Ref	Question	SZC Response	ESIDB response to SZC response
CA.1.65	**Adequacy of any Protective Provisions set out in the dDCO and the need for any other Protective Provisions to safeguard relevant interests** 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?	These matters are considered in the **Statement of Common Ground between SZC Co. and East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board** (Doc Ref. 9.10.3).	It has not yet been agreed but discussions are expected to continue shortly.
CG.1.18	**Impacts on coastal processes** East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board [RR-0345] expresses concern that the identified	(i) The East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board indicate concerns regarding accretion at the Minsmere Sluice, which is approximately 1.6 km north of Sizewell C. The potential accretion (or a reduction in erosion rates) on the southern Minsmere frontage (within a few hundred metres of Sizewell C) arising from deposition SCDF sediments would not extend to the sluice. Therefore, it would not affect the sluice's ability to discharge, for the	ESIDB acknowledges and accepts the applicant's explanation.

	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.	following reasons: (a) SCDF beach shingle (proposed mitigation) would, in net terms, drift slowly to the south, not to the north. Some shingle may accumulate immediately to the north of Sizewell C, but not as far as the sluice (longshore transport calculations and tracer studies indicate that detectable volumes of SCDF shingle are not likely to be encountered more than a few hundred metres north of Sizewell C). Therefore, there would be no impact at the Minsmere Sluice outfall. (b) Any SCDF sediments that are transported north of Sizewell C would most likely be deposited and retained in areas where the shoreline has already receded to a more westerly position than the SCDF (tens to a few hundred metres north of Sizewell C). This would tend to trap shingle and prevent further northward transport for as long as the more westerly shoreline position persisted. (c) The sluice's outfall pipe will continue to disrupt natural shingle transport for as long as it is present, which can be seen as an alternating accumulation of sediment on either side of the sluice determined by storm direction. Sizewell C's activities will have no bearing on that process. ii) n/a (see response to CG.1.18 (i) above).	
FR.1.17	**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?	The wording of Paragraph 5.1.20 of the MDS FRA Addendum [AS-157] has been taken from Paragraph 2.14.35 of the Volume 1 Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]. The ExA is directed to the Fen Meadow Strategy [AS-209], which has been prepared to define SZC Co.'s commitment to provide appropriate compensation measures to mitigate for the loss of fen meadow habitat through the creation of compensatory fen meadow habitats, and the provision of a contingency fund. Please also see the response to question Bio.1.86. Paragraphs 4.1.1 – 4.1.12 of the Fen Meadow Strategy [AS-209] detail: • the studies undertaken to date to identify potential fen meadow compensation sites; • the further studies on-going on the fen meadow sites; and	The ESIDB has not to this point been aware of the intention to use the Fen Meadow Plan as the basis for preliminary discussions in respect of the appropriate consenting regime but looks forwards to hearing more.

		• the development of a Fen Meadow Plan, which will be developed over a series of three reports, with the final Plan drawing upon 12 months of monitoring. The final plan will be submitted for approval, as detailed [Paragraph 4.1.11 in AS-209]. The draft Fen Meadow Plan (in preparation) will be submitted to the examination at a suitable deadline. The suitability of the sites is defined further in the answer to Bio.1.65. However, specifically in relation to flood risk, taking into account guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and its supporting Planning Practice Guidance, the proposed fen meadow site would be classified as 'Amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity' which is a water compatible use and appropriate for location within Flood Zone 3. Furthermore, the nature of the proposed habitat is such that it is required to be located in an area that may be subject to flooding. Therefore, the Applicant considers that the proposed fen meadow sites are appropriate in terms of flood risk. Whilst paragraph 5.1.20 of the FRA recognises that it will be necessary to engage with the EA and other stakeholders in designing the detailed water management regime at the fen meadow sites, each site has been selected based on its inherent suitability. There is no reason in principle to doubt the ability of each site to provide the water environment necessary to establish and sustain a fen meadow habitat. The emerging Fen Meadow Plan will be used as the basis for preliminary discussions with the Environment Agency, Internal Drainage Board and LLFA in respect of the appropriate consenting regime (to be confirmed, but for example, Ordinary Watercourse Consent, Flood Defence Consent and/or Impoundment Licence). The consenting and licensing process will provide the framework for the next iteration of the design in assessing and managing flood risk.	
FR.1.52	**Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [APP-181]** Paragraph 3.4.13 Explain:	(i) Surface water runoff from the main construction area is no longer proposed to be conveyed to Water Management Zones 1 and 2. This option has been superseded by the proposal to install a temporary marine outfall	i) ESIDB acknowledge the change in strategy however no details have been provided as to how this will be achieved or

	(i)	How surface water runoff from the main construction area will be conveyed both to Water Management Zone (WMZ) 1 and WMZ2;	that will allow early surface water runoff from the main construction area to be discharged to the sea. The temporary marine outfall is proposed to be installed early in the construction programme, as a redundancy measure or a precautionary principle for discharging surface water to sea, prior to the commissioning of the Combined Drainage Outfall (CDO). During this period, management of surface water run-off and discharge is required to prevent flooding of the Main Development Site (MDS), and any adverse effects on the nearby Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Minsmere South Levels. For a period of 15 months or so, the temporary marine outfall would principally be used where factors external to the MDS that are out of the control of Sizewell C result in the Sizewell Drain being unsuitable to discharge to, for example, flooding on site caused by off-site flood conditions. The temporary outfall will be controlled through conditions set by the Environment Agency through discharge permit applications. Once the CDO is installed, the temporary marine outfall will no longer be required, and will be removed. The Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3 2A(A)) has been revised to specifically answer the Examination Authority's questions FR.1.51, FR.1.53, FR.1.56 and FR.1.57(i). The Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3 2A(A)) has been updated to include the role of the temporary marine outfall. (ii) As stated in the text above to part (i), the WMZ1 attenuation features are not sized to allow conveyance of surface water from the main construction area (MCA) to WMZ1/2. The WMZ1 attenuation basin has been sized for the WMZ1 catchment, for a 1:100 year, 24 hours storm event including an allowance for climate change, checking the worst case scenario for several rainfall models including FEH1999, FEH2013 and the Flood Studies Report (FSR). The attenuation basin provides a storage of approximately 17,300m3 .	why it is acceptable in accordance with the drainage hierarchy. ESIDB is unable to comment on the response until further details on the drainage strategy of the MDS are received. The ESIDB acknowledge the applicant's response that the intention is to use the TMO only as a redundancy measure but request that clear criteria for use or trigger points be identified. ii) ESIDB are seeking further clarification on the sizing of the attenuation basin in WMZ1 irrespective of the addition of surface water discharge from the MDS
	(ii)	Identify which attenuating features in WMZ1 need to be sized accordingly and how that analysis will be undertaken.		

FR.1.53	**Main Development Site FRA Addendum [AS-157**]- Temporary Outfall Provide an updated Outline Drainage Strategy that includes the role of the temporary outfall	The Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3 2A(A)) has been revised to specifically answer the Examination Authority's questions FR.1.51, FR.1.53, FR.1.56 and FR.1.57(i). The Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3 2A(A)) has been updated to include the role of the temporary marine outfall.	See ESIDB response to FR1.52
FR.1.69	**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.	SZC Co. has provided a standalone response to FR.1.69 as Appendix 15C which sets out how sustainable drainage systems can be implemented and the level of certainty attributed to SZC Co.'s approach.	ESIDB share ESCs concerns. While the response in Appendix 15C is theoretically very reassuring it does not provide the detail necessary to demonstrate feasibility. ESIDB note and look forwards to reviewing the further drainage designs which will be submitted at later deadlines.
FR.1.71	**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	The surface water design has so far been progressed to a developed design level (similar to RIBA stage 3), and the proposed strategy can sufficiently manage surface water runoff generated by the proposed development, within the Order Limits and whilst complying with current local and national guidance. Surface water drainage proposals across all development areas within the application boundary prioritise Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) where possible and have been incorporated across the site in the form of swales, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements and infiltration / attenuation basins.	The ESIDB share SCC concern, specifically in regards to WMZ1 and have requested further details.

	a satisfactory standard." Comment on whether the drainage design strategy being developed can provide the necessary reassurance to the Council.	The design so far has been prepared to account for the worst-case storage volumes required for each Water Management Zone basin across the Main Development Site. The design demonstrates that sufficient space will be provided within the order limits to ensure no surface water, other than at controlled greenfield runoff rates, will run off the site up to a 1:100 year storm including allowance for climate change. Similarly, the surface water drainage strategy for the Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE) has progressed since the original submission of the ODS following discussions with key stakeholders including Suffolk County Council, Essex and Suffolk Internal Drainage Boards, East Suffolk Council, Natural England, and the Environment Agency. Surface water on site will be collected primarily using SuDS in combination with conventional drainage systems, to store, treat and discharge runoff to nearby watercourses at agreed rates. The surface water design improves the existing flood risk of the site by allowing systems to capture surface water runoff and attenuating this up to 1 in 100-year storm event, in accordance with national and local guidance. A similar approach will be undertaken for the Associated Development sites and will ensure that the proposed surface water drainage systems will adhere to the principle stated in the Outline Drainage Strategy (Doc Ref. 6.3 2A(A)).	
FR.1.72	**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	SZC Co. recognises concerns of stakeholders regarding the long-term viability of Minsmere Sluice. It neither owns the structure nor includes it within the Application boundary for the proposed power station. Minsmere Sluice is an Environment Agency owned and maintained structure that controls drainage from the Minsmere New River, Leiston Drain and Scott's Hall Drain. It provides controls and limits the ingress of salt water and is tide locked when water levels in the North Sea are high. At low tide drainage of the upstream fluvial system via Minsmere Sluice is via gravity. SZC Co. notes that the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP)5 policy for the wider coast (MIN12.3 and MIN12.4) in the vicinity of Minsmere Sluice is managed ealignment, whereas the position for Minsmere Sluice is for it to be maintained. Consistent with the policy stated in the SMP, the Environment Agency refurbished Minsmere	ESIDB notes that the Sluice is EA owned and maintained and predominantly defers to the Agency. The ESIDB would however like to elaborate that it is our understanding (based on liaison with the Environment Agency) that the 2013 EA sluice refurbishment project was only undertaken with a 20 year design life, and was *appraised* over 50 years.

	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?	Sluice in 2013 and this work was completed with a 50 year design life. A thorough assessment has been undertaken and reported on in Volume 2, Chapter 19 (Groundwater and surface water) of the ES [APP-297], which concludes that there would be no significant change in water levels and discharge volumes, and therefore there would be no mechanism that could accelerate degradation of the Minsmere Sluice.	We understand that the sluice is expected to be unable to drain via gravity within the aforementioned 50 year timeframe.
FR.1.73	**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?	There is no potential for the SZC development to cause or affect the discharge from Minsmere. Please refer to question CG.1.18 for further detail.	ESIDB acknowledges and accepts the applicant's explanation.