, paragraph 7.3.36, indicates that appropriate strategic options have been considered by SZC Co. for the accommodation of workforce. In addition, the Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 3 sets out the site selection process for development on the main development site. Section 6 considers the temporary construction area including c) the on-site campus location. However, there is criticism raised by IPs of the site selection process that led to proposal for the Eastbridge Lane site to accommodate a worker campus including by the Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council [RR-1214] which states that justifications for selecting the single Eastbridge Lane site are poorly evidenced. (i) Please provide further justification of the selection of the Eastbridge Lane site; (ii) Explain in further detail, how that decision has taken on board responses to the Stage 1 consultation process including the concerns raised by the nearby communities of Theberton and Eastbridge; (iii) What consideration and weight was given to those community concerns, as opposed to the logistical benefits of an 'on-site' campus?</p>
	Response	
Al.1.10	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] states that the Council does not support the Applicant's proposed freight transport strategy as it stands, and considers that it is still reasonably achievable to increase the proportion of rail and potentially sea-borne deliveries. In the light of the Applicant's strategic assessment of alternatives, and the Applicant's subsequent Changes to the original application, please indicate:</p> <p>(i) Why it is considered that an increased proportion of rail transport and sea-borne transport can be achieved without causing undue delay to the construction programme?</p> <p>(ii) Whether the changes to the application have overcome the SCCs concerns in this respect?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight</p> <p>The ES 6.2 Volume 1 Chapter 4 – Project Evolution and Alternatives, sets out the strategic alternatives that have been considered by SZC Co. and how these have guided the evolution of the proposed development. In relation to the movement of freight, this explains why the option of a wide jetty was rejected including the assessment of the potential delay to the construction programme. In the light of the changes to the application including in relation to sea-borne deliveries: Please explain why the amended proposal would be acceptable in environmental terms compared to options previously considered for sea-borne deliveries and how the potential delay to construction and any other disadvantages previously identified associated with sea-borne deliveries would be overcome.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight</p> <p>The ES 6.3 Volume 2 Chapter 6 – Main Site Development, Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 6.2.98, sets out the principal reasons why SZC Co. has chosen not to proceed with the two jetty options which are informed by design development and environmental work since Stage 2 and SZC Co.'s experiences from the construction of Hinkley Point C. Please provide an update in the light of the changes to the application and distinguish the current proposal from the jetty options previously rejected with particular regard to underwater noise, seasonal controls on construction activity, and the potential for delay to the construction programme and the commencement of operation of the power station.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight</p> <p>The ES 6.2 Volume I, Chapter 4 – Project Evolution and Alternatives, paragraph 4.3.66, states that the BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted:</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please explain how the findings and conclusions expressed in the ES submitted in support of the application are compatible with the ES Addendum information relating to Change 2, in that previously the BLF was the “only capacity promoted” and now it is two BLFs and jetty components including the previous concerns expressed as to potential delay to the overall time taken to construct the power station caused by the implementation of those measures?
	Response	
Al.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Strategic alternatives for the movement of freight</p> <p>The ES 6.2 Volume I, Chapter 4 – Project Evolution and Alternatives Paragraph 4.3.63 states that the level of uncertainty of the works needed to deliver the rail-led option would affect SZC Co.’s ability to secure the necessary funding for the Sizewell C Project, and the ability to demonstrate to the Government that the Sizewell C Project can be deployed in time to meet the urgent need for new nuclear power generation. Paragraph 4.3.64 concludes that on the basis of these concerns, the works needed to support a rail-led strategy would not be deliverable. Instead, an integrated strategy was developed to seek to secure the best deliverable rail outcome, whilst addressing the concerns expressed in relation to the road-led strategy:</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details of the reasons for the uncertainty surrounding the deliverability of the works associated with the rail-led option and why it was considered that these could not be overcome within the required timescale?</p> <p>(ii) Please provide further details to explain the complex nature of those rail works, and how this is overcome by the changes to the application?</p> <p>(iii) Please explain how the findings and conclusions expressed in the ES submitted in support of the application are compatible with the ES Addendum information relating to Change 1? In particular, why is it now considered that the changes in relation to the use of rail are now regarded as being deliverable?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Freight Management Facility</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 8, sets out the site selection process for the Freight Management Facility (FMF). The representation of Highways England [RR-0468] points out that the facility would be located to the east of the A14 Orwell Bridge which is susceptible to periods of disruption and closures to traffic during inclement weather. It seeks clarity around the proposed FMF location including whether viable alternative locations west of the A14 Orwell Bridge have been identified, and the criteria used to select the proposed location. Please summarise the selection criteria and explain:</p> <p>(i) The consideration given to the likelihood of closures of the Orwell Bridge in the site selection process;</p> <p>(ii) the consideration of viable alternatives west of the Orwell Bridge.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 6, sets out the site selection process for the Two Village Bypass. This is also noted in the Site Selection Report, paragraph 6.4.70, and the reasons for rejection of that proposal are set out in subsequent paragraphs. The representation of Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council [RR-0379] expresses concern as regards the route alignment for the bypass of Farnham and Stratford St Andrew villages. There are also objections from a number of local residents including Ashtons Legal on behalf of Farnham Environment Residents & Neighbours (FERN) and others [RR-0108 to RR-0117]:</p> <p>(i) Please respond in detail to the criticism made by the Parish Council and other IPs to the proposed alignment of the new road including any change to the Ancient Woodland designation, the impact upon the properties at Farnham Hall and the benefit of facilitating a future four village bypass.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide a larger scale plan of Plate 6.1: A12 Four village route options with the proposed Two Village Bypass route overlaid to aid comparison of those schemes.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Al.1.17	The Applicant	Site selection for the Two Village Bypass The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.2.25, refers to analysis which suggested that congestion was only likely within Farnham due to the narrowing of the road at the Farnham bend. At Stage 2 of the consultation Stratford St Andrew was also added to the bypass options so as to remove Sizewell C traffic congestion from both villages. The Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) for the Sizewell Site (DECC, 2010) noted the Four Village Bypass as one of the key transport interactions for the proposed Sizewell C development. Please explain in detail the reasons for concluding that congestion was only likely to occur at the bend and that the impact of Sizewell C traffic would not be sufficient to justify a bypass of all four villages.
	Response	
Al.1.18	The Applicant	Site selection for the Two Village Bypass The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.25, indicates that the alternative alignment put forward by the Parish Council was reviewed at the Stage 4 consultation stage, taking into account the impacts on woodland, environment and nearby receptors as well as operational matters, but it was not considered to be a better solution. Please explain: (i) The operational matters that weighed upon that decision. (ii) The additional average journey time that users of the alternative alignment would be likely to take compared to the proposed route and the existing routes. (iii) Justification for the conclusion that the proposed route would be likely to encourage road users to bypass the current A12 route through Stratford St. Andrew and Farnham compared to the alternative route.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Al.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.27 states that the alternative alignment would be closer to Walk Barn Farm than the SZC Co. proposal is to any neighbouring property. Nonetheless the proposed route would pass close to the Farnham Hall complex. Please provide in summary a comparison of the distance of the two routes from residential properties in the vicinity; the numbers of residences in the various locations; the anticipated noise impact upon those residents and any impact upon heritage assets.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The Consultation Report Appendix G records concern that the two village bypass would damage Grade II listed buildings and other heritage assets in the area. The response indicates that potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting would be addressed through mitigation measures including standard CoCP measures to minimise noise and air quality effects (construction phase).</p> <p>(i) Please explain in detail why such measures are not proposed for the operational phase and identify the mitigation that is proposed for that phase?</p> <p>(ii) Specifically in relation to ES Vol 5 Chapter 4 Noise and Vibration para 4.7.12, how would further consideration of measures that could be implemented to further reduce traffic noise at detailed design stage be secured, and what type of measures are anticipated?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.28, refers to the potential impact of the alternative alignment upon Friday Street Farm. Please explain further by reference to a plan the various impacts that would result from the alternative alignment upon the separate areas of the business mentioned.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Two Village Bypass</p> <p>The ES 6.6, Volume 5 Two Village Bypass, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.29, refers to the potential impact of the alternative alignment upon Foxburrow Wood ancient woodland and Palants Grove:</p> <p>(i) Please explain in detail the perceived difficulties in maintaining a 15m buffer to Foxburrow Wood and why this could not be overcome?</p> <p>(ii) Provide an update as to the status of Foxburrow Wood and Palant's Grove as ancient woodland.</p> <p>(iii) The extent of the County Wildlife Site that would be lost as a result of the alternative alignment.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 5, sets out the site selection process for the Southern Park and Ride (SPR). The representation of the Hacheston Parish Council [RR-0447] suggests that the SPR should be situated further south on the A12 at Martlesham where an under-used Park and Ride exists. Please indicate whether consideration has been given to the specific alternative site proposed by the Parish Council and, if so, the reasons for rejection.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The Site Selection Report, paragraph 5.4.7, indicates that for the Stage 1 consultation, Option 1 – Wickham Market was considered to be in the optimal position:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further why that was considered to be the case, in particular by way of comparison with a site located further south on the A12.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain further why Options 2 and 3 were considered to have the potential to cause greater issues in terms of congestion, access and highway safety compared to Option 1.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The representation of Great Glemham Parish Council [RR-0438], submits that the SPR facility should be situated alongside the FMF at Sevenhills to reduce pressure on Wickham Market. What assessment has been made of existing pressures on Wickham Market and the impact that the proposed park and ride facility would have on those pressures in comparison to a location beside the FMF?</p>
	Response	
Al.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>The ES 6.5 Volume 4 – Southern Park and Ride, Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.2.22 states that Option 2 (Woodbridge) and Option 3 (Potash Corner) were both considered to be potentially suitable sites in transport terms but would have been in less optimal locations. These would have had the potential to cause greater issues in terms of congestion, as well as access and highway safety when compared with Option 1 (Wickham Market). This is expanded upon in paragraph 3.2.26. Please explain further these potential transport issues identified with Options 2 and 3 and why Option 1 was considered to be preferable in highway safety terms?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, section 7, sets out the site selection process for the Sizewell Link Road (SLR). The Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council [RR-0019] is critical of the location of the SLR junction and submits that it is too far north for traffic from the south and does not provide the necessary relief to the existing road network further south. The Site Selection Report Table 7.1 provides a comparison between various route options including those further to the south of the chosen route. However, the impact on traffic relief to the existing road network is not considered in this analysis. The initial need for the road to alleviate traffic impacts is identified in paragraph 7.4.10 but consequently the route options presented do not consider any traffic network analysis of the various route options. Given the report suggests that traffic analysis has been undertaken on the various route options considered, this analysis should be submitted to support the option appraisal of alternatives. If this has not been undertaken the Applicant should explain how it can therefore conclude that the selected alignment offers the best route choice in terms of network management.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The Planning Statement, Appendix A - Site Selection Report, paragraph 7.4.14, Route W is described as <i>"requiring engineering works to traverse the landform which would have had a significant adverse effect on the existing landscape character and there was the potential for the significant (sic) of several heritage assets to be affected adversely as a result of the route's alignment."</i> Yet in Table 7.1 in comparison with Route Z, the preferred option, there is very little difference in the summary presented in that table between the two options in terms of Landscape and Heritage. Given the level of engineering operations required to traverse the landform in the design progressed the Applicant is asked to explain in more detail why the Route W options have been discounted for the reasons set out in Table 7.1?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.29	The Applicant	Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road It is a working assumption of the Transport Assessment that 85% of the HGV traffic travelling to the Main Development Site is coming from the south. Please additionally set out the proportion of the remaining other Sizewell C related traffic (i.e. construction and operational workers, LGVs, etc) that will be travelling to the selected route of the SLR from the south?
	Response	
Al.1.30	The Applicant	Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road The Site Selection Report, paragraph 7.4.27, recognises that Route W located to the south of Saxmundham was best placed to intercept the Sizewell C HGVs from the south. However, it is asserted that it would not have as effectively relieved B1122 communities of traffic as more northerly routes. Please explain the basis of that assertion and why greater weight was not placed upon the relief from HGVs and other traffic travelling from the south?
	Response	
Al.1.31	The Applicant	Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road The ES 6.7 Volume 6 Sizewell Link Road Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.2.46, states that the W route could have had an adverse effect on the setting of the existing heritage assets including Hurts Hall and Leiston Abbey as they are situated approximately 450m north and 300m north of Route W respectively. Please provide further details of those heritage impacts and the landscape impacts and explain why they could not have been satisfactorily mitigated?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Al.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The ES 6.7 Volume 6 Sizewell Link Road Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution, paragraph 3.3.21, confirms that once operational, the SLR would be open to general traffic during and after the construction of Sizewell C. The Consultation Report, section 8.10 - Changes to the Sizewell C Project in response to the Stage 4 consultation, indicates that a decision was made at that stage to propose the SLR as a permanent facility, rather than temporary. However, the Consultation Report Appendix G Stage 4 Issues Table f Sizewell Link Road/Theberton Bypass – records general support for removal of the SLR following the construction phase and for the land to be restored. Please explain in further detail the assessment of the consultation responses on this topic which led to the decision to permanently retain the SLR and how that reflects the Stage 4 consultation responses.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] submits that the SLR should not be permanent and instead be removed after Sizewell C construction is completed for the reasons set out in paragraphs 40 and 41 of its representation. It submits that the retention of the SLR would cause a greater permanent residual landscape and ecological impact than a temporary solution, as well as resulting in permanent loss of agricultural land. Since there is no strategic transport case for permanent retention of the SLR the Council requests the road to be removed after the construction period:</p> <p>(i) Please provide a detailed response to these concerns relating to the need to retain the SLR on a permanent basis at this location.</p> <p>(ii) Whilst the proposed development would help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project, is it necessary for it to remain to achieve a reduction in traffic during the operational phase? And</p> <p>(iii) Please identify and explain the advantages and disadvantages of retention of the road versus its removal?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Al.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Site selection for the Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>The representation of Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] is critical of the process whereby the SLR route was selected. Please respond specifically to the criticisms made by Ward Farming Ltd including of the Aecom report commissioned by EDF.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.35	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Electrical connection to the National Grid substation</p> <p>The Suffolk County Council [RR-1174], submits that the provision of four additional tall pylons with overhead lines on the development site would have considerable additional detrimental impact on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. The review on behalf of the Council by Pöyry Energy Limited (AFRY) indicates that the use of Gas Insulated Lines (GIL) to connect to the National Grid (NGET) substation is a feasible alternative to overhead lines and pylons. This technical report has been supplied to the applicant for consideration:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further on whether GIL would provide a viable and less impactful alternative in this location?</p> <p>(ii) If not already submitted, please provide a copy of the AFRY technical report.</p>
	Response	
Al.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Electrical connection to the National Grid substation</p> <p>The ES Appendix 8.4 A Site Selection Report indicates that the 4 and 5 pylon and undergrounding options were assessed at Stage 4. The four pylon option was the preferred option.</p> <p>(i) Notwithstanding the details provided in the Site Selection Report, please explain further the safety issues and significant safety and programme-related risks associated with the construction and operation of an underground cable option that specifically apply to this location?</p> <p>(ii) Why could any adverse impact on the SSSI not be satisfactorily overcome by mitigation?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AR.1	Amenity and recreation	
AR.1.0	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Alde Valley Academy Leiston</p> <p>The off-site sports facilities are regarded as an important mitigation in assisting the assimilation of the workforce into the area. As currently set out the facility would not appear to have a time frame for delivery, or in light of the ESC [RR-0342] resolved potential drainage concerns:</p> <p>(i) Please advise on the latest position in respect of the progress of the S106, surface water management issue identified, and what the timeframe for delivery of this facility would be.</p> <p>(ii) In order to achieve the necessary mitigation what timeframe for delivery would be required?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.1	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Leiston and Sizewell PC.	<p>Alde Valley Academy Leiston</p> <p>(i) In the event that the sports pitches and supporting facilities are not in place in a timely manner would the effect on the local community be regarded as significant in your view?</p> <p>(ii) What time frame of delivery needs to be stipulated to avoid such effects?</p>
	Response from Leiston Town Council	<p>AR.1.1 Alde Valley Academy - Sports Facilities</p> <p>(i) Although it is not possible to predict demand for sports facilities in Leiston with any precision, the Town Council is aware of requests from existing clubs and organizations for improved facilities for use of existing residents of the town and surrounding villages. Leiston is a small town with limited sports provision and existing facilities are used not only by Leiston residents but also by those of Aldeburgh, Saxmundham and surrounding villages. With the predicted number of workers on Sizewell C increasing demand, there could be a significant adverse impact on both existing users and Sizewell C workers. This is likely to be felt more after the first two years when numbers of</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>workers in the town are likely to rise dramatically. However, the early workers will have no amenities at all on site.</p> <p>(ii) We, therefore, believe that the sports facility must be built as soon as is feasible within the first two years. Furthermore any further recreational facilities identified as being necessary should also be provided within this timescale.</p>
AR.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (Accommodation)</p> <p>The application anticipates accommodation for up to 600 workers being available:</p> <p>(i) Has a plan been provided showing the layout for the site? Please clarify where this can be found and how this would be delivered through the DCO?</p> <p>(ii) How confident can the ExA be that this provision would be forthcoming in a timely manner, and be retained, and optimally occupied throughout the construction period.</p> <p>(iii) Reference is made by ESC [RR-0342] to the possibility the site may be laid out with mobile homes. These require very different space requirements and no doubt would offer very different levels of accommodation. In light of this suggestion what confidence can the ExA have in the mitigation suggested within the ES being delivered?</p> <p>(iv) In light of reference to two alternatives please explain what has been assessed within the ES and what would be delivered through the DCO.</p>
	Response	
AR.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>In light of the comments from ESC in their [RR-0342] is it agreed a financial contribution to the Suffolk Coast RAMS is an appropriate way of mitigating for the recreational disturbance likely to arise from the accommodation campus as suggested by ESC?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate</p> <p>The temporary construction area may be raised by as much as 5.5m above existing ground levels; please explain:</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) What implications this has for the noise assessment and in particular in respect of the properties in close proximity on Valley Road.</p> <p>(ii) Paragraph 3.4.208 of [APP-184] indicates that the topsoil would be set back so as to not harm residents – how has the effect been assessed?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.5	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Consultation Group</p> <p>[APP-267] paragraph 15.3.12 appears to indicate that the consultation group included a single commercial fisherman:</p> <p>(i) Is this correct?</p> <p>(ii) Were they representing the wider industry or a representative organisation?</p> <p>(iii) Are the Councils satisfied that the makeup of the group was representative of all interests?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Clarification</p> <p>[APP-267] paragraph 15.5.33 final bullet point refers to Appendix 2C should this be 2B?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.7	SCC	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>(i) Are the Council satisfied with the Rights of Way and Access Strategy (Appendix 15I) of [APP-270] and the future intention to submit a Footpath Implementation Plan for approval?</p> <p>(ii) Does the Council consider all parties with protective characteristics have been fully considered in this strategy?</p> <p>(iii) And the approach justified?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AR.1.8	The Applicant, AONB Partnership, ESC, SCC	<p>AONB</p> <p>The AONB Partnership set out detailed concern [RR-1170] with regard to the assessment of and significance of effects on the AONB and its statutory purposes:</p> <p>(i) Can the Applicant please respond in full to these concerns in respect of recreation and amenity?</p> <p>(ii) Can the Applicant also set out the effects on the AONB and its value as a recreational and amenity area through each of the construction, operational and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>(iii) Do the Councils and AONB Partnership consider the ES has fully recognised the benefits of the AONB as a recreational and amenity area and provided for appropriate mitigation?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.9	SCC, ESC	<p>AONB PROW</p> <p>Do the Councils agree with the views as expressed by the AONB Partnership [RR-1170] that the loss of the open access adversely affects the purpose of the AONB and that the limitation of the PROW in the area particularly the coastal path have not been sufficiently mitigated?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.10	SCC, ESC	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>Are the Councils concerned in respect of the location of the proposed accommodation campus and the potential effect it could have on the tranquillity of the AONB or residents of Eastbridge?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AR.1.11	SCC, ESC	<p>Coastal Path</p> <p>Do the Councils consider that the assessment of effect on the National Coastal Path and the mitigation during: Construction; Operation; and Decommissioning are adequate to safeguard the amenity and recreational value they provide? For assistance, paragraph 15.5.11 to 15.5.20 [APP-267] sets out the potential implications for the Suffolk Coast Path, Sandlings Walk and the future route of the England Coast Path. Diversions are explained and shown in The Access and Rights of Way Strategy, Appendix 15I [APP-270].</p>
	Response	
AR.1.12	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, National Trust, RSPB	<p>Displacement of Tourists/Visitors</p> <p>The National Trust [RR-877] and RSPB [RR-1059] indicate that they do not consider the displacement of tourists and visitors from the current pattern of visiting has been undertaken in a way which could be regarded as precautionary, it could therefore underestimate the effects on both the National Trust land at Dunwich, and the RSPB Minsmere site but also elsewhere:</p> <p>(i) Please respond to this concern.</p> <p>(ii) The National Trust and RSPB are seeking a commitment to mitigation, monitoring of activity and potential compensation – please advise on any progress that has been made in this regard.</p>
	Response	
AR.1.13	SCC	<p>PROW</p> <p>Does the Council consider the strategy for the PROW network has sufficient detail and the impacts throughout the construction and subsequent operation of the proposed development are fully understood?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AR.1.14	The Applicant, SCC	PROW The Ramblers Association [RR-1005] have expressed concern regarding the impacts on the local PROW network. Please respond to the concerns identified.
	Response	
AR.1.15	The Applicant, SCC	PROW [RR-809] Miss Maria Toone and [RR-765] Martin Freeman have both expressed concern in respect of the potential safety risks for horse riders by diverting Bridleway 19. Please respond to these concerns and explain how the diversion would address the safety concerns for horse riders, cyclists, and other highway users.
	Response	
AR.1.16	The Applicant, ESC	Aldhurst Farm (i) Please explain how the Aldhurst Farm compensatory land is intended to be managed going forward so that the ecological benefits it is intended to bring can be safeguarded. (ii) In the event that public access is to be provided to the area beyond just the PROW whether this leads to a conflict with conservation of any species on the site and how this would be monitored and managed.
	Response	
AR.1.17	The Applicant	Aldhurst Farm The proposed parking would appear to be at the behest of a third party – please advise what is in place to secure delivery of the parking indicated.
	Response	
AR.1.18	ESC, SCC, English Heritage	Leiston Abbey The Applicant concludes that the effects of construction and operation on Leiston Abbey in amenity and recreation terms would [APP-267 para 15.6.98] be significant.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Is this conclusion agreed? (ii) Is the assessment on potential visitor numbers during construction and subsequent operation conservative and therefore fairly predicts the significance of effect in this respect?
	Response	
AR.1.19	ESC, SCC	Community Impact Report (CIR) The CIR indicates that there would be a significant adverse effect on the amenity of pedestrians and cyclists using the B1122 during the early years of construction (Table 2.2 of [APP-156]). Could this be mitigated to reduce this effect, if so how could this mitigation be secured?
	Response	
AR.1.20	ESC, SCC	Recreational Receptors Do the Councils agree that the only recreational receptors significantly affected by the works on the main development site during construction would be as set out in para 15.3.55 of [APP-267] or are there other areas of concern that should be identified?
	Response	
AR.1.21	The Applicant, Relevant local authorities (iv only)	Methodology (i) In light of the complexity of the assessment and the time period over which the construction would last would it be reasonable to assume that the significance of effect could be greater than that which has been concluded? (ii) What degree of confidence is there in the assessment? (iii) As there is not an agreed methodology for assessing such affects and it is reliant upon professional judgement – has an independent review been undertaken of the findings? (iv) Do the Councils agree with the methodology and the significance of effect found by the Applicant with regard to impacts upon recreation and amenity?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response from Leiston Town Council	<p>AR1.21 (iv) CIR Methodology</p> <p>Whilst having no expertise on methodology for such studies and predictions, we would like to make the observation that sports are not the only recreational activity engaged in by Leiston residents and very probably by workers on SZC. We would like more consideration given to other activities in the town including cultural activities such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Royal British Legion Band, - Amateur dramatics - Youth groups including scouts, cubs, girl guides, brownies, army/air cadets and youth clubs - the cinema - community radio - other groups such as family history, crafts, reading groups, the men's shed at the Long Shop to name but a few. <p>If ways could be found to support these various activities and groups, most of them voluntary, then new or temporary residents might be welcomed in which would help community cohesion. The Town Council has plans for the community centre at the Waterloo Centre which will have space for a wider range of activities including adult education and sport. Sufficient money should be ring-fenced from the community fund for Leiston to support these other activities. With the increased number of construction workers now predicted on the SZC site and the caravan site for 500 workers on the LEEIE with no recreational facilities on site these measures are all the more necessary.</p>
AR.1.22	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>As part of the proposal to improve access to the Southern Park and Ride it is suggested [RR-762] that this may require traffic regulation orders to remove on street parking along the B1078.</p> <p>(i) Is this correct?</p> <p>(ii) If so, how many parking spaces would be removed?</p> <p>(iii) Where is it anticipated the residents using these spaces would park in the event that this is undertaken?</p> <p>(iv) What assessment has been undertaken to ensure no one with protected characteristics would be adversely affected by such a proposal?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AR.1.23	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Southern Park and Ride</p> <p>A number of RRs including [RR-521, RR-588, RR-762 and RR-898] indicate that the location of the P&R would adversely affect Wickham Market during construction and subsequent operation as a consequence of the additional traffic.</p> <p>(i) Please advise how the effects on the character and amenity of the town and its residents have been considered in selecting the location for the P&R and</p> <p>(ii) what mitigation if any would be secured to ensure that the effects are kept below a significant level?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.24	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>Sizewell Link Road</p> <p>A number of residents including [RR-749] have expressed concern that the closure of Pretty Road would result in significant problems of severance, causing significant difficulties for accessing services in Saxmundham. Please respond to this concern.</p>
	Response	
AR.1.25	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Two Village Bypass</p> <p>Residents of Marlesford and Glemham including [RR-1018, RR-758] express concern regarding the adverse effect increased traffic would have from the proposed development, in combination with the positioning of the Southern Park and Ride. This combined with the lack of a bypass to the villages, could result in unacceptable impacts in terms of access to the A12 and severance from the facilities on the southern side of the A12.</p> <p>Please respond to these concerns setting out how you consider the effects are mitigated.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AR.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Northern Park and Ride</p> <p>The Equality Statement [APP-158] paragraph 1.6.16 identifies that the Sai Grace Ashram has the high potential to be adversely affected by the Northern P&R.</p> <p>(i) Please explain where in the Noise and Air Quality Chapters this concern has been explained.</p> <p>(ii) What mitigation could be offered and secured to protect the environment of the property and its residents.</p>
	Response	
AR.1.27	ESC, SCC	<p>Public Sector Equality Duty</p> <p>A number of RRs including [RR-681, 0790, 993] have been received identifying people with protected characteristics who indicate they would be disadvantaged by the proposed development.</p> <p>(i) Do the Councils consider adequate regard has been made to people with protected characteristics in identifying impacts and subsequently setting out appropriate mitigation?</p> <p>(ii) If in answering the above in the negative, what additional work should be undertaken to improve the assessment?</p> <p>(iii) What additional mitigation might be available?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.28	ESC, SCC	<p>Parking Provision</p> <p>Do the Councils consider that the parking details set out in paras 3.4.143, 155, 178, 204 [APP-184] proposed is sufficiently clear and robust to avoid potential problems of fly parking such that this would avoid the need for additional provision/ mitigation/monitoring of parking and be regarded as appropriate?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
AR.1.29	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Leiston Leiston cum Sizewell Town Council [RR-679] express a variety of concerns about the broader impacts upon the town of the proposed development beyond those considered in the ES assessment. Please respond to these concerns and advise what progress has been made in any joint working in particular on the broader cultural issues identified, town centre improvements sought, and enhanced cycle provision.
	Response	
AR.1.30	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Leiston The Town Council [RR-679] indicate they intend to stop vehicular traffic along Valley Road. Please respond to this proposal and what implication if any it might have for the development in the area.
	Response	
AR.1.31	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Leiston Please respond to the Town Council concerns [RR-679] about improvements required for cyclists safety at the Kenton Hills /Lovers Lane junction, and the need to provide appropriate surfacing for walkers along the beach during construction activities.
	Response	
AR.1.32	The Applicant, SCC	Lorry Park/Freight Management Facility [RR-226] raises concern over the potential adverse effects on the health and wellbeing of cyclists as a result of the proposed lorry park. Please respond to the concerns.
	Response	
AR.1.33	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Leiston The Town Council express concern [RR-679] that the mitigation for impacts from a large influx of predominantly male workers has not been fully addressed, with the only specific mitigation proposed the sports facilities at the Academy.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The concerns in respect of the potential community impacts are much broader than just the effects on sports provision.</p> <p>Please respond to these concerns and explain how the ES has considered the broader community effects of a large influx of workers and what mitigation would be secured to address these community effects.</p>
	Response	
AR.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Translation Services</p> <p>It is indicated that Tier 1 Contractors [Table 9.49 APP-195] would be required to have translation services.</p> <p>(i) How is this to be secured?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain the rationale for this service only being provided by Tier 1 contractors.</p> <p>(iii) What proportion of the workforce would be provided by Tier 1 contractors?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.35	English Heritage	<p>Leiston Abbey</p> <p>[APP-577] sets out a summary of project wide effects at the Abbey, do you agree with the overall conclusions?</p> <p>What effect do you consider this would have on visitors to Leiston Abbey and would you regard the effect as significant?</p>
	Response	
AR.1.36	ESC, SCC, The Applicant (part (iii) only)	<p>Beach Landing Facility (BLF) Coastal Path</p> <p>(i) The BLF would affect the use of the coastal path, [APP-267, APP-270, AS-181] do you consider the mitigation proposed adequate during construction and operation of the proposed development?</p> <p>(ii) Would the route under the BLF or which is proposed to cross the BLF access road require to be surfaced in any way to ensure access for all?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) What surface would each of the two alternatives along the beach be?
	Response	
AR.1.37	National Trust, The Applicant (part (ii) only)	Displacement of Visitors (i) Please explain where the figure of 88,000 additional visitors as specified by the National Trust [RR- 877] originates (ii) Does the Applicant agree this would represent a reasonable figure for additional visitor numbers?
	Response	
AR.1.38	The Applicant	Parking To assist in understanding the breakdown for a typical day of construction, for each phase please provide a breakdown of the number of workers on each site and where you anticipate they would have parked in advance of arriving at either the main development site or associated sites.
	Response	
AR.1.39	The Applicant	CoCP Table 7.1 Code of Construction Practice Part B [APP-615] advises that advance notification would be given of the diversion of PROW in accordance with section 4 of Part A please provide a clear description/explanation of what this refers to.
	Response	



Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 21 April 2021

Responses are due by Deadline 2: Wednesday 2 June 2021

ExQ1 PART 3 OF 6

- CC.1 [Climate change and resilience](#)
- CG.1 [Coastal Geomorphology](#)
- CA.1 [Compulsory Acquisition](#)
- CI.1 [Community Issues](#)
- Cu.1 [Cumulative impact and transboundary effects](#)

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CC.1	Climate change and resilience	
CC.1.0	The Applicant	<p>General climate change and policy issues</p> <p>NPS EN-1, section 4.8, states that the ES should take into account how the proposal will take account of the projected impacts of climate change. This should include climate change adaptation. The Planning Statement [APP-590], Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.63, indicates that SZC Co. has complied with those requirements and ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342] sets out the Climate Change Resilience (CCR) assessment:</p> <p>(i) Please specify in summary all appropriate mitigation or adaptation measures that have been identified for the scheme highlighting any relevant changes to the embedded mitigation since the preparation of the ES;</p> <p>(ii) Please clarify the period that they are intended to cover?</p> <p>(iii) Please summarise how the Applicant seeks to demonstrate that EN-1 paragraphs 4.8.6 - 4.8.7 would be satisfied.</p>
	Response	
CC.1.1	The Applicant	<p>General climate change and policy issues</p> <p>In relation to EN-1, paragraph 4.8.8: Please explain how the ES demonstrates that there would be no critical features of the scheme which might be seriously affected by more radical changes to the climate beyond that projected in the latest set of UK climate projections?</p>
	Response	
CC.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES VII Chapter 26 [APP-342] indicates that decommissioning cc 3029f the Sizewell C power station has been scoped out of the detailed Green House Gas (GHG) assessment and a high level summary of the impacts of decommissioning has been provided in Chapter 5. The matter was scoped out of the ES on the basis that an ES for decommissioning of the main site would be secured through the DCO or other suitable mechanism. Please explain how that would be achieved?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CC.1.3	The Applicant	Green House Gas emissions The ES VII Chapter 26 26.4.15 [APP-342] acknowledges that as a result of the amended 2050 carbon reduction target to net zero carbon, the Committee on Climate Change (CCC) would be reviewing the current carbon budgets and to achieve the revised 2050 target, the emissions reduction trajectory set out in the budgets through to 2050 will need to steepen. What are the implications of the CCC's 6th carbon budget for the assessment presented?
	Response	
CC.1.4	The Applicant	Green House Gas emissions The ES VII Chapter 26 [APP-342] explains that IEMA guidance recommends comparing a project's carbon footprint against available carbon budgets. In the absence of any defined industry guidance for assessing the magnitude of GHG impacts for EIA, IEMA recommend the use of professional judgement. Please explain further and specifically identify: (i) those aspects of the GHG assessment for which professional judgment has been used; (ii) the outcome of those judgements; and (iii) the justification for the assumptions made in the exercise of that professional judgement.
	Response	
CC.1.5	The Applicant	Green House Gas emissions Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) [RR-1231] complain that there is a lack of information for independent verification of EDF's carbon emission claims. Please explain further how the calculation has been made setting out the assumptions which underline the carbon calculations and support the conclusion reached.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CC.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342] sets out key measures embedded within the design principles of the Sizewell C Project for the reduction of GHG emissions within Table 26.7: GHG emissions: Primary (embedded) mitigation measures. Please explain how those measures including the Design Principles Document and those intended to achieve design Principles 1, 2, and 3 would be adequately secured by the draft DCO?</p>
	Response	
CC.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342], paragraph 26.4.69, indicates that in accordance with the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) appointed contractor(s) will develop and implement a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to measure, monitor and report energy and water consumption and GHG emissions during construction. Please explain how this aspect of the CEMP would operate in practice including how the reports would be utilised and actions instigated where necessary?</p>
	Response	
CC.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES Vol II Chapter 26 [APP-342], paragraph 26.4.49, in relation to the assessment of GHG emissions during operation explains that by 2034 it is anticipated that Defra and other industry published GHG emissions factors will have considerably declined as the UK transitions towards meeting a net zero carbon emissions target by 2050. To account for the influence of decarbonisation activities across multiple sectors as the UK moves towards the 2050 target, a second step to apply a conservative reduction factor has been undertaken. Please explain and justify the application of a 15% reduction to the calculation compared to 2019 emission factors and why this is likely to represent the highest operational emissions which will be experienced in 2034?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CC.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The ES concludes that the construction emissions for Sizewell C will not exceed 1% of the total five year UK carbon budget period in which they arise, and the construction of Sizewell C will not have a significant impact on the UK meeting its five carbon budgets through to 2032. Chapter 26 [APP-342], paragraph 26.4.61, states that as carbon budgets had only been set by Government through to 2032, it was not possible to assess the operational impact of the Sizewell C Project in the context of the UK meeting its carbon budget targets. However, it is estimated that GHG emissions from the construction would be offset within the first 6 years of operation by GHG emissions displaced. (i) What are the implications of the CCC 6th Carbon budget December 2020 for that assessment? (ii) Does that assessment and the overall conclusion that Sizewell C provides a significantly beneficial impact, when the GHG impact of electricity generated at Sizewell C is compared against the impact of generating the equivalent energy from the anticipated future mix of alternative generation, need to be revised in the light of more recent reports and information on climate change?</p>
	Response	
CC.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council [RR-1214] submits that the operational waste heat vented to the environment has not been assessed against Paris Agreement, 2050 net zero commitments or UK Committee for Climate Change reports. Please comment specifically on the points raised by the Parish Council and explain the position in relation to the climate change impact of the operational waste heat that would be generated.</p>
	Response	
CC.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Green House Gas emissions</p> <p>The Environmental Statement Addendum – Non-Technical Summary [AS-179], Section 2.3 n) indicates that the proposed changes and Additional Information on materials management have been used to re-calculate the construction emissions and lifetime emissions from the Sizewell C Project. Please confirm that these are the only factors relevant to the calculations that would be different as a result of the change.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CC.1.12	The Applicant	<p>The role of the Nuclear Regulators</p> <p>The Planning Statement, [APP-590] Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.59, refers to NPS EN-6 Vol I, section 2.7, which states that the decision maker should not duplicate matters that are within the remit of the Nuclear Regulator. Further details of the potential impacts of climate change that fall within the scope of the Nuclear Site License (NSL) are set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 26, paragraphs 26.5.34 to 26.5.38. Nevertheless, to provide clarity please identify with reasoned justification all those aspects of climate change adaption which the Applicant considers fall within the role of the Nuclear Regulators (whether as part of GDA, site licensing or environmental permitting) and those issues which remain within the remit of the decision-maker for the DCO application.</p>
	Response	
CC.1.13	ONR	<p>The role of the Nuclear Regulators</p> <p>The ONR [RR-0992] explains that in June 2020, NNB Generation Company (SZC) Ltd applied for a nuclear site licence to allow it to install and operate two EPR™ reactors at the Sizewell C site. The ONR is currently assessing this application:</p> <p>(i) Does the ONR have any concerns at this stage associated with the proposed development in relation to climate change impacts and the adaptation measures proposed in the light of experience gained since its assessment of the generic EPR design in 2012?</p> <p>(ii) In the light of EN-6, paragraph 2.7.5, are there any reasons at this stage for the ExA to be concerned that any necessary licence, permit or authorisation will not subsequently be granted?</p> <p>(iii) In the light of EN-6, paragraph 2.7.6, is the ONR aware of any regulatory requirements that are likely to be attached to the grant of a licence and the anticipated timing of the process?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CC.1.14	EA	The role of the Nuclear Regulators The EA [RR-0373] highlights that it is currently unable to advise the ExA of its position on the environmental permits required for operation, or provide representations on any matters covered by those permits. Whilst the ExA appreciates that the EA may not be able to publish the draft decisions on the environmental permits before the Sizewell C DCO Examination closes, does the EA have any specific concerns at this stage associated with the proposed development in relation to climate change impacts and the adaptation measures proposed?
	Response	
CC.1.15	The Applicant	Climate change adaptation In relation to NPS EN-1, paragraph 4.8.10: Please identify all the proposed adaptation measures that could themselves have the potential to give rise to consequential impacts.
	Response	
CC.1.16	The Applicant, EA	Climate change adaptation The Planning Statement, Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.61 [APP-590] refers to the mitigation measures embedded in the design including the elevation of the main platform to take it out of the area of flood risk. The EA [RR-0373] expresses concern that the current Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) identifies increased flooding to properties without identifying appropriate mitigation and compensation measures: (i) Is it agreed that the embedded mitigation proposed including the design changes would overcome the flood risk for the main platform itself for the relevant period under consideration? (ii) In the light of EN-1, paragraph 5.7.16, please demonstrate that the project would be safe without increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere. If that remains a point of disagreement, please identify the area of dispute and any further steps proposed to resolve the matter?
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CC.1.17	The Applicant	Climate change adaptation The Planning Statement, Section 7.3, g), paragraph 7.3.61 [APP-590], refers to the mitigation measures embedded in the design including the elevation of the main platform to take it out of the area of flood risk up to a level of 7.3m AOD and the creation of new coastal flood defences at the heights proposed by the changes up to 10.2m AOD with adaptive design to potentially raise the defence up to 14.2m AOD. These heights have now changed as part of the revised application. Please clarify that the proposed elevation of the main platform and sea defence design now reflect and provide a safe margin in the light of both UKCP18 and later reports and advice on the topic.
	Response	
CC.1.18	The Applicant	Climate change adaptation Change 9 proposes a change to the sea defence to make the scheme more efficient and resilient to climate change. Notwithstanding the details provided in the FRA Addendum [AS-157]: (i) Please explain in further detail how the proposed height of the permanent sea defence would extend the period when future raising may be needed to beyond the operational lifetime of the power station? (ii) Please explain further how the proposed changes to the sea defence would increase resilience to climate change.
	Response	
CC.1.19	The Applicant	In-combination climate change impact (ICCI) assessment The ES Chapter 26, paragraphs 26.6.7 to 26.6.9 [APP-342] explain that limitations associated with the approach taken for the ICCI assessment relate to uncertainties inherent within UKCP18 Projections. To overcome uncertainty issues, forecast climate change data from UKCP18 has been used coupled with the replication of proven effective approaches undertaken for similar project types. Assessments made in relation to

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>'consequence' and 'likelihood' rely on professional judgement and evidence gathered through other environmental disciplines:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further and specify the approaches which have been replicated and the project types to which they relate.</p> <p>(ii) Please identify the elements of professional judgement relied upon and the 'other environmental disciplines to which they relate.</p>
	Response	
CG.1	Coastal Geomorphology	
CG.1.0	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The ES V II, Chapter 20 [APP-311], identifies potential impacts on coastal change. The Change Request provided additional information in relation to coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics including the draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan appended to the ES Addendum. In the light of EN-1, paragraphs 5.5.7 and 5.5.10 and EN-6 paragraph 3.8.5, please demonstrate how the decision-maker can be satisfied in relation to the changed application:</p> <p>(i) That the potential impacts would be minimised;</p> <p>(ii) That the proposed development will be resilient to coastal erosion and deposition, taking account of climate change, during the project's operational life and any decommissioning period.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>A number of IPs have expressed concern that the scheme could inhibit sediment flow or have an adverse impact on coastal processes at other locations. In the light of NPS EN-1, paragraph 5.5.11, please explain how the decision-maker could be satisfied that any</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		impacts of the project on coastal processes would be managed to minimise adverse impacts on other parts of the coast.
	Response	
CG.1.2	The Applicant, EA, Natural England, ESC	Impacts on coastal processes The EA [RR-0373] in relation to the residual uncertainty associated with predicting future changes to the geomorphology of the greater Sizewell Bay, as well as to key driving processes such as sea level rise and wave climate, considers this to be mitigated by SZC's commitment to continued engagement with the Marine Technical Forum of regulators as part of the Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (MMP): (i) Please confirm that the MMP and proposed means of enforcement would provide sufficient security in that respect, particularly in relation to the agreement and funding of specialists to closely monitor the evolution of the coastline and agree and implement the most appropriate measures to manage any unforeseen impacts. (ii) Please indicate when it is anticipated that the detailed design process for the Hard Coastal Defence Feature (HCDF) will take place and how that process would be appropriately appraised and approved? (iii) Are there any draft DCO changes that would be required to exercise sufficient control over that process?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.3	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The East Suffolk Council [RR-0342] indicates that the draft MMP prepared by SZC Co. is currently under consultation with key stakeholders in parallel with the DCO process. There are several points of contention between ESC and SZC Co. In relation to the identified points of contention between ESC and SZC:</p> <p>(i) Is it agreed that a precautionary principle should be applied to assumptions on potential future critical requirements including Impact Assessments, incomplete designs, and the extent of the area to be monitored?</p> <p>(ii) If not, why not?</p> <p>(iii) If so, please suggest how this should be secured through the DCO, including any amended drafting for the draft DCO or other associated documentation?</p> <p>(iv) Please comment further on the project plan and budget and the assumptions to be made as regards the period that the MMP will remain active explaining any points of difference.</p> <p>(v) Please specify the means, in the event of a transfer by SZC Co. of its interest in the site to a new owner, whereby it is suggested that the new owner would be bound by covenant or other legal mechanism to adopt responsibility including costs for maintaining the MMP process setting out any drafting changes to the DCO documentation that would be required to achieve that.</p> <p>(vi) Please comment further on the proposal for an independent body to monitor the MMP, and to direct SZC Co. mitigation and compensation requirements.</p> <p>(vii) Please provide an update on the Council's consultation with MMO as regards the delivery of the MMP.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.4	The Applicant, SCC, EA	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] identifies as an area of key concern: "xii) A comprehensive coastal change Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (MMP), with an allocated mitigation/compensation budget, that allows determining if and to what extent an observed coastal change in the Sizewell C zone of influence is attributable to the development, and appropriate and required mitigation measures; and xiii) Provision for the cost of full removal of the hard sea defence as part of the decommissioning process</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>unless and until a future study changes this position”.</i></p> <p>(i) Please indicate the progress of agreeing the MMP; any associated funding for mitigation/compensation and the removal cost for the hard sea defence;</p> <p>(ii) Please identify any outstanding areas of dispute in relation to the MMP, funding and the removal of the hard sea defence;</p> <p>(iii) Has the means whereby the MMP, funding and other costs would be secured been agreed? If not, please identify any matters which remain in dispute?</p>
	Response	
CG.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The Alde and Ore Association [RR-1206] also raise issues in relation to the MMP. Please respond to those specific matters of concern including the duration and level of monitoring and funding proposed to be available pursuant to that plan.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.6	The Applicant, SCC, EA	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] notes that the draft DCO proposes not to remove the Sizewell C coastal defence after decommissioning, unless required by the Pre-Decommissioning Environmental Impact Assessment. The Council does not consider this acceptable, and expects the Funded Decommissioning Programme to make provision for the cost of full removal of the hard sea defence as part of the decommissioning process, when safe to do so, unless and until a future study, informed by monitoring and other data, changes this position. Why has the removal not been included in the Funded Decommissioning Programme if there is potential for this to be necessary?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.7	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The MMO [RR-0744] advises that any coastal monitoring plan should also be included as a requirement. This is because for any works landward of MHWS, East Suffolk Council will be the enforcement body; any monitoring that relates to the SCDF and HCDF will be of relevance to the Council. Please comment on this matter and, if agreed, set out any drafting changes required for the draft DCO to accommodate this.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.8	The Applicant, MMO, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The MMO [RR-0744] advises that monitoring options to address the uncertainties in the scale of predicted impact and hence the level of monitoring should be included in the MMP in particular for the monitoring of the BLF. It also advises that more detailed monitoring plans must be agreed for each project element and method. The MMO makes a number of other detailed criticisms of the MMP. Please comment on the criticisms made and provide an update as to the progress of agreeing the draft MMP.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.9	MMO, ESC	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237] provides information on the mitigation proposed. Please indicate whether that mitigation is considered to be satisfactory and, if not, suggest any changes considered to be necessary.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.10	MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P, explains that the scope of the assessment has also been informed by ongoing consultation and engagement with statutory consultees throughout the design and assessment process. To facilitate engagement with statutory (and non-statutory) stakeholders on the marine assessments, the Sizewell Marine Technical Forum has been established. The Marine Technical Forum has an independent chair, supported by a technical secretariat supplied by SZC Co. together with nominated technical</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		representatives from Natural England, the EA, the MMO and the East Suffolk Council, and any consultants working on their behalf. The Zone of Influence (ZoI) for the coastal geomorphology assessment has been defined in agreement with the Marine Technical Forum as the Greater Sizewell Bay. Please explain further the role of the MMO as a nominated technical representative of the Marine Technical Forum and indicate whether the ZoI was agreed by the MMO at that stage?
	Response	
CG.1.11	MMO	Impacts on coastal processes The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P [APP-171], Hard coastal defence feature 1.3.45 indicates that the final design and detailed construction plans for the HCDF were not known at the time of assessment. Though considered unlikely, it has been assumed as a worst case that heavy plant will be required to operate on the upper beach as part of the construction works. Please indicate whether it is agreed that the assumption of use of heavy plant in the assessment reasonably represents the worst case. In the absence of detailed design and detailed construction plans explain how the worst case scenario for the HCDF be fairly assessed?
	Response	
CG.1.12	MMO	Impacts on coastal processes The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P [APP-171], Beach landing facility, paragraph 1.3.46, explains that use of a jack-up barge is considered the worst case for construction of the BLF as the cantilever method (installation from each previously assembled deck section) would have no separate impact apart from the piles themselves. (i) Please indicate whether it is agreed that the assumptions made in the assessment reasonably represent the worst case scenario for the construction of the BLF? (ii) Are there any other factors which should have been taken into account? (iii) Please provide an update in the light of Change 2 to the original application.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CG.1.13	The Applicant, MMO	Impacts on coastal processes The ES Vol I, Appendix 6P [APP-171], paragraph 1.3.49, indicates that dredging would only be needed when the BLF approach is too shallow or the requirements for the barge grounding pocket are not met and when the BLF is in use. The dredging requirement (clearance) for vessel (barge and tugboats) access to the BLF is not currently known but is considered to be small (substantially less than 1m). The dredging requirement for the docked (grounded) barge has also not been finalised. Please confirm that: (i) the assumptions set out in Appendix 20A of Volume 2 of the ES [APP-312] made in relation to dredging are agreed; (ii) that these assumptions would over-represent the required barge traffic over the construction period; and (iii) the assessments conservatively assume maintenance of the approach channel and grounding pocket throughout the construction period of the proposed development. (iv) Please provide an update in the light of Change 2 to the original application.
	Response	
CG.1.14	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes The MMO [RR-0744] states that the risk that the wave climate at Sizewell reverts to the pre-1925 case could significantly alter the sediment supply and coastline behaviour and the lack of assessment of changes to the offshore wave climate to a north east domination is a gap in the analysis. In addition, for the nearshore climate, the Applicant assumes that the bank system is stable. (i) Please comment on the criticisms made and provide further justification for the assumptions set out in the ES Volume 2, Chapter 20 [APP-311], including the extent of the study area for coastal geomorphology set out in paragraph 20.3.9 and the assumptions and limitations referred to in paragraphs 20.3.21 and 20.3.29.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(ii) In relation to paragraph 20.4.6, as pointed out by the MMO, why has the impact of the "19th Century" wave climate resuming not been assessed?</p> <p>(iii) Please provide further justification for the assumption that the present wave regime and hence little costal change and impact will continue.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The MMO [RR-0744] states that in general, despite the littoral drift to the south, the mitigation ignores potential impacts to the south of SZC. While the MMO recognises that the assessment concentrates on the stretch of the coast to the north of the site because that is a particularly sensitive area, the less sensitive parts to the south should be further considered. Please explain why this has been omitted to date and whether it is agreed that further consideration should be given to the parts of the coast to the south of the site.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The Alde and Ore Association [RR-1206] expresses concern that the ES fails to justify the assertion that the Great Sizewell Bay is a self-contained unit and changes there will have no impact on the longshore coastal evolution which has resulting in the uniquely long shingle spit of Orfordness, which itself created the Alde and Ore Estuary. Likewise, Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257] submits that EDF have not justified the assertion that coastal effects to the south will not extend beyond the coralline crag to the north of Thorpeness. Given the scope of the ES assessment how can the ExA be satisfied that the proposed change at Sizewell would not adversely these natural processes further to the south?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CG.1.17	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes Walberswick Parish Council [RR-1257] questions the acceptance of the EDF predictions of when the HCDF will be exposed in the absence of a finalised design. Please provide further justification for the reliability of the ES conclusions on this topic prior to the assessment of the final design of the HCDF.
	Response	
CG.1.18	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board [RR-0345] expresses concern that the identified changes to long-term sediment flow off the Coast because of the HCDF would be likely to lead to accretion to the north of the development. (i) Please comment as regards the potential impact that this could cause to future discharge to the sea from the gravitational drainage system at Minsmere; (ii) Please summarise the mitigation proposed and comment on whether this matter has been sufficiently considered.
	Response	
CG.1.19	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes National Trust [RR-0877] in relation to coastal geomorphology and long-term change, expresses concern that there are potential/possible impacts of the proposal on their site during the lifetime of the development that have not been fully explored as part of a holistic and integrated assessment. The Trust submits that the Applicant should be required to define and monitor this change for the lifetime of the development and to include the north of the application site, specifically Dunwich Heath and Beach. (i) Please respond to the specific concerns of National Trust on this topic; (ii) Please explain further and set out the proposals for mitigation/compensation for adverse impacts resulting from the project upon Dunwich Heath and Beach that might arise through coastal change.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CG.1.20	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes Stop Sizewell C (Theberton & Eastbridge Action Group) [RR-1162] sets out its various concerns in relation to the effect of the Sizewell C Project on coastal processes and flood risk. Please respond specifically to the concerns raised including the current absence of a submitted plan for the HCDF structure; the MMP; and the assertion that coastal effects to the south will not extend beyond the coralline crag to the north of Thorpeness.
	Response	
CG.1.21	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes Suffolk Coast Acting for Resilience [RR-1171] raise the issue of coastal erosion outside the narrow Sizewell Bay and the assumption that nothing will change south of the Great Sizewell Bay. Please respond specifically to the concerns raised in respect of: (i) the availability of long-term funds for coastal defence works, including for Aldeburgh to at least Shingle Street. (ii) Whether the latest information on climate change, sea level rise and coastal evolution has been taken into account and, if not, why not and how that affects the soundness of any assessments.
	Response	
CG.1.22	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes A number of IPs express concern that the scheme would exacerbate existing levels of coastal erosion along this coast. For example, Dr Kay Laskey [RR-0329] draws attention to existing rapid coastal erosion especially either side of the site, at both Thorpeness and Cove Hithe. Please comment upon such concerns and whether the proposed new defences would be likely to cause flanking erosion in other locations and identify any proposed mitigation for this issue?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CG.1.23	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes NE [RR-0478] makes specific comments on the Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics report within the application, and sets out additional information or evidence that it requires or which needs clarification including how the various beach measures would avoid an adverse effect and maintain condition of SAC foreshore annuals vegetation communities; the extent to which the measures would also reduce the risk to SAC/SPA habitats in Minsmere Valley behind the barrier beach; the impact of the coastal defence measures on the dune County Wildlife Site and how the loss of most of the site would be mitigated or offset within the footprint of the HCDF and SCDF; how the coast protection of the development site would enhance the wider coastal natural environment, including its form, function, and ability of coastal habitats to contribute to climate change resilience and nature recovery, as part of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan. Please comment on the points raised by NE and provide the additional information/clarity sought.
	Response	
CG.1.24	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes The Environmental Statement Addendum – Non-Technical Summary [AS-179], Section 2.3 k) considers coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics explains that the updated assessment considered the effects associated with the construction and operation of the enhanced permanent beach landing facility, the new temporary beach landing facility, the temporary discharge outfall and the change to the sea defence design and concludes that with mitigation in place all effects on coastal processes associated with the changes are assessed as not significant. (i) Please identify any specific mitigation and/or changes to the Coastal Processes and Monitoring and Mitigation Plan that have been required as a result of these changes.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) In relation to the assessed new significant benefit associated with the changes, please explain in detail the basis for that conclusion.
	Response	
CG.1.25	The Applicant, MMO	Impacts on coastal processes The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237] Table 1, summarises the SZC components that are considered to require coastal geomorphology monitoring, along with the proposed method and rationale. (i) Please indicate whether any other components should be monitored? (ii) Please provide further justification for an explanation of the frequency and spatial extent of the monitoring proposed in this table for the relevant components.
	Response	
CG.1.26	The Applicant, MMO	Impacts on coastal processes The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 2, provides the suite of monitoring methods which would be used to track changes in coastal geomorphic receptors and annual vegetation, including impacts arising from SZC pressures and activities. The methods combine the use of continuous remote sensing techniques for early warning of any impacts with targeted, high-accuracy, field surveys. (i) Please indicate whether any other methods should be utilised? (ii) Please confirm that the suite of methods proposed represents an appropriate balance between remote and on-site techniques.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.27	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 5.2, indicates that all Beach Landing Facilities (BLF) effects have been classified as not significant, although some were minor and some negligible. Minor effects were predicted to arise from the reprofiled navigation channel leading to the permanent BLF jetty and propeller wash from tugboats on the longshore bars. It confirms that seabed reprofiling (dredging) would be required in order to gain safe navigational access to the enhanced permanent BLF jetty. Please explain in further detail:</p> <p>(i) why the altered bed shear stress over this area would have low impact duration and probability;</p> <p>(ii) why the occurrence of a storm could be relied upon to result in rapid shrinkage of the effect;</p> <p>(iii) the reliability of the conclusion reached that higher than natural quiescent levels of suspended sediment concentration arising from propeller wash from tugboats would be directed to the south.</p>
	Response	
CG.1.28	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 5.2, indicates that as the BLF is close to the Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and Minsmere to Walberswick Heath and Marshes SAC, precautionary monitoring associated with BLF-use is proposed in order to confirm the predicted no significant effect of bed reprofiling and tugboat propeller wash. However, it is proposed that this aspect of the beach and longshore bar monitoring would be cease once shown that these activities have no significant effect on the designated sites. Given the designation of these particular sites, does the proposed continuation of background monitoring provide sufficient safeguards for the longer term?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.29	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], in relation to scour around BLF piles, acknowledges that with sea level rise and shoreline retreat (landward translation of the beach profile), terrestrial piles could become exposed by the receding intertidal beach and intertidal profiles could become subtidal. Please explain further why the proposed background monitoring would be sufficient to document any changes arising from beach profile translation?
	Response	
CG.1.30	The Applicant	Impacts on coastal processes The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 6, acknowledges that the likely timeframe of 2053 – 2087 for HCDF exposure is sufficiently far into the future that the details of which part of the shingle beach might become vulnerable, and its extent, cannot be known and neither can an individual mitigation plan be specified years or more in advance. Since the precise beach conditions and matching mitigation actions cannot be known at this stage, how can it be ensured that beach conditions would not threaten HCDF exposure and could be satisfactorily mitigated at that time?
	Response	
CG.1.31	The Applicant, MMO	Impacts on coastal processes The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 6.2 and 6.3, set out the proposed beach management framework and the mitigation trigger (beach volume). Please confirm that these sections of the draft plan have been agreed and, if not, why not and highlight any changes sought.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CG.1.32	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Impacts on coastal processes</p> <p>The draft Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan [AS-237], Section 6.5.4, states that the proposed beach maintenance/sediment management approaches would not have an adverse effect on designated supra-tidal shingle habitats.</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that this section of the draft plan has been agreed. If not, please explain why that is the case and highlight any changes sought.</p> <p>(ii) Is it agreed that the Leiston - Aldeburgh SSSI is too distant to be affected by beach management activity at SZC?</p>
	Response	
CA.1. Compulsory acquisition		
CA.1.0	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-062], paragraphs 6.1.4 and 6.1.5, indicates that in addition to developing the power station itself, SZC Co. is applying for consent for associated development and assesses the consistency of the proposed development with the principles set out in the associated development guidance. Please provide further justification for the conclusions reached in paragraph 6.1.5 bullet points 1, 2 and 4 with particular regard to the provision of the Two Village Bypass (TVP) and the Sizewell Link Road (SLR)?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.1	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], section 5, considers the source and scope of the powers set out in the draft DCO. Paragraph 5.3.3, states that any land within the Order Limits will be subject to a statutory authority to override easements and other rights, and to extinguish private rights of way upon the appropriation of the land for the purposes of the DCO. Please explain in further detail:</p> <p>(i) The need to seek such a wide-ranging power and why all such rights and easements cannot be specifically identified;</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Why it is necessary to include powers of compulsory acquisition as a means of overriding existing rights and interests in or over land, as well as creating new rights over land, and granting the right to take temporary possession of land? (iii) The nature and extent of any delay to the project that might otherwise result? (iv) What alternatives to this approach have been explored?
	Response	
CA.1.2	The Applicant	The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.3.9, explains that Article 30 would allow SZC Co. to compulsorily acquire existing and new rights, as well as impose restrictive covenants over land, for example where flood mitigation works need to be retained. Where SZC Co. only needs to acquire rights over land, it is not required to acquire a greater interest in the land. (i) Please provide an indication of the anticipated content and/or an initial draft of any restrictive covenants intended to be imposed; (ii) Should a requirement for consultation with relevant owners/occupiers as regards the drafting of any such restrictive covenants be imposed?
	Response	
CA.1.3	The Applicant	The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.5.8, states that Article 25 would authorise SZC Co. to enter onto any land within the Order Limits or which may be affected by the authorised development (whether or not that land is within the Order Limits) to undertake various survey and investigative works, including trial holes. Article 25(2) provides for a 14 day notice period to be given to the owner/occupier of the land. Please provide justification for a 14 day notice period and consider whether this is unreasonably short and should be extended to 28 days?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.4	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>To assist with the consideration of whether the extent of the land to be acquired is no more than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development to which the development consent will relate:</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.3.4, states that the Order Limits have been defined to allow sufficient flexibility to enable the final detailed design of the Sizewell C Project to be optimal. In addition, paragraph 7.3.6, indicates that limits within which the highway works may be constructed have been defined to incorporate sufficient land to allow for the final detailed design to be determined. The land included in the Order Land includes the full extent of the area where works may be undertaken. However, in practice only the land needed for the highway works would be acquired.</p> <p>(i) For the avoidance of doubt, please set out and justify the extent of the flexibility that the submitted scheme would allow in terms of Limits of Deviation (LoD) and parameters providing dimensions where relevant;</p> <p>(ii) How would it be ensured that powers of Compulsory Acquisition would not be exercised in respect of land not ultimately required as a result of the detailed design process?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.5	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.4.3, in relation to Article 18, states that this article would allow SZC Co. to use temporarily any private road within the Order Limits for the passage of persons or vehicles for the purposes of, or in connection with, the construction of Sizewell C without the need to obtain an interest (i.e. right of way) over that land. Please explain why it is necessary to seek this power and identify the private roads to which it is intended to apply?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.6	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 5.4.5, explains that Article 38 would provide that SZC Co. must exercise its power to temporarily use land or interests within five years of the Order being granted. However, this leaves the period of temporary possession open-ended from the date the power is exercised. Should there not also be a time limit after which the temporary possession of the land or interests must cease?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.7	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, please confirm the total number of plots falling within each of the six classes listed in the SoR [APP-062], Table 1.1. for the application as amended.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.8	The Applicant	<p>The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], section 2.2, sets out the amendments to the Order Land that are required as a result of the proposed changes. For the avoidance of doubt, please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the extent of the new land to be included within the Order Limits in respect of which compulsory acquisition powers are sought; (ii) the total area of land over which compulsory acquisition powers are sought; (iii) the extent of the new land to be included within the Order Limits in respect of which temporary possession powers are sought; (iv) the total area of land over which temporary possession powers are sought; (v) the extent of the new land over which the compulsory acquisition of rights only are sought; (vi) the total area of land over which the compulsory acquisition of rights only are sought.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.9	The Applicant	The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought In relation to the SoR Addendum [AS-149], Tables 2.1-2.4, please identify and include the number of the relevant change request applicable to each section.
	Response	
CA.1.10	The Applicant	The scope and purpose of the Compulsory Acquisition Powers sought The SoR Addendum [AS-149], Tables 2.1 and 2.4, and the Draft DCO Addendum [AS-145] provide reasons for the additions/changes to the powers sought. However, please provide further details of the necessity for these additions/changes and the assessment of the extent of the Additional Land/Powers sought in each case including in relation to draft DCO, Schedule 17A [AS-143].
	Response	
CA.1.11	The Applicant	Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO The SoR [APP-062], section 7.4, sets out the Applicant's compelling case in the public interest for the proposed compulsory acquisition. Paragraph 7.4.1 asserts that the public benefits of the scheme would outweigh the adverse impacts on the interests of those who would be affected by the proposed use of compulsory acquisition powers. (i) What assessment, if any, has been made of the effect upon individual Affected Persons and their private loss that would result from the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers in each case; (ii) What is the clear evidence that the public benefit would outweigh the private loss and how has that balancing exercise between public benefit and private loss been carried out?
	Response	
CA.1.12	The Applicant	Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.4.3, sets out the expected public benefits of the project. Please indicate whether the public benefits claimed within the five bullet points set out in that paragraph require any update?
	Response	
CA.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.4.7, states that the Applicant has taken pro-active steps to engage with these persons through formal consultation and informal engagement to understand the direct and indirect impacts on them. Paragraph, 9.2.2, explains that the Applicant has engaged directly with individual landowners and those with an interest in the affected land. As a result of this engagement SZC Co. has had a better understanding of the direct and indirect impacts on individual landowners. Please provide further details, with examples where available:</p> <p>(i) How such engagement has helped to shape the proposals and enabled the Applicant to make changes to designs to minimise the private loss;</p> <p>(ii) How has the direct engagement with individual landowners given the Applicant a better understanding of the direct and indirect impacts on them;</p> <p>(iii) Please provide detail, where available, of the direct and indirect impacts thereby identified.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>What weight has the Applicant attached to the compensation that would be available to those entitled to claim it under the relevant provisions of the national Compensation Code in its assessment of private loss?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>The relevant representation of NFU [RR-0885] raises various issues including the justification for the powers sought, extent and location of the land sought to be compulsorily acquired; the powers sought to create new public rights of way; and that no meaningful negotiations have taken place with those it represents. It submits that a compelling case cannot be made. Please respond to the points raised by the NFU on these matters including the adequacy of the negotiations conducted on the Applicant's behalf and the lack of detail within the heads of terms.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the Compulsory Acquisition of the land, rights and powers that are sought by the draft DCO</p> <p>The Procedural Deadline A submission made by Gregory Jones QC on behalf of clients [PDA-020] asserts that there has been a failure to justify size and location of balance ponds and, in relation to the proposed new public rights of way, the Applicant should not be authorised to acquire more land than is needed for the scheme itself. Please provide justification for the extent of and need for the land sought to be acquired for these purposes.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>In the light of the DCLG Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (CA Guidance), paragraph 8:</p> <p>(i) How can the Panel be assured that all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored;</p> <p>(ii) Set out in summary form, with document references where appropriate, what</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		assessment/comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests therein in each case.
	Response	
CA.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.5.20, refers to the four stages of statutory pre-application consultation, between 2012 and 2019, and the targeted statutory consultation, informal consultation and engagement that has also taken place outside of these consultation stages and the consideration given to that in the selection of the most appropriate options.</p> <p>(i) Please explain what, if any, account has been taken of responses to pre-application consultation (both in relation to statutory and non-statutory consultation) in the location and design of the elements of the scheme that were the subject of such consultation in considering whether there are reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition;</p> <p>(ii) Please provide any examples of location/route changes and changes to design development options within the application scheme in response to public consultation.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>The ES 6.7 Volume 6 [APP-450] Sizewell Link Road Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Evolution 3.3.20 states that as part of design refinement and EIA process, there were a number of updates to the design following Stage 4 consultation.</p> <p>(i) Please provide further justification for the extent of the land take that would permanently be required for the new road; the consideration given to the potential severance of holdings and division of existing field patterns and the ability to access and utilise that land following completion of construction.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain in further detail the consideration given to accommodation access</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		tracks and private means of access and how these have been refined or added to reduce severance impacts following Stage 4 consultation.
	Response	
CA.1.20	The Applicant	Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.5.52, asserts that all reasonable alternatives have been considered prior to the making of the Application and such consideration has included reasonable factors at relevant stages, including the minimisation of environmental and visual impacts and land take. Please explain further, by reference to the documentation submitted, the consideration given to the minimisation of land take and the assessment of alternatives to the extent of the land sought to be compulsorily acquired, and the nature of the powers sought for each plot.
	Response	
CA.1.21	The Applicant	Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored The CA Guidance, paragraph 25, state that applicants should seek to acquire land by negotiation wherever practicable. As a general rule, authority to acquire land compulsorily should only be sought as part of an order granting development consent if attempts to acquire by agreement fail. (i) Please demonstrate the Applicant's compliance with this aspect of the CA Guidance. (ii) Has the Applicant offered full access to alternative dispute resolution techniques for those with concerns about the compulsory acquisition of their land or considered other means of involving those affected?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 1.3.3, refers to discussions having taken place with relevant landowners of the Additional Land. Please include details of the negotiations within the update to be submitted to the next Deadline, identifying separately those which relate to the Additional Land.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Whether all reasonable alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition been explored</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 3.3, refers to the summary of main alternatives that have been considered for the Project in the Statement of Reasons [APP-062]. Nonetheless, please expand and explain the consideration of all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition (including modifications to the scheme) of these additional plots in accordance with paragraph 8 of the CA Guidance.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The CA Guidance, paragraph 17, considers the resource implication of the proposed scheme. In the light of that guidance, please set out the degree to which other bodies (public or private sector) have agreed to make financial contributions or to underwrite the scheme, and the basis upon which any such contributions or underwriting is to be made.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>In the light of the CA Guidance, paragraph 18, what evidence is there to demonstrate that adequate funding is likely to be available to enable the compulsory acquisition within the statutory period following any DCO being made?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-590], paragraphs 7.3.3-7.3.10, considers financial and technical viability and makes reference to ENS-1 paragraph 4.1, and concludes that based on the Funding Statement the decision maker can be satisfied of the projects viability and that there is a reasonable prospect of the requisite funds for the acquisition becoming available. Please confirm that it is agreed that:</p> <p>(i) This presupposes that the decision-maker is satisfied based on the information provided in the application, that the financial viability and technical feasibility of the proposal has been properly assessed by the applicant?</p> <p>(ii) If the decision-maker is not satisfied from the information provided that the applicant has properly assessed the financial viability of the project, then remains a matter of relevance for the decision-maker?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>Please summarise the evidence relied upon to support the conclusion that there is a reasonable prospect that the scheme, if granted consent, would actually be taken forward and in what time period?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-066], paragraph 3.2.1, indicates that the current cost estimate for the project is circa £20 billion. That figure includes design, land acquisition, and physical construction. The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.6, indicates that the overall estimated cost of the project remains the same as presented in the Funding Statement [APP-066]. Please explain, in the event that the</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		changes to the application are accepted, how that has been calculated to have no impact upon the overall cost estimate?
	Response	
CA.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-066], paragraph 3.2.2, states that the cost estimate has primarily been informed by learning from Sizewell C's sister project, Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details of the other sources which have informed the costs estimate and evidence to support the accuracy of the estimated cost?</p> <p>(ii) Given the differences between the two sites including their different locations, please explain why the Hinkley Point C experience can reasonably be relied upon in estimating costs for this project?</p> <p>(iii) What contingencies does the figure of £20 billion include? (iv) Please set out the differences between the initial cost estimate for Hinkley Point C prior to the grant of approval and the actual figure that is likely to be expended.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Energy White Paper in relation to nuclear (page 48) expects a 30% reduction in the cost of nuclear new build projects by 2030. Whilst noting that timeline, how does that correspond with the Applicant's own anticipation of costs for the Sizewell C project compared to Hinkley Point C?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-066], paragraph 4.1.1, states that an estimate of the amounts necessary to cover the payment of compensation associated with the exercise of any compulsory acquisition powers granted has been taken into account in the overall project cost. Please provide a separate estimate of the cost of land acquisition. Please explain further the nature of the expert advice taken in that respect and the basis for and reliability of this estimate?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.32	The Applicant	Whether adequate funding is likely to be available The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.6, indicates that the Applicant continues to have positive engagement with potential third party investors: (i) Please explain further what is meant by 'positive engagement'; (ii) whether any formal agreement or commitment to invest from third parties, subject to the necessary approvals being obtained, has been achieved; (iii) Why the development of the RAB funding model would be supportive of the project securing its financing requirements?
	Response	
CA.1.33	The Applicant	Whether adequate funding is likely to be available The Funding Statement Addendum [AS-011], paragraph 3.1.4, states that the replication strategy allows the cost of energy produced at Sizewell C to be substantially less than that produced at Hinkley Point C: (i) Please provide an indication of the anticipated energy cost reduction that it is anticipated would be achieved in comparison to Hinkley Point C; (ii) Please explain further what is meant by "substantially less" and how that would be achieved through the replication strategy?
	Response	
CA.1.34	The Applicant	Whether adequate funding is likely to be available The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.5, refers to the publication of a summary of the responses to the Government's RAB consultation which indicate that a RAB model remains credible for funding large-scale nuclear projects. The Energy White Paper reiterates that position and indicates that it will continue to explore this, alongside a range of financing options with developers. Whilst examining the potential role of Government finance during construction, that is subject to there being clear value for money for consumers and taxpayers. Given that hurdle, explain why the Applicant remains confident that the required funding will be achieved?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraphs 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 refer to the publication of the Government's 'Ten Point Plan' and the Energy White Paper. The Energy White Paper in relation to power, sets out a key commitment to provide up to £385 million in an Advanced Nuclear Fund for the next generation of nuclear technology aiming, by the early 2030's, to develop a SMR design and to build an AMR demonstrator. Does that financial support for Small Modular Reactors indicate a limited window of opportunity for large scale nuclear projects that will be expected to pass the 'value for money' test?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The Second Funding Statement Addendum [AS-150], paragraph 3.3.8, notes a number of factors which increase the Applicant's confidence that it will be able to raise the funding required for the project and for compulsory acquisition to take place within the timescales set by the draft DCO. In relation to the factors listed:</p> <p>(i) The Energy White Paper indicates that the Government's aim to bring at least one large-scale nuclear project to financial close this Parliament is subject to clear value for money, and all relevant approvals. Please explain how the project is anticipated to meet that caveat?</p> <p>(ii) If the Applicant fails to demonstrate that the project represents 'clear value for money' and the negotiations with the Government do not reach a satisfactory conclusion, what are the prospects of obtaining the necessary funds from other sources? In short, is the achievement of the project reliant upon those negotiations reaching a successful conclusion?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Whether adequate funding is likely to be available</p> <p>The relevant representations of Interested Persons including Against Sizewell C (TASC) [RR-1231], Louise Gooch (East Suffolk Council Cllr) [RR-701], NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867], Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259] and NFU [RR-0885] raise concerns as regards the funding of the project, the proposed compulsory acquisition and decommissioning. Please respond to those concerns.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>What degree of importance has been attributed to the existing uses of the land proposed to be acquired in assessing whether any interference would be justified, and why?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.9.1, acknowledges that the powers of compulsory acquisition sought through the draft DCO would engage Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) to the extent that homes are to be compulsorily acquired.</p> <p>(i) Please identify all those homes which are proposed to be compulsorily acquired and indicate whether any agreement has been reached with those owners/occupiers affected in this way?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain separately for each home the necessity and justification for seeking their acquisition and how that acquisition would comply with Article 8(2)?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.40	The Applicant	Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.9.4, states that in pursuing the DCO, SZC Co. has carefully considered the balance to be struck between individual rights and the wider public interest. Explain more precisely the factors which have been placed in the balance (including references to any paragraphs of the relevant NPS and Government Guidance), the weight attributed to those factors and how this exercise has actually been undertaken?
	Response	
CA.1.41	The Applicant	Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 7.9.4, states that to the extent that the DCO would affect individuals' rights, the proposed interference with those rights would be in accordance with law, proportionate and justified in the public interest. (i) How has the proportionality test been undertaken? (ii) Explain further the proportionate approach which has been taken in relation to each plot?
	Response	
CA.1.42	The Applicant	Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected In relation to the Applicant's duties under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010: (i) Please explain how the Applicant has had regard to its public sector equality duty in relation to the powers of Compulsory Acquisition sought and where this can be identified in the Equalities Impact Statement [APP-158]; (ii) Have any Affected Persons been identified as having protected characteristics?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.43	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 3.4, asserts that the proposed interference with the rights of those with an interest in the CA Additional land is for a legitimate purpose, necessary and proportionate. Please expand and provide full justification for reaching that conclusion specifically in relation to the Additional Land.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.44	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 3.7.2, relies upon the original Statement of Reasons [APP-062] to justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected. Please indicate the specific consideration given to the human rights of those affected by the proposed CA of the Additional Land.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.45	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>Please provide specific details of the need and justification for the powers of compulsory acquisition sought and the consideration given to the Human Rights of each owner/occupant in respect of the following residential garden areas and/or properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Round House, Eastbridge Road, Leiston, (Plot Ref MMDS/01/05); (ii) 54 and 55 Stockhouse Cottages, Main Road, Benhall, Saxmundham, (Plot Ref: 2VB/18/02); (iii) Annison's Cottage, Annesons Corner, Middleton (Plot Ref SLR/21/16); (iv) Upper Abbey Cottage, (Plot Ref MDS/02/04).
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.46	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The Relevant Representation of Susanne Nujeerallee [RR-1194], states that: <i>"If Sizewell C goes ahead my family and I will be made homeless"</i>.</p> <p>(i) Please respond to the concerns raised by the occupier of Upper Abbey Cottage (Plot ref MDS/02/04) and explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon this family and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.47	The Applicant	<p>Whether the purposes of the proposed Compulsory Acquisition justify interfering with the human rights of those with an interest in the land affected</p> <p>The Procedural Deadline A submission made by Gregory Jones QC on behalf of clients [PDA-020] complains that in breach of guidance and case law (as well as Article 8 European Convention of Human Rights and the First Protocol to the Convention) no meaningful negotiations have taken place alongside the formal procedures for compulsory purchase. Therefore a compelling case cannot be made for the proposed compulsory acquisition. Please respond including details of any negotiations that have taken place and what, if any, consideration has been given to the prospect of achieving different locations and/or lesser rights in relation to those plots.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.48	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Please confirm that the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151] together accurately set out the various plots and interests. Please identify any inaccuracies that</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		have come to light since the submission of the application and any further updates that need to be made at this stage.
	Response	
CA.1.49	The Applicant	The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification The Statement of Reasons [APP-062], paragraph 9.1.2, states that diligent inquiry to identify relevant persons with an interest in land was undertaken by Land Referencers appointed by the Applicant and sets out the process that was followed to identify such persons: (i) Please comment on the reliability and accuracy of the BoR in the light of those inquiries. (ii) Please provide further details of the process for identifying Category 3 persons. (iii) Explain why that process should be regarded as a conservative approach towards identifying Category 3 persons.
	Response	
CA.1.50	The Applicant	The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification What assurance and evidence can the Applicant provide of the accuracy of the land interests identified as submitted and indicate whether there are likely to be any changes to the land interests, including the identification of further owners/interests or monitoring and update of changes in interests?
	Response	
CA.1.51	The Applicant	The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Explain how the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151] comply with the guidance published by the former Department for Communities and Local Government – Planning Act 2008: Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition for land Annex D, paragraph 10?
	Response	
CA.1.52	The Applicant	The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification Where have the proposed new rights and restrictive covenants been identified and cross-referenced to the relevant development consent order articles? Please explain how this has been achieved by the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151]?
	Response	
CA.1.53	The Applicant	The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification Please confirm that the BoR [APP-067] and the BoR Addendum [AS-151] comply with the advice contained in Annex D, paragraph 8, of the guidance. For example, are all those identified in Part 3 also recorded in Part 1?
	Response	
CA.1.54	The Applicant	The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification The Consultation Report [APP-069], paragraph 2.4.18, indicates that previously unregistered areas of land were periodically checked to ensure the land remained unregistered. What reliability can be placed upon the process by which those with an interest in unregistered land were initially identified and subsequently checked for accuracy?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.55	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Please provide an up to date list of those plots of land where ownership still remains unknown.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.56	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>Please indicate whether a cover letter accompanied the Land Referencing Questionnaire attached as Appendix G4 to the Consultation Report [APP-084] and/or how the need to complete the document accurately was conveyed to recipients? Was this sent at the same time as the Request for Information Form attached at Appendix G6?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.57	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>The relevant representation of Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Magnox Limited [RR-0991] and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority [RR-0992], indicates that regardless of Article 26 in the draft DCO, the NDA and Magnox are of the opinion that land plots MDS/05/06 and MDS/05/07 should be excluded from the BoR [APP-067] altogether. Please respond to their concerns and indicate whether the BoR will be amended in that respect?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.58	The Applicant	<p>The accuracy of the Book of Reference (BoR), Land Plans and points of clarification</p> <p>The SoR Addendum [AS-149], paragraph 1.3.2, states that the Applicant has carried out diligent inquiry in the CA Additional Land and persons with a claim for compensation as a result of the proposed development of the CA Land. Please provide specific details of the inquiries that have been made and justification for the reliance placed upon the outcome of those inquiries.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.59	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.9.5, refers to section 127 PA 2008. However, Article 40 would allow SZC Co. to acquire land or rights in land owned by statutory undertakers (such as telecommunications and electricity suppliers) or to interfere with their apparatus by removing or repositioning the apparatus within the Order Limits. In addition, the relevant representation of Network Rail [RR-0006] makes reference to s138 PA 2008. (i) Please clarify whether or not s138 PA 2008 is engaged by the Sizewell C project. (ii) If s38 is so engaged, then please identify all statutory undertakers to which that applies and provide details of the relevant right or apparatus to be extinguished or removed and why the Applicant considers that to be necessary? (iii) Please explain and justify the extent of the land over which such powers are sought given the width of the corridors likely to be needed for the reaction and acquisition of new rights to accommodate the diversion of statutory undertakers' apparatus.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.60	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.9.7, states that adequate protection for the statutory undertakers will be included within protective provisions in the DCO. SZC Co. therefore considers that the statutory undertakers will not suffer serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking as a result of the compulsory acquisition of land or rights over land or powers of temporary possession. (i) Have any Protective Provisions and/or asset protective agreements between the various parties been agreed. If not, please identify any outstanding areas of disagreement? (ii) For those Statutory Undertakers' who have been sent the draft protective provisions but have not confirmed agreement, please explain for each one why these protective provisions are considered to provide adequate protection and why SZC Co. considers that the land and rights can be acquired without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.61	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of Network Rail [RR-0006] objects to the inclusion of the Plots in the Order and to all other compulsory powers in the Order that affect, and may be exercised in relation to, Network Rail's property and interests. Please provide an update on the matters required by Network Rail in order for it to be in a position to withdraw its objection, including whether appropriate protective provisions have been agreed?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.62	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of Anglian Water Services Ltd [RR-073]:</p> <p>(i) Has the proposed amendment to Article 23 draft DCO been agreed? If not, why not?</p> <p>(ii) Have the specific protective provisions suggested by Anglian Water been agreed? If not, why not?</p> <p>(iii) Please indicate whether agreement has been reached in relation to temporary possession of land in Anglian Water's ownership to provide access to a proposed construction compound for the proposed Yoxford Roundabout?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.63	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of Cadent Gas Limited [RR-0168] explains why adequate protective provisions for the protection of Cadent's statutory undertaking are required and in discussion between the parties but not yet agreed. Please provide an update on the progress of those discussions and indicate whether any agreement has yet been reached?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.64	The Applicant	<p>The acquisition of Statutory Undertakers' land – s127 PA2008</p> <p>The relevant representation of National Grid Electricity Transmission Ltd (NGET) [RR-0874] states that NGET's rights to retain its apparatus in situ and rights of access to inspect, maintain, renew and repair such apparatus located within or near the Order limits</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		should always be maintained and access to inspect and maintain such apparatus must not be restricted. Please provide an update on the progress of discussions with NGET in relation to protective provisions highlighting any outstanding areas of disagreement?
	Response	
CA.1.65	The Applicant	<p>Adequacy of any Protective Provisions set out in the dDCO and the need for any other Protective Provisions to safeguard relevant interests</p> <p>The relevant representation of East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board [RR-0345] welcomes the consideration of the benefits of including a protective provision for drainage and flood risk authorities (including Internal Drainage Boards) within the draft DCO. Please provide an update on progress and indicate whether such protective provisions have been agreed. If not, please set out any areas of disagreement?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.66	The Applicant	<p>Adequacy of any Protective Provisions set out in the dDCO and the need for any other Protective Provisions to safeguard relevant interests</p> <p>The relevant representation of Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Magnox Limited [RR-0991] and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority [RR-0992], states that Protective Provisions should be included in the draft DCO in order to preserve and protect their respective abilities to effectively carry out their statutory functions and regulatory responsibilities and to reflect agreement reached on the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers. Please provide an update on progress and indicate whether such protective provisions have been agreed. If not, please set out any areas of disagreement?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.67	The Applicant	Adequacy of any Protective Provisions set out in the dDCO and the need for any other Protective Provisions to safeguard relevant interests

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The relevant representation of Suffolk County Council [RR-1174], seeks Protective Provisions for its role as the Local Highway Authority in order for it to continue to discharge its duties under the Highways Act (1980) within those parts of the public highway included within the Order Land. The Council also proposes that Protective Provisions should be considered for other topic areas, such as its Lead Local Flood Authority and statutory archaeological roles. Please respond and indicate whether any such protective provisions are being negotiated and/or have been agreed?
	Response	
CA.1.68	The Applicant	Crown Land The CA Guidance, paragraphs 39 and 40, provides guidance in relation to Crown Land. It advises that discussions between applicants and the appropriate Crown authority should start as soon as it is clear that such land or interests will be required and that the aim should be to ensure that agreement is in place no later than the time that the application for the project is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. Please set out when those discussions began and explain why no agreements were in place when the application was submitted.
	Response	
CA.1.69	The Applicant	Crown Land The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.9.4, states that the Applicant is in negotiation to acquire the necessary interests directly with the Crown Estate Commissioners and does not perceive any obvious impediment to acquiring these interests. In addition, the Applicant's response [AS-006] to the ExA's [PD-005] request for clarification in relation to Crown Land states that in accordance with Annex A of the CA Guidance, it will seek any necessary consents prior to the end of the examination. Please provide an update to the progress of any such negotiations and also those with the Department of Transport and the Department of Education with reference to relevant plots numbers and when it is anticipated that any such consents and/or voluntary agreements will be concluded?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.70	The Applicant	Other matters In the light of the CA Guidance, paragraph 19, please demonstrate: (i) How potential risks or impediments to implementation of the scheme have been properly managed; (ii) the account taken of any other physical and legal matters pertaining to the application, including the programming of any necessary infrastructure accommodation works and the need to obtain any operational and other consents applicable to this type of development.
	Response	
CA.1.71	The Applicant	Other matters The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 4.5.2, states that the Sizewell Link Road has been proposed to avoid the adverse effects that would otherwise be associated with the addition of the construction traffic to the existing volume of traffic that would travel along the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton. Please therefore provide justification for the compulsory acquisition of this land on a permanent rather than a temporary basis for the duration of the construction works.
	Response	
CA.1.72	The Applicant	Other matters The SoR section 10, refers to the Schedule of Other Consents, Licences and Agreements (Doc Ref. 5.11) [APP-153] which identifies the other consents, licenses and agreements that are required for the Sizewell C Project to be implemented. Please indicate whether there are any changes to the status and/or timeframe for each consent, licence and agreement listed within that schedule since the application was submitted.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.73	The Applicant	Other matters The SoR [APP-062], paragraph 3.3.7, states that the emerging local plan contains a number of site specific policies, including area specific strategies for Darsham, Leiston, Saxmundham and Woodbridge, which have relevance to some of the Sizewell C Project's associated development sites. Please provide further details of those policies, as adopted, and explain many implications they may have for the associated development sites?
	Response	
CA.1.74	The Applicant	Other matters Please include in the next submission of the Updated Statement of Reasons Appendix B 'Status of Negotiations with Owners of the Order Land' the relevant parts of the BoR within which each affected person falls and further details of any engagement including dates of any letters sent and/or meetings.
	Response	
CA.1.75	The Applicant	Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession The relevant representation made by Clarke and Simpson on behalf of Family Mellen [RR-0241] raises objection to the proposed powers sought in relation to a 9 acre field that came with their house and is integral to their future plans. Please explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this land; whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs and the consideration that has been given to impact upon and the implications for the human rights of this family in seeking these powers.
	Response	
CA.1.76	The Applicant	Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession The relevant representation of LJ and EL Dowley Farming Partnership [RR-0697] states that the EDF proposed land-take for roads/roundabouts etc and for borrow pits for the spoil from the site would make their arable business unviable. Please explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land; whether a lesser or

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		alternative area of land would meet those needs and the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of those individuals comprising the farming partnership in seeking these powers.
	Response	
CA.1.77	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of NJ Bacon Farms [RR-0867] refers to the Applicant's proposal, as a result of the proposed Sizewell Link Road (SLR), to compulsorily acquire some 12 acres of productive arable and vegetable land from them. The construction of the SLR would cut five fields into halves and quarters and reduce their farmed area. They indicate that it is highly unlikely that they could replace the high quality irrigable vegetable land that is being taken. In addition, the application plans do not provide enough detail for them to know that satisfactory access to areas farmed would be made available in the future:</p> <p>(i) Please explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs;</p> <p>(iii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned;</p> <p>(iv) Please provide specific details by including by reference to a plan of the proposed means of access to the reduced land area in the event that the powers sought are exercised?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.78	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of Norton Rose Fulbright LLP on behalf of Hevingham Hall Estate (HHE) [RR-0908], explains that part of HHE is located south of the temporary Northern Park and Ride site and a proportion of HHE also falls within land to be compulsorily acquired to facilitate the roundabout at Yoxford (plot OHI/24/02):</p> <p>(i) Please explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs;</p> <p>(iii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.79	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of Oliver Holloway on behalf of Clarke and Simpson [RR-912] raises concerns amongst other things in relation to the justification for the need for the Sizewell Link Road, Fen Meadow mitigation, the consideration of alternative options and funding:</p> <p>(i) Please respond to the concerns raised and explain further the need for the powers sought in respect of this Objector's land;</p> <p>(ii) whether a lesser or alternative area of land would meet those needs;</p> <p>(iii) the consideration that has been given to the impact upon the business and the implications for the human rights of the individuals concerned?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.80	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of Pinsent Masons LLP on behalf of Magnox Limited [RR-0991] and Nuclear Decommissioning Authority [RR-0992], indicates that they oppose the acquisition of any land, or the extinguishment of any rights etc, in any land plots which are: (a) within the boundary of the nuclear site licence, held by Magnox, for the Sizewell A Nuclear Site, and (b) land which the NDA has responsibility for decommissioning and cleaning-up in accordance with the Energy Act 2004 and the Sizewell A Directions, being land plots MDS/05/06 and MDS/05/07. Please respond to the specific concerns raised including:</p> <p>(i) Why the Applicant may need to acquire the plots detailed in column (2) of Part 1 of Schedule 15 to the draft DCO;</p> <p>(ii) Why land plot MDS/02/28, in respect of which Magnox is a Category 1 person, is not detailed in column (2) of Part 1 of Schedule 15 to the draft DCO;</p> <p>(iii) Why the protection afforded to the Sizewell B Nuclear Site in Article 26(2)(b) of the draft DCO should not be extended also to the Sizewell A Nuclear Site;</p> <p>(iv) Whether Article 30 should be made subject to Article 26?</p> <p>(v) the implications of these powers for those plots that abut the nuclear site licence area, being plots MDS/05/02 and MDS/05/13;</p> <p>(vi) Whether the Applicant has undertaken diligent enquiry as to why the relevant Class 4 powers are required, or how the compulsory acquisition of Class 4 powers may affect more widely the ability of the NDA and Magnox to carry out their respective statutory functions and regulatory responsibilities?</p> <p>(vii) Whether there is a need to for a Nuclear Site Licensees' Co-operation Agreement(s) to be entered into between the NDA, Magnox, the Applicant and EDF?</p>
	Response	
CA.1.81	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Justin and Emma Dowley [RR-1099], Nat and India Bacon [RR-1100] and the Trustees of A W Bacon Will Trust [RR-1101], question why the 'Road D2' option was not taken forward. Please provide a response to those queries and justify the response to consultation in that respect.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CA.1.82	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of Ward Farming Ltd [RR-1259], object to the proposed compulsory acquisition of some 12 acres of productive arable and vegetable land that the company farms. They indicate that the construction of the road would cut five fields into halves and, quarters and result in a reduction in farmed area of around 41 acres. Please respond to their complaints in relation to:</p> <p>(i) The failure of the Applicant's experts to meet as requested and to genuinely engage with them;</p> <p>(ii) the analysis, rigour and level of detail provided by the Aecom Report on the SLR route;</p> <p>(iii) the impact of the proposed reduction in land area.</p> <p>(iv) the provision of satisfactory means of access in the future; and (iv) the creation of new rights of way.</p>
	Response	
CA.1.83	The Applicant	<p>Objections to the grant of powers of compulsory acquisition and temporary possession</p> <p>The relevant representation of the CLA Country Land and Business Association [RR-0229] raises concerns in relation to the fragmentation of farms and other rural businesses by new infrastructure and overall impact of the scheme. Please explain including by reference to the application documentation the impact upon such businesses in considering design and route alternatives to the application scheme and the associated powers of compulsory acquisition sought.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CI.1	Community Issues	
CI.1.0	The Applicant ESC	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>Within the Accommodation Strategy [APP 613] para 5.4.10 – reference is made to the layout being shared with ESC.</p> <p>(i) Please provide a copy of the layout and indicate the facilities that are to be included.</p> <p>(ii) Please provide an update of the latest position on the delivery, operation and management of the site and how these components would be secured through the DCO</p>
	Response	
CI.1.1	The Applicant Leiston Town Council ESC SCC	<p>Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE)</p> <p>Please provide an update on the strategy that has been developed for the movement of workers from the main development site to and from the LEEIE and between the LEEIE and Leiston Town.</p>
	Response from Leiston Town Council	<p>CI.1.1 LEEIE Movement of Workers</p> <p>There has been discussion about how workers will move from the caravan site and the Park and Ride at the LEEIE site to the main construction site and into Leiston town centre. This has focused on shuttle buses with a request for buses to be fuelled by electricity or hydrogen rather than diesel to minimize air pollution and support the efforts of Leiston to become a zero carbon town. There has also been a proposal for improved cycle routes and footpaths including the closure of Kemps Hill to vehicles.</p> <p>However, in spite of these measures being discussed the Town Council remains exceedingly concerned about traffic entering and leaving the LEEIE site and the pressure this will put on Lovers Lane. In addition to the traffic associated with movement of workers, there will also be the freight arriving by train but needing to be transported to the construction site by road. The caravan site will have no amenities; maybe there could be a scheme for local businesses to provide satellite or pop-up outlets on site?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CI.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>The facilities to be provided at the accommodation (gym, restaurant, amenity area etc.) campus to assist in managing the needs of onsite staff and reducing the pressure on local facilities do not appear to be described in detail. There is no obvious indication of the scale of these facilities, the time period for their delivery/maintenance/availability.</p> <p>(i) Please explain in light of this how the assessment of the effectiveness of these proposed mitigations has been undertaken and explain where this information defining their scale, availability etc. is set out within the ES?</p> <p>(ii) How and when would the facilities be delivered through the DCO?</p>
	Response	
CI.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>(i) Please provide a timeline mapping the number of workers expected to be working on the main development site alongside the provision of the accommodation campus, camping/caravanning area and provision of gymnasium, restaurants and any other supporting facilities.</p> <p>(ii) Please explain how each element is linked to a delivery mechanism within the dDCO to ensure the mitigation anticipated would materialise at an appropriate time.</p>
	Response	
CI.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>Several RRs express concerns that the scale of the accommodation campus did not change when the staffing numbers increased during the consultation process.</p> <p>Please explain the rationale for the quantity of accommodation relative to the quantity of workforce anticipated to be on site throughout the construction period.</p>
	Response	
CI.1.5	The Applicant	Accommodation Strategy

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In assessing the accommodation needs both during construction and subsequent operation:</p> <p>(i) Did the assessment include the additional 850 staff that may be on site at Sizewell B during planned outages?</p> <p>(ii) Please advise where this is set out within the ES.</p>
	Response	
CI.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>(i) What confidence can the ExA have that the accommodation campus and proposed caravan site would be optimally occupied during construction?</p> <p>(ii) How would this be achieved?</p>
	Response	
CI.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>(i) Please confirm whether or not the figures provided for bed spaces within the private rented sector include bed spaces that would come from holiday self-catering accommodation or second homes?</p> <p>(ii) Explain how have the figures been differentiated between private rented and holiday cottages/flats?</p> <p>(iii) Provide details of what safeguards are in place to ensure that double counting of holiday cottages/flats as both 'tourist accommodation', 'private rented sector' or 'second homes' has not occurred?</p>
	Response	
CI.1.8	ESC, SCC	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>Are there any concerns regarding the effect of demand for temporary worker accommodation and any effect this may have on the private rented sector and or holiday accommodation?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CI.1.9	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>Licensing or planning restrictions may exist for caravanning and camping sites regarding occupancy.</p> <p>(i) Are there similar restrictions for example planning conditions for other property within the tourism stock such as holiday cottages?</p> <p>(ii) If there are, how would this effect the availability of such accommodation and has this been factored in?</p> <p>(iii) Would ESC support the temporary removal/suspension of such conditions or licence restrictions to enable this stock to be used for worker accommodation during the construction period?</p>
	Response	
CI.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>There would appear to be the potential for significant pressure on local accommodation during the construction period. Please explain where the additional pressure from outages at Sizewell B has been considered and how this has been addressed?</p>
	Response	
CI.1.11	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Leiston</p> <p>The Town Council express concern that the mitigation for impacts from a large influx of predominantly male workers has not been fully addressed, with the only specific mitigation proposed the sports facilities at the Academy.</p> <p>The concerns in respect of the potential community impacts are much broader than just the effects on sports provision.</p> <p>Please respond to these concerns and explain how the ES has considered the broader community effects of a large influx of largely male workers and what mitigation would be secured to address these community effects.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
CI.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Effect of the proposed development on the local population</p> <p>In light of the concerns expressed by the CCG [RR-0500] and the Suffolk Constabulary [RR 1140] amongst others please comment on whether you still regard the assumptions of impacts on the local community as conservative and fully assess the likely impacts. In responding please address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Whether the increased workforce could be supported by existing GPs (ii) Whether the effect on housing availability has been underestimated; (iii) The potential for adverse effects on health workers capacity to do their work due to impacts on journey times; (iv) Whether the equalities assessment adequately assesses effects on vulnerable groups; (v) Whether the mitigation for noise, dust, and impact on travel times has fully addressed health impacts; and (vi) Whether there has been a full assessment of the impacts on care homes and their residents.
	Response	
CI.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Access to Health Services</p> <p>The Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG and West Suffolk CCG [RR-0500] have expressed concern that the proposed development could have an adverse impact on health visitors and other professionals accessing residents in a timely manner.</p> <p>In light of the need to ensure there are not adverse indirect health impacts how do you respond to these concerns?</p>
	Response	
CI.1.14	The Applicant, Suffolk Constabulary	Community Safety

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Suffolk Constabulary [RR-1140] express concern that important community safety and policing impacts raised during the pre-application consultation stage have yet to be addressed. Please advise what progress has been made between the parties in this regard.
	Response	
CI.1.15	The Applicant, Suffolk Constabulary	Community Safety In light of the concerns raised by the Suffolk Constabulary in respect of what they describe as the narrowness of the assessment please advise what you have done to address this criticism, and what could be put in place to respond to these concerns. Please advise how you consider any appropriate mitigation could be delivered through the DCO in order to achieve a satisfactory level of community safety.
	Response	
CI.1.16	The Applicant Suffolk Constabulary	Community Safety (i) Please advise on the progress in developing the assessment of likely community safety impacts and policing impacts following the more detailed assessment of transport, staffing and demographic data. (ii) Is it intended to provide a copy of this assessment into the Examination? (iii) Is this assessment now agreed?
	Response	
CU.1	Cumulative impact	
Cu.1.0	The Applicant	Cumulative assessment in EIA and HRA 'in-combination' assessment Natural England (NE) [RR-0878] does not consider that a suitably robust assessment has been undertaken within the HRA of impacts from different aspects of the project, or of 'in combination' impacts between other projects which may impact on the same internationally designated sites and features. In particular, the cabling for East Anglia ONE North (EA1N) and East Anglia TWO (EA2) would come ashore and be routed through this

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		part of the AONB close to the Sizewell C construction site. (i) Please provide an update on the latest position in relation to discussions with NE on this topic and indicate any outstanding points of disagreement for this element of the HRA process; (ii) Please provide an update on the part of the Sizewell project's nine to twelve years construction phase that would be likely to coincide with the EA1 North and EA2 cable route's construction?
	Response	
Cu.1.1	The Applicant	Inter-relationship effects NE [RR-0878] does not consider that a suitably robust assessment has been undertaken on cumulative impacts from all project elements on nationally designated sites (SSSIs) and their notified features. Please provide an update on the latest position in relation to discussions with NE on this topic and indicate any outstanding points of disagreement on this aspect of the SSSI impact assessment process.
	Response	
Cu.1.2	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes NE [RR-0878] highlights the impact of the Sizewell C scheme on how Sizewell B currently relates visually to its immediate and wider landscape setting and submits that the potential mitigation benefits would not address a general cumulative effect of the power station with existing energy infrastructure on the landscape character of the AONB. Please comment on the criticisms made and indicate whether there is any additional mitigation, such as by way of updates to the LEMP or mitigation route maps which might alleviate the adverse cumulative impact of the scheme and avoid the visual clutter anticipated by NE?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.3	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4, Table 4.16 [APP-578], identifies those effects that have been found to be greater in-combination with the non-Sizewell C schemes than for the proposed development alone. For transport, this includes the A12 at Little Glemham and Marlesford. (i) Please explain further how the proposed mitigation would operate in practice and how this would satisfactorily overcome the anticipated cumulative moderate adverse effect on fear and intimidation; (ii) Please indicate whether there are any other steps which could be taken in mitigation of this adverse effect?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, Table 4.16 in relation to landscape and visual impact, and amenity and recreation, identifies significant adverse cumulative effects for Visual Receptor Groups 18, 19 and 20 during the construction period.</p> <p>(i) Please explain further why there are considered to be no more practicable and proportionate mitigation steps available?</p> <p>(ii) For these receptors, please explain in detail how the combined effects of these cumulative impacts arising under these different topics have been assessed, including on the overall effect on health and well-being of those concerned?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, Table 4.16 in relation to health and wellbeing and effects associated with changes to noise and vibration, identifies significant adverse cumulative effects for the rail proposals (construction), and the two village bypass (construction and operation). Please explain further why there are considered to be no more practicable and proportionate mitigation steps available?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Cu.1.6	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, paragraphs 4.21.35 to 4.21.38, in relation to cumulative quality of life and wellbeing effects associated with general stress and anxiety, recognises that due to their scale, larger projects may generate stress and anxiety. However, it concludes that on the basis that each individual development would inherently manage stress and anxiety associated with the planning application process, the cumulative health and wellbeing effects would remain minor adverse and not significant. (i) Please explain further how such stress and anxiety would be inherently managed rather than exacerbated by the planning process? (ii) Please provide further evidence and reasoning to support the conclusion reached that the cumulative effect would not be significant?
	Response	
Cu.1.7	The Applicant, EA1N	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes EA1N [RR-0340] indicates that its representatives have engaged proactively with Sizewell C representatives to better understand the scope and impact of the proposed Sizewell C Project and its potential cumulative and in-combination effects, in particular on transport related matters. Please confirm that such discussions are ongoing and indicate whether any further information is available at this stage in relation to potential cumulative and in-combination effects of the projects with particular regard to transport- related matters.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.8	The Applicant, EA1N, EA2	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>EA1N [RR-0340] and EA2 [RR-0341] explain that the Order limits for the EA1N Project and the Sizewell C Project overlap in three areas of the public highway, namely: Sizewell Gap (close to the Junction of Sizewell Gap/King George's Avenue); the junction of A12/A1094 (Friday Street); and the junction of A1094/A1069 (Snape Road).</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any progress has been made in relation to opportunities for co-ordinating works in these areas and how this would be secured by the DCO(s).</p> <p>(ii) If not, what are the perceived obstacles to any such co-ordination?</p> <p>(iii) Explain the way in which the various works for these schemes in these locations could conflict?</p> <p>(iv) Explain how it is proposed that the necessary access for the EA1 North and EA TWO Projects would be maintained?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.9	The Applicant, EA1N, EA2	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, paragraph 4.4.13, indicates that the construction of EA1N and EA2 could overlap with the construction of the Sizewell C Project. Paragraph 4.14, states that the 'concurrent build' traffic flows have been used, derived from the preliminary environmental information for the EA2 development.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any further information is available at this stage as to the likely timing and duration of the overlap should all these projects be approved. (ii) Please comment on the reliability of the ES assessment given that it has utilised preliminary environmental information and indicate whether this has now been superseded?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects [APP-578], Chapter 4, paragraph 4.4.47, states that at peak construction all of the highway improvement schemes associated with the Sizewell C Project will be operational. (i) Please explain how</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		that would be secured and enforced through the draft DCO or other means? (ii) Would there be any consequential effects on the assessment conclusions were this not to be met, even if it were for short periods?
	Response	
Cu.1.11	The Applicant, EA1N, EA2, SCC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects with Other Plans, Projects and Programmes [APP-578], paragraph 4.4.53, explains that the cumulative assessment for Sizewell C with EA1N and EA2 is based on certain worst case assumptions. Please indicate whether those assumptions are agreed between all parties and that they comprise a complete list of potential 'worst case' factors?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.12	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects with Other Plans, Projects and Programmes [APP-578], paragraph 4.4.54, indicates that it is possible that the significant adverse effect on fear and intimidation would not arise. The construction programmes for East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO and the Sizewell C Project will be monitored through the transport review group throughout the construction phase of the Sizewell C Project and should there be a potential for the worst case traffic flows to arise concurrently, additional mitigation measures would need to be secured through the transport contingency fund, which is to be secured via the Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>(i) Please explain further how the effect on fear and intimidation could be satisfactorily managed through the transport review group and transport contingency fund?</p> <p>(ii) Although the contingency fund is referred to in the Mitigation Route Map, Plate 1.1 [APP-616], it does not appear to be mentioned in the main mitigation route map tables. Please explain why not?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Please outline the additional mitigation measures anticipated and explain how this would achieve the desired objective?
	Response	
Cu.1.13	The Applicant, EA1N	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes EA1N [RR-0340] in relation to offshore matters notes that whilst the Sizewell C Project's Work Nos. 2B, 2D and 2F fall outside the EA1N Order limits, there remains an overlap in the Order limits. The company expresses concern that it must not be hindered from undertaking the necessary works for the EA1N Project as a result of the Sizewell C Project works at these locations. Please indicate the form of assurance sought in this respect and whether this has been provided to the satisfaction of EA1N?
	Response	
Cu.1.14	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 4 Assessment of Cumulative Effects with Other Plans, Projects and Programmes [APP-578], section 4.19 Climate Change, paragraph 4.19.1, states that presenting the impact of the proposed development in the context of the UK carbon budgets is an inherently cumulative assessment and as such it is concluded that further assessment of cumulative GHG emissions is not applicable. Please explain further the basis for this approach and why the cumulative impact of a number of different projects that each fall below the 1% threshold should not be a matter of concern?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.15	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes Beach View Holiday Park [RR-0126] propose that an independent 'cumulative impact study' should be undertaken to safeguard the AONB and wider area from the impact on multiple large-scale industrial projects including Sizewell C, EA1N and EA2 wind farms, Nautilus and Eurolink and SCD1 and SCD2 Interconnector. Please comment specifically on the need for and benefits of such an additional study?
	Response	
Cu.1.16	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes ESC [RR-0342], expresses concern that the potential in-combination effects on the labour market of Sizewell C with other major construction projects including ScottishPower Renewable projects, Bradwell B, other power stations in England and Wales and sizeable engineering projects such as Crossrail 2 has not been fully considered or reflected in the mitigation package. Please respond to this specific point and explain further the consideration of this factor and any mitigation proposed.
	Response	
Cu.1.17	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes ESC [RR-0342] states that during the construction phase of Sizewell C, particularly the peak years, cumulative effects related to the labour market may arise in-combination with other NSIPs in the region. Please explain in detail the means of delivering, monitoring and enforcing the proposals for boosting skills and employment to minimise the cumulative effects arising from the in-combination construction of the various consented or under consideration NSIPs in the region.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.18	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ESC [RR-0342] accepts that the primary issues arising in the cumulative assessment are predominantly managed with the proposed transport strategy. However, one element that continues to raise concern is the A12 west of Woodbridge and the A12/A1094 junction to Aldeburgh pre: Two Village Bypass construction.</p> <p>(i) The Council is requested to explain further its stated intention to work with the Highway Authority to understand how capacity here can be increased and indicate the prospects of that objective being achieved?</p> <p>(ii) Please provide further explanation as to the anticipated timetable for the provision of the Two Village bypass and the scope for the Friday Street roundabout element of the Two Village Bypass to be brought online as soon as possible during the Sizewell C construction.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.19	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>ESC [RR-0342] in relation to amenity and recreation notes that during the early years of construction there may be impacts in some areas should other NSIPs be under construction simultaneously. The majority of these impacts will be on receptor groups using public footpaths. The majority are considered to be not significant, but receptors at Aldringham Common and The Walks are likely to experience significant effects.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether it is considered that any further mitigation other than that already proposed is necessary for receptors in these locations.</p> <p>(ii) If not, why not?</p> <p>(iii) If so, what additional mitigation is sought and how could that be secured through the draft DCO?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.20	The Applicant, National Grid (in relation to (i))	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>Norfolk County Council [RR-0906] raises cross-boundary electricity transmission issues in respect of the 400kV network which runs between Norfolk and Suffolk including the potential for reinforcement and new lines in both Norfolk and Suffolk.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether there is likely to be any requirement in the wider area for either: (a) reinforcement; of the existing 400 kV network; or (b) new overhead lines (400kV).</p> <p>(ii) Please explain how the cumulative impact on the 400 kV transmission network in the wider strategic area has been considered by the ES?</p> <p>(iii) Please comment on the need for further evidence and studies setting out the full implications of both Sizewell C and the planned/emerging offshore wind energy projects on the existing 400 kV network across the two Counties.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>Suffolk Coast & Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Partnership [RR-1170] considers the cumulative impacts of proposed and existing infrastructure appear to have been underplayed when taken into combination in relation to the statutory purpose of the AONB. Please provide further explanation and justification for the ES conclusion in relation to cumulative impact upon the AONB having regard to the other proposed and existing Nationally Significant Infrastructure in the area that has been referred to in that representation.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>SCC [RR-1174] considers that the full cumulative impacts of the existing and potential future projects in the East Suffolk area have not been adequately assessed.</p> <p>(i) Please indicate whether any further information has come to light on the schemes considered by the ES and other schemes coming forward since the time of the assessment including offshore wind projects, inter-connector cables across the North Sea and the</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>interconnector project to Kent;</p> <p>(ii) Please summarise the proposals for the delivery of traffic mitigation schemes and explain how that could be achieved in practice without disrupting traffic from other projects including use of the A12/B1122 and A12/A1094/B1069 transport corridors by East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO traffic;</p> <p>(iii) Please explain how cumulative impacts which are not currently proposed to be mitigated due to the length of time they are expected to occur and their deemed likelihood of occurring would be monitored, identified and then mitigated should they in fact occur?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>SCC [RR-1174] in respect of the cumulative ecological impact, submits that it is not clear why the construction of the EA1 North and EA2 have been scoped out of the assessment of cumulative impacts, particularly in respect of Natura 2000 sites, when the cable corridor passes relatively close to the Sizewell C project. Please provide further details and reasoning to justify the scoping out of that matter from the cumulative impact assessment.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes</p> <p>SCC [RR-1174] in relation to economic development and skills is critical of the ES consideration of the potential in-combination effects on the labour market of Sizewell C with other major construction projects. In addition, it indicates that the timelines for construction of East Anglia THREE (EA3) have changed and are significantly different to the timelines presented in the application.</p> <p>(i) What account has or will be taken of the other significant projects to be delivered in the same time period as the proposed construction of Sizewell C, as identified by the Technical Skills Legacy Study?</p> <p>(ii) How is it proposed that changes in the timelines for the construction of EA3 compared to those presented in the application will be reflected in the cumulative impact assessment?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Please respond to the Council's criticism of the cumulative impact assessment methodology and whether this should have taken into account the different skill sets needed to deliver at particular phases of the project, rather than only concentrating on construction labour.
	Response	
Cu.1.25	The Applicant, SCC	Cumulative effects with other plans, projects and programmes SCC [RR-1174] considers that the cumulative pressure on the local housing stock may increase impacts in East Suffolk and may push workers to look further afield creating pressures on adjacent authorities such as Ipswich and Mid Suffolk. (i) Please respond to the criticism that appropriate monitoring and mitigation measures need to be put in place for all affected areas, to ensure housing impacts are managed and mitigated. (ii) Should anything else be included in the accommodation strategy and other measures related to housing in addition to those measures already set out in the Mitigation Route Map?
	Response	
Cu.1.26	The Applicant	Inter-relationship effects NPS EN-1, paragraph 4.2.6, explains that consideration should be given to how the accumulation of, and interrelationship between, effects might affect the environment, economy or community as a whole, even though they may be acceptable when considered on an individual basis with mitigation measures in place. Please explain how the overall effects (cumulative, inter-related, intra-related and inter-related) on health and well-being for the various individual communities affected has been considered by the application?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.27	The Applicant	Inter-relationship effects ESC [RR-0342] on the topic of inter-relationship effects recognises that a summary of each element of the development and its potential impact is included in the ES and does not disagree with its findings. However, it considers that the mitigation proposed to address these potential effects lacks clarity. Please provide further details, by way of expansion of the Mitigation Route Map, of the mitigation proposed including what would be available, in particular for residential properties, to mitigate for the interrelationship effects of the proposal.
	Response	
Cu.1.28	The Applicant	Inter-relationship effects ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] assesses the potential for residential properties, commercial facilities and schools to experience effect interactions as a result of the Sizewell C Project. Paragraph 2.3.10 identifies that a number of receptors within close proximity to the main development site have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and views during construction. In addition, paragraph 2.3.13, identifies a number of receptors that are also likely to have high potential for combined effects arising from impacts during operation. There are also areas where new and/or different environmental effects may be experienced including properties between Yoxford and Leiston, close to the B1122. (i) Please explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome these additional or new impacts. (ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.29	The Applicant	Inter-relationship effects ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Northern Park and Ride, paragraph 2.3.22, identifies receptors at residential properties on the western side of Main Road adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site that have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction, operation and removal and reinstatement. (i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors. (ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?
	Response	
Cu.1.30	The Applicant	Inter-relationship effects ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Two Village Bypass, identifies receptors at The Red House and Timbers, Main Road; Hall Cottages, Farnham Hall, Farnham Street Farm; Farnham Hall Farmhouse; and Rosehill Cottages that have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction. Paragraph 2.3.36, identifies a number of receptors are also likely to have high potential for combined effects arising from impacts during operation. (i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors. (ii) If no additional mitigation is proposed, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components, please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.31	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Sizewell Link Road, paragraph 2.3.43, identifies receptors at Kelsale Lodge Cottages; Fir Tree Farm; The Red House Farm and Rosetta; Vale Cottage and Oakfield house; Valley Farm House; Annesons Cottage; Coronation Cottages; Forge Cottage and Walnut Cottage have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction. In addition, a number of receptors are also likely to have high potential for combined effects arising from impacts during operation. (i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors.</p> <p>(ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, then explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Freight Management Facility, paragraph 2.3.57, identifies residential properties at 1 and 2 Keepers Cottage have a high potential for combined effects arising from noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual impacts, during construction and removal and reinstatement.</p> <p>(i) Please identify and explain in detail any mitigation proposed to overcome the additional significant adverse inter-relationship effect that is likely to be experienced by these receptors.</p> <p>(ii) If no additional mitigation, and/or mitigation to further reduce the impact of individual components is proposed, then please explain why that approach is considered to be acceptable?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Inter-relationship effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 2 Inter-relationship effects [APP-575] in relation to the Green Rail Route, paragraph 2.3.65, identifies that during construction, noise generated from rail movements on the East Suffolk line have the potential to interact with air quality effects from road traffic and rail emissions and could result in new and or different environmental effect within a number of areas. It recognises that there is a potential for effect interaction to occur and result in a further significant effect at those receptors where noise effects from the rail movements would be significant (within 20 metres of the East Suffolk Line). The rail noise effects would be mitigated where possible through the implementation of speed restrictions along the East Suffolk Line.</p> <p>(i) Please identify the receptors where the effects would be significant?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain further mitigation proposed and the extent to which the proposed speed restrictions would assist in that respect;</p> <p>(iii) How could it be ensured that the proposed speed restrictions would be implemented and adhered to?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative impact of water supply strategy</p> <p>The ES Addendum Volume 1: Environmental Statement Addendum Chapter 10 Project Wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects - Revision 1.0 [AS- 189] paragraph 10.4.229 indicates that the proposals would require an upgrade to some existing water treatment plants and a new high capacity water main. Please provide further details and explanation to support the view set out in paragraph 10.4.232 that the preferred water supply strategy proposal would not change the conclusions of the waste and material resource cumulative assessment presented within Volume 10, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-578], based on expected waste arisings and material quantities required due to the scale and nature of the scheme.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative impact of water supply strategy</p> <p>The ES Addendum Volume 1: Environmental Statement Addendum Chapter 10 Project Wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects - Revision 1.0 [AS-189] paragraph 10.4.233 b)(iii) Transport – explains that works associated with the preferred water supply proposal are currently programmed to coincide with the Early Years construction of the Sizewell C Project. In addition, paragraph 10.4.235 b) (iv) noise and vibration, identifies that if the earthworks for the cut and fill, and the pipelaying task for the preferred water supply proposal works were to take place at a time when other construction works associated with the Sizewell C Project is occurring nearby, there is the potential for a cumulative effect. This could occur at receptors close to construction works for the Sizewell link road, the main development site and along the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line.</p> <p>(i) Please explain further how it is proposed that routing and logistics associated with the water supply would be managed to ensure existing and Sizewell C traffic is not disrupted as a result.</p> <p>(ii) How would that be secured through the draft DCO?</p> <p>(iii) What further work is required to understand the programme and scope of works, and to determine the best measures to put in place?</p> <p>(iv) Please provide further details, for example, of anticipated trip generations and duration of works to support the view that the construction traffic generated by the preferred water supply strategy proposal would not change the conclusions of the transport cumulative assessment.</p> <p>(v) Please indicate if any updated information is available in relation to the temporary nature of the construction works and the extent of the works required for the installation of the water main.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative impact of water supply strategy</p> <p>The ES Addendum Volume 1: Environmental Statement Addendum Chapter 10 Project Wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects - Revision 1.0 [AS- 189] paragraph 10.4.258 states that overall the preferred water supply connection strategy would result in no new</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		or different significant effects than those reported in Volume 10, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-578]. Please confirm that that remains the position in the light of any updated information on that topic.
	Response	
Cu.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 3 Assessment of Project-wide Effects [APP-577] Table 3.1, identifies receptors or receptor groups where there is potential overlap of noise impacts from different elements of the project, and where two or more of the project elements could be close enough to receptors such that combined noise levels may have a significant effect. This includes Receptor 13 (Leiston Abbey, including Pro Corda music school) combined effects are therefore considered significant.</p> <p>(i) Please provide further details and the timing of the proposed bespoke assessment of impacts from the Sizewell C Project on the Pro Corda Music School at Leiston Abbey;</p> <p>(ii) Please indicate whether there has been any progress in relation to the provision of any additional mitigation requirements?</p> <p>(iii) Please explain exactly how that mitigation would be secured through planning obligations.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 3 Assessment of Project-wide Effects [APP-577] Table 3.1 identifies Receptor 14 (Lovers Lane / Sandy Lane Junction) as a location where the combined effects of the construction and construction road traffic noise may result in a perceived worsening of effects during the day during some early phase construction work at LEEIE.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Please explain further the role of professional judgment in assessing the combined impact of these two noise sources.</p> <p>(ii) How in practice would an exceedance of the SOAEL be determined and how would that be avoided through the application of the Noise Mitigation Scheme?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>[APP-577] Para 3.5.6 In terms of habitat loss and fragmentation, it is said that (i) impacts are considered to be <i>"temporarily moderate adverse and significant during the construction phase"</i> and (ii) that <i>"avoidance measures have been incorporated into the scheme design in the "associated design principles"</i>.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant state where these are secured. Please will it also explain what is the effect with those principles in place.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.40	The Applicant	<p>Project-wide effects</p> <p>[APP-577] In section 3.5, there are a number of cases where the argument for no significant project-wide effect is that there is no significant effect at the relevant individual sites, therefore there is no significant project-wide effect. But cannot several non-significant effects add up to a significant effect? Examples of paragraphs where this approach is taken are: 3.5.10; 3.5.12; 3.5.14; 3.5.15; 3.5.19; 3.5.21; 3.5.22. The Applicant's reply should not please be limited to those paragraphs but also address the issue generally across the ES.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Cu.1.41	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.8.30 – peak construction, breeding birds. This does not have a conclusion on effects. Please could the Applicant explain.
	Response	
Cu.1.42	The Applicant, ESC	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.8.33 – bats – this conclusion of no significant effect relies on an explicit assumption. How likely is that assumption to hold good?
	Response	
Cu.1.43	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.15.67. Assessment of cumulative effects of noise on harbour porpoise appears to be limited to the winter period or area only. Please could the Applicant point the ExA to the summer (and other seasons) assessment or clarify why winter alone is the correct approach. Is the answer para 9.2.7 of [APP-145]? Please could the Applicant submit an amended version of Fig 22.15 of [APP-333] to demonstrate this and confirm separation distances to the summer area?
	Response	
Cu.1.44	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.17.1 Assessment of cumulative navigational effects. This says schemes outside the 10 mile radius ZOI have been included if vessels may cross the route of AIL vessels for the Proposed Development, <i>that is</i> “if the transshipment base is at Harwich” (emphasis added). What happens if the transshipment base is not at Harwich? What other candidate locations are there?
	Response	
Cu.1.45	The Applicant	Cumulative effects with other plans etc [APP-578] Para 4.17.14. Presumably the reference in the heading to “construction” is a misprint for “operation”. But please will the Applicant confirm this.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
Cu.1.46	The Applicant	<p>Transboundary effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 5 Transboundary Effects, Appendix 5A: Long Form Transboundary Screening Matrix sets out the Applicant's response to a screening exercise using the matrix in Annex 1 of Advice Note Twelve. In relation to risk of accidents, reliance is placed upon the Nuclear Site Licence and the Euratom Treaty obligations. It indicates that the proposed UK EPR™ design of reactor has been the subject of a regulatory justification process.</p> <p>(i) Please confirm that reliance is no longer placed upon the Euratom Treaty obligations;</p> <p>(ii) Please clarify the stage of construction by which the Nuclear Site Licence must be in place; and</p> <p>(iii) Please indicate whether any further review of the proposed UK EPR™ design of reactor is anticipated and whether that review takes into account the latest available information on risk of accidents?</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.47	The Applicant	<p>Transboundary effects</p> <p>Ministry of Energy, Agriculture, the Environment and Nature – Germany and Digitalisation of the State of Schleswig-Holstein [RR-0801] expresses concern that the UK's withdrawal from Euratom may have a negative impact on reactor safety and radiation protection in relation to both existing plants and planned projects. The ES Volume 2 Chapter 27 Major Accidents and Disasters [APP-344] footnote 2 provides details of the position during the transition period for the UK exiting the EU and the Euratom Treaty. Please provide an update and/or any relevant changes to that information post Brexit.</p>
	Response	
Cu.1.48	The Applicant	<p>Transboundary effects</p> <p>ES Volume 10 Project-wide, Cumulative and Transboundary Effects, Chapter 5 Transboundary Effects [APP-580], paragraph 5.4.43, in relation to Major Accidents and</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Disasters recognises that without mitigation, such hazards and threats could result in significant environmental effects and might result in transboundary effects. Please explain in further detail the conclusion reached that following the implementation of the identified mitigation, all risks including any potential transboundary effects are considered to be tolerable or tolerable if as low as reasonably practicable and not significant.
	Response	
Cu.1.49	The Applicant	Transboundary effects There are a number of RR's and other submissions made under EIA Reg 22 including Belgian State [RR-0127], Danish Emergency Management Agency [RR-0265], National Planning Agency [RR-0876], Nucléaire Stop Kernenergie [RR-0909], Stowarzyszenie 'Wspólna Ziemia' (Association Common Earth) [RR-1163], Swedish NGO Office for Nuclear Waste Review and member org [RR-1197], Ministry of Energy, Agriculture, the Environment and Nature – Germany and Digitalisation of the State of Schleswig-Holstein [RR-0801], The Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management [RR 802] for the Netherlands and Wiener Plattform Atomkraftfrei [RR-1267] that raise transboundary issues. Please ensure that responses to the Reg 32 submissions are included as psrt of the comments on RRs.
	Response	
Cu.1.50	The Applicant	Transboundary effects Brigitte Artmann [RR-0155] expresses concern that the proposal as carried out to date is in breach of the Aarhus convention. Please respond to the specific points raised in relation to the requirements of this convention.
	Response	



Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 21 April 2021

Responses are due by Deadline 2: Wednesday 2 June 2021

PART 4 OF 6

DCO.1 [Draft Development Consent Order \(DCO\)](#)

FR.1 [Flood risk, ground water, surface water](#)

HW.1 [Health and wellbeing](#)

HE.1 [Historic environment \(terrestrial and marine\)](#)

LI.1 [Landscape impact, visual effects and design](#)

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	
DCO.1.0	The Applicant	Art 2. Definition of "commence" and the exclusions from it. The EM para 3.6. states that "the Environmental Statement does not indicate that these works would be likely to have significant environmental effects". Could this be expressed positively as "The ES indicates that these works are not likely to have significant effects"? Is there a statement in the ES that the excluded works are not likely to have significant effects.
	Response	
DCO.1.1	The Applicant	Art 2. Definition of "commence" and the exclusions from it. Given that e.g. the Sizewell B Relocation Works will involve decontamination, is this exception from the definition of "commence" appropriate?
	Response	
DCO.1.2	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	Art 2. Definition of "commence" and the exclusions from it. (i) Are the exclusions justified for all of the Proposed Development? (ii) Might it be appropriate to exclude later phases and to limit the exclusions to the earliest phases of the Proposed Development? In both (i) and (ii) please explain concisely why.
	Response	
DCO.1.3	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	Art 2 definition of "harbour" and the harbour provisions in general in the DCO. This refers to a harbour "to be constructed" by the undertaker. However, the harbour does not appear to comprise any construction (Works 2A – 2L are water intakes, outfalls and tunnels). Are there legal powers to designate a harbour, harbour authority and related matters without physical construction works to create the harbour?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.4	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	<p>Art 2 definitions of "harbour" and "Order limits".</p> <p>The harbour limits described in Art 51 and shown on the Works Plans (e.g.Key Plan 3) extend beyond the Order Limits. The ExA notes that the dDCO gives powers to do other things outside the Order limits. Please will the Applicant explain:</p> <p>(i) what is the rationale for where the line of the Order limits is drawn; and</p> <p>(ii) whether it is permissible and how for the order to apply outside the Order limits?</p> <p>(iii) confirm that the ES assesses the extent of any proposed works if they are outside the RLB.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Art 2 – definition of land.</p> <p>Is the reference to land covered by water intended to include (a) sea bed and (b) Crown interests in such "land"? If so, does this create any compulsory acquisition issues?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.6	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	<p>Art 2 – definition of "local planning authority".</p> <p>This defines the phrase to mean East Suffolk Council and its successors in title. Successors in title is a phrase more normally used in relation to land interests (title) than statutory functions. Please will the Applicant and Host Authorities consider whether the phrase "successors to its functions as local planning authority as defined in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990" would be more appropriate? The ExA consider this is probably what is intended given that the functions of the local planning authority specified in the DCO are largely of a development control nature.</p> <p>However, might it not be simpler simply to adopt the definition in the TCPA 1990 (s.1 is the relevant section, combined with s.336). That way, any local government</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>reorganisation or reallocation of planning functions will be taken through to the operation of the DCO automatically rather than relying on an interpretation of who is meant by the Secretary of State as the successor to the "title" or functions of ESC, which are wider than planning. The ExA is aware of the Inspectorate's guidance note's preference for naming authorities.</p> <p>If the intention of the definition is to ensure that the planning matters allocated to the local planning authority by the DCO are allocated to the district council rather than to the county (which is normally limited to minerals and waste planning) then the use of the TCPA definition could be refined to exclude the county council.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.7	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	<p>Art 2 – definition of "maintain" and Art 6 – power to maintain.</p> <p>The definition includes "alter, remove or reconstruct". On its face, that would include decommissioning and the construction of a new power station. The ExA doubts this is what is intended and notes that there is intended to be a limit by reference to new or materially different environmental effects. However, lesser reconstructions may pass that test but nonetheless be development which ought to be regulated by planning control?</p> <p>(i) Might the following definition be adequate: "maintain" includes inspect, repair, adjust, alter, clear, refurbish or improve, and any derivative of "maintain" is to be construed accordingly", with the addition of the prohibition relating to maintenance causing environmental effects?</p> <p>(ii) If the Host Authorities consider that the current definition is too wide, would they please give examples of development it permits but which the Host Authority considers should be subject to planning control? Would they please also consider whether the ExA's suggestion above would deal with their concern and give reasons?</p> <p>(iii) If the Applicant disagrees with the ExA's suggestion, please will it, in answering the question, explain clearly the intent of the breadth of the definition and reflect on whether it ought to be reduced?</p> <p>(iv) See also the ExA's questions on Sch 2 para 1 (tailpieces in the context of EIA). Taking that also into account, how does the Applicant expect that the prohibition relating</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>to maintenance causing environmental effects would work in practice and be enforced? How would the local planning know in advance of an item of maintenance that materially new / different effects would be caused by the maintenance? What action would they be able to take? Or is the intention and practice simply going to be that maintenance which breaches the prohibition would be without approval, a breach of the DCO and therefore a criminal offence?</p> <p>Please will the Host Authorities also consider question (iv) and respond?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Art 2 "marine works" definition.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant list what development and works are included in the phrase "and any other works below mean high water springs authorised by this Order".</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.9	The Applicant, the Host Authorities, MMO	<p>Art 2, definition of "mean high water springs".</p> <p>Does the time period need to be specified?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.10	The Applicant, National Grid	<p>Art 2, definition of National Grid.</p> <p>This definition encompasses real estate ownership ("successors in title"), personal estate ownership ("assigns"), agents ("any other person exercising its powers"), and functions such as statutory functions, but not limited to those ("any other person exercising its powers or performing the same functions").</p> <p>The three categories will not necessarily all be kept together (as the drafting recognises) and the references in the dDCO to National Grid may therefore devolve onto more than one entity. For example land might be sold by National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET plc) to X and its transmission functions be transferred to a different body. Are both to have the rights, duties, powers and privileges of NGET? Will it always be intended and acceptable that rights or duties, powers and privileges of (NGET plc) under the DCO can be held by more than one entity at the same time and that different aspects of the business of NGET plc may be held by different entities?</p> <p>At first sight it appears to the ExA that this is undesirable and that it would be better to distinguish between property rights on the one hand and statutory functions on the other. Are there other types of functions?</p> <p>Please will the Applicant and National Grid each explain what aspects of the involvement of National Grid Electricity Transmission plc are intended to be covered and explain either why the current drafting is appropriate or what changes should be made?</p> <p>Their attention is also drawn to Art 9(7) which allows transfer to amongst other "National Grid or its statutory successor". The reference to statutory successor both makes the point raised above about the range of aspects of the business of NGET and appears to be otiose if the definition remains as drafted.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.11	The Applicant	Art 2 – order land.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please will the Applicant confirm that the Land Plans and the Book of Reference refer to the same land, neither more nor less? If there are differences, please explain what they are, including by reference to a plan.
	Response	
DCO.1.12	The Applicant	Art 2 – definition of Secretary of State. Why is this needed? It is contrary to the Inspectorate’s advice and to normal statutory drafting practice. The Applicant will be aware that the business of government is not infrequently allocated to different or new departments from time to time and that some departments are abolished altogether when their functions are moved to others.
	Response	
DCO.1.13	ESC	Definition of Sizewell B relocated facilities permission. Please will ESC confirm that this is the correct description, date and reference number?
	Response	
DCO.1.14	The Applicant	Art 2 – definition of Sizewell B relocation works, “Work No. ID”. Please will the Applicant correct the typographical error. Presumably it should read “Work No. 1D”.
	Response	
DCO.1.15	The Applicant	Article 2 - definition of special direction, says “Special directions to vessels” is article 65 but the correct article appears to be 67. Please will the Applicant correct in the next draft?
	Response	
DCO.1.16	The Applicant	Art 2 - Definition of “SZC construction works” – “associated with” appears to go wider than the actual construction of Works 1A – 1D. Please will the Applicant indicate where it ends and consider amending the definition so as to apply only to the works of constructing those Works.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.17	The Applicant, Host Authorities, EA	<p>Art 2 – definition of watercourse.</p> <p>This is as follows: “includes all rivers, streams, ditches, drains, canals, cuts, culverts, dykes, sluices, sewers and passages through which water flows except a public sewer or drain: and”</p> <p>(i) It appears to include private storm water drains, private foul drains and private sewers. Whether this appropriate will depend amongst other factors on the use made of the word “watercourse” in the rest of the DCO. Are the Applicant and Host Authorities satisfied that the definition is appropriate in all those circumstances? If not, please explain why and suggest any amendments to the drafting.</p> <p>(ii) Please will the Applicant consider whether the word “and” is correct at the end of the definition and make any necessary change in the next version of the DCO?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.18	The Applicant, Host Authorities	<p>Art 2(5) – references to statutory bodies.</p> <p>This reads as follows: “References to any statutory body includes that body’s successor bodies from time to time that have jurisdiction over the authorised development”. Why are bodies who do not have jurisdiction over the development excluded from the reference. Are all the references in the DCO to statutory bodies only to such bodies with jurisdiction over the development?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Art 2(7): "A reference in the Schedules to a "relevant site" is a reference to the site of that name shown in the Works Plans, Rights of Way Plans and Land Plans".</p> <p>(i) Please could the Applicant explain what is meant by this interpretation rule? There is no site named "relevant site".</p> <p>(ii) The ExA infers that Art 5(7) is directing the reader to find the location of the sites listed in the schedules under a column headed "relevant site" by finding the sites referred to on the Works Plans Rights of Way Plans and Land Plans. Is that right? However, beginning only with the Main Development Site ("MDS"), which plans and which notation in the legend define it? Whilst sheets 3-10 of the Works Plans are titled "Main development site and rail works plans" where is the reader told what is the MDS? The ExA has not carried out a similar enquiry with regard to the other sites shown in columns headed "relevant site".</p> <p>(iii) In addition, please could the Applicant provide a list of the relevant sites and explain how to find them?</p> <p>(iii) The phrase "relevant site" also appears in the requirements, Schedule (Sch) 2, R 24. Is the same approach intended? It does not appear so from the context.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.20	Response	<p>Art 2. "main development site".</p> <p>(i) The definition is "the land within which Work No.1 may be constructed as shown on the Works Plans". However, Works Plans sheets 1-10 and Key plans 3 and 4 are titled "Main development site and rail works plans". In addition, Sheet 5 shows works which are neither Work No.1 nor rail works. The shading for Work No 1 and Work No. 4A are not always obviously distinct unless they are side by side. The legend to Key plan 4 says the dark shading is "order work areas", whereas on 1-5 and 10 it is 1A and in 8 although there is shading it does not get definition in the legend. The position is not entirely clear, at least not at first sight. Please will the Applicant supply a new plan showing only the area of Work No.1 if that is indeed the intended meaning. It would be helpful to refer to that plan in the definition.</p> <p>Doc 7.2 makes reference to these main site development plans at para 2.2.1 "<i>Whilst the Sizewell C Project does not meet the thresholds defined in the Planning Act 2008 for highway and railway NSIPS, the equivalent information is included on the relevant plans in</i></p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<i>Book 2 Plans: Main Development Site Plans (Doc Ref. 2.5)</i> ". Please will the Applicant list exactly which plans it considers to be the Main Development Site Plans, and which are the plans with the "equivalent information" to meet the criteria in Reg 6(2) APFP?
	Response	
DCO.1.21	The Applicant	<p>Art 4(1) – vertical limits of deviation.</p> <p>This permits unfettered vertical deviations, subject to the Requirements and provisions in Art 11 relating to streets. Art 4(2) limits vertical deviation to 1 metre for Work 4C (Saxmundham – Leiston branch line) and Works 11 and 12 (Two village bypass and the Sizewell Link Road).</p> <p>The ExA see that the Requirements contain some references to Parameter Plans. But to take requirement 11 as an example, it is not immediately clear that Work Nos. 1A (a) to (e) are subject to the Parameter Plans (though any variations from the Approved Plans and the design principles in Ch 5 of the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement must accord with the Main Development Site Operational Siting and Height Parameters and two of the three Main Development Site, Operational Parameter Plans). (to be found at SZC Book 2, 2.5, [APP-018]).</p> <p>Similarly, a somewhat close reading of the Requirements is necessary to see which Parameter Plans have been applied to which Work, whether they are applied to the right Works, to ascertain whether the whole of the Proposed Development is limited by the Parameters Plans and whether or not all the Parameters Plans have been applied.</p> <p>As the ExA reads the Requirements and the rest of the DCO there appears to be no general overriding rule that the development must not exceed the limits in the Parameter Plans. A clear straightforward limitation in the DCO preventing the Proposed Development from exceeding the Parameter Plans (which the ExA assumes describe the limits of what was assessed on normal Rochdale principles) would be helpful.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Please will the Applicant insert such a provision in the next draft of the DCO or alternatively explain why it would be inappropriate?</p> <p>(ii) Please will the Applicant also provide a reconciliation of the Parameter Plans in the DCO with the project assessed in the ES?</p> <p>Please will the Applicant specify and explain the power for Art 4 – it is not referred to in the EM?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.22	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	Sizewell B relocated facilities permission Art 5(1)(b). Is limiting the exception to prior breaches appropriate? For example, are there any ongoing restoration or maintenance conditions in the Sizewell B relocated facilities permission which should continue to be enforceable?
	Response	
DCO.1.23	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	<p>Art 5(3).</p> <p>Is this inserted simply for the avoidance of doubt or is there a specific concern that Art 5 restricts any other powers in the DCO?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.24	The Host Authorities	<p>Art 5(5).</p> <p>Will the Host Authorities indicate if they are content with Art 5(5) and the list of conditions and corresponding requirements deemed to be satisfied set out in Sch 8</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.25	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	<p>Art 5(6).</p> <p>What happens if the undertaker and the local planning authority do not agree?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.26	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	<p>Art 9(6).</p> <p>The EM states (para 4.25) "As the undertaker will be entering into a section 106 agreement with local planning authorities, this provision is necessary to ensure that the transferee complies with all obligations etc. that have been imposed on the undertaker, as well as ensuring that the undertaker is released from liability upon transfer (given that it would no longer be involved in the authorised development). This approach is standard under section 106 agreements".</p> <p>(i) Whilst confirmation that planning obligations are to bind the transferee / lessee is welcome, why would the planning obligations under s.106 TCPA not bind the transferee under s.106(3)? Or is this paragraph addressing transfer / lease of the benefit of the DCO without transfer / lease of land?</p> <p>(ii) Should transfer / lease of benefit without transfer / lease of land be permitted?</p> <p>(iii) If so, is it proper to allow the transferor to escape from its obligations in the s.106 agreement?</p> <p>(iv) Is it appropriate in the case of any transfer or lease on this project to allow the original covenantor to escape from its obligations under s.106?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.27	The Applicant, the Host Authorities	<p>Art 9.</p> <p>(i) 9(1) Is it appropriate to transfer the CA powers in this DCO? The Applicant is required to demonstrate adequate resources to pay compensation. A transferee may not be have the same resources and the article does not expressly require that they are shown to exist.</p> <p>(ii) 9(1)(b) Should the CA powers be lettable? What would be the lessee's title to land compulsorily acquired and to whom would such land be transferred on CA? Does CA by a lessee raise any difficulties?</p> <p>(iii) 9(1) and (2) What would be the criteria for the SoS to decide whether or not to consent?</p> <p>(iv) Art 9(4). Is it appropriate for decisions of the Secretary of State on what is largely a regulatory issue to be subject to arbitration?</p> <p>(v) Art 9(6)(a). It is clear that the alienation provisions of Art 9 allow alienation of part of the land or part of the benefits. It would appear that Art 9(6)(a) attempts to limit the</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>burdens transferred to those “imposed by virtue of the provisions to which the benefit relates”. However, it is unusual for burdens to be divided up across the land or benefits. And burdens may be imposed on the whole development or project. Please will the Applicant amend the article so as to ensure that burdens, whether they relate to the whole benefit of the order or only the benefit transferred, bind the transferee or lessee as the case may be?</p> <p>(vi) Art 9(6). Para (b) – how can “benefits” be enforced “against” the undertaker (original or otherwise). What is the Applicant’s intention by this provision?</p> <p>(Vii) Art 9(6). If the intent is to release the transferring undertaker from liability, is it really appropriate to release the undertaker where only a lease is created? The lessor undertaker should surely remain liable and take whatever indemnities are appropriate from the lessee. What would the position be at the end of the lease, whether it runs its full term (and the term is not known at this point in time) or is terminated for breach?</p> <p>(viii) Art 9(6)(c). It is good to make it clear that development consent obligations are intended to bind the transferee / lessee. Please will the Applicant state whether there are any concerns that they would not do so? Is this paragraph seeking to cut down the provisions of s.106 TCPA 1990 which make obligations bind persons deriving title?</p> <p>What would be the position if Art 9(8) is not complied with? Please will the Applicant amend the article so as to make it clear that in such a case the transfer or lease would be invalid?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.28	The Host Authorities	<p>Art 10(1).</p> <p>This provides a defence to statutory nuisances relating to dust (and other effluvia), light and noise. Are the Host Authorities satisfied that the controls on these nuisances in the DCO justify the inclusion of this defence?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Art 10(2).</p> <p>The ExA suggests that the words “will not apply” are changed to “does not apply” so as to meet statutory drafting advice.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.30	The Applicant, SCC	Part 3 (Arts 11 – 23) generally. Please will the Applicant and SCC explain how the adoption of new roads is addressed.
	Response	
DCO.1.31	The Applicant	Arts 12(a) and 23(3). The former permits the breaking up and opening of (amongst other things) sewers and drains. The latter prohibits the creation of openings into sewers and drains except in accordance with (amongst other things) approved plans. How do they inter-relate and work together. Is the first subject to the second?
	Response	
DCO.1.32	The Applicant	Art 14. (i) Please will the Applicant explain what is meant by the word “possession” of land in Art 14(5)(a)? (ii) EM – para 5.33. Please will the Applicant explain more clearly how this provision is within the powers of the PA2008 and specifically what it is saying and its reasoning with regard to the power in Sch 5, para 17 (“stopping up highways”). The ExA notes that the definition of “street” in Art 2, to which their attention is drawn, is wide and includes what might be thought to be private spaces, such as passages, squares and courts “and any land laid out as a way whether or not it is ... a footpath or not”. Is it the Applicants’ case that these are within Sch 5 para 17 of the PA2008? Not all “streets” are, in law, highways. This question is also relevant to Art 17.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.33	The Applicant	Art 18 Use of private roads for construction. The Applicant in its EM para 5.56 relies on s.120(3) as the power for this provision. Does it also consider Sch 5 para 2 applies, which allows interference with rights over land?
	Response	
DCO.1.34	The Applicant, SCC	Art 22(5)(b). In line with the ExA's earlier comments on identifying authorities by reference to function rather than name, the ExA invites the Applicant and SCC to consider whether it would be better to specify the capacity (e.g. highway authority if that is the case) in which this power is to be exercised.
	Response	
DCO.1.35	The Applicant	Art 23(5). The EM says this is a departure from DCOs it does not specify. The ExA assumes that the Applicant is referring to those at Silvertown, Wrexham, Triton Knoll and Wylfa (draft) referred to in para 6.6. The justification for 23(5) given is that "this exemption is necessary to ensure that the undertaker can undertake the necessary works to give effect to article 3 of the Order (Development consent, etc. granted by Order) even where such works may damage or interfere with watercourses.". How is this unique to the Proposed Development? This justification would appear to apply to all DCOs. Please can the Applicant explain if this is indeed their view, and if that is so, why the provision is necessary in this case. Or are other DCOs lacking?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Art 23.</p> <p>(i) Please will the Applicant confirm that nothing in Art 23 contravenes s.150 of PA 2008?</p> <p>(ii) Is it appropriate to impose deemed approval provisions on private individuals? If it is, should that be on condition that they are warned that silence may become consent, and warned shortly before the deemed approval period expires?</p> <p>(iii) At what point in time is a s.23 notice received?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Art 24(2)(a).</p> <p>Please will the Applicant explain what is meant by “in the vicinity”? Is there a limit? What is intended to be the consenting position where a building is listed or in a conservation area? Please bear in mind that this power might be exercised some 15 years hence.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.38	DfT, BPA, Chamber of Shipping, UKMPG, Trinity House, Maritime and Coastguard Agency, MoJ	<p>Part 6 – Harbour powers.</p> <p>Please consider and comment on Part 6 of the dDCO (comprising Arts 46 – 75) which creates a harbour (without walls) in the area of Greater Sizewell Bay adjacent to the Proposed Development. The ExA is interested in hearing your views in particular on the application of the Harbours, Docks and Piers Clauses Act 1847 with amendments (see Art 46), but that is not intended to limit any comments you wish to make.</p> <p>The MoJ is requested to comment on the offences and penalties created by Part 6. Please will the MoJ address specifically whether the fact that Part 6 incorporates the standard “boilerplate” for Harbour Orders addresses concerns?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.39	The Applicant	Part 6.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please explain the mischiefs which the creation of a harbour is intended to address and its purpose.
	Response	
DCO.1.40	The Applicant	Part 6. Please supply a copy and explanation of any similar provisions, harbour order or other creation made in relation to Sizewell A and B (or either of them) to address the same issues as Part 6. If there are none, how was the mischief Part 6 is designed to address dealt with in those cases?
	Response	
DCO.1.41	The Applicant	Art 46(2) to (8).
	Response	The wording "must have effect" is unusual. Would simply "has effect" be more appropriate?
DCO.1.42	The Applicant, MMO	Art 46(1). (i) This incorporates s.63 of the Harbours Docks and Piers Clauses Act 1847 which prohibits vessels from lying near the entrance of harbour or dock without permission "as soon as the harbour or dock shall be so far completed as to admit vessels to enter therein". How is it envisaged that this operates for a harbour without walls, the entire boundary of which is its entrance, and what is its purpose? Is it practical from either the point of view of the undertaker or from the masters of vessels? Also from what point in time is the harbour "so far completed as to admit vessels to enter therein" in this case? (ii) It also incorporates s.74 of the same Act which makes vessel owners responsible for damage done to the harbour etc and works connected with it by any "vessel or float of timber". Is this justifiable and practical for a harbour which is not itself protected by walls or any other barrier? It would appear that the owner of drifting timber or a drifting vessel from absolutely anywhere would be liable, notwithstanding that damage to this harbour would not have been foreseeable from the place where the timber or vessel broke free or was cast adrift.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) It also incorporates s.84 of the same Act. Should the incorporation expressly limit the offence to summary jurisdiction in order to meet s.120 and Sch 5 para 32B of the PA2008?
	Response	
DCO.1.43	DfT, The Applicant	Art 50. In relation to this article the MMO has commented, " <i>In relation to Article 50 'Application of Pilotage Act 1987' to become a Competent Harbour Authority (CHA), the MMO notes that a CHA is in relation to Pilotage and is not the same as a Statutory Harbour Authority (SHA). The MMO does not process the creation of CHAs; the method to become one is under separate legislation from the Harbours Act 1964. DfT would be the body responsible for creating CHAs. Therefore, the MMO advise that PINS should discuss this with DfT</i> " [RR-0744]." Please will the DfT advise? Please will the Applicant and DfT submit a statement of common ground if possible recording areas of agreement and disagreement on this issue.
	Response	
DCO.1.44	The Applicant	Art 51(2). Why would there be a discrepancy between Sch 19 and the works plans?
	Response	
DCO.1.45	The Applicant, MMO	Art 62. (i) This begins with an A which appears to be a typographical error. (ii) Why is Art 62(1) needed? What mischief is it designed to overcome? Or is it simply setting out the circumstances in which the rest of Art 62 takes effect? Please will the Applicant clarify the drafting. (iii) Is the reference to "grant" intended to include the grant of a freehold? (iv) Is the grant of a lease or freehold under Art 62(1) which includes provisions referred to in Art 62(2) intended to or capable of relieve the undertaker of the duties and functions delegated and the duties, responsibilities and consequences of their exercise? If so, how is that justified?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(v) Is the intent to put the lessee / grantee in the same position as the undertaker in the exercise of those functions, both positive and negative, both criminal and civil obligations and consequences?
	Response	
DCO.1.46	The Applicant, MMO	Art 64(9). This provides for byelaws to be available at the harbour master's office. Should they not also be available online?
	Response	
DCO.1.47	MMO	The ExA notes the MMO's concerns expressed in its RR, particularly at para 1.1.4, and its offer of further advice. Will the MMO please give its fullest advice in its written representation and follow through any responses, comments and so on to these ExQs on the Harbour Powers.
	Response	
DCO.1.48	The Applicant, MMO	Part 6 (other than Art 75). Please will the Applicant and the MMO include in their Statement of Common Ground the provisions in Part 6 setting out clearly the areas of agreement and of disagreement.
	Response	
DCO.1.49	The Applicant	Art 77. This applies to agreements for leases of all or part of the Proposed Development and to agreements for its construction, maintenance, use or operation, so far as such an agreement relates to the terms on which land is to be provided. It provides (Art 77(2)) that no enactment or rule of law in relation to the rights and obligations of the landlord or tenant is to prejudice the operation of the agreement. (i) Is the intention that it should apply to the lease granted by the agreement for lease? It seems to the ExA that this is probably the case, but it would be helpful if this could be clarified and then the drafting adjusted if necessary.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(ii) Is the intention to disapply tenant protections such as the Landlord & Tenant Act 1954?</p> <p>(iii) Is, for example, s.146 of the Law of Property Act 1925 also disapplied, which protects tenants facing forfeiture by giving them time to remedy the breach before the lease is terminated?</p> <p>(iv) The ExA are not experts in landlord and tenant law. The examples given are merely those which spring to mind. But are not all the rights and obligations of landlords and tenants the creation of rules of law or enactments? Does not this provision remove all such laws in which case how are the rights and obligations of the parties regulated?</p> <p>(v) The ExA is obviously concerned and the Secretary of State will wish to be assured that if the DCO is granted, the Proposed Development will actually go ahead. At present the ExA is concerned that Art 77 will adversely affect the ability of the undertaker to obtain tenants and funding.</p> <p>The ExA notes that the DCO for Hinkley Point C does not appear among the list of precedents for this Article in the EM and presumably did not contain an equivalent. Will the Applicants please reflect on this Article? What mischief is it designed to address? If the Applicant wishes to persist with it, please will the Applicant submit to the Examination very clear legal advice that Art 77 does not affect the fundability of the Proposed Development, the ability to let it, and the ability to construct, maintain, use and operate it. In short, that Art 77 does not prejudice the full implementation of the project on reasonable terms.</p> <p>The EM, para 9.6, states that the power to make Art 77 is s.120(5)(a) PA2008. However, that only applies to statutory provisions. Art 77 disapplies rules of law as well. If the Applicant is persisting with Art 77 please will it explain what power it suggests the Secretary of State adopts for this?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.50	The Applicant, The Host Authorities	<p>Art 79.</p> <p>This allows felling and other tree surgery to any tree or shrub "near any part of the [Proposed] Development". How far is near? Could a maximum distance be added?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.51	The Applicant	Art 80(3). Why would certified documents, which are to be submitted after the making of the DCO (see Art 80(1)), refer to draft versions of the DCO? Should those documents not be updated to refer to the DCO as made?
	Response	
DCO.1.52	The Applicant	Art 81. At what point in time are documents deemed to have been served (or received, depending on the wording of the article under which the document is sent).
	Response	
DCO.1.53	The Applicant	Art 82(2). Is it appropriate for decisions of the Secretary of State to be subject to arbitration? The Hornsea Three DCO includes an explicit provision that decisions of the Secretary of State and MMO are not to be subject to arbitration (see Art 37(2)).
	Response	
DCO.1.54	Response	Art 83 and Sch 23 – procedure for approvals, consents and appeals. (i) The ExA invites comments in general on Sch 23 from the Host Authorities who will be the recipients of most applications and appeals to which Sch 23 will apply. (ii) Parties to which the deemed consent provisions in the Articles of the dDCO apply are also invited to comment on Sch 23, and their attention is drawn to the EM para 9.25 and following. (iii) In para 1(2) of Sch 23, there are two different time periods for discharge of requirements depending on whether consultation is necessary. The shorter period, 5 weeks, is shorter than the period specified in the model Sch at Appendix 1 of the Inspectorate's Advice Note 15. Whilst the ExA note the Applicant's more generous 8 week period in consultation cases, what is the justification for taking a week off the standard period? (iv) Fees. The ExA notes that there is no drafting at present and that the Applicant hopes to cover these with a performance or s.106 agreement. Until such time as that is

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>concluded satisfactorily, the ExA would prefer to see drafting on fees in the dDCO. Please will the Applicant insert in the next draft of the dDCO the wording to be found at Sch 2 Part 2 para 3 of the Northampton Gateway DCO as made, (2019/1358). The ExA is not, by requiring this, expressing any view as to the desirability or fairness of those provisions.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant explain why para 3(11) of Sch 23 which reads: "the appointed person must have regard to Communities and Local Government Circular 03/2009 or any circular or guidance which may from time to time replace it" refers to Circular 03/2009 rather than "the Planning Practice Guidance published by the Department for Communities and Local Government on 6th March 2014 or any circular or guidance which may from time to time replace it" which is the wording in Appendix 1 of AN15?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.55	The Applicant	<p>Art 85.</p> <p>Has the Applicant obtained all necessary consents from the Crown to carry out the Proposed Development?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.56	<p>The Applicant (I) – (v)</p> <p>The Applicant and the Host Authorities (vi)</p>	<p>Sch 1.</p> <p>(i) Please will the Applicant supply a list of which parts of the Proposed Development ("authorised development" as defined in the dDCO) are associated development?</p> <p>(ii) Please will the Applicant clarify how it is lawful to include the temporary accommodation campus (Work No 3) given that PA2008 s.115(2)(b) says that associated development may not consist of or include the construction of one or more dwellings.</p> <p>(iii) The ExA notes that Doc 7.2 states at para 2.2.1: "Whilst the Sizewell C Project does not meet the thresholds defined in the Planning Act 2008 for highway and railway NSIPS, the equivalent information is included on the relevant plans in Book 2 Plans: Main Development Site Plans (Doc Ref. 2.5)".</p> <p>(iv) Please will the Applicant clarify how it is that Works 4A, 4B, 4C and 4D (individually or together in whatever combination) which include the construction of a 4.5 km railway line which at first sight are within s.14(1)(k) and s.25(1) are not a separate NSIP or NSIPs. In doing so please address each of the tests in PA2008 s.25.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(v) Please will the Applicant also clarify in the same way how it is that Works 11A and 11B do not constitute an NSIP or NSIPs? In doing so please address each of the tests in PA2008 s.22.</p> <p>(vi) Please will the Applicant and Host Authorities comment on whether, in the event that they do constitute a separate NSIP or NSIPs, the result is that the criteria and policies for such NSIPs should be applied and whether there are any other consequences for the Examination and the SoS's decision?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.57	The Applicant	<p>Sch 1 Part 1.</p> <p>Work No. 1A, para (h) states that the work includes "buildings, structures and plant within the 'ancillary structures', including (but not limited to)—...". Please will the Applicant show what controls there are on the extent of these and how the full range has been subject to environmental assessment or that there are limits so as to ensure they do not trigger the need for such assessment.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.58	The Applicant	<p>The Applicant's response [AS-006] to the first procedural decision [PD-005] Annex A, para A6 is noted. Please will the Applicant explain fully and clearly how the "structures and plant" and "associated structures and plant" which appear in Work No.1A(f) and (g) respectively after the word "including" are described in Chapter 7 and thus have been subject to assessment in the other chapters of the ES assessing the main site. The alternative would appear to be to remove those words from the DCO.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.59	The Applicant	<p>Work No. 1A (w), temporary and permanent accesses [PD-005] and [AS-006].</p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant's replies to [PD-005] in [AS-006] paras 4.7</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.60	The Applicant	There are various ES documents which refer to the Combined Heat and Power Plant (CHP) for the temporary accommodation as being retained during the operation of the plant. Please explain how this has been assessed through the ES and how it would be delivered through the DCO which lists it under Work No 3 'Temporary Accommodation' and ensures upon completion of construction its removal under R16. [4]
	Response	
DCO.1.61	The Applicant, ESC, MMO, Natural England	<p>Sch 1 Part 1. Work No 2.</p> <p>The routes of the tunnels are not shown. Please will the Applicant explain why. Please also confirm that whether shown or not, they will not extend outside the Order Limits or the limits to the Works comprised in Work No. 2 shown on the Works Plans.</p> <p>Work numbers 2B and 2D shown on the works plans indicate the separation between the cooling water intakes for units 1 and 2.</p> <p>Can the applicant explain the separation distances between them, which presumably accounts for tunnelling for unit 1 (work no. 2A) being 200m shorter than the corresponding water intake for unit 2 (work no. 2C)?</p> <p>Whilst the intake locations are set out on the works plans, the limits of deviation for the bored tunnels themselves are unlimited within the harbour area as shown on the works plans. This also applies to work no. 2E, 2G, 2I and 2K, which extend between work no 1A and terminate at work 2F, 2H, 2J and 2L respectively Can the applicant confirm what assumptions have been made regarding their alignment within the ES and HRA, and why more defined limits of deviation cannot be set out on the works plans.</p> <p>ESC, MMO and Natural England may also wish to comment on this.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.62	The Applicant, MMO, Environment Agency	Sch 1 Part 1, Work No. 2B. This includes the phrase "capital dredging". The ExA's understanding of this is that it means "dredging to a depth not previously dredged, or to a depth not dredged within the last 10 years" (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/dredging). Is that the meaning which the Applicant intends and is it an accepted definition? Would it be helpful to include this in the definitions? If not, why not? And what alternative wording does the Applicant propose?
	Response	
DCO.1.63	The Applicant	Sch 1 Part 1. Work No 4. Please will the Applicant explain why Work 4A stops at Work 1A when Work 4B goes inside 4A? See e.g. Works Plans, sheets 7 and 8.
	Response	
DCO.1.64	The Applicant	Sch 1 Part 1. Work No 4. Please will the Applicant supply a clearly labelled drawing showing where these works are in relation to other features, especially the level crossings in Work No. 4C, at a scale of 1:25,000. If this could be done on the latest Ordnance Survey sheet that would be convenient.
	Response	
DCO.1.65	The Applicant	Sch 1 Part 1, Work No. 8. This is in square brackets. Please will the Applicant point the ExA to the provision in the application documents which sets out whether or not this provision is to be included in the final DCO?
	Response	
DCO.1.66	The Applicant, SCC	Sch 1 Part 1, Work No. 9, para (b). Is reinstatement of the A12 alignment in some 60 years time the appropriate course? Or does "operational use" refer to use of the Northern park and ride? If the latter, some clarificatory wording would seem sensible.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.67	The Applicant	Sch 1 Part 1, Work No. 12D. Should the sentence which begins "the location of the below works ..." be moved to the end of 12D and read "The location of the above works ...", or to the opening of the description of Work No. 12?
	Response	
DCO.1.68	The Applicant	Sch 1 Part 2, Other Associated Development. Please explain how this is limited by the Parameter Plans.
	Response	
DCO.1.69	The Applicant, ESC	Sch 1 Part 2, Other Associated Development. The Works in Sch 1 Part 2 may be carried out during both the construction period and the operational period which is some 60 years. They apply also to maintenance. Many of them are works which would normally require planning consent. For example para (b) would allow new drainage systems; (c) allows stacks and chimneys; (i) allows new amenity buildings; (i) also allows "associated structures and plant; and (i) also allows associated post-operation phase work" without stating with what they are to be associated (the post-operation phase is presumably some 60-70 years hence and includes the decommissioning phase); (k) allows extensive alterations to highways; (n) includes habitat creation; (o) includes works for the protection of land or structures; and (p) allows "such other works as may be necessary or expedient" for construction, operation and maintenance (with a reference to environmental effects). (i) Is it justifiable to have such extensive powers in relation to the operation and maintenance of the Proposed Development? (ii) Is the location of the works limited to the Order Limits? (iii) What will be the constraints in the DCO if made on the development they permit? (iv) The EM para 10.4 says they are "minor works". Where is such a limit set out in the dDCO?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(v) Please will the Applicant supply a reconciliation of the works described in Sch 1 Pt 2 with the development assessed in the ES?
	Response	
DCO.1.70	The Applicant	Sch 1 – works which include parking. Please see questions 8-12 of Annex A to the First Procedural Decision [PD-005] and subsequent responses and observations. The ExA is of the view that the difficulties it has experienced in locating (or not) these facilities within the ES, leading to the exchanges following Annex A to [PD-005], demonstrates the need for a list in the DCO of all the parking facilities, with their Work No., location, a name, number of spaces to be provided for different modes of transport and the triggers by when they are to be operational, as suggested in [PD-009]. A Requirement would secure compliance with the capacity and triggers. Such a trigger could be phase related. Unless this has already been included in the current draft DCO, please will the Applicant amend the DCO accordingly in the next version.
	Response	
DCO.1.71	The Applicant	Sch 2 (Requirements). This does not have its related article number in the heading. Please will the Applicant correct this in the next draft?
	Response	
DCO.1.72	The Applicant	Sch 2 para 1(2). Should the reference to Art 76 be to Art 80?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.73	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Schedule 2 para 1(3).</p> <p>This paragraph is relevant to approvals of details or documents under a requirement <i>"where compliance with a document contains the wording "unless otherwise agreed" by the discharging authority"</i>. The approval is not to be given unless the changes or deviations have been demonstrated to the discharging authority not to give rise to <i>"any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those assessed in the environmental information"</i>.</p> <p>Environmental assessment is a process which assesses not effects but projects to see what significant effects the project is likely to have.</p> <p>(i) Why is comparison with assessed effects relevant? Those effects will include things found to have various degrees of significance, which may then have been mitigated by for example secondary or tertiary mitigation.</p> <p>(ii) Should the assessment instead be against the position at the time of seeking the "unless otherwise agreed" - the baseline may have changed by then. If there is to be a comparison with the current assessment, or the assessment after mitigation, what is the appropriate documentation against which the comparison should be made and how is it to be identified and accessed?</p> <p>(iii) How is the decision on effects to be taken? Could the "subsequent application" approach in the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017/572 be applied by the DCO to the approvals addressed by para 1(3) of Sch 2 and provide a suitable procedure? The ExA notes that the subsequent approvals process incorporates a screening process so as to weed out matters not needing EIA.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.74	The Applicant, ESC	<p>Sch 2 Art 1(4).</p> <p>This exempts external projections such as plant rooms and telecommunications infrastructure from the Parameter Plans. Such items can be sizeable.</p> <p>(i) Please will the Applicant explain what constraints and regulation will exist on their design, size and location in the DCO or s.106 agreement?</p> <p>(ii) How have they been environmentally assessed?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) Please will ESC also consider this and indicate what constraints or regulation they consider is in the DCO or s.106 and indicate whether they are content with that, or propose different controls?
	Response	
DCO.1.75	The Applicant, ESC	Art 1(5). Is not the default meaning for the phrase "commencement of development" rather counterintuitive? Please will the Applicant consider reverting to the position that the phrase means commencement of any part of the Proposed Development? This would be consistent with the definition of "commence" in Art 2 of the dDCO. Please will ESC also consider and comment?
	Response	
DCO.1.76	The Applicant, ESC	R2 and (in Revision 1) R3 both refer to "removal and reinstatement" of the authorised development. Whilst this is so as to regulate such matters, what is "removal and reinstatement" this intended to cover?
	Response	
DCO.1.77	The Applicant, ESC	R2 introduces the obligation to comply with the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP). What happens on the current wording in the event of inconsistency between the CoCP and the DCO? Is it necessary to state anything on that? It should also be borne in mind that the ES relies on the CoCP in its conclusions on significance of effects.
	Response	
DCO.1.78	The Applicant, ESC	R4. (i) Please will the Applicant collate where the ES sets out the need and content of ecological monitoring which is referred to in this requirement? Please will it also explain

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>how R4 complies with the need for EIA prior to decision in the light of <u>R v. Cornwall CC ex p Hardy</u> Env L R 25; [2001] JPL 786?</p> <p>(ii) Why is the terrestrial ecology monitoring plan confined to the works listed on R4? Should it not be required for all the Works?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.79	ESC	<p>R6, site clearance.</p> <p>Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the drawings referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.80	The Applicant, ESC	<p>R7.</p> <p>(i) How is the proper implementation of the water levels management plan to be enforced?</p> <p>(ii) R7 concerns the Water Monitoring and Response Strategy but in 7(3) it is called the Site Water Mitigation and Response Strategy, which would appear to be incorrect Please will the Applicant consider, respond and amend as necessary.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.81	ESC	<p>R8, temporary buildings.</p> <p>Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the drawings referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Is the chapter no. correct?</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.82	The Applicant, ESC	R10. What obligation is there to operate the regulation of vehicular access specified in this requirement?
	Response	
DCO.1.83	The Applicant, ESC	R11. (i) Should not the reference be to "Sizewell B relocation works" rather than "Sizewell B relocated facilities"? (ii) Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the drawings referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Is the chapter no. correct?
	Response	
DCO.1.84	ESC	R12. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the drawings referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Is the chapter no. correct?
	Response	
DCO.1.85	ESC	R13. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the drawings referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Is the chapter no. correct?
	Response	
DCO.1.86	ESC	R14. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the drawings referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the chapter no.s correct?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.87	The Applicant, ESC	(i) It seems to the ExA that the implementation of the landscape and ecology works could be avoided simply by failing to submit the landscape scheme. Should not the prohibition on commencing the landscape works be changed to a prohibition on commencing the authorised development? (ii) Is this the Requirement referred to at para 7.1.2 of the oLEMP [APP-588]?
	Response	
DCO.1.88	The Applicant ESC	R14. (i) Please will the Applicant explain what obligation there is to maintain the landscape and ecological works arrived at via R14(1)(i) – (vii)? Should there not be an obligation to comply not only by carrying out the landscape works but also to maintain them in accordance with the landscape and ecology management plan? (ii) Should not the words “and ecology” be inserted between “landscape” and “works” in R14(2)?
	Response	
DCO.1.89	ESC	R15. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the section no.s correct? R15 – Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the section no.s correct?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.90	ESC	R17. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the parts referred to correct?
	Response	
DCO.1.91	ESC, The Applicant	R18. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the parts referred to correct? Please will the Applicant list the "relevant sections" of the Associated Development Design Principles and set them out in this requirement in the next version of the dDCO?
	Response	
DCO.1.92	ESC	R19. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the parts referred to correct?
	Response	
DCO.1.93	ESC, The Applicant	R19. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the parts referred to correct? Please will the Applicant list the "relevant sections" of the Associated Development Design Principles and the relevant plans / details in Sch 6 and set them out in this requirement in the next version of the dDCO?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.94	ESC	R20. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the parts referred to correct?
	Response	
DCO.1.95	ESC	R21. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be the correct documents?
	Response	
DCO.1.96	ESC	R22. Please will ESC say whether or not they consider the documents referred to in this requirement to be (a) adequate and (b) the full suite relating to this aspect in the Application documents? Are the parts referred to correct? Please will the Applicant list the “relevant sections” of the Associated Development Design Principles and the relevant plans / details in Sch 7 and set them out in this requirement in the next version of the dDCO?
	Response	
DCO.1.97	The Applicant, ESC	R24.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		How will ESC be able to know that and verify that the SZC construction works have finished?
	Response	
DCO.1.98	The Applicant	R25. Please will the Applicant explain how R25 complies with the need for EIA prior to decision in the light of <u>R v. Cornwall CC ex p Hardy</u> Env L R 25; [2001] JPL 786?
	Response	
DCO.1.99	The Applicant	R25. (i) Please will the Applicant clarify the following: R25(1) requires a noise mitigation <u>strategy</u> ; (2) then requires the strategy capable of avoiding exceedances "through a noise mitigation <u>scheme</u> ". Should that be "strategy" or is the intent that the strategy in (1) is a type of "scheme"? Or is there some other intent and explanation? (ii) R25(3) then says the approved strategy referred to in (2) must be implemented. Should that not be the strategy approved under (1)?
	Response	
DCO.1.100	The Applicant, SCC	Sch 19. Article 2 in the definition of harbour limits says "Schedule 19 (Limits of harbour)" whereas the Schedule is actually named "Limits of the harbour". Please would the Applicant consider making them consistent in the next draft of the DCO?
	Response	
DCO.1.101	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20 – deemed Marine Licence ("DML") – definition of "authorised development". Why is this needed? There is a definition already in Art 2. What is to be the position if there is a conflict between the two definitions? Surely the convention that by including the matter the draftsperson will have intended there to be meaning (and therefore a difference) will come into play. The DML uses other terms from the remainder of the DCO

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		without redefining them, such as Work No. 1A(m). And it includes other terms, such as "commence" giving them a different meaning. Also, the definition of "environmental information" in the DCO and the DML is different and it is not clear if this is for good reason.
	Response	
DCO.1.102	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Sch 20 Para 1. Definition of "maintain".</p> <p>This originally required maintenance activities to have been subject to the assessment in the environmental information and in Revision 3 [AS-143] has the proviso that the work do not give rise to unassessed effects.</p> <p>(i) Should it be made clear that the mitigation required by the ES and that applied elsewhere in this DCO must be complied with?</p> <p>(ii) Is it right to apply this to the whole of the "authorised development" as defined in the DCO given that this is in a deemed marine licence?</p> <p>(iii) The same question the ExA raises on Art 2 of the dDCO in relation to "maintain" also applies here.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.103	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Sch 20 Para 1, definition of "undertaker".</p> <p>The name given here for the company is different from the name in the definitions of the DCO. Please align the two.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.104	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20 Para 1, definitions of Work No. 1A(m) and other works. Is there not an element of circularity or repetition here? Para 1 tells us that Work No. 1A(m) means the Beach Landing Facility. The ExA has searched for this phrase elsewhere in the DCO. It appears only in Sch 1, Part 1, the list of works where we are told that Work No 1A(m) is "Beach landing facility, including associated structures and plant;". Beach Landing Facility is a more helpful and practical phrase than Work No.1(M), but (i) the phrase is only used in paragraph headings to the deemed marine licence and (ii) should not the definition be the other way around: "Beach Landing Facility" means Work No 1A(m)"? This may be a small drafting point. If there is more to it than that, please will the Applicant and MMO explain.
	Response	
DCO.1.105	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20, Para 2 – change of the MMO address and email address can be notified in writing. How does this operate for members of the public who may wish to raise issues or alert the MMO to a state of affairs?
	Response	
DCO.1.106	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20 Para 3 – transfers of the DML. This appears to allow transfers which do not fall within Art 9 of the DCO to take place, in other words for the DML to be separated from the DCO. Is it not the intention to ensure that only the transfer of both together should be possible?
	Response	
DCO.1.107	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20 Para 4. This is the heart of the licence and para 4(1) licences any licensable marine activities under s.66(1) of the MCAAct 2009 which form part of the authorised development which are not already exempt under a s.74 provision. The attention of the Applicant and MMO is drawn at this point to the definition of "authorised development" in Art 2 of the DCO and to the definition on para 1 of Sch 20 which is apparently to the same effect. What is the purpose of Para 4(2)? It is not stated whether it expands or limits the authorisation given by para 4(1). Please will the Applicant and MMO consider, explain and amend the drafting as necessary.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.108	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20 Para 5(e). This allows replacement of structures. Should it be limited to like for like or otherwise limited? If not, how will environmental assessment aspects be met?
	Response	
DCO.1.109	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20 Para 6. This refers to "sub-paragraphs (4)(a) to (4)(m)". Of which para please?
	Response	
DCO.1.110	MMO, ONR	Sch 20 Para 8. This states that certain failures by the licence holder "may render this licence invalid". This would appear to be a draconian penalty or remedy where essential elements of a nuclear power station are concerned, a remedy which cannot in reality be used when it is borne in mind that the licensed activities include maintenance and replacement of for example the cooling water intakes, outfalls and tunnels. It is obviously important that the DML is observed and that effective sanctions exist. Is invalidity a legal consequence which follows from certain failures by the licence holder? Please will the MMO explain what other remedies are available to it short of revocation whether it considers them to be adequate on the assumption that the licence could not in reality be revoked. Should there be some consultation or liaison between the MMO and ONR if invalidity or revocation were to be contemplated? These questions are addressed primarily to the MMO, and also to the ONR, but the Applicant should feel free to contribute.
	Response	
DCO.1.111	MMO, ONR, The Applicant	Sch 20 Para 11. This requires prior approvals from the MMO for each licensed activity and prohibits commencement until that approval has been issued. There are similar and allied provisions in paras 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20. This may be appropriate during the construction phase. How is it intended to work during operation (again, the repair and maintenance of the structures are licensed activities) and should there not be exceptions for urgent or emergency works? Is the defence in s.86 of the MCAAct 2009 adequate?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.112	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20 Part 3 – para 29 – “rock material from a recognised source”. What is meant by “recognised source”? As drafted this lacks clarity and precision.
	Response	
DCO.1.113	MMO, The Applicant	Sch 20 Para 41. This regulates commencement of work on the Soft Coastal Defence Feature. Is that not above MHWS and thus outside the jurisdiction of the MMO? The ExA raises the same question in relation to the Hard Coastal Defence Feature.
	Response	
DCO.1.114	MMO, The Applicant	Sch 20 Para 43 prohibits the delivery of rock armour “until the relevant details have been submitted to and approved by the MMO”. What mischief is this designed to prevent and what are “relevant details”? (a) – (f) presumably give some indication but the list is inclusive not exclusive. Is the issue quality and chemistry of the rock armour, or the delivery details or some other concern?
	Response	
DCO.1.115	The Applicant	Sch 20 Para 45. Small typo “untillo”.
	Response	
DCO.1.116	The Applicant, MMO, EA	Sch 20 Para 50. Does this not overlap and duplicate the Environment Agency’s controls, and if not, should it not rather be a requirement
	Response	
DCO.1.117	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20, Part 4. Please will the Applicant supply plans showing these Works areas? Is there not a case, in the interests of practicality of use, for referring to deposited plans (which would in case of conflict be subordinate to the co-ordinates in Part 4) which can then be also be placed on the MMO website?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.118	The Applicant	Sch 20, the DML, general. For comparison purposes, please will the Applicant provide a document setting out the provisions in the Hinkley C DCO which are equivalent to Sch 20? The ExA notes there was not a separate DML in the DCO for that NSIP. Please specify the requirements or other provisions in the Hinkley C DCO and the destination in Sch 20.
	Response	
DCO.1.119	The Applicant, MMO	Sch 20. Please will the Applicant and the MMO provide a Statement of Common Ground on the provisions in Sch 20 and Art 75 setting out clearly the areas of agreement and of disagreement, and explaining the reasoning for their positions.
	Response	
DCO.1.120	The Applicant	Sch 20. The Explanatory Memorandum [APP-060] does not contain any commentary or full explanation of the provisions of Sch 20. Please will the Applicant submit a full explanation of this schedule, either as a separate document, or (preferably) as a re-issue of the EM.
	Response	
DCO.1.121	MMO	The MMO's relevant representation does not use the examination library references. Please will the MMO submit a revised RR-0744 with the references alone added and ensure their use in future submissions to the examination.
	Response	
DCO.1.122	The Applicant, ESC	Sch 23 – procedure for approvals, consents and appeals. Will the Applicant and ESC please provide a SoCG stating: (i)The names of the discharging authorities and all other persons whose approval, consent or appeal procedure is to be subject to Sch 23 (ii)The functions of those persons subject to Sch 23

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(iii) what differences there are between the procedure for approvals, consents and appeals and the procedure set out in Appendix 1 of AN15, accompanied by a trackchanges version showing the differences</p> <p>(iv) what parts of Sch 23 are not agreed between the Applicant and ESC</p> <p>(v) The case of the Applicant and ESC in relation to any parts not agreed</p> <p>The reason and purpose of any difference from Appendix 1 of AN15 whether or not the provision is agreed</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.123	The Applicant	<p>Sch 23.</p> <p>Will the Applicant please supply a SoCG with each IP which or who is also (a) a discharging authority or (b) an other person whose approval, consent or appeal procedure is to be subject to Sch 23 (in addition to ESC under the previous question) stating</p> <p>(i) Whether or not that IP agrees with the description of their function in point (ii) of the previous question and if not setting out that person's preferred description and why.</p> <p>(ii) The position in relation to points (iv) and (v) so far as that person's functions are subject to Sch 23</p> <p>(iii) The reason and purpose of any difference from Appendix 1 of AN15 relating to that person's functions whether or not the provision is agreed</p> <p>(iv) What aspects are not agreed between them.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.124	MMO	<p>Sch 23.</p> <p>The ExA notes that the MMO in its RR-0744 has concerns about Sch 23 and seeks instead that disputes over approvals pursuant to the DML should be dealt with by way of judicial review (para 2.1.12 and following). The norm in the case of regulatory approvals is for there to be an appeal process on the merits before a right to review on the law is available. Whilst the PA2008 does not contain such a process for approvals pursuant to requirements it is now common for a process along the lines of Sch 23 to be included in DCOs. Should not the comparison be with the appeal system under s.73 of the MMCA Act 2009 suitably adapted for approvals pursuant to conditions of a DML, rather than judicial</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		review? Will the MMO please outline the process which applies to disputes over submissions for approvals under a DML?
	Response	
DCO.1.125	The Applicant, ESC	Sch 24, para 3. Will the Applicant please explain what is the effect of this paragraph which relates to Community Infrastructure Levy? Will ESC give its understanding and indicate if it accepts this provision?
	Response	
DCO.1.126	The Applicant, ESC	Sch 24, para 5. Please will the Applicant explain the effect of para 5(2)? Surely the question of whether or not the Applicant is a person interested in the Order land is one to be determined on the facts, and not deemed. Please will the Applicant explain why it is not a person interested in the land if that is the case? The s.106 agreement must bind the land and all persons deriving title from the original covenantor. The Applicant and Host Authorities should note the questions below on s.106 agreements.
	Response	
DCO.1.127	The Applicant	Sch 24 as a whole. Please would the Applicant explain fully the purpose and effect of the modifications and exclusions set out in Sch 24, and give the statutory power for making them? The EM does not contain much explanation on this Schedule.
	Response	
DCO.1.128	ESC, the Applicant	At para 2.316 of [RR-0342] ESC state that they "would prefer a Natural Environment Fund that encompasses all areas of concern including impact on the AONB. A Natural Environment Fund would be able to address issues and provide mitigation outside of the AONB boundary should it be required which is preferable to the more restrictive boundary of the AONB". Please will ESC and the Applicant comment on what areas of concern are

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		appropriate and whether and how this would meet the legal tests for valid planning obligations. Are the policy tests also met?
	Response	
DCO.1.129	SCC, the Applicant	<p>At para 8 of [RR-1175] SCC set out a list of funds they submit should be considered. Are they accepted by the Applicant and where are they secured?</p> <p>Please will SCC and the Applicant comment on which funds are appropriate and whether and how this would meet the legal tests for valid planning obligations. Are the policy tests also met?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.130	The Applicant	<p>On Works Plan 7 (which is in [APP-011]) works are to be carried out to the existing railway near Buckles Wood Road. They are part of Work No. 4C and inside the Order Boundary. But it is not shown on SZC-EW0103 -XX-000-DRW-100102 (in [APP-016] - Rail Plans For Approval, and [AS-121] which supersedes it), as being within the "Development Site Boundary" despite the red line showing the "Development Site Boundary".</p> <p>Please will the Applicant clarify what is the status of the land and works along the railway between Works No. 4A and 4C. Is it within or without the Order Limits? What works are being carried out?</p> <p>Is the plan listed in the dDCO and if not, should it be?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.131	The Applicant	<p>Please will the Applicant clarify SZC Bk 2 2.5 which is titled Rail Plans for Approval. However the individual plans are titled Main Development Site Temporary Construction Area. They do appear to relate only to rail works.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.132	The Applicant	Material Changes. Please will the Applicant clarify why the 15 additional parking spaces at Kenton Hills Car Park (Work No. 1A (cc) in Doc 3.1B are omitted. What is the extent of the remaining improvement works, where are they described and limited in the DCO and where are they assessed in the ES?
	Response	
DCO – the questions which follow relate to the Third Draft DCO [AS-143] and focus on the changes between the original – [APP-059] and the third draft. The previous questions in this section on the DCO should be answered in the light of the changes and take changes into account. They should explain how changes affect the answer.		
DCO.1.133	The Applicant	Please will the Applicant confirm that the Explanatory Memorandum Revision 2 [AS-147] relates to Third Draft DCO [AS-143] (or otherwise).
	Response	
DCO.1.134	The Applicant	Please will the Applicant confirm that the Third Draft DCO [AS-143] includes the changes it seeks to accommodate its change request.
	Response	
DCO.1.135	The Applicant	<p>The Explanatory Memorandum makes reference a number of times to the draft Wylfa DCO. That order was not made as the application was withdrawn in late 2020. Following withdrawal, the ExA's report to the SofS was published by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>The Sizewell C ExA makes neither endorsement nor criticism of any of the comments of the Wylfa ExA on the DCO in that case. However, please will the Applicant take into account any comments made by the Wylfa ExA when preparing the next drafts of the DCO and the Explanatory Memorandum and explain why it proposes or rejects them. Please also state whether references to the Wylfa DCO which are already in the Explanatory Memorandum are consistent with the comments by the Wylfa ExA.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.136	The Applicant	Has the Third Draft incorporated the changes the Applicant made in the light of the procedural decisions made by the ExA prior to the close of the Preliminary Meeting?
	Response	
DCO.1.137	The Applicant	Interpretation, Art 2: "marine works". There is a misprint in this definition. The ExA suspects that 1(bb) should be 1A(bb).
	Response	
DCO.1.138	The Applicant	Art 2 – "marine works". Please explain why work 1A(o) – the HCDF – has been removed from the definition of marine works.
	Response	
DCO.1.139	The Applicant	<i>The Explanatory Memorandum refers at para 2.8 to Work No 18 (works at Pakenham). Whilst the ExA at first thought that there was no Work No 18 in the Third Draft, on further reading it sees that Work No.18 is sandwiched between Works 7 and 8, presumably on the ground that Works 6-8 are grouped together as Fen meadows and marsh harrier habitat.</i> <i>Notwithstanding that, this is likely to cause confusion to many for years to come if the DCO is granted.</i> <i>Is there not a more intuitive way to deal with this?</i> <i>Please could the Applicant reflect on this and respond.</i>
	Response	
DCO.1.140	The Applicant	Art 2 – references to Works 1D and 1E. it is evident that the intention is that these are in the alternative. Please will the Applicant explain the criteria and method for deciding which is to apply and guide the ExA to all the parts of the DCO which are used for the decision. Please will the Applicant do the same for Sizewell B relocated facilities permission 1 and Sizewell B relocated facilities permission 2.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
DCO.1.141	The Applicant, ESC	Art 2 "Sizewell B relocated facilities permission 2". Please will the Applicant and ESC report on the current position with the application for the Sizewell B relocated facilities permission 2, and the anticipated forward programme that is reasonably expected within the timeframes of the examination?
	Response	
DCO.1.142	The Applicant	Art 5 and para 4.7 of the Explanatory Memorandum. The latter states that "If the undertaker has commenced Work No. 1E, it may not thereafter carry out works under Work No.1D (article 5(3))". (i) Where does this appear in Art 5? The article appears to hinge on whether notice is served as to which Work is being implemented. (ii) What is the reason for the preventing Work No 1E(d) if Work 1D(d) or (e) have been implemented? (In passing, the term "implemented" is new at this point and is undefined. Whilst it is a common and useful term, is not "commenced" preferable in Art 5(3)?) (iii) The intention seems to be that Work 1E is preferred; please confirm that understanding. (iv) How practically will it be known that Work 1D or 1E has been commenced?
	Response	
DCO.1.143	ESC, the Applicant	Art 10. Please will ESC comment on the appropriateness of adding the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement and the Associated Development Design Principles to the defences to statutory nuisance in this Article. In particular, are they sufficiently precise documents for this purpose?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.144	SCC, the Applicant	<p>Art 14(1)(b) and 14(3) and Sch 10 Part 3.</p> <p>The Explanatory Memorandum states that this new provision allows for the status of streets from highways open to all traffic to highways for pedestrians only. They are referred to as NMUs in Sch 10 Part 3.</p> <p>(i) Please will SCC give its view on this?</p> <p>(ii) Does NMU mean "non-motorised users"?</p> <p>(iii) Where and when has this provision been previously publicised and consulted on?</p> <p>(iv) Please point the ExA to the responses to consultation on this proposal?</p> <p>(v) What policies apply to such a restriction being included in the DCO?</p> <p>(vi) What legal tests must be met for such a restriction to be included in the DCO?</p> <p>(vii) Art 14(3)(a) does not appear to make sense as currently drafted. What is intended? Is there a missing "and" between "the street authority" and "is open for use"? Or is something else intended?</p> <p>(viii) what protections are there for those who currently use the highways in question as highways for all traffic other than pedestrians / NMUs, especially owners of land which abuts either side of the highways?</p> <p>(ix) should protections similar to those which apply to changes under the other parts of Sch 10 be applied, and if so would they be adequate?</p> <p>(x) with the inclusion of an extra paragraph in Art 14 some of the cross-references need to be adjusted, for example in what is now para (5) the reference to para (5) should become a reference to para (6). There is a mirror of this issue in what is now para (6).</p> <p>(xi) Please will the Applicant provide specific confirmation of the power for the new provisions in Art 14 and Sch 10.</p> <p>(xii) Is the aim of this provision better achieved by traffic regulation orders?</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.145	The Applicant	<p>Art 16(1). "Order limits" has been changed to "permanent limits". Is this intentional? If so, please explain what is meant by "permanent limits".</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The same phrase occurs in Art 37(1)(a)(ii). Please will the Applicant address it there as well.
	Response	
DCO.1.146	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Art 17 – temporary stopping up of streets and private means of access.</p> <p>Please will the Applicant and highway authority consider whether “temporary stopping up” is the correct approach. Is not “stopping up” the extinguishment of public rights? Once the rights are extinguished the land ceases to be highway and the land that formally formed the highway (depending on the definition either about 1.5 to 2 ‘spit’ depths) reverts to the owner of the subsoil. Thus the Highway Authority who usually maintains public highway would cease to have any interest in the land (unless they were also the landowner)? Highway Authorities are not necessarily the owner of the subsoil. Landowners dedicate the surface of the land for highway purposes but usually do not give up their ownership of the land underneath. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the subsoil will belong to the landowners on either side, up to the median line. That being the case the Applicant would need to ensure all the land under any stopped up highway was under their control in order to do any work in that land and also to be certain the landowner would rededicate the land again as highway once they had finished, the work.</p> <p>This point was raised at the Southampton to London Pipeline NSIP examination. Highways England agreed with it and stated they would be seeking to change the approach on their own DCOs.</p> <p>Would the Applicant please consider this issue and propose revised drafting or explain why the current drafting is still appropriate.</p>
	Response	
DCO.1.147	The Applicant, MMO	<p>Art 64(4).</p> <p>What is the justification for choosing 28 days rather than the original one month for notice of application for confirmation of byelaws.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.148	The Applicant, MMO	Art 73 – use of BLFs. As the temporary BLF is not intended to be used after construction, its use for maintenance and decommissioning is surely unwarranted. If so, please will the Applicant propose amendment to this article.
	Response	
DCO.1.149	The Applicant, MMO	Art 75A – appeals in relation to deemed marine licence. There needs to be explanation of this addition in the Explanatory Memorandum. It would be helpful if that explanation could also be set out in the response to this question. Please will the MMO set out its view on this Article and Sch 20A
	Response	
DCO.1.150	The Applicant, MMO	Art 82(6) no arbitration of consents or approvals by the MMO. Please will the MMO say if it approves this wording.
	Response	
DCO.1.151	The Applicant, MMO	Art 86 – marine enforcement authority. Please will the Applicant explain and give the statutory references for the mischief this Article and the amendment since the first draft DCO is addressing. Please will the MMO also comment and say if it approves the wording in the third draft..
	Response	
DCO.1.152	The Applicant	Sch 1 Pt 1- Work No. 5. This now includes “one 3G pitch”. Should this not be defined?
	Response	
DCO.1.153	The Applicant	Sch 1 Pt 1 Work No. 18. Please see question above on the Explanatory Memorandum
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.154	The Applicant, SCC	Sch 2, R3 – archaeology. Please will the Applicant explain the reason for the changes? Please will SCC indicate if they are content with the new wording and if not explain what they seek and why.
	Response	
DCO.1.155	The Applicant	Sch 2 – Requirements, generally. A number of capitalised terms have been introduced but the ExA has been unable to find corresponding definitions. Examples include Peat Written Scheme of Investigation, Statutory Nature Conservation Body and RSPB. Please will the Applicant review Sch 2 and the DCO as a whole and submit a list of terms which are not but should be defined, together with the proposed definitions. It would be helpful if the list could also show where the terms are first used in the dDCO.
	Response	
DCO.1.156	The Applicant , SCC, ESC	In a number of Reqs, terms such as “local planning authority” have been changed to the name of a council (such as in that case East Suffolk Council). Examples are R 2, 3, 4 and 5. Given that local government reorganisation occurs from time to time and that functions may move from one authority to another, is it not better to refer to the function (such as highway authority) rather than use the current name of the body?
	Response	
DCO.1.157	The Applicant	R 14B(1) – Wet woodland. Is it necessary to refer to clearance as being pursuant to Work No.1A? Surely no clearance within the Sizewell Marshes pursuant to the DCO should be commenced prior to approval of the wet woodland strategy.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.158	The Applicant, SCC	R 6A – is “general” accord with the Public Rights of Way Strategy appropriate? Why not “in accordance”?
	Response	
DCO.1.159	The Applicant, ESC, Natural England	R 14A. The ES refers to financial contribution should the fen meadow recreation not succeed. Please will the Applicant point the ExA to where that is to be found.
	Response	
DCO.1.160	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20 and Sch 20A – the deemed marine licence and the appeals procedure. Please will the MMO provide its comments on the changes to Sch 20 since the original submission and on new Sch 20A. Please will the Applicant provide a note on the reasons for the changes, or point the ExA to where the reasons may be found in the Applicant’s submissions thus far.
	Response	
DCO.1.161	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 1, para 2(3). Should there not be an “(2) Unless otherwise advised in writing by the MMO ... ” introduction to this sub-para? Otherwise, a change to the web address or new system would appear to require a variation of the DCO. This question applies to other instances of addresses and telephone numbers in the deemed licence, e.g. Sch 20, Pt 3 para 9
	Response	
DCO.1.162	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 2 para 4(2)(c)(ii). Does this make sense? What is “by pass (movement alongshore)”?
	Response	
DCO.1.163	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 2, para 7A.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		This contemplates transfer of the deemed marine licence to an entity which is not the Undertaker. Would it not be preferable for and Art 8 (or should the reference be to Art 9?) transfer to transfer also the deemed marine licence?
	Response	
DCO.1.164	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 2, para 7A. Are the remedies in s.72 of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 likely to be used in practice? Are modifications, strengthenings or other sanctions and remedies necessary in the case of a nuclear power station?
	Response	
DCO.1.165	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 2, para 7B. Should the amendments to plans etc in this Art be subject to the usual EIA limitation?
	Response	
DCO.1.166	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 3, para 10. What is meant by "(a) a planned timetable for each activity <i>as outlined in Part 2</i> ". The reference to Part 2 appears to be Part 2 of a different document.
	Response	
DCO.1.167	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 3 para 17. Application for approval of a Coastal Processes Monitoring and Mitigation Plan. By sub-para (f) this application "must include (f) confidence that the proposed mitigation will be effective". (i) Should it not rather be demonstrating confidence? In addition, what level of confidence, how is misplaced confidence avoided? (ii) Should there be a statement of the purpose for which the mitigation is to be "effective"? (iii) Whatever the answer to (ii), please explain what is the purpose of this mitigation.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
DCO.1.168	MMO, the Applicant	Sch 20, Pt 3 para 39. This has been deleted. What process is now proposed for UXO clearance? Please will the MMO state whether or not it agrees with that process.
	Response	
DCO.1.169	ESC, SCC, the Applicant	Sch 23, unless dealt with in the SoCGs on Sch 23 required above, will ESC and SCC please comment on the changes to Sch 23 between the original dDCO and Revision 3 [AS-143]. If such matters are dealt with in those SoCGs please will ESC, SCC and the Applicant state as much in their reply to this ExQ.
	Response	
FR.1 Flood risk, ground water, surface water		
FR.1.0	The Applicant	Main Platform – Temporary Coastal Defences Paragraph 7.1.12 of [AS-018] states a temporary reinforced coastal flood defence will be built to form the haul road. Paragraph 4.2.6 of [AS-157] confirms that a temporary sheet pile wall of 7.3m AOD is now also proposed. There is little detail on the process of constructing these temporary works, including removing existing sea defences, placing temporary defences and constructing the permanent defences. Additionally, there is little detail on the timing of the various elements of sea defence works. Figures 2.2.20 to 2.2.23 [AS-190] provide some detail. Provide more detail on the sea defence construction programme and plans showing how they will develop in relation to construction phases.
	Response	
FR.1.1	Environment Agency	Main Platform – Temporary Coastal Defence The EA's RR [RR-0373] raised concerns regarding the Applicant's intention to remove the existing coastal flood defences before the new coastal flood defences had been constructed. As part of the Applicant's material change, installation of a temporary sheet pile wall (with a crest set at a minimum level of 7.3m AOD) is now proposed around the construction area, prior to the removal of the existing defences.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Could the EA comment on the extent to which the temporary sheet pile wall addresses its concerns in this regard, considering the revised overtopping assessment presented in the MDS FRA Addendum [AS-157] and accompanying Appendix E [AS-170]?
	Response	
FR.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Main Platform – Adaptive Sea Defence</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1.9 of [AS-157] states that the designed crest level of the sea defences with landscaping will be 14.6m AOD. The defence would have an adaptive design with the potential to raise the crest up to 16.4m AOD in the future if required to address sea level rise and change in wave conditions due to climate change. Explain in relation to the requirements in the draft DCO how the following would take place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Monitoring to understand the need for any adaptive sea defence works; (ii) How such monitoring would be secured within the DCO; and (iii) How the adaptive sea defence works would be secured and delivered in the DCO.
	Response	
FR.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Main Platform – Adaptive Sea Defence</p> <p>The Environment Agency [RR-0373] and other IP's ask for more detail on the design and construction of the Hard Coastal Defence Feature (HCDF). Paragraphs 4.2.13 to 4.2.17 and Plates 4.3 and 4.4 of [AS-157] provide some information on the HCDF. However, the detailed design and construction of the HCDF has still not been set out. Provide a detailed description of the design and construction of the HCDF including how any subsequent adaptive element will be provided.</p>
	Response	
FR.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Main Platform- Internal Flooding</p> <p>Paragraph 7.2.27 [AS-018] sets out a worst case internal flooding scenario of around 70 - 170mm of water for up to three hours during the extreme tidal cycle. Managing such a low probability event through a temporary shut-down of operations is considered adequate by the Applicant. Explain:</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) How such an event would affect operation, and (ii) Any implications for the storage of radioactive material on site.
	Response	
FR.1.5	The Applicant	Main Platform – Construction Groundwater Management Paragraph 7.5.7 [AS-018] explains the groundwater management approach for the main development platform. It includes the provision for a low permeability cut-off wall. Explain: (i) The construction process for the proposed cut-off wall; and (ii) How groundwater will be managed whilst the cut-off wall is being constructed.
	Response	
FR.1.6	The Applicant	Main Platform – Cut off Wall Extent Provide a plan showing the extent of the cut-off wall and also sections of the main development platform showing the cut-off wall extent and also any deep excavations for underground structures proposed within the area enclosed by the cut-off wall or adjacent to it.
	Response	
FR.1.7	The Applicant	Groundwater Overtopping of Cut off Wall Paragraph 7.5.19 of [AS-018] explains that the final top level of the cut-off wall is not yet confirmed so groundwater levels over-topping the cut-off wall could pose a risk to underground structures. Explain how the design and construction process will mitigate such a risk.
	Response	
FR.1.8	The Applicant	Water Monitoring and Response Strategy [AS-236]

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Appendix 2.14A relates to both surface water and groundwater, whereas Requirement 7 of the draft DCO relates to groundwater. Explain how: (i) Surface water regime monitoring is secured within the draft DCO; and (ii) Any necessary responses or remedial action will be secured and delivered within the draft DCO.
	Response	
FR.1.9	East Suffolk Council, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board, Environment Agency, Suffolk County Council	Water Monitoring and Response Strategy [AS-236] Provide comment of the coverage and suitability of the proposed strategy and the process to secure any required mitigation
	Response	
FR.1.10	The Applicant	Breach Modelling Paragraph 11.2.6 of [AS-018] refers to results shown in Table 8.2. It is not readily apparent how the figures quoted in the paragraph relate to Table 8.2. Clarify this analysis.
	Response	
FR.1.11	The Applicant	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] Paragraph 2.2.1 This paragraph suggests reviews and updates have been undertaken in response to both the EA and other key stakeholders. Other key stakeholder engagement is not outlined in Appendix A or B. Outline any other key stakeholders' engagement and how this has also affected the review and update.
	Response	
FR.1.12	Environment Agency	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] Are you satisfied that the modelling undertaken on the effects of the revised design of the HCDF provides a robust assessment of the safety of people during construction and operation of the Proposed Development?
	Response	
FR.1.13	The Applicant	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157]

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Table 2.1, 200 year return period, 2140 epoch Explain why different Climate Change criteria is used for this particular prediction?
	Response	
FR.1.14	Environment Agency	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] The EA [RR-0373] highlighted that the Proposed Development would result in an increase in hazard rating category for 4 residential properties and increased fluvial flood risk to 5/6 non-residential properties, as set out in the MDS FRA [APP-093, updated by AS-018]. The EA advised that compensatory flood storage measures (or other appropriate measures) should be investigated to mitigate fluvial flood risk to residential and non-residential properties. The Applicant has made design changes intended to mitigate fluvial flood risk and undertaken further assessment work, as presented in the MDS FRA Addendum [AS-157]. To what extent does this address the EA's concerns in this regard?
	Response	
FR.1.15	The Applicant	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] Paragraph 3.3.18, Is this saying that there is no property at this postcode or that it would not be flooded?
	Response	
FR.1.16	The Applicant	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] Paragraph 3.3.27 has the doorstep height of any affected residential properties been checked to ascertain whether even a small increase in flood depth could create a significant flooding issue?
	Response	
FR.1.17	The Applicant, Environment Agency, Suffolk County Council	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] Fen Meadow Mitigation Habitat Paragraph 5.1.20 At what point will the ExA be able to understand whether the proposed mitigation sites are suitable?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
FR.1.18	Environment Agency, Suffolk County Council	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] Surface Water Drainage Paragraph 5.1.46, What is your view of the suitability of the proposals at this stage of the development?
	Response	
FR.1.19	The Applicant	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157] Flood Risk Activity Permits The MDS FRA Addendum explains that a Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) would be required in relation to the proposed fen meadow habitat compensation areas. The Applicant states that since the design of the scheme is ongoing, the application for the FRAP will be prepared and submitted to the EA "...at an appropriate stage of the Project". The EA's RR also indicates that works to remove existing flood defences are likely to require a permit. The ExA notes the contents of PINS Advice Note 11: Working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process (Annex D) in this regard, which states that if the DCO and permit application(s) are not appropriately coordinated, there is a risk that the EA will be unable to comment on detailed technical matters raised by the Inspectors during the examination of the DCO. In view of these matters, can the Applicant confirm how many FRAP applications would be required and provide any firm commitment on the likely timescales for submission of these application(s) to the EA? The Other Consents, Licenses and Agreements document [APP-153] should also be updated, as required.
	Response	
FR.1.20	The Applicant	Two Village Bypass FRA Paragraph 7.2.17 [APP-119] and paragraph 2.1.5 [AS-171] state that talks are ongoing with the relevant landowner with respect to increased flood depth, hazard and velocity in an affected area. Provide an update on the current status of negotiation with the relevant landowner.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.21	East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board, Environment Agency, Suffolk County Council	Sizewell Link Road FRA [APP-136] It is explained [APP-136] that two of the proposed watercourse crossings have not been hydraulically modelled (SW4 and SW7). The Applicant confirms there would be no impact from SW4. For SW7, the Applicant sets out its proposed approach to addressing the current lack of information regarding the existing culvert and lack of modelling, at detailed design stage. Please comment on the Applicant's approach in this regard.
	Response	
FR.1.22	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] The Environment Agency [RR-0373] state that the Fen Meadow compensation area water body areas have been incorrectly identified and that the correct water body areas should be screened in and assessed. Respond to their concerns.
	Response	
FR.1.23	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.156 does not mention the pressure on groundwater bodies that would be created depending on the final solution for site water supply. The assessment should include impact on groundwater bodies depending on the possible impact of the water supply solution proposed. Explain how this is addressed and provide references to particular sections of the WFD Compliance Assessment report.
	Response	
FR.1.24	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.1.160 does not mention the implications for surface water levels and consequently river water bodies of the requirement for demand for water in both

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		construction and operation of the proposal. Depending on the water supply solution, should this not be a consideration in the assessment?
	Response	
FR.1.25	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621]
	Response	Paragraph 2.2.196 Explain where the decommissioning area is and the distance to the mentioned site boundary.
FR.1.26	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621]
	Response	Paragraph 2.4.8 first bullet point. Explain how the presence of the power station platform and the cut of wall could also result in indirect effects on the Suffolk coastal water body.
FR.1.27	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621]
	Response	Paragraph 2.4.26. Given the detailed plume information was unavailable at the time of scoping, what are the implications for the effects assessed and at what stage will the detailed plume information be available so that the effects can be properly considered?
FR.1.28	Environment Agency	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621]
	Response	Paragraph 2.5.38 "For the purpose of this WFD Compliance Assessment, only biological elements of relevance to WFD (fish, invertebrates and aquatic flora) are outlined below." Is this an acceptable approach?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.29	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.46 Figure 2.8 is not in APP-629, signpost or provide.
	Response	
FR.1.30	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.60 Figure 2.9 is not in APP-629, signpost or provide
	Response	
FR.1.31	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.98 Explain the significance of the exceedance of the Environmental Quality Standard for levels of zinc in the Suffolk coastal marine water body.
	Response	
FR.1.32	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.106 Explain the significance of the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas) Action levels with respect to this assessment.
	Response	
FR.1.33	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.153 Explain why the current baseline conditions are considered appropriate for the whole construction period that could be as long as 12 years.
	Response	
FR.1.34	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621]

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Paragraph 2.5.156 Explain the implications of Defra's "Water Abstraction Plan" to this assessment.
	Response	
FR.1.35	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.196 states "all foul waters generated during construction would be collected in a self-contained chemical system and tankered off site for disposal". The Outline Drainage Strategy [APP-181] sets out in paragraph 3.6.5 "Disposal to sea following treatment has been selected, as the receiving waters are less sensitive, and dilution of the treated effluent is much greater than for a watercourse." Explain the apparent discrepancy in these two statements.
	Response	
FR.1.36	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.248 Explain: (i) The term "synthetic baseline"; and (ii) Where in Chapter 19 of Volume 2 of the ES the data relating to Leiston Beck referred to, can be found.
	Response	
FR.1.37	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.3.335 state whether the stated concentrations have any implications for the compliance assessment or not.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.38	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.336 provide references to the relevant paragraphs above.
FR.1.39	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.346 Is it correct to assume that the reactors will be commissioned in succession not as this seems to imply only one reactor will be commissioned?
	Response	
FR.1.40	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.363 Given the site is in most documents is stated to have an operational life of 60 years and it is stated in Paragraph 2.5.153 of this section to be operational until approximately 2100, explain the discrepancy in operational life stated here of 2130.
	Response	
FR.1.41	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Table 2.45 Explain why the bottom part of the Table abandons the column headings in the top part.
	Response	
FR.1.42	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.537 Does this include staff for an outage and if not, what effect does the additional staff during an outage have?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.43	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.553 What are the implications for the WFDCA of an exceedance of the absolute 23°C threshold mentioned?
	Response	
FR.1.44	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.649 What is the implications for the WFDCA of the predicted exceedance of the EQS?
	Response	
FR.1.45	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Paragraph 2.5.651 refers to Biological Oxygen Demand not exceeding the EQS but what is the conclusion for the rest of physico-chemistry?
	Response	
FR.1.46	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Page 265 O4 Suffolk Explain the implications for the WFDCA is there is an impact on hydromorphological parameters created by the hard coastal defence.
	Response	
FR.1.47	The Applicant	Water Framework Directive Compliance Assessment (WFDCA) Part 2 or 4 [APP-621] Page 265 O5 Suffolk. Provide paragraph reference numbers to where considerations, stated in the last sentence, of other adjacent water bodies is set out.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.48	The Applicant, Relevant Authorities	Flood Risk Emergency Plan (FREP) Appendix F [AS-170] The Suffolk Resilience Forum comments in Appendix A of the FREP: (i) Do they relate to this version of the FREP? (ii) If not, have they been consulted on this version; and (iii) Provide any additional comments they may have made.
	Response	
FR.1.49	Environment Agency	Main Development Site (MDS) - Flood Risk Emergency Plan (FREP) Appendix F [AS-170] The Applicant has now provided a FREP. Could the EA confirm: (i) Whether this plan addresses its concerns regarding safety during any fluvial, coastal and tidal breach flood events, as outlined on pages 24 and 28 of its RR [RR-0373]? (ii) Any other outstanding matters of concern with respect to the FREP.
	Response	
FR.1.50	The Applicant	(MDS) Flood Risk Emergency Plan (FREP) Appendix F [AS-170] (i) How would adherence with the measures set out in the FREP be secured through the DCO? (ii) Whilst the MDS FREP contains reference to the permanent SSSI crossing, it is unclear from this document how the Applicant intends to manage the risk of fluvial flooding to the temporary SSSI crossing and people using it. In view of the EA's comments on page 27 of its RR [RR-0373], can the Applicant provide clarity on this point and make any necessary updates to the FREP?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.51	The Applicant	<p>Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181]</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4.4 the Temporary Sewage Plant location is not indicated on Plate 3.4. This plate and subsequent plates are clearly extracted from larger plans that have a number of areas, facilities and buildings shown and annotated. Provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Full annotation on all relevant plates in the ODS; and (ii) A set of the full plans that show more detailed layouts of the temporary construction areas.
	Response	
FR.1.52	The Applicant	<p>Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181]</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4.13 Explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) How surface water runoff from the main construction area will be conveyed both to Water Management Zone (WMZ) 1 and WMZ2; (ii) Identify which attenuating features in WMZ1 need to be sized accordingly and how that analysis will be undertaken. (iii) Page 29 of the EA's RR [RR-0373] outlined concerns relating to the Applicant's proposals for Water Management Zone 1. The Applicant sets out how it intends to address these comments in paragraphs 5.1.3 – 5.1.7 of the MDS FRA Addendum [AS-157], confirming that a temporary outfall from the main platform area out to the sea is now proposed (prior to construction of the permanent Combined Drainage Outfall). Management of flood risk during construction of the earth bund for Water Management Zone 1 has also been discussed within the MDS FREP (Appendix F [AS-170]) (as part of the 'temporary construction area'). To what extent does this address the EA's concerns in this regard?
	Response	
FR.1.53	The Applicant	<p>Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157]- Temporary Outfall</p> <p>Provide an updated Outline Drainage Strategy that includes the role of the temporary outfall</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.54	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Paragraph 3.4.57 Explain, with reference to the Schedule of Other Consents, Licences and Agreements document [APP-153], how permission would be obtained for discharge of treated storm water to the foreshore in extreme storm conditions.
	Response	
FR.1.55	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Tables 3.1 and 3.2, Row 7 Discharge to Combined Sewer discounted due to no known combined sewers. Could the Combined Drainage Outfall (CDO), once constructed not be considered in the event of flooding?
	Response	
FR.1.56	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] After WMZ2 all subsequent text about WMZs have errors in referencing the correct plate number. These are WMZ3 paragraphs 3.4.28 and 3.4.36, WMZ6 paragraphs 3.4.37 and 3.4.43, WMZ4 paragraph 3.4.45, WMZ5 paragraphs 3.4.50 and 3.4.53, WMZs 7, 8 and 9 paragraphs 3.4.55 and 3.4.59, WMZ10 paragraph 3.4.65 and LEEIE paragraph 3.4.80. Correct this referencing.
	Response	
FR.1.57	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Table 3.4 Row 5 – Discharge to watercourse. “Surface water may be discharged into the surrounding watercourses following appropriate measures to account for the volume of surface water and the presence of silt and contaminant load.” All the other Group 1 WMZs state that water will be discharged “indirectly into surrounding watercourses” Explain: (i) Is direct discharge intended in WMZ6; and (ii) Describe the appropriate measures referred to in this context.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.58	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Plate 3.17. (i) It is assumed that the red dotted line on this plate is the CDO. Confirm this assumption and explain the operation of the CDO including identifying any elements on the plate that relate to such operation; and (ii) In Paragraph 3.4.59 explain which other techniques are shown on Plate 3.17 (3.16 sic).
	Response	
FR.1.59	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Paragraph 3.4.61 states that the CDO will be discontinued once cold commissioning is completed. Explain whether this also means that the CDO will be removed at this point and if not, when will it be removed?
	Response	
FR.1.60	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Paragraph 3.4.64. Explain which tunnel the access shaft connects to is it the CDO or cooling water tunnel?
	Response	
FR.1.61	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Table 3.7 Row 6 There is little description of the capacity and suitability of surface water drainage system referred to. Explain how its suitability has been assessed.
	Response	
FR.1.62	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Paragraph 3.4.82. Explain why underground geocellular storage is suitable for parts of the LEEIE and also how the necessary maintenance regime will be undertaken in the areas suggested for its use.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
FR.1.63	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Paragraph 3.5.10. Has the groundwater model been used to model the potential impact of the cut off wall so that after its construction the ongoing monitoring could be used to examine any significant adverse impacts not originally modelled?
	Response	
FR.1.64	Environment Agency and other Relevant Authorities	Appendix 19F – Monitoring and Response Strategy [APP-309] Provide comment on the Monitoring and Response strategy set out in this document.
	Response	
FR.1.65	The Applicant	Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157]- Water Resource Storage Area Paragraph 5.1.21 states that “The water would be used for construction activities and would not have direct links to the outline drainage strategy methods as it is for water storage.” This area is now proposed to be in WMZ5, how will the non-potable water be collected if not by some form of drainage system. Explain how this collection system and distribution system will operate and also why this has not been included in the ODS.
	Response	
FR.1.66	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Figure 2A.6. The proposed foul water network has been indicated on a plan of the existing area. Provide a fully annotated plan shown on a base layer showing indicative layouts of the Main and Temporary Construction Areas. By way of example of base layer most of the plates used in the ODS have a base layer that would mean the proposed foul drainage system could be related to temporary works proposed.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.67	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Paragraphs 3.6.13 to 3.6.14 describe a number of options for foul water drainage at the LEEIE. Has work to secure a feasible option progressed? and if so, explain the option that will be pursued.
	Response	
FR.1.68	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Foul water drainage of associated development sites could, if all more suitable alternatives prove not to be feasible, rely on tankering to works. Has suitable treatment works capacity been identified should this be required?
	Response	
FR.1.69	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] East Suffolk Council [RR-0343] express concern that the ODS does not at this stage demonstrate that appropriate sustainable drainage systems can be implemented at all sites. Comment on the level of certainty that can be attributed to the total implementation of sustainable drainage solutions for the Proposed Development.
	Response	
FR.1.70	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] East Suffolk Council [RR-0343] have queried whether suitable pollution control techniques will be implemented as part of the drainage solutions at the Associated Development sites. Explain how any runoff pollution will be dealt with as part of the sustainable drainage solution for those works.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
FR.1.71	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Suffolk County Council [RR-1174] paragraph 125 state they have “not yet seen evidence that any of the surface water drainage infrastructure proposed to serve the Main Development Site, the Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate and Associated Developments can be facilitated within the proposed red line boundaries to a satisfactory standard.” Comment on whether the drainage design strategy being developed can provide the necessary reassurance to the Council.
	Response	
FR.1.72	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] The East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board (ESIBD) [RR-0345] raise an issue concerning the importance of Minsmere Sluice in relation to surface water drainage. Their concern is that Minsmere Sluice is reaching the end of its useful life and changes to water level and discharge volumes as a result of the development will accelerate the change to a pumping station that could have significant implications for surface water management. Has this concern been considered as part of the surface water management regime of the development?
	Response	
FR.1.73	The Applicant	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] ESIDB [RR-0345] have expressed concerns that changes to coastal processes as a result of the HCDF element of the Proposed Development could hamper discharge to the sea from Minsmere. Explain how this has been considered?
	Response	
FR.1.74	Environment Agency, Suffolk County Council, East	Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181] Provide any comments you have on the coverage and content of the ODS at this stage.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Suffolk Council, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board	
	Response	
HW.1	Health and wellbeing	
HW.1.0	ESC, SCC, CCG, Sizewell Health Working Group	Methodology (i) Do you agree that the methodology and scope for assessment of effects from the proposed development as set out in [APP 346] is appropriate and has properly assessed the potential health and wellbeing impacts of the proposed development on the local community? (ii) Do the Councils agree with the methodology in determining the degree of intimidation from traffic and in particular from HGVs? (iii) Do you consider the findings of this part of the ES have been adequately justified?
	Response	
HW.1.1	The Applicant	Uniform Approach Please respond to East Suffolk Councils concern [RR-0342] that by adopting an approach which uniformly applies across the whole area that particular groups might have been missed and therefore this might underplay the degree of effect in certain circumstances.
	Response	
HW.1.2	The Applicant, SCC, ESC part (ii)	Severance Concern has been expressed by a number of RRs including (RR-0758, RR-1008) with regard to the degree of severance that could occur for their local community either through physical barriers – e.g. Sizewell Link Road, or through volume of additional traffic.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(i) Please advise how you consider the proposal minimises these affects for each community and how the scheme has taken into account consideration for more vulnerable groups.</p> <p>(ii) Do the Councils consider the assessment of severance has justified the approach taken, or do you consider there are more adverse effects than have been reported?</p> <p>(iii) In answering please comment on the suitability of the methodology used and be specific in respect of the locations where there remain concerns should this be the case.</p>
	Response	
HW.1.3	Relevant local authorities, CCG	<p>Severance</p> <p>Do the Councils and CCG agree the assessment of severance as set out in [APP-198] reasonably reflects the degree of effects of severance on the local communities concerned such that the ExA can be confident that the proposed development would not have any indirect health impacts or adversely affect access to key public services as sought by the NPS EN-1.</p>
	Response	
HW.1.4	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<p>On Street Parking B1078</p> <p>Concern has been expressed [RR-0762] that the removal of on street parking in this locality would have an adverse effect particularly on the disabled and elderly, please respond to this concern and whether this has been considered as part of any equalities assessment.</p>
	Response	
HW.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Potential Delays</p> <p>Please explain if the ES has considered the potential for delays in the construction programme, and how if at all this potential has been considered in terms of the potential</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:																																																
		effects on the local community from the works extending beyond an already lengthy build programme.																																																
	Response																																																	
HW.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Equality Statement</p> <p>Table A1.2 [APP-158]</p> <p>Appears to have a series of errors the table below has been populated with what are believed the corrected figures highlighted, please clarify and check the rest of this table and confirm what are the correct figures.</p> <table><tr><td>Ward</td><td></td><td>0-15</td><td>%</td><td>16-64</td><td>%</td><td>65+</td><td>%</td></tr><tr><td>Leiston</td><td>6360</td><td>1167</td><td>18.3%</td><td>3819</td><td>60.0%</td><td>1374</td><td>21.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Saxmundham</td><td>4913</td><td>894</td><td>18.2%</td><td>2765</td><td>56.3%</td><td>1254</td><td>25.5%</td></tr><tr><td>Snape</td><td>1911</td><td>271</td><td>14.2%</td><td>1126</td><td>58.9%</td><td>514</td><td>26.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Yoxford</td><td>1901</td><td>215</td><td>11.3%</td><td>1022</td><td>53.8%</td><td>664</td><td>34.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Aldeburgh</td><td>3225</td><td>329</td><td>10.2%</td><td>1519</td><td>47.1%</td><td>1377</td><td>42.7%</td></tr></table> <p>Have the apparent errors affected any of the subsequent conclusions?</p>	Ward		0-15	%	16-64	%	65+	%	Leiston	6360	1167	18.3%	3819	60.0%	1374	21.6%	Saxmundham	4913	894	18.2%	2765	56.3%	1254	25.5%	Snape	1911	271	14.2%	1126	58.9%	514	26.9%	Yoxford	1901	215	11.3%	1022	53.8%	664	34.9%	Aldeburgh	3225	329	10.2%	1519	47.1%	1377	42.7%
Ward		0-15	%	16-64	%	65+	%																																											
Leiston	6360	1167	18.3%	3819	60.0%	1374	21.6%																																											
Saxmundham	4913	894	18.2%	2765	56.3%	1254	25.5%																																											
Snape	1911	271	14.2%	1126	58.9%	514	26.9%																																											
Yoxford	1901	215	11.3%	1022	53.8%	664	34.9%																																											
Aldeburgh	3225	329	10.2%	1519	47.1%	1377	42.7%																																											
	Response																																																	
HW.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Equality Statement</p> <p>(i) Paragraph 1.6.26 [APP-158] Please advise on what basis you reach this conclusion, when the evidence suggests there is a higher proportion of the population in the locality in the higher age groups.</p> <p>(ii) Do you have direct evidence of the age profile of users of the PROW network?</p>																																																
	Response																																																	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HW.1.8	The Applicant	Equality Statement (i) Paragraph 1.6.31 [APP-158] limited control would be available over a certain proportion of the journeys, in these circumstances at what level would the mitigation be applied? (ii) How would this be communicated and subsequently controlled in conjunction with other major projects?
	Response	
HW.1.9	SCC, ESC	Equality Statement The Applicant considers that with mitigation significant adverse transport effects on schools, nurseries, places of worship, GP surgeries and community facilities would not be significantly adverse. Paragraph 1.6.39 [APP 158] (i) Do you agree that the mitigation identified would overcome any significant adverse effects? (ii) Do you consider the mitigation is adequately secured?
	Response	
HW.1.10	The Applicant, SCC, ESC, CCG	Equality Statement The Applicant advises that the Public Services Contingency Fund which would be secured through the S106 would be an appropriate response to the concerns identified in respect of the difficulties associated with recruiting and retaining staff. Paragraph 1.6.49 [APP 158] (i) Please provide an update on the progress of the S106 (ii) Do the Councils and CCG regard this as an appropriate method of mitigation?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
HW.1.11	Ipswich and East Suffolk, CCG, West Suffolk CCG	Anchor Institution (i) Please explain what you mean when you refer to 'an Anchor Institution approach' [RR-500] and how you envisage this approach might be delivered through the DCO. (ii) In light of point 7 of your [RR-500] please explain in detail your concerns regarding the shortcomings of the assessment and how you consider these could be addressed to ensure appropriate mitigation. (iii) Has the reliance on historic data as referred to in the [RR-500] at paragraph 6 diminished the findings of the ES such that you consider the findings could not be relied upon? (iv) How would the CCG wish to see this issue addressed? (v) At paragraph 10 of your [RR-500] you refer to 'most active county' objectives – what/where does this come from? If the ExA is to rely on this document it will need to be submitted into the Examination?
	Response	
HW.1.12	The Applicant	Housing Market (i) Please respond to the concerns identified by the CCG [RR-500] in respect of the additional volatility they anticipate in the housing market and the knock-on effects to healthcare. (ii) How would you propose to minimise these effects such that the indirect health impacts are not caused as a consequence of the proposed development? (iii) How would the mitigation proposed be secured?
	Response	
HW.1.13	The Applicant	Care Home Residents

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The CCG [RR-500] raise questions of the conclusions reached in para 28.6.80 of [APP-346] particularly the potential impact upon two care homes, please respond to this specific concern and highlight how you have assessed any likely effects on this potentially vulnerable group.
	Response	
HW.1.14	The Applicant	Vulnerable Groups The Suffolk Safeguarding Group [RR-1179] express concern about insufficient risk assessments of the potential impact on vulnerable groups and the lack of a strategy to minimise the risks which may arise from the proposed development. Please respond to this specific concern and advise how the information provided meets the tests set out in the NPS EN-1.
	Response	
HW.1.15	The Applicant	Vulnerable Groups The CCG [RR-500] and Suffolk Constabulary [RR-1174] also raise the concern over potential exploitation of vulnerable groups. (i) What is proposed to be in place to mitigate this concern? (ii) How would it be secured?
	Response	
HW.1.16	The Applicant	Vulnerable Groups Impact on the wellbeing of the older community in the locality is a concern expressed by both the CCG [RR-500], and Suffolk Safeguarding Partnership [RR-1179] amongst others. How do you propose to ensure that appropriate mitigation would be in place to support this sector of the community and mitigate any adverse effects such that they could be regarded as not significant?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HW.1.17	ESC, SCC, CCG, Suffolk Safeguarding Partnership	Vulnerable Groups In light of the concerns expressed [RR-1179, RR-500, RR-1140, RR- 0342, RR-1174] in respect of the age demographic in the locality and the potential effects on the older population, do you consider the assessment on health and wellbeing and the equality assessment is adequate?
	Response	
HW.1.18	The Applicant, Suffolk Constabulary	Community Safety From the [RR- 1140] it would appear you are working together on a Strategic Relationship Protocol (SRP). Assuming this is agreed, is this intended to form part of the examination and be delivered through the DCO or a separate side agreement between the parties?
	Response	
HW.1.19	The Applicant, Network Rail	Rail Safety Network Rail [RR-006] identifies concerns, that by introducing any Freight Trains onto the East Suffolk line will (due to their slower running speeds), cause an increased risk and delay to users of level crossings. (i) Please respond to this concern and advise if any mitigation could be provided to address this issue. (ii) If this were appropriate, how would it be delivered through the DCO?
	Response	
HW.1.20	The Applicant	AONB The AONB is designated in part due to the unspoilt landscape and the opportunity this provides for recreation and the enjoyment, peace and health benefits that can arise for the public from having access to such a location. The ESC [RR-0342] and AONB [RR-1170] Partnership both express concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on the broader noise environment as well as the access to this area. Please respond to these concerns and in particular, advise how the proposed mitigation might reduce effects to ensure there are not knock on effects to health and wellbeing.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
HW.1.21	The Applicant	Health Impact Assessment Please respond to the concerns raised by RRs with regard to potential health impacts [RR-0291, RR-0376, RR-853] and the concern raised by others over the lack of a Health Impact Assessment – [RR-1255, RR-0051]
	Response	
HW.1.22	The Applicant, ESC	Ozone Please respond the concern raised in [RR-392] over the potential effects from the proposed development on the release/creation of ozone.
	Response	
HW.1.23	ESC, SCC, CCG, East of England Ambulance Service, PHE	Effects on Mental and Physical Health A number of RRs including [RR-376, 546, 853, 291, 241] express concerns over the direct or indirect effects on health that the construction could have on an individual's health. (i) Please respond to the concerns and advise whether you consider the assessment properly addresses the potential effects of the proposed development. (ii) Additionally, is there confidence that the mitigation proposed adequately addresses any concerns and that this is appropriately secured?
	Response	
HW.1.24	ESC, SCC	Sizewell Link Road In paragraph 2.126 of the ESC [RR-0342] adverse effects on 19 receptor groups are identified for residential receptors. (i) Are the mitigation measures proposed considered within the ES sufficient? (ii) Is the method of securing the mitigation appropriate and enforceable?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
HW.1.25	ESC, SCC, CCG, Sizewell Health Working Group	Methodology (i) Is it agreed that the methodology and scope for assessment of effects from the proposed development is appropriate and has properly assessed the potential health and wellbeing impacts of the proposed development on the local community? (ii) Do you consider the findings of this part of the ES have been adequately justified?
	Response	
HW.1.26	The Applicant	BLF (i) With increased activity on the beach from the introduction of the changed BLF and increased number of deliveries, please explain how these changes have been assessed in terms of the effects on the amenity and recreational use of the beach and the coastal path both during construction and subsequent operation (ii) What implications would this have for tourism and or numbers of users of the coastal path and the beach?
	Response	
HW.1.27	The Applicant, Network Rail	Change Request No. 2 The Change Request could see an increase in the number of freight trains running along the line. Please advise how this could be safely delivered to ensure there would not be unacceptable risks to users of level crossings both for the branch line and the Ipswich to Lowestoft main line.
	Response	
HW.1.28	The Applicant, Network Rail, Suffolk Constabulary, East of England Ambulance	Change Request No. 2 In the event the number of trains were to be increased, please explain what implications this may have for the operation of level crossings on the branch line and the main Ipswich

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Service, Suffolk Fire and Rescue, SCC, ESC	to Lowestoft line and the effect on severance of communities or impacts on emergency services.
	Response	
HW.1.29	East of England Ambulance Service	Service Impact Model (i) Please advise on the latest position in respect of the model being developed to assess the effects of the proposed development on service delivery? (ii) Has this model been agreed as an appropriate method to assess effects with the applicant or any other party?
	Response	
HE.1 Historic environment (terrestrial and marine)		
General		
HE.1.0	The Applicant	Guidance In respect of the '2011 Research and Archaeology Revisited: A Revised Framework for the East of England' it is noted that additional period-based summaries have become available since the submission of the DCO (Paragraph 1.2.36 [APP-171]). Have the new summaries been reviewed? How has any new relevant content been taken into consideration in the formulation of mitigation strategies?
	Response	
HE.1.1	The Applicant	Site Investigation Surveys In addition to location specific questions relating to survey work detailed below, please provide a general update as to whether any additional site investigation surveys have been undertaken since the submission of the DCO? Please confirm how findings will be incorporated into the existing assessments?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HE.1.2	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Overarching Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) Please provide a critique of the Overarching WSI contained within Appendix 2.11.A of [AS-210]. Are you satisfied that the content and level of detail would allow you to discharge your responsibilities?
	Response	
Main Development Site (MDS)		
HE.1.3	The Applicant	Public Outreach Please provide a response to the request made by ESC at paragraph 1.97 [RR-0342] that public outreach for archaeology should be secured via either a Requirement or s106.
	Response	
HE.1.4	The Applicant	Built Heritage Repair Please provide a response to the statement made by ESC at paragraph 2.15 [RR-0342] that the proposed investment for built heritage repair appears very low compared to the landscape and ecology investment.
	Response	
HE.1.5	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Evaluation Trenching At paragraph 16.3.31 [APP-272], the Applicant confirms several limitations in respect of the assessment. One such limitation is that it has not been possible to undertake evaluation trenching on some areas of the site, however most of the site has been subject to a magnetometry survey. Are you satisfied with this approach?
	Response	
HE.1.6	The Applicant	Evaluation Trenching Has evaluation trenching been completed east and south east of Lower Abbey Farm (Paragraph 16.4.31 [APP-272])? If so, how are the findings to be incorporated into the assessment?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HE.1.7	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Summary of Survey Status Table 16.5 [APP-272] confirms where geophysical surveys and/or evaluation trenching has not been undertaken. In such areas, the Applicant has confirmed that a programme of further work will be set out in a site-specific Written Scheme of Investigation. Do you see any significant limitations with this approach?
	Response	
HE.1.8	The Applicant	Summary of Survey Status Please confirm if the name of the field listed in row 20 of Table 16.5 and row 19 of Table 16.6 [APP-272] is complete?
	Response	
HE.1.9	The Applicant	Summary of Survey Status Has the evaluation trenching at Area 4, as detailed in Table 16.5 [APP-272], been completed? If so, how are the findings to be incorporated into the assessment?
	Response	
HE.1.10	The Applicant	Unrecorded Heritage Assets Paragraph 16.4.69 [APP-272] discusses the potential for heritage assets which have not previously been identified or recorded to be present in areas of the site that have not been subject to geophysical surveys and/or evaluation trenching. Please confirm if the SSSI crossing and borrow pit field 2 have been subject to survey? If not, please explain why.
	Response	
HE.1.11	The Applicant	Offsite Heritage Assets Please detail the archaeological interest for the following: (i) Aldeburgh Conservation Area (paragraph 16.4.146 [APP-272]) (ii) Slaughden Martello Tower (paragraph 16.4.154 [APP-272]) (iii) Southwold Conservation Area (paragraph 16.4.158 [APP-272]) (iv) Orford Castle (paragraph 16.4.166 [APP-272])

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
HE.1.12	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England, English Heritage	Direct Effects on Heritage Assets – Construction Paragraph 16.6.55 [APP-272] notes that groundworks associated with the construction of the accommodation campus, roundabout and site entrance of the MDS has the possibility of potentially harming buried archaeological remains associated with the Leiston Abbey assets (LB 121573, LB 1215754, LB 1216380 and LB 1268290). Please comment as to whether such assets comprise relatively minor and peripheral elements of the monastic landholding? Would harm to such designated assets discernibly affect the informative potential of them?
	Response	
HE.1.13	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Peat Strategy Please confirm whether the content of the Peat Strategy contained within Appendix 16G [APP-275] is satisfactory? If required, please provide suggested amendments or additions.
	Response	
HE.1.14	The Applicant	Leiston Abbey Asset Group (SM 1014520, LB 1215753, LB1215754, LB 1216380 and LB 1268290) Paragraphs 16.6.45 to 16.6.61 [APP-272] sets out the assessment of construction effects on the setting of the Leiston Abbey assets. It is acknowledged that changes to setting would occur given the proposed length of construction, visibility of at-height construction, noise levels and visibility of construction infrastructure for visitors travelling by road from both the north and south. It is identified at paragraph 16.6.50 [APP-272] that the construction features experienced would diminish the contribution of the setting to the heritage significance of the asset group. Given the presence of these new features, please explain how the retention of arable land between the asset group and the B1122 (Abbey Road) would serve to maintain a strong perceptual buffer between the proposed development and the asset group (paragraph 16.6.49)?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
HE.1.15	The Applicant, English Heritage	<p>Leiston Abbey Second Site – Sustainable Conservation and Management Plan</p> <p>Please provide detail and a progress update on the proposed Sustainable Conservation and Management Plan.</p> <p>To the Applicant - Is the plan to be included as mitigation? If so, how is this to be secured?</p>
	Response	
HE.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Non-Designated Coastguard Cottages, Dunwich Heath</p> <p>Due to their prominent positioning, the Coastguard Cottages are highly visible within their landscape setting and have a medium heritage significance for architectural and historical interests. Whilst they directly face Sizewell B power station, it is stated that the distance and intervening landscape provides a noticeable sense of separation and isolation.</p> <p>It is noted that both the construction and operation phases would result in intensification of industrial buildings and infrastructure. In addition, there would be a notable reduction in sense of seclusion and the aesthetic appreciation of the asset, particularly when the Coastguard Cottages are viewed from the north. Please provide further justification for the finding of a minor adverse effect which would not be significant in respect of the historic interest and diminution of aesthetic appreciation of the asset.</p>
	Response	
HE.1.17	ESC	<p>Abbey Cottage (LB 1216395)</p> <p>In respect of significance of effect on the setting of Abbey Cottage, paragraph 16.6.82 [APP-272] concludes changes would be significant during construction. Due to the</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		decommissioning of the proposed accommodation campus, main site entrance hub and various storage areas, no effect is anticipated during operation. Please provide further detail in respect of paragraph 2.16 [RR-0342] as to where the contradiction occurs and what mitigation is required.
	Response	
HE.1.18	ESC	Sizewell B Relocated Facilities – Pillbox Field (Change 3) Noting comments made in [AS-307] in respect of Pillbox Field (Option 1), are you satisfied with the following: i) The proposed location of the landscaping scheme in regard of the location of archaeologically sensitive areas; and ii) The production of a management plan within a site specific WSI to outline how remains are to be preserved in-situ during and after proposed landscaping works. If further measures are considered necessary, please detail.
	Response	
HE.1.19	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England, National Trust	Enhancement of the Permanent Beach Landing Facility (BLF) (Change 2) Due to the proposed enhancement of the permanent BLF, it is stated that increased visibility of construction plant is likely from the Coastguard Cottages, Leiston Abbey first site and from the edges of the Aldeburgh and Southwold Conservation Areas. Are you satisfied that, as detailed in [AS-181], such an increase in visibility would not alter the level of significance of effect on the above assets?
	Response	
HE.1.20	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England, National Trust	Temporary Beach Landing Facility (BLF) (Change 2) Are you satisfied that the construction of the temporary BLF would be seen within the wider context of construction related activity and visibility would be relatively limited? Do

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		you concur that as a consequence of such limited visibility the level of significance of the effects on Coastguard Cottages, Leiston Abbey first site and from the edges of the Aldeburgh and Southwold Conservation Areas would not change to that detailed in the initial assessment findings in [APP-272]?
	Response	
HE.1.21	The Applicant	Additional Fen Meadow Habitat at Pakenham (Change 11) Please confirm what survey work has been undertaken at Pakenham to date.
	Response	
HE.1.22	The Applicant	Site of Special Scientific Interest Crossing (Change 6) Both ESC and SCC state that the terrestrial historic environment should be considered because of the change in design [AS-307]. Please expand on why this change does not alter the assessment of effects on the terrestrial historic environment.
	Response	
HE.1.23	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England, English Heritage	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI and Peat Strategy, is any further mitigation necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects at the MDS? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Sizewell Link Road (SLR)		
HE.1.24	The Woodland Trust	Veteran Trees Please confirm, on an annotated plan, the location of the veteran oak tree which may be lost due to the proposed SLR, as referred to in [RR-1213].
	Response	
HE.1.25	The Applicant	Ancient and Veteran Trees

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please confirm whether ancient and veteran trees would be retained and adequately protected during construction? Would measures employed comply with Natural England's Standing Advice in relation to tree buffer zones?
	Response	
HE.1.26	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Historic Landscape Character - Important Hedgerows Paragraph 9.4.21 [APP-467] confirms that it is likely that most surviving hedgerows within the site would be considered important under the Hedgerow Regulations. Are you satisfied that these hedgerows are best considered of low heritage significance?
	Response	
HE.1.27	The Applicant	Site Investigation Surveys Figures 9.4A and 9.4B [APP-469] illustrate archaeological fieldwork undertaken at the time of submission of the DCO. Has any further access been granted to areas highlighted 'no access'? Please confirm how much of the route remains unassessed?
	Response	
HE.1.28	The Applicant	Archaeological and Historical Background - Theberton Hall and Theberton House Paragraph 9.4.47 [APP-467] refers to both the parkland landscape at Theberton Hall and the garden area of Theberton House. Please confirm whether the final sentence of paragraph 9.4.47 [APP-467] refers to Theberton Hall, Theberton House or both assets?
	Response	
HE.1.29	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Primary Mitigation - Theberton Hall Would the proposed woodland planting to the west of the SLR, described at paragraph 9.5.5 [APP-467], in the vicinity of Dovehouse Farmhouse adequately compensate for the loss of woodland in the belt west of Theberton Hall? In addition, would the proposed woodland planting east of the SLR successfully minimise views from Theberton Hall Estate and help integrate the proposed Pretty Road overbridge into the surrounding landscape?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
HE.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Significance of Effect</p> <p>Paragraph 9.6.61 [APP-467] describes noise related to construction activity as being limited and long-term temporary. In respect of significance of effect, paragraph 9.6.62 [APP-467] states any change as being short-term temporary.</p> <p>Please explain why the significance of effect is considered short-term if it is previously accepted that noise elements would be long-term temporary?</p>
	Response	
HE.1.31	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	<p>Historic Landscape Character - Construction</p> <p>Are you satisfied that although the construction of the SLR would bisect several fields and truncate historic boundaries it would not eliminate the overall landscape pattern or ability to understand it (paragraph 9.6.67 [APP-467])?</p>
	Response	
HE.1.32	ESC	<p>Historic Road Pattern – Yoxford to Leiston</p> <p>Please provide additional detail regarding the conclusion that the effects of the interruption and realignment of the historic road pattern from Yoxford to Leiston would be moderate adverse and significant (Paragraph 2.105 [RR-0342]).</p>
	Response	
HE.1.33	The Applicant and ESC	<p>Moat Farmhouse (LB 1228246)</p> <p>To the Applicant - Please respond to the statement made by ESC in respect of Moat Farmhouse in [RR-0342] that the assessment findings cannot be supported as the land to the north is one of the earliest farming landscapes in Suffolk. Noting this, please consider whether a review of the finding of no significant adverse effects is required?</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		To the ESC - Please provide further detail in support of your concerns regarding the assessment of Moat Farmhouse. If additional mitigation is considered necessary, please provide detail.
	Response	
HE.1.34	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI, is any further mitigation considered necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects at the SLR? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
HE.1.35	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) Would the proposed landscape measures within the oLEMP [AS-264] minimise impacts on cultural heritage resources? If not, please detail why.
	Response	
Freight Management Facility (FMF)		
HE.1.36	The Applicant	Site Size At paragraph 9.4.6 [APP-528] the site is described as approximately 9.4 hectares (ha). In other ES chapters, the site is described as 11 ha. Please confirm the size of the site.
	Response	
HE.1.37	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Historic Landscape Character - Construction Please comment on the effectiveness of the proposed planting at the eastern, northern and western borders of the FMF in ensuring that any change to existing landscape would be kept internal to the field (paragraph 9.6.15 [APP-528]).
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HE.1.38	ESC, SCCAS Historic England	Historic Landscape Character - Operation Would the retention of existing boundary vegetation, the 10m buffer zone around the north, east and west site boundaries and the addition of three landscape bunds be effective in adding a visual screen and close the operational facility off from the rest of the agricultural landscape (paragraph 9.6.25 [APP-528])?
	Response	
HE.1.39	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Effect on Setting of Heritage Effects - Operation In respect of assets located to the south west of Redhouse Farm (SM 1011344), would the provision of additional planting in existing hedgerows and the landscape bund on the eastern boundary be sufficient in order to reduce any sense of intrusion experienced during operation (paragraph 9.6.20 [APP-528])?
	Response	
HE.1.40	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Secondary Mitigation Measures Would the proposed secondary mitigation measures detailed in paragraph 9.7.4 [APP-528] reduce the low magnitude of adverse impact on the bowl barrow south west of Redhouse Farm (SM 1011344) to a residual minor adverse effect that would be not significant?
	Response	
HE.1.41	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI, is any further mitigation considered necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects at the FMF? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Southern Park and Ride (SPR)		
HE.1.42	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Landscaping Scheme

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Would the proposed landscaping scheme, as detailed on the illustrative masterplan [AS-196], minimise the impact on setting of historic assets and the historic landscape character?
	Response	
HE.1.43	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Historic Landscape Character - Important Hedgerows Hedgerows on the site boundary to the east and in a small enclosure in the south-west [AS-196] are considered important under the Hedgerow Regulations. Are you satisfied that these hedgerows are best considered of low heritage significance?
	Response	
HE.1.44	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI, is any further mitigation considered necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects at the SPR? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Marine Historic Environment		
HE.1.45	The Applicant	Figures 23.1.-23.3 - Update Please can Figures 23.-23.3 [APP-336] be updated to reflect Change 2.
	Response	
HE.1.46	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Enhancement of the Permanent BLF and Construction of Temporary BLF (Change 2) Are you satisfied that the proposed changes in respect of BLFs would not alter the assessment conclusion detailed in [APP-334]? If not, please provide detail.
	Response	
HE.1.47	The Applicant	Enhancement of the Permanent BLF and Construction of Temporary BLF (Change 2) – Wreck Sites

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please confirm the distance of both the permanent BLF and temporary BLF sites from wreck sites MSF20289 and MSF11344?
	Response	
Two Village Bypass (TVB)		
HE.1.48	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) Would the proposed landscape measures within the oLEMP [AS-263] minimise impacts on cultural heritage resources? If not, please detail why.
	Response	
HE.1.49	The Applicant	Extension and Reductions of Order Limits (Change 12) Both ESC and SCC state that the terrestrial historic environment should be considered because of the change in design [AS-307]. Please provide a response.
	Response	
HE.1.50	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI, is any further mitigation considered necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects at the TVB? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Northern Park and Ride (NPR)		
HE.1.51	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Oak Hall (LB 1030664) – Operational Effect on Setting Considering the assessment findings and the representative viewpoint provided at Figure 6.14 [APP-362] do you concur that during operation of the NPR there would be no change to heritage significance?
	Response	
HE.1.52	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Old Hall (LB 1198815) – Operational Effect on Setting

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Due to the existing landscaping and buildings located to the north and west of Old Hall, due you concur that there would be no change to either the non-designated parkland or setting of the building?
	Response	
HE.1.53	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI, is any further mitigation considered necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects at the NPR? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Rail		
HE.1.54	The Applicant	Post-Medieval and Modern – Heritage Significance What is the level of heritage significance for archaeological interest for post-modern and medieval periods within the study area?
	Response	
HE.1.55	The Applicant	Change to the Setting of Archaeological Heritage Assets – Abbey Complex Paragraph 9.6.14 [APP-560] confirms that the perception of construction works to the south of the Abbey complex would result in a discernible loss of historic interest. Please confirm the significance of this effect.
	Response	
HE.1.56	The Applicant	Increased Frequency of Freight Train Movements (Change 1) – Abbey Ruins Paragraph 9.6.32 [APP-560] states that the limited number of rail movements means that perceptibility of rail operations would be intermittent and infrequent and would not significantly affect that ability to understand or appreciate the assets interests. Please signpost to where consideration on significance of effect of Change 1 in relation to the setting of the Abbey ruins is located.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HE.1.57	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England, English Heritage, Pro Corda Trust/Leiston Abbey	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI and Heritage s106 agreement to provide for enhancements to the visitor experience for the two Leiston Abbey sites, is any further mitigation considered necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements (YROHI)		
HE.1.58	ESC, SCCAS, Historic England	Mitigation Alongside of the proposed site-specific WSI, is any further mitigation considered necessary in relation terrestrial heritage effects at the YROHI? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
LI.1	Landscape impact, visual effects and design	
General		
LI.1.0	The Applicant	Design Approach Design is a matter which is cross-cutting in relation to multiple topics identified within the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues. Please explain the design approach and design credentials of the Main Development Site and Associated Development Sites. Reference should be made to the objectives listed in section 4.5 of NPS EN-1 and how the proposed development seeks to address or exceed the expectations of good design as set out in the National Design Guide. Whilst noting that the NPS is the primary source of policy under which applications will be considered, reference should also be made to policy within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which stipulates good design. In addition, please also have regard to 'Design Principles for National Infrastructure', published by the National Infrastructure Commission (February 2020) in respect of Climate, Places, People and Value in construction, operation and where relevant, decommissioning.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
LI.1.1	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Historic England, Natural England, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Partnership, Parish and Town Councils, Together Against Sizewell C, Stop Sizewell C	<p>Design Approach</p> <p>It is imperative that the proposal represents a good quality sustainable design which can be effectively integrated into the landscape. As such, please comment on whether the following measures would ensure this would be achieved in the detailed design, construction and operation phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) A 'design champion'. Such a role would advise on the quality of sustainable design and the spatial integration of the both the Main Development Site and Associated Development Sites ii) A 'design review panel' to provide a 'critical friend' role. Such a role would provide comment on the development of sustainable design proposals iii) The production of an approved 'design code' or 'design approach document' which would establish the approach to delivering the detailed design specifications to ensure good quality sustainable design (as approved in the Hinkley Point C Connector Project (EN020001)). <p>Please advise on how such measures could be secured. In addition, please comment as to whether any other measures or approaches are considered necessary?</p>
	Response from Leiston Town Council	<p>LI.1.1 Design issues and Landscape</p> <p>It seems to LTC highly unlikely that the design can be sympathetically integrated into the landscape visually and we are not qualified to comment on sustainability and quality. However, the suggestions put forward might all help to lessen the adverse impact of the building. A code drawn up by people with relevant professional expertise, a review panel of stakeholders to comment and discuss and a 'design champion' whose job would be to advise and make sure recommendations were implemented. Concerns have been expressed about the grey concrete domes compared with the white cladding on Sizewell B and also about the height of the stacks on the turbine buildings and the new pylons.</p>
LI.1.2	ESC, SCC, Historic England, Natural England, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB Partnership, Parish and Town Councils, Together	<p>AONB – Adverse Effects</p> <p>Has sufficient weight has been given to the statutory purpose and need for protection of the landscape, character and special qualities of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB both within and outside its boundary, in accordance with paragraphs 5.9.9 and 5.9.12 of NPS</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Against Sizewell C, Stop Sizewell C	EN-1? Please qualify your answer. If not, please identify what additional measures are required?
	Response from Leiston Town Council	<p>LI.1.2 AONB – Adverse Effects</p> <p>Leiston Town Council has always expressed concerns about the siting of another nuclear power station of this scale within the AONB. The aim of the AONB is to “conserve and enhance” a landscape that has special qualities. The development of SZC will do nothing to conserve or enhance the landscape qualities, scenic value, relative wildness or the tranquility of the area. Indeed, during construction, the landscape, character and special qualities will be lost completely for the duration of the construction and the restoration will take decades and the generations currently enjoying this environment will never see a return to its current character. Splitting the AONB into two parts is also seen as detrimental to the whole. While recognizing there will be an attempt to screen the buildings from both the land and seaward sides and the ambition to enhance the estate in the long term, without question, it will lead to the total destruction of our much loved and enjoyed section of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB.</p> <p>During construction, the view of high cranes will be seen from Leiston itself and for miles along the coast, including within close proximity to RSPB Minsmere and National Trust Dunwich Heath. Light pollution will affect the residents within the local area and also its ecology. In addition, noise and dust and the loss of clean air, will mean the enjoyment of the AONB in this area is deemed impossible.</p> <p>We can evidence the above views by observing the site at Hinkley Point C, which despite the topography in Somerset, can still be seen for miles around – even from Dunkery Beacon on Exmoor National Park, which is 30 miles away. Also by the experience of the Sizewell B construction which was on a smaller scale.</p> <p>It would therefore, in our view, be impossible to protect the landscape, character and special qualities of the SC&H AONB should this project go ahead. Furthermore, experience has shown (with Coronation Wood for example) that mitigation or safeguards built in at this stage cannot be guaranteed for the long term should future unforeseen needs involve further demand for land from the AONB.</p> <p>Leiston Town Council concurs with the Relevant Representation and other submissions by Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB to further evidence these observations and concerns.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.3	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Natural England	<p>AONB and Heritage Coast</p> <p>In their RR [RR-1170], the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership state that the linking of the AONB designation to the Heritage Coast in various places throughout the ES is misleading. The AONB Partnership requests that each of the designations should be treated separately and the impacts on the purposes of each of the designations should be undertaken in recognition of each of their defined purposes. Please provide a response to this statement.</p> <p>To ESC, SCC and Natural England – Are you satisfied with the approach adopted by the Applicant in respect of the two designations? If not, please provide detail.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.4	ESC, SCC, Natural England and AONB Partnership	<p>Baseline Photographs and Visualisations</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the presentation of baseline photographs and visualisations prepared for the Proposed Development, including the Associated Development Sites?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.5	ESC, SCC, Natural England and AONB Partnership	<p>Night-Time Assessment of Lighting</p> <p>No specific guidance exists on which to base a night-time assessment of lighting on landscape and visual receptors. Are you satisfied with the approach adopted by the Applicant?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)</p> <p>Did the LVIA for both the Main Development Site and Associated Development Sites include an assessment of sequential views, for instance relating to users of public right of way networks?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.7	SCC	Mitigation and Offsetting

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide additional detail in respect of concerns raised in [RR-1174] regarding inadequate proposals for mitigating and offsetting landscape impacts both within and beyond the AONB.
	Response	
LI.1.8	The Applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plans – Ecological Steering Group Which stakeholders would be involved in the proposed Ecological Steering Group [APP-588]? The Steering Group is proposed to advise on the management measures to be specified within the LEMP. The establishment of such a group is not proposed for the Two Village Bypass oLEMP [AS-263] or the Sizewell Link Road oLEMP [AS-264]. Please confirm why not? How are management measures within the two additional LEMPs to be advised upon?
	Response	
LI.1.9	The Applicant	Associated Development Design Principles Please confirm how the Associated Development Design Principles are to be secured in the DCO?
	Response	
LI.1.10	The Applicant	Associated Development Design Principles – Gas Mitigation Measures Please confirm what gas mitigation measures are, as referred to in 'Building Design Principles' in respect of the proposed Northern Park and Ride, Southern Park and Ride and Freight Management Facility in [APP-589].
	Response	
LI.1.11	The Applicant	Sizewell B Infall and Outfall Structures Please confirm the distance of the Sizewell B infall and outfall structures from MHWM.
	Response	
LI.1.12	SCC	Detailed Design

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Noting comments made in [RR-1174] please expand on what additional control SCC considers necessary in respect of detailed design issues within the DCO requirements?
	Response	
Main Development Site (MDS)		
LI.1.13	The Applicant	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Please confirm whether findings from the noise and vibration assessments have been included as a source of data for the LVIA? If not, please explain why.
	Response	
LI.1.14	The Applicant	Proposed Landscape Masterplan Please confirm how the proposed Landscape Masterplan [AS-117] is to be secured?
	Response	
LI.1.15	ESC, SCC, Natural England, AONB Partnership	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) The overarching objective of the oLEMP [APP-588] is to create a large area of Dry Sandlings Grassland bordered by native woodland and scattered trees/scrub. Alongside of the proposed increase in biodiversity value, the oLEMP considers that the new habitats would enhance the landscape character of the Estate Sandlands LCT. Are you satisfied, once established, that the LCT would be enhanced?
	Response	
LI.1.16	ESC, SCC, Natural England, AONB Partnership	Pillbox Field - Planting Would the one hectare of new woodland and woodland edge planting proposed within Pillbox Field provide adequate replacement planting for the loss of Coronation Wood? In addition, would the planting successfully provide enhanced visual screening of the power station infrastructure from Sizewell Gap and Sandy Lane?
	Response	
LI.1.17	The Applicant	Pillbox Field – Soil Conditions

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In their consultation response to the proposed changes [AS-307], ESC commented that the potential problems of establishing trees on light sandy soils has recently been agreed in respect of the 2019 Town and Country Planning Act consent. Please provide a summary of how this issue is to be addressed.
	Response	
LI.1.18	The Applicant	Sizewell B Relocated Facilities - Planting Please comment on Suffolk Preservation Society [AS-307] request for additional levels of planting within the car park and at the boundaries of the western access road to soften potential industrialising effects in the landscape.
	Response	
LI.1.19	The Applicant	Sizewell B Relocated Facilities – Coronation Wood Please provide a response to the concerns raised by the Suffolk Preservation Society [AS-307] that the loss of Coronation Wood to accommodate Sizewell B relocated facilities has not been adequately mitigated. Please review as to whether the proposed planting would be sufficient to screen, soften and/or provide filtered views of the facilities.
	Response	
LI.1.20	The Applicant	Sizewell B Relocated Facilities – Parameters Where possible please confirm maximum height of the following infrastructure: i) Outage Store ii) Training Centre iii) Visitor Centre iv) Administrative Building
	Response	
LI.1.21	The Applicant	Design A significant proportion of the proposed design of the MDS is a replica of the Hinkley Point C site. In [RR-1170] the AONB Partnership raises concern that this is not appropriate as

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		the Hinkley Point C design fails to recognise the siting within a nationally designated landscape. Please provide a response.
	Response	
LI.1.22	The Applicant	Photomontages/Wireframes In respect of construction impacts, the AONB Partnership does not consider the visualisations submitted are fit for purpose [RR-1170]. In addition, they also consider similar visualisations as provided for the Wylfa project would be more useful. Please respond and explain how the Wylfa visualisations differ to those submitted? How would the production of material similar to that provided for the Wylfa project assist the ExA?
	Response	
LI.1.23	AONB Partnership	Photomontages/Wireframes Please expand on why you consider the submitted visualisations are not fit for purpose in respect of construction impacts, as detailed in [RR-1170]. Please also confirm how the production of material similar to that provided for the Wylfa project would assist the ExA? Are you satisfied in respect of operational visualisations?
	Response	
LI.1.24	The Applicant	Photowire Visualisations Please provide operational phase photowire visualisations for the existing view, year 1 and year 15 for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viewpoint 10: Suffolk Coast Path and Sandlings Walk east of Hill Wood • Viewpoint 26: 1800m directly east of Sizewell power stations Please confirm whether, given the proposed changes, it is also necessary to update the following photowire visualisations in [APP-219]? If not, please detail why. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viewpoint 5: Footpath south of Leiston Abbey • Viewpoint 6: Suffolk Coast Path east of Goose Hill • Viewpoint 8: Footpath north of Leiston Abbey • Viewpoint 9: Sizewell Gap south of Greater Gabbard sub-station

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoint 14: Suffolk Coast Path at Minsmere Sluice Viewpoint 17: National Trust Dunwich Coastguard Cottages car park
	Response	
LI.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Photomontages – Construction Lighting</p> <p>Please provide visualisations for the worst-case scenario in respect of construction lighting (to show infrastructure up to and including exceptional height parameters) for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Viewpoint 5: Footpath south of Leiston Abbey Viewpoint 6: Suffolk Coast Path east of Goose Hill Viewpoint 8: Footpath north of Leiston Abbey Viewpoint 9: Sizewell Gap south of Greater Gabbard sub-station Viewpoint 10: Suffolk Coast Path and Sandlings Walk east of Hill Wood Viewpoint 14: Suffolk Coast Path at Minsmere Sluice Viewpoint 16: RSPB Minsmere (Whin Hill) Viewpoint 17: National Trust Dunwich Coastguard Cottages car park Viewpoint 26: 1800m directly east of Sizewell power stations
	Response	
LI.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment – Night-time</p> <p>The AONB Partnership do not consider the night-time impacts of the proposal have been appropriately assessed against the AONB criteria [RR-1170]. Please provide a response to this and confirm whether, considering the comments made, it is necessary to amend the night-time assessment?</p>
LI.1.27	ESC	<p>Operational Effects – AONB</p> <p>At paragraph 1.54 of [RR-0342], the findings in respect of operation effects on the AONB and Heritage Coast are stated as being a 'highly dubious and unsatisfactory conclusion'. Please expand upon the reasoning behind this conclusion.</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
LI.1.28	The Applicant	General Arrangement Plan Please explain why the building numbering on Figure 2.2 of [APP-183] is different to the building numbering on Figures contained with the Part 2 of the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement [APP-586].
	Response	
LI.1.29	The Applicant	Turbine Halls and Operational Service Centre (OSC) Please provide additional visual information confirming how the plinth storeys to the turbine halls and OSC would appear.
	Response	
LI.1.30	The Applicant	Main Access Building – Design Noting the comments made in [RR-0342] and the proposed location of the main access building, what consideration been given to a more innovative design?
	Response	
LI.1.31	The Applicant	Design Council Review – Operational Service Centre (OSC) The Design Council, in their November 2019 correspondence, (Appendix B [APP-587]) stated 'The design of the OSC appears to address the wider site considerations of the AONB at the expense of the staff within the proposed building the site layout of the worker's accommodation does not appear to have been designed with the users in mind'. Please provide a response, confirming how the proposed design has considered the needs of users.
	Response	
LI.1.32	The Applicant	Design Council Review - Cladding In their 2019 review the Design Council (Appendix B [APP-587]) commented that consideration should be given to the proposed colour of the panels in respect of the sky

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		rather than the earth. Furthermore, the proposed colour palette was stated as limited as reference is only from Autumnal colours. Please provide a response to these points. The Design Council also suggested that a large-scale mock-up of the proposed cladding panels may be beneficial to further assess how the façade would work. Has any consideration been given to such an exercise? Please confirm whether this would be feasible.
	Response	
LI.1.33	The Applicant	Cladding Colour Assessment The cladding colour assessment was undertaken over a two-day period. In which season was the assessment was undertaken? Please confirm how seasonal variations, in respect of weather conditions and lighting, were taken into consideration?
	Response	
LI.1.34	The Applicant	Cladding Selection Has a final design been made in regard of which pressed panel profile variant is to be utilised, as detailed at Figure 7.28 of [APP-586]?
	Response	
LI.1.35	ESC, SCC, AONB Partnership, Natural England	Ancillary and Plant Buildings The ancillary and plant buildings are likely to be clad with profiled sheet metal. It is proposed that they would have a consistent façade treatment which is likely to comprise a darker, visually recessive colour. Are you satisfied that the use of a darker finish would allow the ancillary and plant buildings to appear grounded within the wider operational platform?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.36	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus</p> <p>In their 2019 review the Design Council (Appendix B [APP-587]) commented that the design of proposed accommodation campus is 'largely constraints-driven, suboptimal in terms of its use of land and does not create a welcoming sense of place. The proposal also seems to prioritise car movements and car parking within the site, and is constrained by sightline and key views, potentially to the detriment of the quality of life on the site'.</p> <p>Please respond to this statement confirming how the comments made have been taken into consideration in the proposed design.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus – Materials Palette</p> <p>Paragraph A.30.6 [APP-587] states that the materials palette will not be fixed at this stage of the design process. However, specific colour palettes and illustrative elevations and perspectives depicting the palette of colours are shown in figures A.39-A.44 [APP-587]. Please confirm if the detailed colour palette is fixed?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.38	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus – Materials Palette</p> <p>Please respond to the statement made by ESC [RR-0342] regarding how the local vernacular would lend itself to a modular form of construction.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.39	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Campus – Modular Design</p> <p>Please respond to the statement made by ESC [RR-0342] regarding the need to ensure the design of the accommodation campus avoids a stacked portacabin effect.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.40	ESC, SCC, AONB Partnership, Natural England	<p>Accommodation Campus – Massing Model and Photomontage/Wireframe Visualisations</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Following the Procedural Decision letter in December 2020 [PD-0009] the Applicant has supplied an annotated 3D massing model and photomontage/wireframe visualisations from three viewpoints in respect of the accommodation campus. Please review the additional information and provide any comment considered necessary.
	Response	
LI.1.41	ESC, SCC, Natural England, AONB Partnership	Accommodation Campus – Key Design Principles Alongside of the relevant parameter plans, the Key Design Principles listed at Table A.1 [APP-587] provides the detail for the delivery of the proposed accommodation campus. Are you satisfied that Table A.1, as drafted, is sufficiently robust and precise?
	Response	
LI.1.42	ESC, SCC, Natural England, AONB Partnership	Accommodation Campus – AONB In respect of the location of the proposed accommodation campus, please provide a detailed response regarding potential effects on the statutory purpose of the AONB.
	Response	
LI.1.43	Yoxford Parish Council	Accommodation Campus – Scale Please provide additional information as to why it is considered that the proposed accommodation campus would not provide enough accommodation [RR-1277].
	Response	
LI.1.44	The Applicant	Accommodation Campus – Refuse Stores Paragraph A.33.1[APP-587] refers to the location of dedicated refuse stores on Figure A.17. Please confirm where on Figure A.17 the refuse stores are depicted? Should the reference be to Figure A.25? Please also clarify which figure also shows the larger refuse store as stated in paragraph A.33.2 [APP-587]. Please make any amendments as necessary.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.45	The Applicant	Outage Car Park SCC consider that the staff car parking and outage car parking at Goose Hill represents additional development within the AONB for which there is no overriding need in the proposed location ([RR-1174] and [AS-307]). What consideration has been given to less sensitive locations, including the shared use of the Sizewell B outage car park?
	Response	
LI.1.46	The Applicant	SSSI Crossing – Design (Change 6) The MDS Flood Risk Assessment Addendum [AS-157] states that by 2090 the maximum crest height of the SSSI crossing is likely to need to be increased to 10.5m AOD. Noting the comments made by SCC in [AS-307], please explain why no further change is proposed in respect of the height of the crossing to mitigate against future flood overtopping? What consideration has been given to any future disturbance in respect of established landscaping on the embankments if an increase in height is required in the future?
	Response	
LI.1.47	ESC, SCC, AONB Partnership, Natural England	SSSI Crossing – Assessment (Change 6) Would the changes made to the embankment slopes on the SSSI crossing [AS-181] better integrate the crossing into the landscape from coastal viewpoints? Are you satisfied that because of the change, the level of significance of effects during the operational phase would remain as stated in [APP-216]?
	Response	
LI.1.48	AONB Partnership	Alison Farmer Associates Report Please provide a copy of the Alison Farmer Associates report as referred to in your response to the proposed project changes [AS-307].
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.49	The Applicant	<p>Independent Environmental Trust</p> <p>In respect of the proposed independent Environmental Trust, please provide further detail on the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Governance and Implementation ii) Financing iii) Membership <p>Would the Trust form part of any mitigation for the proposed development?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.50	SCC	<p>Pylons – Underground Cabling Options</p> <p>In respect of the proposed changes Richard Smith, Suffolk County Councillor for the Blything Division refers to a report [AS-307] produced by SCC which examines underground cabling options. Please provide a copy of the report and any responses received from the Applicant regarding it.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.51	The Applicant	<p>Pylons – Alternatives and Impact</p> <p>The change to both the location of pylon parameter zone P3 and reduction in height of the southernmost pylon from 79m AOD to 59m AOD is noted. Nonetheless, concern has been raised by several IPs, including [RR-0877, RR-0878, RR-1170, RR-1174], regarding the impact within a sensitive landscape and whether all alternatives to pylons have been adequately discounted. Noting the comment made at paragraph 3.2.82 of Appendix 8.4A [APP-591] please confirm the outcome of any further assessment regarding undergrounding options. Please also confirm what consideration has been given to the use of Gas Insulated Lines.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.52	SCC	Pylons – Mitigation

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In respect of the use of pylons, please confirm what a 'significant compensation package' would consist of, as detailed in paragraph 86 of [RR-1174].
	Response	
LI.1.53	The Applicant	Interim Spent Fuel Store (ISFS) In their review the Design Council stated that they 'strongly recommend the inclusion of the dry fuel store as a detailed component of the DCO application given its key role' [APP-587]. Whilst parameters of the ISFS are detailed within [AS-202], please comment on why detailed design of the ISFS is to be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority before construction commences.
	Response	
LI.1.54	The Applicant	Changes to Proposed Development – AONB Characteristics The AONB Partnership [AS-307] state a specific detailed assessment of the potential change impacts in relation to the statutory purpose of the AONB has not been undertaken. Please advise if such an assessment has been undertaken and signpost to its location.
	Response	
LI.1.55	The Applicant	Enhanced Beach Landing Facility (BLF) – Assessment (Change 2) Has the operational assessment considered the visual impact of additional moored and moving vessels due to the enhanced BLF?
	Response	
LI.1.56	The Applicant	Temporary Beach Landing Facility (BLF) – Visual Receptor Group 20 (Change 2) In respect of Visual Receptor Group 20 – Sizewell to Thorpeness Coast, at what distance would effects become moderate (not significant) and adverse further south of the temporary BLF?
	Response	
LI.1.57	The Applicant	Enhanced and Temporary Beach Landing Facilities (BLF) – Lighting (Change 2)

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		How often would the enhanced permanent and temporary BLF be used at night-time? Please signpost to detail of the required navigation lighting for both the enhanced and temporary BLF.
	Response	
LI.1.58	ESC, SCC, MMO, Natural England and AONB Partnership	Temporary Beach Landing Facility – Assessment (Change 2) Are you satisfied with the findings of effects relating to the temporary BLF detailed in section 2.8 [AS-181] as compared to the judgements in [APP-216]?
	Response	
LI.1.59	The Applicant	Lighting Management Plan Due to proposed Changes 1, 2 and 3 Natural England have commented [AS-307] that the Lighting Management Plan [APP-182] should be reviewed. Please confirm as to whether this is considered necessary. If not, please explain why.
	Response	
LI.1.60	The Applicant	Coastal Defences – Supporting Vegetation (Change 9) Please confirm what measures are proposed to ensure the safeguarding of the sand and shingle supporting coastal vegetation.
	Response	
LI.1.61	The Applicant	Coastal Defences – Landscaping/Vegetation (Change 9) Please confirm how long it is likely to take for the proposed landscaping/vegetation on the HCDF to mature to reflect the visualisation provided at Figure 2.2.24 [AS-190]?
	Response	
LI.1.62	The Applicant	Coastal Defences – Northern Mound (Change 9) Please confirm how long it is likely to take for vegetation to become established on the top of the substrate on the rock armour on the Northern Mound? Also, how long will it take for the Northern Mound profile to match the profile of the existing Sizewell B defences?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.63	The Applicant	Coastal Defences – Adaptive Design (Change 9) In respect of the adaptive design, paragraph 2.8.110 [AS-181] states that substantial uncertainties exist regarding the characteristics of future baseline conditions so the exact nature and significance of effects cannot be accurately reported. Is it possible to apply a range of possible worst-case scenarios to enable the significance of effects to be considered?
	Response	
LI.1.64	The Applicant	Additional Fen Meadow Habitat at Pakenham (Change 11) Please confirm the following: (i) The distance of the residential dwellings off Fen Road and Thurston Road (Old Hall) from the Pakenham site? (ii) Is lighting required during the construction phase? If so, has this been included within the assessment? (iii) What is the proposed length of establishment works?
	Response	
LI.1.65	The Applicant	New Bridleway Link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills (Change 15) How much hedgerow vegetation would be lost due to the new bridleway link and how much mitigation hedgerow planting is proposed? Please annotate on a plan.
	Response	
LI.1.66	The Applicant	Change to Certain Parameter Heights and Activities – Pylon Parameter Zones (Change 4) Please confirm from which locations visibility of the southernmost pylon would be reduced? Please annotate on a plan.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.67	The Applicant	Change to Certain Parameter Heights and Activities – Bat Barn (Change 4) Paragraphs 2.2.114 and 2.11.26 [AS-181] and Figure 2.2.1 [AS-190] refer to a new operational parameter zone 1G for a proposed bat barn. Figure 2.2.1 [AS-190] depicts zone 1K. Please confirm the correct zone reference. If necessary, please update plans and documentation accordingly.
	Response	
LI.1.68	ESC, SCC, Natural England, AONB Partnership	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to the MDS? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Freight Management Facility (FMF)		
LI.1.69	The Applicant	Draft DCO Work No. 13 as described in Schedule 1 [AS-145] states '(c) landscape works; including the provision of ecological habitat, hardstanding, and vehicle, motorcycle and bicycle parking areas;'. Please confirm where within the proposed FMF is the provision of ecological habitat? If the ecological habitat is no longer proposed, please update Work No. 13 in the next version of the draft DCO.
	Response	
LI.1.70	The Applicant	Parameter Plan Parameter Plan Figure 2.6 [APP-513] states that Zone 1A is to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ amenity and welfare building up to 4m ○ security building up to 4m ○ shelters (smoking and cycle) up to 3m ○ HGV screen and search canopy up to 6m

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		These parameters are also reflected at Table 2.1 [APP-511]. However, the Freight Management Facility Proposed General Arrangement Plan (Drawing SZC-SZ0204-FP-000-DRW-100026 Rev 01) [APP-512] states different heights for the amenity and welfare building and security building. The height of the HGV screen and search lane is not stated. Please confirm the correct heights of all buildings within Zone 1A. Please update all relevant documents to reflect any amendments made.
	Response	
LI.1.71	The Applicant	Landscape Bund The proposed 3m high landscape bund does not run the whole length of the eastern boundary (Figure 2.1 [APP-513]). (i) Please confirm if this is due to the location of the unlined infiltration swale on the southern/eastern boundary? (ii) If so, please confirm whether it would be possible to reorientate the swale to enable the bund to extend the full length of the eastern boundary? Would such a change make any difference to the assessment findings? (iii) Where necessary, please update all relevant documents to reflect any amendments made.
	Response	
LI.1.72	The Applicant	Representative Viewpoint 1: Junction of Bridleways E-365/007/0 and E-365/006/0 Please provide a wireframe for Figure 6.5 [APP-522] with mature planting in-situ.
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.73	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>Representative Viewpoint 3: Footpath E-169/017/0</p> <p>In respect of Figure 6.7 [APP-522] construction and removal/reinstatement effects would be of medium scale and adverse. During operation, fencing, parking areas, lighting columns, site buildings, shelters, the screen and search canopy and vehicle movements would be visible. It is accepted that such views would be seen in conjunction with traffic movement along the A14. Despite the FMF remaining a prominent feature, it is stated that once planting begins to mature effects would be reduced to small scale.</p> <p>(i) Is the reduction in scale of effect solely due to the increased height of the planting?</p> <p>(ii) Whilst accepting that the lower elements of the development would be screened, several structures and buildings would remain visible above the landscaping. The Applicant is therefore requested to review the assessment made in respect of Figure 6.7 and provide comment.</p> <p>Are the Councils satisfied that effects would reduce from medium scale to small scale as the proposed planting matures at this viewpoint?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.74	The Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>Please explain why only lighting along the perimeter of the FMF is to be fitted with demountable light shields to reduce the backward spill of light? Why is it not necessary for all lighting columns on the FMF to be fitted with such shields?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.75	The Applicant	<p>Lighting</p> <p>What, if any, is the predicted level of light spill anticipated to occur beyond the site boundary of the FMF?</p>
	Response	
LI.1.76	ESC, SCC	Lighting

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Are you satisfied that the effects of the operational night-time lighting from the FMF would be not significant for the LCTs and identified Visual Receptor Groups [APP-520]? In answering please be specific in respect of location if any concern exists.
	Response	
LI.1.77	The Applicant	Primary Mitigation – Landscaped Buffer Zone Please provide additional information in respect of the proposed landscaped buffer zone. Please provide detail of: i) Proposed species ii) Proposed height of planting at year 1 and year 10
	Response	
LI.1.78	The Applicant	Landscape Character Types Please confirm how the design of the proposed FMF complies with the landscape management guidelines contained within the Guidance Note which supports the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (Paragraph 6.6.15 of [APP-520]). Please respond in respect of both the Estate Sandlands and Plateau Estate Farmlands LCT.
	Response	
LI.1.79	ESC, SCC	Landscaping Would the retention of the existing boundary vegetation, the implementation of a 10m buffer zone and three landscape bunds be effective in adding a visual screen and therefore contain the FMF from the adjoining agricultural landscape [APP-520]? In answering please be specific in respect of location if any concern exists.
	Response	
LI.1.80	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to the FMF? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Sizewell Link Road (SLR)		
LI.1.81	The Applicant	Description Figure Figure 2.1 is referred to in paragraph 2.2.5 [APP-446] but is not found in [APP-449] which is said to be the suite of Figures 2.1-2.11. Please confirm the location of Figure 2.1 or if found to be missing, please supply a copy.
	Response	
LI.1.82	The Applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) Please provide higher resolution versions of Plates 4.1 to 4.7 [AS-264].
	Response	
LI.1.83	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) In respect of the proposed oLEMP [AS-264], please comment on the following: (i) Would the proposed measures and monitoring within the oLEMP ensure post-construction habitats would be created correctly and provide adequate management to allow the successful establishment and integration within the surrounding landscape? (ii) Would the proposed new habitats contribute to the enhancement of the landscape character of this section of the Ancient Estate Claylands and Rolling Estate Claylands LCT? (iii) Would the new habitats help to minimise any visual impact of the SLR in views from the surrounding landscape and ensure the long-term sustainability and resilience of the landscape?
	Response	
LI.1.84	The Applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) Please provide a detailed plan to illustrate the extent of the proposed additional native woodland to be created east of the East Suffolk line.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.85	The Applicant	<p>AONB Statutory Purpose</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4.46 [APP-457] states that no effects on the AONB and its special qualities are predicted and as such, the AONB is not considered within the assessments of effects. The RR received from the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership [RR-1170] states that the introduction of the SLR would bring development into the AONB that would not conform with its statutory purpose and would also permanently split the AONB and negatively impact on the setting of the AONB. Please provide a response.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.86	The Applicant	<p>Rosetta Lodge</p> <p>Red House Farm and Rosetta Lodge are both referred to in the Community Impact Report [APP-156] as having the potential to be significantly affected by the proposed SLR. In [APP-446] the new three arm roundabout required for the SLR is described as approximately 180m north of Red House Farm.</p> <p>Please confirm:</p> <p>(i) Is Rosetta Lodge a residential property?</p> <p>(ii) How close is it to the three-arm roundabout to Rosetta Lodge?</p> <p>(iii) Has this property been included within the assessment? If not, please explain why not.</p>
	Response	
LI.1.87	The Applicant	<p>Planting</p> <p>Tree and shrub planting is proposed in Area 1 around the roundabout at the junction with the A12. Figure 2.2 [APP-449] depicts a grassed area with proposed hedgerow planting. Is tree planting also proposed in this area? If necessary, please update Figure 2.2.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.88	ESC, SCC	Lighting In respect of night-time lighting effects, Receptor Group 1 would experience a significant effect [APP-458]. As such effects would be permanent are any mitigation measures necessary?
	Response	
LI.1.89	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Lighting and Special Landscape Area (SLA) Are you satisfied that effects from the proposed lighting around the A12 roundabout is unlikely to be experienced within the SLA (Appendix 6B, paragraph 1.4.31 [APP-458])? If not, please provide detail.
	Response	
LI.1.90	ESC	Layout Please can you expand on the statement made at paragraph 2.102 [RR-0342] in respect of potential adverse impacts on settings and views from existing properties due to layout issues. Where necessary please provide annotated plans to show specific locations.
	Response	
LI.1.91	The Applicant	Photowire Visualisations Please provide additional photowire visualisations for the following: i) Representative Viewpoint 2: Footpath E-515/004/0, west of Theberton ii) Representative Viewpoint 3: Pretty Road, west of route iii) Representative Viewpoint 6: Footpath E-396/023/0 near Trust Farm iv) Representative Viewpoint 7: Littlemoor Road v) Representative Viewpoint 8: Footpath E-584/016/a, south of route
	Response	
LI.1.92	The Applicant	Planting Please explain how woodland planting east of the proposed SLR would assist in integrating the Pretty Road overbridge into the surrounding landscape?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
LI.1.93	The Applicant	Pretty Road Overbridge Please provide an illustrative example of the proposed Pretty Road overbridge.
	Response	
LI.1.94	The Applicant	Pretty Road Overbridge – Operation Effects Permanent residual significant effects, once the proposed planting has become established by year 15 of operation, have been identified in the vicinity of the proposed Pretty Road overbridge. Such effects would also be experienced by the users of the nearby public footpaths. Given the orientation of the bridge and the associated earthworks, it is noted that it would not be possible to successfully implement mitigation planting that would screen the structure from view (Paragraph 6.7.2 [APP-457]). The bridge would be widely visible from Theberton, surrounding residential properties and footpaths in the locality. What consideration has been given to alternative, potentially more innovative, design options?
	Response	
LI.1.95	The Applicant	Receptor Group 1 – Operation Effects By year 15 of operation, effects are stated as not significant for this receptor group 1 (Paragraph 6.6.4 [APP-457]). It is however noted that whilst the proposed hedgerows and planting would have matured, the highest points of the road and traffic travelling on it would remain visible and users of the diverted public footpaths would still be required to cross it. Furthermore, the A12 roundabout would introduce a focused area of artificial lighting into a predominately unlit area. Please provide additional detail to support the 'not significant' assessment finding for this receptor group.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.96	SCC	Design and Mitigation Paragraph 42 [RR-1174] states that if the ExA was to disagree with SCC and conclude that the SLR should be retained then satisfactory detailed designs with suitable landscape mitigation would be required. Please provide detail as to what would be considered appropriate in respect of landscape design and mitigation.
	Response	
LI.1.97	The Applicant	Landscape Character Types Please confirm how the design of the proposed SLR complies with the landscape management guidelines contained within the Guidance Note which supports the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (Paragraphs 6.6.18 and 6.6.25 of [APP-457]). Please respond in respect of both the Estate Sandlands and Plateau Estate Farmlands LCT.
	Response	
LI.1.98	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to the SLR? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Two Village Bypass (TVB)		
LI.1.99	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) In respect of the proposed oLEMP [AS-263], please provide comment on the following: (i) Would the proposed measures and monitoring within the oLEMP ensure post-construction habitats would be created correctly and provide adequate management to allow the successful establishment and integration within the surrounding landscape? (ii) Would the proposed new habitats contribute to the enhancement of the landscape character of this section of the Rolling Estate Claylands, Rolling Estate Sandlands and Valley Meadowlands LCT? (iii) Would the new habitats help to minimise any visual impact of the TVBP in views from the surrounding landscape and ensure the long-term sustainability and resilience of the landscape?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
LI.1.100	The Applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) Please define 'in the vicinity of' in respect of the proposed creation of native planting near Foxburrow Wood [AS-263].
	Response	
LI.1.101	The Applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) Please provide a detailed plan to illustrate the extent of the proposed reinforcement and expansion of existing linear wooded corridors and new corridors [AS-263].
	Response	
LI.1.102	The Applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP)
	Response	Please provide detail as to how the new broadleaved woodland planting would link with existing areas of woodland within the site [AS-263].
LI.1.103	The Applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) Please provide a high-resolution version of Plate 4.1 [AS-263].
	Response	
LI.1.104	The Applicant	Foxburrow Footbridge Design The RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust have stated their disappointment [AS-307] in respect of the design of the footbridge. Please respond to this and confirm whether, given the likely significance effects during the early years of operation, consideration has been given to an alternative bridge design?
	Response	
LI.1.105	The Applicant	Landscape Character Types Please confirm how the design of the proposed TVB complies with the landscape management guidelines contained within the Guidance Note which supports the Suffolk

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Landscape Character Assessment (Paragraphs 6.6.18, 6.6.25 and 6.6.32) of [APP-421]). Please respond in respect of the Rolling Estate Sandlands, Valley Meadowlands and Rolling Estate Claylands LCT.
	Response	
LI.1.106	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation over and above that detailed in Section 6.5 [APP-421] is considered necessary in relation to the TVBP? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
LI.1.107	The Applicant	Photowire Visualisations Please provide additional photowire visualisations for the following: vi) Representative Viewpoint 1: A12 north of junction with A1094 vii) Representative Viewpoint 6: Tinker Brook near access to Glemham Park viii) Representative Viewpoint 7: A12 north west of route
	Response	
Northern Park and Ride (NPR)		
LI.1.108	The Applicant	Lighting Darsham Parish Council has confirmed that the village is a dedicated dark sky village and home to the Darsham And Surrounding Villages Astronomical Society [AS-307]. Given that the village is visited by an astronomical society, please confirm why a 'community value' in respect of sensitivity has been allocated to this landscape character type? Please review and confirm whether a 'local value' sensitivity would be more appropriate. What, if any, implications would this have on the assessment undertaken?
	Response	
LI.1.109	The Applicant	Lighting

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		What, if any, is the predicted level of light spill anticipated to occur beyond the site boundary of the NPR?
	Response	
LI.1.110	The Applicant	Landscape Character Types Please confirm how the design of the proposed NPR complies with the landscape management guidelines contained within the Guidance Note which supports the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (Paragraphs 6.6.1-6.6.15 [APP-360]).
	Response	
LI.1.111	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to the NPR? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
Southern Park and Ride (SPR)		
LI.1.112	The Applicant	Landscape – Legacy Marlesford Parish Council have requested the delivery of a long-term legacy of landscape improvements within/around the site of the SPR [AS-307] and have provided specifics relating to this. Please provide a response.
	Response	
LI.1.113	The Applicant	Representative Viewpoint 5: Footpath E-178/003/0 Near Bottle and Glass Cottages - Photowire Please provide a photowire of the proposed development for Representative Viewpoint 5.
	Response	
LI.1.114	The Applicant, Wickham Market Parish Council	Representative Viewpoint – Wickham Market Please liaise with Wickham Market Parish Council as to a suitable location for an additional representative viewpoint to be produced from within the Wickham Market locality.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.115	The Applicant	Dark Skies Area Both Hatcheson Parish Council and Marlesford Parish Council [AS-307] and [RR-0758] state that the location of the SPR is within a Dark Skies Area. Please confirm what consideration has been given to this?
	Response	
LI.1.116	The Applicant	Lighting – Light Spill What, if any, is the predicted level of light spill anticipated to occur beyond the site boundary?
	Response	
LI.1.117	The Applicant	Lighting – Dark Night Sky Please respond to the concern raised by Pettistree Parish Council [AS-307] that Pettistree will lose its enjoyment of its present relatively dark night sky.
	Response	
LI.1.118	The Applicant	Landscape Character Types Please confirm how the design of the proposed SLR complies with the landscape management guidelines contained within the Guidance Note which supports the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (Paragraphs 6.6.13 and 6.6.15 of [APP-390]).
	Response	
LI.1.119	The Applicant	Landscape Bunds Please provide a detailed plan annotated to confirm the heights of the proposed bunds. Please ensure the plan clearly shows where the bunds are reduced from 3m.
	Response	
LI.1.120	ESC, SCC, Natural England	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to the SPR? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Rail		
LI.1.121	The Applicant	Photowire Visualisations Please provide an additional photowire visualisation for Representative Viewpoint 5: Footpath E-363/006/0.
	Response	
LI.1.122	The Applicant	Ballast Stockpiling Please annotate on a plan the proposed location for ballast stockpiling, as detailed in paragraph 2.4.75 [AS-256] and confirm the maximum height of the stockpile.
	Response	
LI.1.123	The Applicant	Landscape Character Types Please confirm how the design of the proposed Rail developments comply with the landscape management guidelines contained within the Guidance Note which supports the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (Paragraphs 6.6.15 and 6.6.21 of [APP-551]). Please respond in respect of both the Ancient Estate Claylands and the Estate Sandlands LCT.
	Response	
LI.1.124	Pro-Corda/Leiston Abbey, English Heritage	Design – Leiston Abbey Does the design of the rail extension route effectively minimise the visibility of the route from Leiston Abbey?
	Response	
LI.1.125	ESC, SCC, Natural England,	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to the Rail proposals? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	
Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements		

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LI.1.126	The Applicant	Landscape Character Types Please confirm how the design of the proposed Rail developments comply with the landscape management guidelines contained within the Guidance Note which supports the Suffolk Landscape Character Assessment (Paragraphs 6.4.75 and 6.4.82 of [APP-490]). Please respond in respect of both the Rolling Estate Claylands and Valley Meadows and Fens LCT.
	Response	
LI.1.127	ESC, SCC, Natural England,	Mitigation What, if any, further mitigation is considered necessary in relation to the Yoxford Roundabout and other highway improvements? If necessary, how do you consider such measures should be secured?
	Response	



Application by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for The Sizewell C Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 21 April 2021

Responses are due by Deadline 2: Wednesday 2 June 2021

ExQ1 Part 6 of 6

- SE.1 [Socio-economic](#)
- TT.1 [Traffic and Transport](#)
- W.1 [Waste \(conventional\) and material resource](#)

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SE.1	Socio-economic	
SE.1.0	All relevant local authorities	<p>Assessment of Socio-Economic Effects</p> <p>The NPS at paragraph 5.12.3 sets out what an assessment of socio-economic affects should cover. Are there any shortcomings within the assessment that require further assessment or clarification?</p>
	Response from Leiston Town Council	<p>SE.1.0 Assessment of Socio-Economic Effects</p> <p>Although the assessment of socio-economic impacts appears comprehensive in the number of issues and locations it covers, the report acknowledges a high degree of uncertainty involved in the projections. Having identified many potential adverse effects on housing, social services and community cohesion – for example – the summary then assesses these as negligible or insignificant.</p> <p>Socio Economic impacts on the town of Leiston itself are complex and numerous and much emphasis has been put on the Section 106 agreement to help mitigate the adverse effects of social integration and anti-social behaviour. The S106 does not adequately spell out how this will be addressed.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>Our town has seen the effect of nuclear build twice before - and in the not too distant past as host to the most recent generation of reactor, which many local people still remember. The economy thrived during the build, then fell quickly afterwards and has only seen recovery since the closure of Sizewell A. Much emphasis is being made about employment for local people, but most of these roles are likely to be in the lower skills sector to support the contractors (e.g. catering, cleaning, administration) and not the highly skilled roles that will undoubtedly move over from HPC. And they will be transitional. How will the gradual loss of this employment towards the end of the build be addressed by the applicant?</p> <p>The hospitality, farming and social care sectors have huge concerns about the drain of local people from their businesses, especially as workers from the EU are not as available since our departure. How will the applicant assist these sectors in back-filling the roles lost to the construction site?</p> <p>Anti-social behaviour</p> <p>Sports facilities were originally intended to be positioned within the campus but are now being proposed within the town, at the school. The caravan site is also positioned close to the town and residents'</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>homes. Siting the sports facilities on the campus and the caravan park within the construction site red line would have kept contractor footfall within Leiston to a minimum and away from the school. Leiston Town Council would like more evidence that the code of conduct would ensure anti-social behaviour while contractors are moving within the town, will be addressed. We recognise that the facilities are a legacy benefit, but not for many years. SZC will effect an entire generation of school students and their families and this must be taken into account. Unlike the much larger town of Bridgwater, where there are already leisure facilities, the contractor numbers cannot easily be absorbed into the current population. We are yet to see a draft code of conduct tailored to the particular needs of Leiston.</p> <p>Health and Welfare</p> <p>The draft S106 agreement references mitigation for any shortcomings in the health and welfare of our community during construction but there is no definite proposal. We would like to see evidence of how the applicant is engaging with the local NHS Trust to address this.</p>
SE.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>As there appears to be the potential for both Sizewell B and the Proposed Development to be operating simultaneously:</p> <p>(i) are you able to explain how the outages at the respective plants would operate, and whether they would be co-ordinated or operate independently?</p> <p>(ii) Please explain the basis for the ES assessment in this regard and the different implications of the different scenarios.</p> <p>(iii) In the event that they might be co-ordinated- how would this be achieved?</p>
	Response	
SE.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Accommodation Strategy</p> <p>In light of the concerns highlighted by Westleton Parish Council [RR-1264] please explain how the accommodation assessment has assessed the potential effects on both the rental and purchase prices of local housing.</p>
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SE.1.3	The Applicant	Accommodation Strategy In light of the concerns highlighted by Westleton Parish Council [RR-1264] please explain how the socio economic assessment has assessed the potential effects on the supply and provision of local trades people.
	Response	
SE.1.4	The Applicant	Workforce Skills Enhancement Please explain what progress has been made on developing a programme of workforce skills enhancement and how any programme would be secured through the DCO.
	Response	
SE.1.5	The Applicant, relevant local authorities	Economic Benefits The Economic Statement suggests [APP-610] there would be substantial economic benefits arising from the development. Please explain whether the experiences that arose from the development of the current and former nuclear power stations resulted in positive benefits. A number of RRs indicate that there has not been a long term benefit to the local area (RR-002, RR-008) how do you anticipate that this scheme could ensure a positive legacy in economic terms for the local area?
	Response	
SE.1.6	The Applicant, relevant local authorities	Sizewell Link Road The link road as proposed would sever Petty Road which [RR-0014] considers an important link between Saxmundham and Theberton providing access for the village community to the services in Saxmundham. Please explain how these concerns have been addressed.
	Response	
SE.1.7	The Applicant	Effect on Local Business Several RRS make reference to adverse effects on their businesses. [RR-0131] - effect on family business due to effect on tourism

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		[RR-0126] – lack of detail on tourism fund [RR-0123] - impact on retail sales reliant on tourism/visitors [RR-0050] - adverse effect on caravanning and camping due to development [RR-1023] – adverse effect on livery businesses in the local area Please respond to these concerns and set out how if justified mitigation would be provided for each of these businesses.
	Response	
SE.1.8	The Applicant	Fishing Industry [RR-0140] suggests the failure to have an acoustic fish deterrent system would adversely affect the fishing industry. Please respond to this criticism and explain your position in this respect.
	Response	
SE.1.9	Mill Hill Farm Caravan and Campsite [RR-799], Sue Townsend [RR-1167], Sea Poppies Furnished Holiday Lets [RR- 1103], Sasha French [RR-1096], Anthony Philip Baskett [RR-105], Cipher Crystal [RR-0228], Steel Sculptures [RR-1141], Tom Lagdon [RR-1233],	Effect on business operations Please provide more detail in respect of your concern on the impact that the Proposed Development would have on your business.
	Response	
SE.1.10	Nacton Parish Council [RR-868]	Effect on business operations

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		You indicate in your Relevant representation that the Freight Management Facility would adversely affect Nacton Home Farm, please provide details as to how you consider the business would be affected by the Proposed Development.
	Response	
SE.1.11	The Applicant	Northern Park and Ride [RR 799] Indicates that the Northern P&R would adversely affect the Mill Hill Farm Caravan and Camping site. Please respond to this concern and explain how the scheme would avoid or mitigate for adverse effects.
	Response	
SE.1.12	The Applicant	Two Village Bypass (TVB) [RR 812] Indicates the TVB would adversely affect the holiday business, water supply and drainage at Molletts Partnership. Please respond to these concerns and explain how the scheme would avoid or mitigate for adverse effects.
	Response	
SE.1.13	The Applicant	Displacement of Visitors The RSPB [RR-1059] express concern that the ES does not adequately assess the impacts on visitor numbers and consequently appropriate mitigation for such affects has yet to be provided and subsequently delivered by an appropriate mechanism through the DCO. Please respond to these concerns and advise on the latest position in respect of any ongoing discussions with the RSPB.
	Response	
SE.1.14	The Applicant	Potential Effects on Tourism Snape Parish Council [RR-1132] have expressed concern that the ES does not adequately assess the economic impacts of the Proposed Development on the tourism sector within the parish and the significant cultural events run in the locality. Please respond to these concerns.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SE.1.15	The Applicant	Pressure for skilled labour Essex CC [AoC-003] express concern over cumulative effects on socio economics, tourism, the supply chain for materials and workforce, with ongoing effects on broader economic objectives/infrastructure projects. How have the in-combination effects of other major infrastructure projects been considered and sought to be addressed to avoid problems of shortages as expressed by Essex CC.
	Response	
SE.1.16	The Applicant, relevant local authorities	Potential Effects on Tourism Essex CC [AoC-003] indicated a desire to see a broader assessment of the impacts on tourism and the relationship to Bradwell B, please respond to this particular concern and whether the assessment of effects on the tourism sector are considered robust and conservative.
	Response	
SE.1.17	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy [APP-611] identifies that through dedicated skills and employment interventions mitigation for and improvements to the local workforce would arise. (i) Please explain precisely what dedicated skills and employment interventions are proposed; (ii) How these interventions would be secured; (iii) What monitoring would be in place to assess their effectiveness, and In the event they were not proving successful, what further arrangements may be put in place and to what timetable.
	Response	
SE.1.18	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In light of the recognised pressures on the provision of and availability of skilled labour both regionally and nationally, has anything been put in place already to commence preparedness for the project?
	Response	
SE.1.19	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy As part of the Guiding Principles set out in para 1.3 of [APP-611] you refer to maximising the fleet effect. The final sentence of the 4 th bullet point suggests this is intended to maximise regional benefits. Please explain how this works in respect of the intention to transfer skills, jobs and contracts from Hinkley.
	Response	
SE.1.20	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy (i) In light of the lessons learned from Hinkley is it your intention not to develop an Energy Skills Centre similar to the Bridgewater and Taunton College in Suffolk? (ii) It is recognised at para 1.5.8 [APP-611] that new entrants training would need to commence shortly after a financial investment decision had been made. What is in place to facilitate this?
	Response	
SE.1.21	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy Please advise what progress has been made in investigating the potential for a National College for Nuclear hub in the East of England?
	Response	
SE.1.22	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy (i) How do you envisage the conveyor principal referred to in para 1.6.8 of [APP-611] working in practice? (ii) Have a number of places been set aside for residents from the NALEP area (if so how many), or would the opportunities be offered nationally/internationally and be subject to open competition?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.23	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy (i) Has the 'Going Early' initiative referred to in the third bullet point of para 1.6.12 [APP-611] commenced? (ii) If not please explain the reasoning behind this and when you now anticipate it would commence.
	Response	
SE.1.24	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, NALEP	Employment Skills and Education Strategy (i) The Asset Skills Enhancement and Capability Fund is proposed to be governed by a several stakeholders. Is there agreement as to who they should be? (ii) Who would make the final decision?
	Response	
SE.1.25	The Applicant	Employment Skills and Education Strategy The skills initiatives as referred to under sub heading c) [APP-611] refers to the 'potential' delivery mechanism and 'could' be extended to deliver the National College for Nuclear curriculum. Has this moved any closer to being a part of the delivery mechanism for upskilling the local workforce or being offered as a commitment through the DCO/S106?
	Response	
SE.1.26	The Applicant	Training and Assessment Reference is made to Tier 1 Partners and training boards contributing towards investment to fill gaps in training (paragraph 1.6.19 [APP-611]). (i) Which organisations and Tier 1 Partners have committed to this? (ii) How is this to be secured?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SE.1.27	The Applicant, (Suffolk Chamber of Commerce ESC SCC NALEP (iii) only)	Supply Chain Strategy [APP-610] in paragraph 7.3.6 refers the reader to Appendix B [APP-611]. The section on Supply Chain (1.7) does not however explain how this strategy will be delivered. (i) Please provide precise details on this strategy and the delivery and monitoring mechanism. (ii) Please set out the details of governance arrangements and progress of the S106 so this strategy can be more fully understood. (iii) Do the respective parties agree that the S106 would deliver an appropriate supply chain strategy?
	Response	
SE.1.28	The Applicant, Relevant local authorities	Labour Market Considering the number of construction workers envisaged to be required please advise on the implications this may have for the labour market both locally and regionally.
	Response	
SE.1.29	Relevant local authorities	Labour Market (i) Following on from the previous question do you consider the assessment of effects on the local labour market has robustly assessed likely impacts? Are there any concerns that you would wish to identify in this respect? (ii) The effects on the labour market for the area would be different during operation from that experienced during construction. Are you content with the assessment in this regard and the potential mitigation offered?
	Response	
SE.1.30	The Applicant	Labour Market ESC in paragraph 1.149 [RR-0342] express concern that the ' <i>dynamic labour market is not evidence based</i> ' Please respond to this concern and explain what assumptions have been made concerning the dynamic nature of the labour market.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.31	The Applicant, all relevant local authorities	Labour Market (i) What is being undertaken to maximise the number of local people that could aspire to and achieve higher paid skilled employment on the project? (ii) How could this be secured through the DCO?
	Response	
SE.1.32	The Applicant	Home Based Workers ESC [RR-0342] criticises the assessment of the proportion of homebased workers to be employed that are already in employment. (i) Please respond to this concern and support your response with evidence as to how you arrived at the range of 42% to 50%[APP-610 section 5.4] (ii) In the event the figure were inaccurate either higher or lower, what implications would this have for the conclusions reached within the ES? (iii) In undertaking such assessments, a number of assumptions are made. Would it be more reasonable to suggest that in the conclusions there would be a range of the proportion already in employment? (iv) If so, what percentage range would this be?
	Response	
SE.1.33	The Applicant, all relevant local authorities	Home Based Workers ESC suggest they are seeking 36% of workers to be homebased[para 1.157 RR-0342]. (i) Please explain why this figure is being sought, and upon what evidence this is based. (ii) Should this figure be regarded as a minimum for the whole project, or particular phases? (iii) How should this be secured? (iv) In the event the figure were to be lower for either the whole project, or particular phases what would the implications be?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.34	The Applicant, all relevant local authorities	Operational Roles Has a strategy been prepared to support local people becoming permanent members of staff during the operational phase of the development?
	Response	
SE.1.35	The Applicant	Tourism Impacts (i) Please explain how the tourism fund would be managed and how existing companies affected by the proposed development might access funding? (ii) What governance arrangements are proposed in order to ensure a transparent and robust management process would be in place?
	Response	
SE.1.36	The Applicant	Tourism Impacts A number of RRs including [RR-0131, 123, 160, 163, 228, 241, 263] consider the development would adversely affect tourism and impact not only existing businesses, but the much broader appeal of the area which is considered so important to the economic success of Suffolk. Please respond to these concerns and explain how you consider any significant adverse effects could be mitigated.
	Response	
SE.1.37	The Applicant	Displacement Concern is expressed by ESC [RR-0342 para 1.165] over the definition of displacement and whether it would actually be significant. Please respond to this concern and support it with evidence in terms of the degree of effect on the local economy and what could be done and delivered through the DCO to ensure any adverse effect is minimised.
	Response	
SE.1.38	The Applicant	Supply Chain

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) Is there a commitment to a proportion of contracts to be provided through local suppliers? (ii) If so, how would this be secured, monitored and delivered?
	Response	
SE.1.39	The Applicant, SCC, ESC, New Anglia LEP	Cumulative Effects (i) Please explain how any effect on the labour market might be managed when considered in conjunction with other potential major construction projects. In providing a response please set out the list of projects that are being considered and whether this list has been agreed with the relevant local authorities. Suffolk CC [RR-1174] at paragraph 156 provides a list, but it not clear whether this is agreed. Please support the response with the most up to date position of the prospective delivery times of these projects where known. (ii) Please consider the different demands on the different phases of the project and how this might affect the labour market and supply chain.
	Response	
SE.1.40	The Applicant	Beach Landing Facility (BLF) With increased activity on the beach from the introduction of the changed BLF and increased number of deliveries and potentially extended season, please explain how these changes have been assessed in terms of the effects on the tourism industry.
	Response	
SE.1.41	The Applicant	Freight Management Strategy Please advise what modal split would be most beneficial in socio economic terms for the Suffolk area?
	Response	
SE.1.42	The Applicant, ESC, SCC	Freight Management Strategy A number of RRs including [RR-0040] expressed concern that the original application would cause economic harm by severing communities and reducing the quality of the

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		environment which is an important contributory factor to the tourism sector. Would an increase in rail and seaborne freight provide an economic benefit by reducing such severance?
	Response	
SE.1.43	The Applicant, Network Rail	Rail Passenger Services (i) A number of RRs [Greater Anglia, Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council, Framlingham Town Council, Sudbourne Parish Council in response to proposed changes AS-307] express concern about the potential loss of passenger rail services in the event the freight paths are created as suggested, please explain what effect the proposed freight strategy would have on passenger rail services. (ii) Has the alternative of dualling the Lowestoft to Ipswich line which could give significant legacy benefits including providing the opportunity to significantly increase passenger train services been considered as an option? (iii) Was any other form of expanding the network considered?
	Response	
SE.1.44	The Applicant	Inshore Fisheries The Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority [RR-0348] have expressed concern that the proposed development has not fully explored or explained the degree of effects on both recreational and commercial fishing. This concern is further expanded in the response to the consultation to the proposed changes [AS-307]. Please respond to these concerns.
	Response	
SE.1.45	The Applicant, Network Rail	Rail Freight (i) In light of the comments from Associated British Ports (ABP) in response to the consultation on the proposed changes [AS-307] would rail paths be available from either Lowestoft or Ipswich ports? (ii) Have these alternatives been considered?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
SE.1.46	The Applicant	Visitor Centre (i) Are their figures available which indicate the number of visitors who come to the current visitor centre at Sizewell B and any indication of the economic benefits this provides? (ii) Has the economic assessment included an assessment of the closure/reduced availability of the current visitor centre? (iii) Would there be an opportunity to have a visitor centre open during construction?
	Response	
SE.1.47	The Applicant	Accommodation Campus (i) Is the ExA understanding correct that the accommodation campus would provide ensuite bedrooms, but these rooms would not have kitchens, sitting areas etc? (ii) If this is incorrect, please explain what the accommodation consists of and what would be made available for the on-site workforce.
	Response	
TT.1	Traffic and Transport	
TT.1.0	The Applicant	Freight Management Strategy - Concrete Materials Table 2.1 [AS-280]. The updated assumption of concrete materials is stated as 4.8 million tonnes but the following paragraphs 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 set out in more detail the amounts of aggregate, sand and cement. The total of which does not equate to 4.8 million tonnes. Explain this discrepancy.
	Response	
TT.1.1	The Applicant	Freight Movement Modal Split by Rail Table 2.2 [AS-280]. Explain why the lower limit in the Rail column of this table is lower than the original application amount of 38% by rail?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.2	The Applicant	Marine Freight Quantities Table 2.1 [AS-280]. Indicate where the following are accounted for: (i) All Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) arriving at the BLF and by road; and (ii) The permanent Hard Coastal Defence Feature (HCDF) rock armour said to be directly deposited by barges on the beach in paragraph 3.4.103 [AS-202]
	Response	
TT.1.3	The Applicant, Network Rail	Provision of Additional Rail Capacity Explain whether the current additional rail proposals are based on ongoing development of the Network Rail Governance for Railway Investment Projects (GRIP) 2 report prepared when a Rail Led strategy was being considered at Stage 3 Consultation and if so: (i) Explain what GRIP stage proposals are currently at; and (ii) Set out the delivery timescale for the necessary improvement works.
	Response	
TT.1.4	The Applicant	Provision of Additional Rail Capacity Surrey County Council [RR-1174] Paragraph 24 provided a link to a consultant's report concerning the deliverability of rail improvements. Provide a response to the issues set out in that report
	Response	
TT.1.5	The Applicant, Network Rail	Deliverability of Rail Capacity (Reference Table 4.1 [AS-280]) Provide comment on the deliverability and anticipated availability date of the following: (i) The early years rail provision – 2 trains /day to the Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE): (ii) The DCO baseline rail provision – 3 trains / day; (iii) Enhanced rail provision – 4 trains / day; (iv) The potential to run trains 6 days a week rather than the 5 proposed; and (v) The potential to run 5 trains a day.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.6	The Applicant	Capacity by Rail Paragraph 3.2.8 [AS-280] sets out the theoretical capacity of each train in tonnes. On that basis set out the theoretical maximum carrying capacity for each year and in total over the construction period by the nominal number of trains indicated in Table 3.1.
	Response	
TT.1.7	The Applicant	Capacity of Rail Wagons Appendix 9.3A Appendix B Appendix III [AS-257] identifies the rail wagon parameters used in the ground borne noise and vibration report. It states that the payload of a rail wagon is approximately 77.9 tonnes. This would make the theoretical capacity of the rail provision greater at 1558 tonnes per train. This is further supported by the experience set out in Associated British Ports (ABP) submission [AS-307] section 3.2.14 where they also suggest that train capacity can be 1560 tonnes per train. Explain this discrepancy and also if necessary, provide alternative calculations, using train numbers in Table 3.1 [AS-280], as required in previous question of revised rail capacity.
	Response	
TT.1.8	The Applicant	Additional Marine Capacity - Permanent BLF Does the revised design reduce the number of AIL that will need to travel by road? If so set out the original and revised numbers of AIL by: (i) By road each year and in total; and (ii) By sea each year and in total.
	Response	
TT.1.9	The Applicant	Permanent BLF – Usage

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Confirm whether, other than AIL, the permanent BLF will be used for other freight deliveries and if so, set out what quantity of freight is expected to be delivered via this facility each year and in total.
	Response	
TT.1.10	The Applicant	Temporary BLF – Total Capacity Paragraph 3.3.34 of Appendix 2.2B [AS-202] states that the temporary BLF will operate for approximately 8 years. In paragraph 3.3.35 it goes on to say that 1,275,000 tonnes per year could be achieved. On that basis set out the calculation to show the theoretical maximum marine freight capacity of the temporary BLF each year of operation and in total.
	Response	
TT.1.11	The Applicant	Provision of Road Capacity – Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Total Capacity Paragraph 3.2.8 [AS-280]. Using the assumption (HGV capacity = $1250/67.5 = 18.5$ tonnes) and understanding that no controls are proposed that limit the size of HGV's to those set out in paragraph 2.1.23 concerning potential HGV sizes, provide the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The theoretical HGV capacity by year and in total using the original submitted limits set out in paragraph 1.2.4 and the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608]; and (ii) The theoretical HGV capacity by year and in total using the suggested limits in paragraph 4.1.12.
	Response	
TT.1.12	The Applicant	Change to Percentage of Freight by Road Paragraph 2.1.15 [AS-280] reduces the freight by road to an anticipated 40%. Using the methodology in the above question how many HGV's does 40% by road equate to and how would that number be distributed over the construction period?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.13	The Applicant	HGV Higher Capacity Potential ABP [AS-307] in their submission, section 3.2.14 suggest greater payloads per HGV can be achieved for certain materials. Explain how this is taken into account and if not should this be considered in the calculation of HGV numbers?
	Response	
TT.1.14	The Applicant	HGV - Associated Development Sites Table 2.1 [AS-280] shows the total expected import of materials for what is said to be the Sizewell C Project. From reading of the Materials Management Strategy [AS-202] it is assumed that this includes the materials required for the Associated Development Sites. Confirm the following: (i) Do the figures in Table 2.1 include all the Associated Development site material requirements; and (ii) Provide a breakdown of the quantities of materials for the main development site (iii) and for each of the associated development sites
	Response	
TT.1.15	The Applicant	HGV Associated Development Sites The limits set out in the CTMP [APP-608] refer to HGV movements to the main development site. Provide: (i) The number of HGV movements by year to the associated development sites; and (ii) The yearly and total quantity of materials transported by HGV for the associated developments sites.
	Response	
TT.1.16	The Applicant	Minimum HGV Numbers Plate 4.2 [AS-280] Provide the input numbers for this graph in a table and include any missing months at either end of the construction period.
	Response	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Freight Management Facility (FMF)</p> <p>In the Planning Statement [APP-594] the need for the FMF is described as “The facility would provide ancillary buildings and structures where paperwork, and goods can be checked prior to delivery to the Sizewell C main development site, and a location where HGVs can be held and searched while they wait to enter the Sizewell C main development site. The facility would also provide a location where HGVs can be held in the event of an accident on the local road network which prevents access to the Sizewell C main development site”. Explain in further detail the requirement for the FMF for each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Paragraph 4.1.14 of the CTMP [APP-608] sets out the objectives of the Delivery Management System (DMS), which seems to be a system to manage the flow of deliveries to the site without physical facility; (ii) The Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-107] sets out that the FMF will have 6 screen and search bays out of a total of 154 HGV spaces, so why this level of search facility could not be undertaken at port of arrival or elsewhere; (iii) Taking into account the 154 HGV spaces at the FMF, 90 spaces at the Traffic Incident Management Area (TIMA) , the 80 spaces provided at an early stage at the LEEIE and finally the 75 spaces provided on site why a provision of just under 400 HGV parking spaces are required to manage HGV movements in the event of a traffic management incident; and (iv) The proposed change places less reliance on road freight so is the level of provision still appropriate?
	Response	
TT.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Freight Management Facility – Control of HGV Flows</p> <p>Table 7.4 of the TA [AS-017], shows the arrival and departure pattern of HGVs at the Main Development Site. The FMF is intended to be in part used to regulate the flow of HGVs to the Main Development Site. Is it intended that HGVs would leave the FMF in convoys or individually?</p>
	Response	
TT.1.19	The Applicant	Alternative Freight Management Facilities

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ABP [AS-307] in Section 3.1.13 suggest there are adequate staging areas to accommodate the proposed levels of HGV within their port estates. Has this capacity been considered as an alternative to the provision of a separate FMF?
	Response	
TT.1.20	The Applicant	Alternative Freight Management Facilities The TA [AS-017] also suggests that Felixstowe Docks may be a point of origin for a number of HGV. If physical facility is needed has consideration been given to doing this within the port in a similar way to that suggested by ABP.
	Response	
TT.1.21	The Applicant	Freight Modal Shares - Revised Freight Management Targets Provide: (i) Explanation of how the revised modal targets for freight management and HGV numbers will be secured within the DCO; (ii) A revised CTMP to reflect the updated Freight Management Strategy?
	Response	
TT.1.22	The Applicant	Freight Management Strategy [AS-280] Paragraph 4.1.12 sets out the potential to reduce daily HGV movements during construction and Paragraph 5.1.4 sets out the potential to reduce freight transport by road to 40% of the total. Paragraph 5.1.5 states "The relative balance to be struck between transport modes can now be examined and, through this revised approach to its FMS, SZC Co. has provided the environmental, transport and practical information necessary to enable any necessary controls to be put in place to regulate the use of the proposed transport infrastructure to ensure that an appropriate balance is struck in the public interest." Explain: (i) What controls are suggested to ensure target HGV numbers and sizes are limited to those assessed in the application; (ii) The monitoring process to ensure compliance; (iii) Remedial actions should HGV numbers exceed any limits set; and (iv) How such controls, monitoring and remedial actions will be secured within the DCO.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.23	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608], Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) [APP-607], Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609] – Transport Review Group</p> <p>The Transport Review Group membership, structure, roles and responsibilities is explained in the CTMP, the CWMP and the TIMP. The group consists of six members three appointed by SZC and three from other stakeholders. Notwithstanding information in the draft Section 106 [PDB-004], explain how the decisions will be made in this group if there is not a majority vote?</p>
	Response	
TT.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Traffic Management Monitoring System (TMMS)/ Delivery Management System (DMS).</p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.23 of the CTMP [APP-608] describes the use of the TMMS in monitoring compliance. The use of this information seems from following paragraphs to be largely to be used for monitoring rather than active management of vehicles in the same way the DMS will be used. Given the use of technology proposed, could the TMMS/ DMS be used to actively manage freight movements by road on a daily basis so that any required preventative action could be taken quickly.</p>
	Response	
TT.1.25	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Traffic Management Monitoring System (TMMS)/ Delivery Management System (DMS).</p> <p>Could the TMMS/ DMS be coordinated and developed to actively manage the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) HGV movements to associated development sites; (ii) HGV movement to avoid sensitive periods in areas where impact might be high, e.g. schools, etc.; (iii) Light Goods Vehicle (LGV) movements and routes; (iv) Bus movements and routes;

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(v) Route monitoring to ensure that HGV numbers did not exceed those modelled on specific routes; and (vi) Currently the earliest and latest timings of freight movement to/ from the main site will be 07.00 and 23.00, however depending on origins and destinations HGV movements could be on the adjacent highway network for longer periods. In addition to on site monitoring of HGV timings, can HGV movements be managed so as to avoid much earlier and later disruption in sensitive areas?
	Response	
TT.1.26	The Applicant	Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608], Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) [APP-607], Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609] – Transport Review Group Will the monitoring reports and assessments against aims and targets be published information?
	Response	
TT.1.27	The Applicant	Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-608] In the case of the CTMP can the following be included: (i) LGVs are assessed in the TA and the Environmental Statement (ES) so can there be monitoring and reporting of LGV numbers; and (ii) Annual reporting of monitoring and adherence to relevant targets.
	Response	
TT.1.28	The Applicant	Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP) [APP-607] In the case of the TIMP can this be extended to include management of emergency service responses in the event of: (i) Traffic incidents already covered in the plan; and

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) Traffic delays created by movement of abnormal loads and their potential impacts on emergency services responses
	Response	
TT.1.29	The Applicant	Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609] In the case of the CWTP explain the apparent anomaly of the total workforce on the main site of 1500 in Tables 3.1 and 3.2 for the early years mode of travel when in Plate 1.1 the chart shows a total workforce as high as 4000 at the end of construction of the Associated Development sites.
	Response	
TT.1.30	The Applicant	Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)[APP-609] Explain why the CWTP does not cover the construction workers at the associated development sites?
	Response	
TT.1.31	SCC	Streetworks Permit Scheme Does the Council operate a streetworks permit scheme for temporary works on the adopted highway? And if so, is the Council satisfied that the permit scheme is adequately covered in the proposed Development Consent Order.
	Response	
TT.1.32	The Applicant	Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) A number of RR's express concern whether movement of AIL will hinder traffic movement and potential response times for emergency services in the area. Explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) How many AIL movements are expected on a typical day in the early years in advance of the Sizewell Link Road being open; (ii) How traffic movement and emergency service access will be maintained during the early years prior to a suitable alternative route being available; and (iii) How many AIL's movement are expected on a typical day during peak construction and on the busiest days.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.33	The Applicant	Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) – Road Based Provide details of the likely origin and routes for the road based AIL movements.
	Response	
TT.1.34	The Applicant, SCC, Scottish Power	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Cumulative Assessment with EA1 and EA2 In the Table 26.2 of Chapter 26 of Environmental Statement (ES) for the East Anglia One North and Two Offshore Windfarm application it is identified that there may be a need for potential structural alterations to the existing bridge on the A12 at Marlesford to facilitate the movement of abnormal load vehicles over this bridge. Has this requirement: (i) Been considered as part of the Sizewell C project? (ii) If this was to be required how would construction work impact on traffic flows on the A12 at Marlesford?
	Response	
TT.1.35	The Applicant	Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) – Two Village Bypass Bridge Will the proposed bridge over the River Alde be capable of carrying AIL's?
	Response	
TT.1.36	The Applicant, SCC	Fly Parking Fly parking if uncontrolled will potentially lead to several problems not least of which is modelled traffic flows being underestimated on some routes. Paragraph 13.3.2 of the TA Addendum [AS-266] states further work is ongoing about the management of fly parking. Explain how fly parking on the local highway network will be controlled, monitored, and enforced during the construction period.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.37	The Applicant	<p>Movement Frameworks</p> <p>In order to assist full understanding of movement patterns around the area and how they will change as the development progresses and after completion, provide movement frameworks by travel mode showing how movement around the main development site, the temporary construction area, the accommodation campus, the LEEIE and their immediate surroundings will develop through the construction process. These movement frameworks should be prepared in a similar phased pattern to the Description of Construction Figures [APP-186] but include an operational version and clearly indicate on each, routes by the following modes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) HGV; (ii) LGV and cars; (iii) Buses; (iv) Cycle routes; (v) Equestrian routes if any separate routes provided; and (vi) Pedestrian routes /paths, including any construction required diversions.
	Response	
TT.1.38	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Change 15, New Bridleway Link between Aldhurst Farm and Kenton Hills</p> <p>Figure 2.2.32, of the ES Addendum [AS-202], shows the proposed new bridleway. Explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Why the former site access road junction is retained for what is assumed, after construction, to be a field access, including the right turning pocket; and (ii) How does the proposed bridleway and crossing relate to the desire lines for intended users in the area.
	Response	
TT.1.39	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] - Scoping

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Paragraph 1.6.1 references extensive scoping discussions. Has there been a formal scoping process with the relevant Highways and Planning Authorities on development of the TA? If so, submit copy of agreed scoping report.
	Response	
TT.1.40	SCC, Highways England	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] - Scoping Do you consider that the scoping process and the coverage of the TA reflect your pre-application input?
	Response	
TT.1.41	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] - Existing Conditions In paragraph 2.3.73 justification for not considering August as an analysis month refers to the inclusion in the May analysis of the atypical outages at Sizewell B to provide robust assessment. Provide the following for the traffic level that would be associated with an outage at Sizewell B: (i) 24 hour daily traffic flow as a number and assumed percentage increase over a day without an outage; (ii) 24 hour daily flow as number for August traffic levels and a percentage increase over a day in May used in the assessment; (iii) Peak hour flows both as a number and a percentage of daily peak hours without an outage; (iv) Duration of outages at Sizewell B; and (v) How outages would avoid the peak holiday seasons?
	Response	
TT.1.42	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Daily Traffic Variations Paragraphs 2.3.74 to 2.3.76 outline the assessment of daily variations set out in Table 2.2. Mention is made throughout the TA about traffic variations being compared to daily

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		variations in traffic. What percentage typical daily variation is assumed for these comparisons and how is this derived?
	Response	
TT.1.43	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Journey Times In Paragraph 2.3.78 explain why Route 3 A12 Martlesham to Sizewell C does not use a route from the A12 further south than the B1122 at Yoxford, when more direct and shorter routes are available.
	Response	
TT.1.44	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Policy Paragraph 3.4.30 states that the Suffolk Rail Prospectus 2015 included the opportunity of achieving a passenger service and station for Leiston as a legacy benefit from the new development at Sizewell should be explored. Explain how this issue has been explored.
	Response	
TT.1.45	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Policy Paragraph 3.4.33 states that the New Anglia Strategic Economic Plan (2014) details a key transport priority with regards to the Sizewell C development: "A bypass of Stratford St. Andrew, Farnham, Little Glenham and Marlesford is needed to keep HGV traffic off the A12 through these villages." Explain in this context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Why only two of these villages is proposed to be bypassed rather than the four; and (ii) What consideration has been given to the alignment of the Two Village Bypass with respect to the eventual alignment of a four village bypass envisaged in the Plan
	Response	
TT.1.46	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – LEEIE Temporary Park and Ride Paragraph 4.3.3 of the TA [AS-017] sets out the temporary nature of the LEEIE Park and Ride facility. It is stated not to be required once the remote Park and Ride sites are in operation. Explain when this facility will be removed along with any temporary use for the area for the remainder of the construction period.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.47	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – LEEIE Temporary Caravan Park Paragraph 4.3.2 states workers would be bused from the caravan park to the main site. No detail is provided of the layout of the LEEIE to show how these workers will connect with bus services. Provide a layout of the LEEIE showing how workers on the caravan park will connect with the bus services operating from the Park and Ride to the main site.
	Response	
TT.1.48	SCC, Highways England	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] / [AS-266] – Modelling Approach Are you satisfied with the strategic modelling scope and approach outlined in Section 6 of the Transport Assessment?
	Response	
TT.1.49	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Changes to Modelling Approach Paragraph 6.1.1 identifies that a number of changes to the traffic modelling approach have taken place as result of ongoing consultation with stakeholders. Identify: (i) The changes that have taken place to the modelling approach; and (ii) Summarise the key effect on modelled traffic flows on key routes.
	Response	
TT.1.50	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Trip Generation, Distribution and Mode Share There is no replacement Table 7.1 in the TA Addendum [AS-266] so the following questions relate to Table 7.1: (i) The routing of direct bus services is this correct for all services, including from Saxmundham and Leiston? (ii) How is the number of bus passengers derived? (iii) What is the peak number of buses required? (iv) How are LGV numbers derived? (v) How were the HGV numbers derived? and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(vi) Why paragraph 7.2.1 [AS-266] states the only change relates to bus frequency but not overall HGV numbers?
	Response	
TT.1.51	SCC	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Car Share Factors Paragraph 7.2.24 states average occupancies for cars. Are you satisfied this will adequately reflect the pattern of car sharing for the Proposed Development?
	Response	
TT.1.52	The Applicant, SCC	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Classification of HGV. Paragraph 7.2.43 states “HGVs include, for transport modelling purposes, all goods vehicles over 3.5 tonnes. HGVs are usually classified as goods vehicles over 7.5 tonnes; however, the lower threshold has been applied to provide a robust basis for the Transport Assessment.”. Explain this assumption in the following context: (i) It is unlikely that the pattern of sizes of goods vehicles associated with the Proposed Development would replicate the sizes of types of goods vehicles in the existing flows surveyed. It is more likely the Proposed Development HGV traffic would be in the ‘usual’ classification of HGVs mentioned above. That being the case the same usual classification of HGV size of 7.5 tonnes would seem the most accurate one to use; (ii) With the inflation of the baseline number of HGVs represented by the current assessment it would mean that the baseline (existing) level of HGV’s are over estimated and therefore percentage increases in HGVs associated with the Proposed Development are being under estimated both in the Transport Assessment and in the Chapter 10 of the ES; and (iii) If the applicant is satisfied that the HGV traffic associated with the Proposed Development will replicate the size pattern of baseline surveyed traffic, explain how

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		this would be controlled within the DCO process to avoid the dominance of much larger vehicles being used.
	Response	
TT.1.53	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – HGV movements between LEEIE and Main Site (i) In Table 7.4, do the numbers of HGV set out in this include HGV trips from to LEEIE? (ii) In TA Addendum [AS-266] it is stated in Paragraph 7.4.3 that the revised Table 7.4 does include these trips but in order to ensure direct comparison confirmation is needed that in the original Table 7.4 [AS-107] is also correct.
	Response	
TT.1.54	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Early Years Construction 2023 Explain: (i) The limit of 300 HGV deliveries to the main site was used as a limiting target for HGV movements on the wider network when in Table 7.10 of the TA there are 380 daily one way movements shown entering and leaving the Main Development site? (ii) Why this limit could not be expressed as total for all Sizewell related construction on the network? (iii) Can limits for particular routes be derived so that impacts do not exceed those identified in the ES?
	Response	
TT.1.55	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Strategic Modelling Traffic surveys used to build the model were undertaken in 2015. Explain: (i) The extent to which more recent traffic flows have been collected; and (ii) How the model outputs have been validated against more recent traffic flows.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.56	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Strategic Modelling Explain how the selection of the network peak hours were determined?
	Response	
TT.1.57	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Strategic Modelling The workforce profile shown in Plate 1.1 of the Construction Worker Travel Plan [APP-608] and Figure 2.1 of the Accommodation Strategy [APP-614] shows that the total workforce in the early years prior to the completion of the Associated Development sites exceeds 3000. Explain: (i) Why in Table 7.7 of the TA [AS-017] the early years workforce assumption for modelling purposes is 1500 people? (ii) Why using this much reduced figure does not mean modelled levels of predicted traffic would not be underestimated?
	Response	
TT.1.58	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Strategic Modelling In Table 3 in Appendix 7A car park accumulations are derived from the modelling and the maximum accumulations are significantly less than the car park capacities. Explain: (i) Why car park capacity in excess of these modelled figures is being proposed? (ii) Has modelling been undertaken for flows that would fill the desired car park capacities? and (iii) If not, why has this not been done as if car parks do fill to capacity this will impact on traffic flows on the network.
	Response	
TT.1.59	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Strategic Modelling Explain how the traffic associated with workers travelling from home to and returning from the accommodation campus and the caravan site on the LEEIE has been taken into account in the modelling?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.60	The Applicant, SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Committed Developments Paragraph 8.2.8 does the current reference case traffic modelling take account of all relevant committed developments?
	Response	
TT.1.61	The Applicant, SCC	A12 improvements: A14 'Seven Hills' to A1152 Woods Lane. Explain how the development of this project takes account of the impact of the Proposed Development and also whether the submitted modelling of the Proposed Development takes account of any of the improvements planned.
	Response	
TT.1.62	The Applicant, SCC, Scottish Power	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Cumulative Assessment with EA1N and EA2 Is the traffic data input provided used in the modelling of the Scottish Power proposal EA1 and EA2 still the correct current data?
	Response	
TT.1.63	The Applicant, SCC, Scottish Power	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Cumulative Assessment with EA1N and EA2 Explain: (i) How highway mitigations proposed for this project would be aligned with those proposed by East Anglia One North and Two offshore windfarms; (ii) How any overlap of mitigations proposed would be managed to minimise potential abortive work; (iii) How highway works would be coordinated between the projects; and (iv) How the Construction Traffic Management Plans would be aligned and managed to ensure consistent approach to traffic management between all projects and existing highway users.
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.64	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling In their representation both Suffolk County Council a [RR-1174] paragraph 33 and East Suffolk Council [RR-0342] paragraph 1.204 consider that the highway mitigation proposed by the Applicant is not comprehensive. They propose the areas listed in the two cited paragraphs require additional consideration for improvement. Provide a detailed response to these concerns.
	Response	
TT.1.65	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling In paragraph 9.1.2 says 42 junctions have been assessed but in paragraph 9.5.2 it says that 54 junctions have been assessed. Explain this anomaly.
	Response	
TT.1.66	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 5 A1094/ B1069 junction, explain why the cumulative impact of Scottish Power is not considered given that in the assessment in the TA [AS-107] the cumulative impact has the junction operating over capacity in some time periods in both the Early Years and Peak Construction periods with Scottish Power traffic.
	Response	
TT.1.67	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 5 A1094/ B1069 junction. Are you satisfied that the mitigation proposed is an appropriate response to the proposed development impact at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.68	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 9 B1119 / B1122 / B1069 Leiston Crossroads was modelled to be operating over capacity in the morning peak hour 08.00 to 09.00 in the operational phase of development 2034 onwards in the original TA [AS-017]. Revised modelling results in Table 9.16 show additionally the 15.00 to 16.00 peak construction period over capacity. Is the Council

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		content that no additional mitigation is required beyond what is suggested in the TA and the TA Addendum?
	Response	
TT.1.69	SCC, ESC, Leiston Town Council	<p>Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] - Leiston Public Realm Improvements</p> <p>Paragraph 12.6.6 are SCC and Leiston Town Council satisfied with the scope and extent of these works as mitigation for the predicted transport effects in Leiston?</p>
	Response from Leiston Town Council	<p>TT.1.69 Transport Assessment Addendum</p> <p>The transport proposals cited in the Leiston Public Realm Improvements have still not reached a conclusion. Consultation with local residents has yet to be carried out. The current proposals for a one way system, improvements to the road surfaces and cycle routes aim to stop SZC traffic from driving through the centre of Leiston. The proposals are not a perfect solution; some roads will have a significant increase in traffic and some residents suffer adverse impacts. While LTC recognizes the willingness of the applicant to engage with LTC and the local authorities to resolve the effect of construction and contractor traffic in Leiston town centre, we believe that there is still much left to do to ensure Leiston town centre remains a safe and comfortable place to visit and to shop. We recognise that even SZB outage traffic makes the town centre problematic, with its narrow roads and pavements and we are anxious to ensure a good resolution is reached.</p>
TT.1.70	The Applicant, SCC	<p>Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling</p> <p>Junction 11 A12 /A144 junction –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Explain why Junctions 9 modelling was not undertaken for the existing layout of this junction. Although changes are proposed it would give a comparable assessment of the operation of the junction in its current layout (without mitigation); (ii) Explain in more detail why Junctions 9 could not be used on the proposed layout as it has been used on A12 / B1119 staggered T junctions; and (iii) Suffolk County Council provide your views of the proposed junction assessment and potential improvement.

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.71	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Junction Modelling Junction 13 A12 / B1122 Junction. Provide a Junction 9 assessment of the early years scenario of the existing layout so as to enable direct comparison of performance between the existing and proposed layouts and in addition so comparison can be made with the Junctions 9 assessment undertaken within the East Anglia windfarm applications.
	Response	
TT.1.72	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 13 A12 / B1122 Junction. Paragraphs 9.5.29 and 9.5.30 suggest that the introduction of the roundabout will add or even create queues on the A12. What is the Highways Authority's view of the introduction of this roundabout?
	Response	
TT.1.73	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 14: B1069 / A1094. Explain why this junction is expected to operate better following the additional modelling undertaken.
	Response	
TT.1.74	SCC, Highways England	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 21: A14 / A12 Seven Hills Interchange. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.75	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 22: A12 / Foxhall Road / Newbourne Road. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.76	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 24: A12 / Anson Road / Eagle Way. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.77	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 26: A12 / B1438. Explain how the refined DCO flows changes have created significant changes in junction performance.
	Response	
TT.1.78	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 26: A12 / B1438. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.79	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 27: A12 / B1079 Grundisburgh Road. Are you satisfied that predicted traffic levels do not require additional mitigation at this junction?
	Response	
TT.1.80	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 29 A12 / New Road / Woodbridge Road. Paragraph 9.5.133 states that "SZC Co. propose that the traffic flow, driver delay and road safety performance of this junction be monitored during the construction of Sizewell C via the Transport Review Group (TRG), and impacts managed in alignment with the construction phase management plans. The Draft Section 106 Agreement (Doc Ref. 8.17) [PDB-004] sets out transport contingency effects funds that would be available to the TRG to address any identified issues, should they arise. Are you satisfied with the suggested approach at this junction?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.81	The Applicant, SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling Junction 38: A12 / B1125 Angel Lane, Blythburgh. Paragraph 9.5.137 states that “The Refined DCO forecast flows at this location have changed very little, however visibilities in the model have been adjusted to address comments made by SCC. This results in RFCs changing by +/- 0.13 and delays changing by +/- 15s per vehicle.”. Explain these comments and the adjustments to visibilities made.
	Response	
TT.1.82	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Junction Modelling A12 Corridor Assessment. Paragraph 9.6.20 states that “Based on the VISSIM assessment, no perceivable impact is predicted and therefore no mitigation in the form of highway improvements is considered to be required for the A12 corridor between Seven Hills and Melton. SZC Co. will implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan and Construction Worker Travel Plan to monitor and manage the impacts of Sizewell C freight traffic and workforce movements during the construction of Sizewell C. A Transport Review Group (TRG) will be established to review these plans and review the monitoring report produced each quarter. A transport contingency fund will be made available to the TRG to be used if necessary, to implement any further mitigation measures and remedial actions.” Do you agree with this analysis and the suggested approach to any necessary mitigation?
	Response	
TT.1.83	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Journey Times Paragraph 14.2.15. What are the daily variations of journey times along this section of the A12?
	Response	
TT.1.84	SCC	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Road Traffic Collision Forecasts

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Section 10.2 sets out the Applicant's approach to assessment of future road traffic collisions. Do you agree with the assessment approach used and also in general where they suggest improvements these are required?
	Response	
TT.1.85	SCC, ESC, Wickham Market Parish Council	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Road Traffic Collision Forecasts Paragraph 10.3.8 states that "In Wickham Market, between Border Cot Lane and the River Deben bridge, proposals have been developed in consultation with Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council and Wickham Market Parish Council. They include footway widening around the Border Cot Lane / High Street junction, kerb build-outs and parking rationalisation over this length. There would be no change to the existing 30 mph speed limit." Paragraph 10.3.10 in the first bullet point sets out that B1078 safety measures would hope to reduce vehicle speeds. Given there is a section of the B1078 that passes through a residential section of Whickham Market could you explain whether a reduction of the speed limit to 20mph was considered here?
	Response	
TT.1.86	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] – Walking and Cycling Routes References to Access and Rights of Way Plans. Confirm: (i) Paragraph 12.2.7 wrongly references new bridleway being shown on Access and Rights of Way Plans [AS-013] should this be submitted with the Applicant's change request [AS-113]? and (ii) Paragraph 14.3.16, wrongly references changes being shown on Access and Rights of Way Plans [AS-013] should this be submitted with the Applicant's change request [AS-113]?
	Response	
TT.1.87	The Applicant, SCC	"Rat Running" Traffic Routes

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Numerous Relevant Representations have raised concerns around rat running through less suitable routes by workers and traffic associated with Sizewell C. Explain measures that are proposed or that could be employed to ensure compliance with recommended routes including any signing and digital navigation services proposed.
	Response	
TT.1.88	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Rail Paragraph 2.7.10 explains that Sizewell Halt was last used for the decommissioning of Sizewell A but is not currently used. However, paragraph 2.7.8 also states that the East Suffolk Line carries occasional nuclear flask trains for Sizewell A and B. Explain the current operation used for occasional nuclear flask movements and if this relates to any usage of Sizewell Halt.
	Response	
TT.1.89	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Rail Was the use of Sizewell Halt considered in relation to construction of Sizewell C?
	Response	
TT.1.90	The Applicant	Transport Assessment (TA) [AS-017] – Rail Rail siding in LEEIE. Will this be used after the opening of the Green Rail Route? If not, will it remain until all of the LEEIE is reinstated?
	Response	
TT.1.91	The Applicant	Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis In [APP-450] the consideration of the alternatives in paragraph 3.2.50 does say initial traffic modelling was done on alternative alignments but presents no findings. Table 3.1 does not have transport as a key environmental factor. Given routes further south could potentially provide alleviation of development traffic on other routes through Knodishall, Leiston and Saxmundham. Provide a more detailed response on the various possible route alignments with reference to the initial modelling undertaken and include any initial modelling assessment

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Response	
TT.1.92	The Applicant	<p>Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis</p> <p>In the case of the preferred route of the Link Road a number of Relevant Representations question the legacy benefit of the proposed alignment. In Tables 8.5, 8.7 and 8.9 of the Transport Assessment [AS-017] it can be derived the traffic levels on the combined B1122 / Sizewell Link Road corridor return to early years levels on the B1122 during operation. Given this level of traffic is considered acceptable on the B1122 in the early years of construction, explain the legacy benefit of the proposed link road in this context?</p>
	Response	
TT.1.93	The Applicant	<p>Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.64 [APP-450] states that Stage 4 consultation preferences were expressed for the D2 route as it was considered by respondents that this would have provided more of a legacy benefit, a safer route for HGVs, catered better for HGVs coming from the south, and reduced amenity impacts to villages. Provide more detail on the transport analysis in this respect for the alternative routes.</p>
	Response	
TT.1.94	The Applicant	<p>Sizewell Link Road -Traffic Analysis</p> <p>85% of HGV's are assumed from the south in the Transport Assessment. Using the same basis of analysis, for all remaining traffic including workers on the main site what is the proportion of traffic from the south of the Sizewell Link Road junction on the A12?</p>
	Response	
TT.1.95	The Applicant	<p>Sizewell Link Road -Traffic on B1122</p> <p>Given that traffic levels on some routes such as the B1122 are predicted to be highest in the early years (2023) ahead of completion of the mitigation schemes, explain why:</p> <p>(i) The works on the main development site are started in advance of all the mitigation projects being completed; and</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) no mitigation is proposed on the existing B1122 to mitigate the increase in traffic during the early years other than highway maintenance.
	Response	
TT.1.96	The Applicant	Sizewell Link Road - Pretty Road Vehicle Severance A number of Relevant Representations are concerned about the severance created by the loss to Pretty Road to vehicular traffic. Explain in detail why vehicle movement cannot be retained on Pretty Road?
	Response	
TT.1.97	The Applicant	Sizewell Link Road – Route for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) Figure 2.4 [APP-449] suggest that AIL will use the Middleton Moor Link road to access the Sizewell Link Road. Explain: (i) Why they will not use the whole length of the Sizewell Link Road; and (ii) Will the new roundabout on the B1122 be designed to accommodate AIL?
TT.1.98	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] - Two Village Bypass Tables 8.4 shows total daily traffic. On the A12 in the vicinity of the Marlesford and Farnham, they peak in the early year's scenario at an increase due to Sizewell traffic of 2000 vehicles/ day. Given the traffic levels through Farnham how will this be managed in the early years especially given the limitations relating to the 'Farnham' bend?
	Response	
TT.1.99	The Applicant	Transport Assessment Addendum [AS-266] - Two Village Bypass In the case of Little Glenham and Marlesford how will the traffic increases shown in these Tables be mitigated throughout the construction programme?
	Response	
TT.1.100	The Applicant	Northern Park and Ride, Darsham

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Given the proximity of the site to the Darsham railway station and the narrow footway provision along the A12 from the site entrance to the station explain what consideration has been given to a direct connection to the eastern platform of the station?
	Response	
TT.1.101	The Applicant	Northern Park and Ride, Darsham Have improvements to the existing footway connection to the station been considered?
	Response	
TT.1.102	The Applicant, Network Rail	Northern Park and Ride, Darsham Two RR's [RR-0244 and RR-0908] have raised the issue relating to the safety of the level crossing at the station. Their concern is based on Network Rail's classification of the crossing safety being exacerbated by the additional traffic. Has the impact of the proposed development on this level crossing safety been assessed and discussed with Network Rail?
	Response	
TT.1.103	The Applicant	Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market Explain why the use of the existing Park and Ride site at(or adjacent to) Martlesham was not considered as part of the assessment of alternatives?
	Response	
TT.1.104	The Applicant	Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market Explain why the existing layout on A12 northbound carriageway would be changed from two lanes to one lane before the northbound slip road from the B1078 joins the A12?
	Response	
TT.1.105	The Applicant	Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market Has an initial road safety audit been undertaken for the new site entrance / exit on the A12 slip road? If so either signpost in the submission or provide it
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.106	The Applicant	Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market In the case of the Traffic Incident Management Area (TIMA) provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) More detail on the number of HGV's that could use the TIMA including maximum occupancy in the event of any traffic incident; and (ii) Details on how its use would be controlled in the DCO so that it would only occur in the event of a clearly defined traffic incident.
	Response	
TT.1.107	The Applicant	Southern Park and Ride, Whickham Market In the case of the Postal Consolidation Facility provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Details of whether postal consolidation facility will be used for the main site and Sizewell accommodation provision; and (ii) Details of vehicle type to take consolidated deliveries to main site.
	Response	
TT.1.108	The Applicant	Freight Management Facility (FMF) On Felixstowe Road, the national speed limit applies on this road. Has an initial road safety audit been undertaken for this access junction? If so either signpost in the submission or provide it
	Response	
TT.1.109	The Applicant	Freight Management Facility (FMF) Several Relevant Representations comment that closure of the A14 Orwell Bridge is a regular occurrence and this site would be severely affected by such a closure. Explain how this was considered in the analysis of the suitability of this site?
	Response	
TT.1.110	The Applicant	Freight Management Facility (FMF) Also, in relation to the FMF provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The peak times of activity for HGVs entering and leaving the site; and

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(ii) The anticipated direction of travel of the vehicles entering and leaving the site.
	Response	
TT.1.111	The Applicant	<p>Freight Management Facility (FMF) – Temporary Construction Access</p> <p>Paragraph 2.4.11 [APP-511] states that “It is anticipated that a temporary construction access point would be provided to the site off the A12 until construction of the site access road is completed.” This infers that there will be two accesses created, one for the main road and a more temporary construction access. The Schedule of Accesses submitted [AS-297] identifies only one access for the FMF. Explain:</p> <p>(i) This anomaly and if necessary, update the Schedule and any related plans; and</p> <p>(ii) Confirm whether similar temporary site access arrangements will be in place at other Associated Development Sites and if so, identify the sites and amend the Schedule of Accesses and relevant plans.</p>
	Response	
TT.1.112	The Applicant	<p>ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT</p> <p>Paragraph 10.2.23 states that “For peak construction the representative hour was initially identified as 22:00- 23:00 when ‘daytime hours’ of 07:00-23:00 were considered. Given the assessments are to primarily assess impact on vulnerable road users, it is important that the representative hour is a reflection of when vulnerable road users are likely to be on the network. As such, the representative hour for peak construction has been taken to be 07:00-08:00”. Explain why this “representative” hour was chosen if it is meant to be a period when vulnerable road users are on the network.</p>
	Response	
TT.1.113	The Applicant	<p>ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT / ES ADDENDUM [AS-181]</p> <p>The Institute of Environmental Management (IEMA) Guidance also recommends that the period of highest environmental impact should also be considered. This could be time</p>

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		around the beginning or end of school when children are going to school for example. Why has the period of highest environmental impact not been considered?
	Response	
TT.1.114	The Applicant	ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT Paragraph 10.6.8 sets out that screening has been undertaken using 24hr AAWT. In the IMEA Guidance Paragraph it acknowledges that, “for many impacts such as noise and severance it is considered that average or total daily traffic flows provide insufficient information for any real understanding of environmental effects.” Understanding this, what are the implications for the screening process if the hours of greatest change or the hours of greatest impact are used on the screening?
	Response	
TT.1.115	The Applicant	ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT In Table 10.16 the assessment of pedestrian amenity is undertaken on the selected representative hour 07.00 to 08.00 which is the hour of greatest change but has there been consideration of the hour of greatest impact when there are likely to be more pedestrians present? By way of example Table 7.4 in the Transport Assessment [AS-017] shows that the hour of greatest HGV movement is between 15.00 and 16.00.
	Response	
TT.1.116	The Applicant	ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT In terms of Fear and Intimidation the IMEA Guidance suggest that consideration should also be given to areas exposed to higher than average levels of school children and / or vulnerable users that should be separately identified. Has this been considered?
TT.1.117	The Applicant	ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT Given that speed limits on most roads in the area are a minimum of 30mph, explain how in the assessment of the effects on Fear and Intimidation that traffic speeds seem not to

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		have been considered, as recommended in both the IMEA Guidance and Table 10.2, where speeds of +20mph are considered part of the high impact category?
	Response	
TT.1.118	The Applicant	ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT Explain why given the major adverse impact on pedestrian amenity which is considered a significant effect that no mitigation is proposed on sections of the B1122 in the early years of construction prior to the opening of the Sizewell Link Road
	Response	
TT.1.119	SCC, ESC	ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT Do the Council's agree with the Applicant's assessment of the early years environmental traffic effects along the B1122 in the early years of construction? If so please explain the details of any concerns you have about the assessment.
TT.1.120	The Applicant	ES CHAPTER 10 [APP-198] – TRANSPORT Paragraphs 10.6.14 to 10.6.17 identify four routes in the early years that are said to have adverse impacts that are identified but none are judged to be significant effects. This in the case of 3 routes is said to be because in the selected representative hour, other activity of the routes would be relatively light. Has the hour of greatest impact been considered in regard to severance when there is likely to be much more activity on these sensitive routes?
	Response	
TT.1.121	The Applicant	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Pedestrian Delay Methodology Paragraph 2.5.4, explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Why the methodology has changed; (ii) Explain how pedestrian delay is now calculated; (iii) Whether any comparison has been undertaken of how this has changed the analysis, if so, provide such evidence; and

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iv) Why this is apparently contrary to the methodology outlined in paragraphs 1.3.46 to 1.3.48 Volume 1, Chapter 6, Appendix 6F of the ES [APP-171].
	Response	
TT.1.122	SCC, ESC	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Severance 2023 Early Years Table 2.10 Link 11 B1125 Westleton, this changes from minor adverse to major adverse, but significance is dismissed due to absolute traffic volumes. Given this represents a 61% rise in traffic volumes in the representative hour do the Councils agree with this assessment?
	Response	
TT.1.123	The Applicant	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Severance 2023 Early Years Paragraph 2.5.23, has the hour when children are likely to be arriving or leaving the Centre and nursery been considered, i.e. the hour of greatest environmental impact?
	Response	
TT.1.124	The Applicant	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Severance 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day Table 2.16 Link 4c text states the primary mitigation proposed makes this change not significant. Paragraph 2.5.53 explains the new bridleway with Pegasus crossing will mean there is no severance. The new crossing will be across the B1122 north of the proposed site entrance. This link is south of the entrance and the new bridleway seems not to reflect the overall north south desire line. Explain how the proposed bridleway alignment and crossing addresses severance.
	Response	
TT.1.125	The Applicant	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Amenity 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day Paragraphs 2.5.64 and 2.5.65 the assessments of amenity are based on revised traffic modelling and assumptions about bus routes. How will these bus route assumptions be

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		controlled through the DCO to ensure any subsequent changes in bus routes does not reintroduce effects that have not been considered or screened out.
	Response	
TT.1.126	The Applicant	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Fear and Intimidation 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day Paragraph 2.5.67, Link 26 A12 Marlesford given an increased and significant effect has been identified is the Applicant proposing any mitigation?
	Response	
TT.1.127	The Applicant	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Fear and Intimidation 2028 Peak Construction Busiest Day Paragraph 2.5.67, Does the refinement of the bus strategy mentioned and the reduction in vehicles travelling to the southern park and ride affect the demand at the southern park and ride? And If not why?
	Response	
TT.1.128	The Applicant	ES ADDENDUM [AS-181] – Driver Delay 2028 Peak Construction Paragraph 2.5.89, explain how is this level of delay judged to be not significant in this case?
	Response	
TT.1.129	The Applicant	Cumulative Impact Appendices [ES-201]- Appendix 10.4 Fear and Intimidation Explain why Tables 2.13 to 2.18 and Tables 3.13 to 3.18 are entitled in 24hr AAWT when original assessment methodology is undertaken on 18hr AAWT flows
	Response	
TT.1.130	The Applicant	Cumulative Transport Impacts [ES-201]- Appendix 10.4 Explain why in the cumulative assessment provided with the East Anglia projects none of the assessments have considered traffic levels in the representative hour. Using this methodology, as is used in Chapter 10 [APP-198], it could for example change the Severance assessment in the early years such that it may show a major adverse effect

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		significance on Link 11, B1125 through Westleton, with cumulative traffic added. Provide comparable assessment methodology using the representative hour as in the original Chapter 10 so direct comparison can be made.
	Response	
TT.1.131	The Applicant	Cumulative Transport Impacts [AS-189] [ES-201]- Hour of Greatest Impact Why has there been no consideration of the hour of greatest environmental impact in the Cumulative assessment?
	Response	
TT.1.132	The Applicant	Cumulative Transport Impacts [ES-201]- Appendix 10.4 Scottish Power in the assessment of the transport impacts of both EA1 North and EA2 have identified the following area of mitigation required. Provide explanation why in the assessment of the effects of Sizewell C traffic, the following mitigations are not identified: (i) For the EA projects only footway improvements in Theberton on the B1122; (ii) Cumulative impact with SZC pedestrian improvements at Yoxford on the A12; and (iii) Cumulative impact with SZC pedestrian improvements at Marlesford on the A12
	Response	
TT.1.133	SCC	Cumulative Transport Impacts [AS-189] [ES-201] Explain any issues the Council has with respect to how cumulative impact has been assessed and also any areas where the Council considered mitigation is required and the reasons for any such mitigation.
	Response	
W.1	Waste (conventional) and material resource	
W.1.0	The Applicant	Water Supply Strategy Appendix 2.2D [AS-202] Paragraph 1.3.1 sets out the options still being considered for water supply solutions. Provide:

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(i) An update on progress of these options; and (ii) Confirmation that the site water supply demands can be met without any implications for water supply elsewhere.
	Response	
W.1.1	The Applicant	Water Supply Strategy Appendix 2.2D [AS-202] Plate 1.2 seems to show that the pipeline transfer connection to Darsham will run along a part of the Sizewell Link Road. Explain: (i) Whether the pipeline will be installed along part of the Sizewell Link Road: and (ii) How this work will be delivered and coordinated within the powers secured by the DCO.
	Response	
W.1.2	Essex and Suffolk Water Company	Water Supply Strategy Appendix 2.2D [AS-202] Provide an update on the delivery of water supply to the Proposed Development and the expected delivery timescales.
	Response	
W.1.3	The Applicant	Main Development Site Chapter 8 Conventional Waste and Material Resources - [APP-193] Table 8.7 shows material resource requirements compared to amounts available in Suffolk and UK. Concrete is a manufactured product consisting mostly of cement, sand, aggregate and water. The Temporary Construction Area is proposed to include batching plants so concrete will be produced on site. Explain why this Table does not take this into account or show the raw materials needed to manufacture concrete?
	Response	
W.1.4	The Applicant	Main Development Site Chapter 8 Conventional Waste and Material Resources - [APP-193]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Table 8.17. Will concrete used on the associated development sites be manufactured on the Temporary Construction Area or imported?
	Response	
W.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Cut and Fill Balance</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6.27 [APP-193]. This states “a neutral cut and fill balance is targeted for the main development site, with any surplus excavated material to be retained on-site for re-use in landscaping.” Further emphasised in Paragraph 1.2.1 [APP-185] where it sets out in the second bullet point that an objective of the Materials Management Strategy is to achieve a neutral cut and fill balance across the main development site and associated development sites. Demonstrate how this neutral balance will be achieved by way of setting out the values of the cut and fill by location either in tonnes or m³. Include all significant areas of cut and fill, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The main platform area including marine shafts and cut off wall; (ii) All Associated Development sites; (iii) Borrow Pits; (iv) Stockpiles; (v) The SSSI crossing; and (vi) Any landscape features
	Response	
W.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Materials Management Strategy Update Appendix 2.2.C [AS-202]</p> <p>Paragraph 1.2.9 sets out that “Further testing has allowed the project to assume that some of this additional crag material would now also be available for higher specification backfill material when treated with binders. This significantly reduces the amount of such backfill material that would otherwise have needed to be imported (by approximately 2.4 million tonnes). It also significantly reduces the amount of residual material that would otherwise have needed to be either exported off-site or incorporated into the permanent landscape.”. Explain in this context why the changed application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Increases the need imported backfill by 1.3 million tonnes (Table 1.20); (ii) Would it mean without the additional crag material that 3.7 million tonnes of imported backfill would be needed?

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		(iii) This paragraph infers that previously material could have been exported off site, how is this consistent with neutral cut and fill? (iv) Is there any disposal off site of non-contaminated arisings, and if so, how much? (v) Has any export of arisings off site been considered in either the Freight Management or the Transport Strategy?
	Response	
W.1.7	The Applicant	Introduction to the Environmental Statement Chapter 6 EIA Methodology Appendix 6D – [APP-171] Paragraph 1.1.6 states “It is acknowledged that the use of material resources and the generation and management of waste would be likely to generate adverse environmental effects, predominantly through transportation (both to and from site)”. Does the analysis of traffic generation in both the Transport Assessment [AS-017] and Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-198] include any traffic generated by the transport of waste? If so, please signpost where the assumptions about waste removal trip generation from site have been included in the modelling undertaken.
	Response	
W.1.8	The Applicant	Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296] Figure 1.1 showing the locations of the borrow pits is missing from the report. Provide this figure and also a plan showing borrow pits and stockpiles.
	Response	
W.1.9	The Applicant	Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296] Paragraph 1.2.1 of the Materials Management Strategy Update [AS-202] states that detailed site investigations have led to a revised assumption about arisings. Given this detailed site investigation has been undertaken after the submission of the Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix does the additional site investigation have any implications for the risk assessment undertaken?
	Response	

ExQ1: 21 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: 2 June 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
W.1.10	The Applicant	Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296] Will any stockpiling take place over borrow pits?
	Response	
W.1.11	The Applicant	Borrow Pit Risk Assessment Report Appendix 18E [APP-296] Summarise the main areas of potential environmental effects from the use of borrow pits and set out how such effects will be monitored and potentially mitigated in the DCO.
	Response	
W.1.12	The Applicant	Conventional Waste and Material Resources Appendix 8A Waste Management Strategy - [APP-194] The Environment Agency [RR-0373] Appendix A. In the table on page 35 of their representation they highlight the lack of performance indicators and the consequent lack of a monitoring process. Respond to their concerns.
	Response	