

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
<b>DCO.2 Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) – comments on the Applicants’ responses to ExQs1 (all para numbers are prefixed DCO.)</b>		
DCO.2.0	The Applicant, ESC, SCC, Natural England, MMO	Attention is drawn to the Commentary on the DCO which includes commentary on the Deed of Obligation
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Noted. Please see <b>Response to ExA's Commentary on the Draft DCO</b> (Doc Ref. 9.72).
DCO.2.1	Applicant, Environment Agency	1.35; “The reason for the inclusion of the specific exemption is that the Applicant proposes to divert an existing main river, Middleton Watercourse, as part of the construction of the Sizewell link road. Such a diversion will involve interference with the bed or banks of a main river”. Should the article not therefore be limited to the Middleton Watercourse?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The Applicant does not consider it practicable or necessary to make article 12(5) specific to the Middleton Watercourse as this is not a defined work area and the reach of the exception is limited in any event to the Works authorised under the DCO.
DCO.2.2	Applicant	1.36. It would be helpful to warn that silence is deemed to be consent in that case.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The Applicant considers that the drafting “...and fails to notify the undertaker of its decision within 28 days...will be deemed to have granted consent or given approval” is clear enough to warn that silence is deemed to be consent.
DCO.2.3	Applicant, Maritime and Coastguard Agency	1.43 – please provide an update on the position. The SoCG indicated much work had yet to be done.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	An agreed SoCG with the MCA will be submitted to the ExA at Deadline 7.
DCO.2.4	MMO	1.44 – please will the MMO consider and confirm whether the coordinates are correct.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response required from SZC Co. is required.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
DCO.2.5	Applicant	1.49 – noted. But as the Applicants’ counsel pointed out during ISH7 the system is not bound by precedent. Please will the Applicant consider and respond to the substantive points in this question.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(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</p> <p>SZC Co.'s response: This is intended to apply to any Agreement that governs the operation of a Lease granted pursuant to it, and in that way it does affect the operation of the lease itself.</p> <p>(ii) Is the intention to disapply tenant protections such as the Landlord &amp; Tenant Act 1954?</p> <p>SZC Co.'s response: Please see response to your question (iv)</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>SZC Co.'s response: Please see response to your question (iv)</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>SZC Co.'s response: The Article relates to any agreement (the "Agreement") that would have the potential to affect the terms or operation of a lease granted pursuant to the Agreement. The context of such an Agreement and grant of lease is the anticipated Lease referred to at Art 9(1)(b). Where such an Agreement is</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>entered into, then when the lease is granted, the Agreement will be treated as not limited in its effectiveness in controlling the terms on which the land is provided to the tenant under the associated lease. The Article is about preventing such an Agreement becoming wholly or partially ineffective, hence under A77(2) the reference is to preventing "prejudice" to the effectiveness of that Agreement. Article 77(3) lists subcategories of this, namely that where the Agreement is in place, its ability to dictate the basis upon which the lease will operate cannot be affected by rules of law or statute. It would be open for the Agreement, for example, to disapply the right for a tenant to claim relief from forfeiture on termination or to argue that it has a business lease that will survive the expiry of its term. Instead, so far as provided for in the Agreement, the lease will operate solely on its contractual footing. It is not intended that this wording should exclude "rules of law" generally, given that real estate, contract, and all other areas of the law are governed by "rules". Instead, the point is that the Agreement itself will be taken as effective. It will not be constrained by rules that might otherwise mean that contractual position under the Agreement (in turn governing the position under the associated lease) is varied from what is stated on the face of the Agreement itself.</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>SZC Co.'s response: Art 77 will provide a straightforward matrix of rights and liabilities under any Agreement governing the grant of a lease. The extent of those exclusions depends on the drafting of the Agreement and not on Art 77, and accordingly we do not consider that the Article itself will affect the deliverability of tenants and funding. It should also be noted from the Applicant's previous response to this question that very many DCOs include this provision in identical form and it hasn't, so far as the Applicant is aware, affected the deliverability of these projects.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(vi) 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. 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> <p>SZC Co.'s response: Fundability and ability to let etc. are ultimately market questions rather than legal ones and therefore advice is not available. However, as stated at item (iv) above, Art 77 does not create a negation of statutes/rules of law but only the ability for the Agreement at the relevant time to take effect on terms agreed by the tenant without such statutes/rules of law interposing on the Agreement so as to curtail its provisions. The negotiation of the Agreement would be a matter between the negotiating parties at the time as to what would be acceptable to each of them. Given the significant list of precedent examples where this language has been adopted (which incidentally does include Hinkley Point C), the Applicant does not see that specific reference is needed to cover "rules of law" as well as statute, but the jurisdiction for the Secretary of State to do so is contained within section 120(5)(c) (<i>"any provision that appears to the Secretary of State to be necessary or expedient for giving full effect to any other provision of the order"</i>).</p>
DCO.2.6	Applicant, ESC, SCC	1.54 – Please update the ExA on the position. In particular what are the views of the councils on fees?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	It has now been agreed that council resourcing will be included in the <b>DCO</b> as opposed to the <b>Deed of Obligation</b> . SZC Co.is working with ESC to agree the

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		approach to the drafting and this will be included in the next revision of the draft DCO.
DCO.2.7	Applicant, SCC	1.56(iv). Noted, but what about the status of the road being altered, i.e. the A12. Is the SofS or a strategic highway authority the highway authority (s.22(3)(b)? Does this affect the approach?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The A12 is maintained by Suffolk County Council so this does not affect the approach as set out in the <b>SZC Co.'s response to the Examining Authority's First Written Question (ExQ1) DCO 1.56.</b>
DCO.2.8	Applicant	1.66 - The clarificatory drafting did not appear to be in Revision 4. Is it in the latest version?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	This drafting was added to revision 7 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 6 [REF].
DCO.2.9	Applicant, ESC	1.75 – The ExA will consider this response further and in the light of ISH1.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response required from SZC Co. is required.
DCO.2.10	Applicant, ESC	1.97 – what is the position if notice of end is not given?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	If the Owner failed to give notice of the end of the Construction Period then this would result in a breach of the Deed of Obligation.
DCO.2.11	Applicant, MMO	1.106 – should not s.72(7) then be disapplied?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	We agree that s72(7) and s72(8) of the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 should be disapplied in order to ensure that the deemed marine licence can only be transferred with the consent of the Secretary of State pursuant to article 9. Paragraph 3 of the deemed marine licence (Schedule 20 Rev 8 of the dDCO) has therefore been revised accordingly.
DCO.2.12	Applicant, MMO	1.112 – can wording be added to explain what is meant by rock material from a recognised source?

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The Applicant will consider how best to define or provide further detail around what is meant by "recognised source" and will include updates to the Deemed Marine Licence at a future deadline.
DCO.2.13	MMO	1.117 – is the MMO satisfied the coordinates are right?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required
DCO.2.14	Applicant, ESC	1.128 – "In the Applicant's view, the proposed Natural Environment Improvement Fund in its final form is likely to meet the policy tests for obligations set out in National Policy Statement". "Likely" sounds rather tentative.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The term "likely" was used because the final form of the drafting had not yet been settled. In the Applicant's view, the proposed Natural Environment Improvement Fund will be used to fund necessary off-site mitigation directly related to the impacts of the Project and meets the policy tests for obligations set out in National Policy Statement EN-1 (at paragraph 4.1.8).
DCO.2.15	Applicant, ESC, SCC	<p>(i) Please include the TEMMPP in the documents to be certified by the SofS.</p> <p>(ii) There are some concerns about including the entire ES as one certified document given its size. Evidence of that is the length of the ES Signposting Document [REP2-025] at 108 pages. Should it be broken down in the certification provisions?</p> <p>(iii) Additionally, given its complexity, the ExA would welcome views from the Applicant, ESC and SCC on the inclusion and certification of a guide if a suitable document exists in the examination documentation.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) this was added to Sch. 23 in revision 7 of the draft DCO (REF).</p> <p>(ii) Whilst the Applicant acknowledges that the ES is a lengthy document, it should be read as a whole and therefore in the Applicant's view it would not be appropriate to split it into separate certified documents.</p> <p>(iii) The certified documents will all be listed in Schedule 22 of the final DCO. Therefore the Applicant considers that it would not be necessary to include an</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		additional guide. Certified Documents are limited to those documents and plans that are referred to within the DCO (e.g. as control documents). Final versions of these documents will all be submitted to ensure that there is clarity on exactly which version of each document is to be certified. The Applicant has submitted, for example, the DCO Signposting Document, ES Signposting Document and Navigation Document to assist in understanding the structure of the submission but it would not be appropriate for any of these to be included as Certified Documents.
<b>FR.2 Flood risk, ground water, surface water</b>		
FR.2.0	The Applicant	<b>Northumbrian Water Limited (NWL) – Potable Water Supply [REP5-257]</b> In its representation, Walker Morris LLP, on behalf of NWL state that the Water Industry National Environment Programme (WINEP) abstraction sustainability investigations, has not yet concluded, so it is unable to confirm that the water requirements of Sizewell C can be met. Even assuming the provision of the required amount of water was possible the additional infrastructure required to supply Sizewell C would likely take until 2026 at the earliest to deliver Explain: (i) How will water supply be delivered until such a time NWL supply can be delivered; and (ii) How water requirements will be delivered if NWL supply is not possible in part or in total.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	(i) An updated Water Supply Strategy is being submitted at Deadline 7 (Ref 8.4k(A)) which explains how the water supply would be delivered until such time that the NWL supply is available. SZC Co notes that NWL has indicated that their supply (the proposed 'Sizewell transfer main') would not be available until December 2024 at the earliest and most likely not until December 2026. A phased approach is therefore now proposed, whereby potable water requirements would initially be met by a temporary desalination plant. Water trucks would be used to supply the site before the

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>temporary desalination plant is available. SZC Co. has consulted on temporary desalination as a proposed change to the application and a change application request is being submitted at Deadline 7 taking account of the feedback from that consultation.</p> <p>(ii) Until very recently, NWL has indicated that at least 3.5MI/day potable water is likely to be available for construction, subject to completion of their abstraction sustainability ('WINEP') studies. SZC Co's Water Supply Strategy has therefore been prepared on this basis. It is noted that these studies are still underway and are expected to conclude within the next few weeks—Should these studies demonstrate that insufficient water is available to sustainably supply Sizewell's 4MI/day construction peak, this would be met by the proposed temporary desalination plant. However, it is assumed that the Sizewell transfer main would be available by the end of mid-2028 at the latest, although the desalination plant can be retained throughout the construction process if necessary. Provided NWL can supply the power station's operational demand (2MI/day when both units are generating rising to approximately 2.8 MI/day for two in every 18 months approximately, when one unit is in planned outage), SZC Co's position is as set out in its updated Water Supply Strategy.</p> <p>SZC Co. is aware of NWL's most recent letter to the EXA dated 24 August, which suggests that NWL may have difficulty supplying water to SZC, even in the longer term, based on its current capital investment programme. Its letter raises issues which affect the availability of sustainable supply across the whole of the East of England and which, if confirmed, will require a strategic response by the water company in order that it can continue to fulfill its water supply duties under the Water Industry Act for Sizewell and elsewhere, including its duties under both sections 41 and 55.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>SZC Co. is aware that the position is still the subject of the continuing studies and that no conclusions have yet been reached by NWL or by the Environment Agency. SZC Co. is engaging both parties on the continuing work and its potential implications and will continue to keep the examination updated. Longer term plans will need to be put in place to serve the region and its committed growth.</p> <p>SZC Co.'s Water Supply Strategy preempts any risk for the duration of the construction period, allowing considerable time for longer term outcomes to be examined by all stakeholders.</p> <p>SZC Co. is aware that there are a range of long term options open to NWL in discussion with the Environment Agency, in order to meet its supply obligations, including the current or alternative options for a transfer main, sustainable abstraction, waste water recovery, desalination and investment in more strategic water storage and transfer options.</p> <p>SZC Co. welcomes the commitment from NWL to continue to engage proactively on these issues.</p>
FR.2.1	The Applicant	<b>Water Supply – Non Potable Water</b> Set out the non-potable water requirements for Sizewell C and explain how this demand will be met.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	A Water Supply Strategy is being submitted as part of Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 8.4K(A)) which sets out the requirements for the non-potable water, and explains how this demand will be met.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
FR.2.2	The Applicant	<b>Water Supply</b> Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) [REP2-481i] set out their concerns with respect to the ability of the project to have a sustainable water supply for both potable and non-potable water. Their concerns focus on the ability of the water supply solution not to impact on the water supply for the residents and other users within the region. Explain how the proposed water supply solutions will not adversely impact on other users.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	A Water Supply Strategy is being submitted as part of Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 8.4K(A)) which sets out the requirements for the potable and non-potable water. The Strategy outlines how this will be achieved. The strategy does not utilize local water sources, apart from a potential license transfer of two surface water abstractions within the EDF Sizewell estate. These two licenses, for summer abstraction, are currently for the irrigation of crops within the EDF Sizewell estate that would no longer be required as the fields are within the red line boundary. There would be no proposed increase in summer abstraction, and as such no impact local users or residents. Water is proposed to be provided by temporary desalination until NWL's Sizewell transfer main is available. This transfer main would utilize existing licensed headroom within NWL's Central/Northern Water Resource Zone. As such it would not detract water supplies locally but may improve capacity and resilience for existing customers within the local area through improved supply.
FR.2.3	The Applicant	<b>Main Platform – Temporary Coastal Defence Construction</b> Explain how the risk to construction workers installing the temporary sheet pile wall sea defences will be mitigated utilising the measures set out in the Flood Risk Emergency Plan.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Paragraph 2.3.9 of the <b>MDS Flood Risk Emergency Plan (FREP)</b> , submitted as <b>Appendix F</b> of the <b>MDS FRA Addendum</b> [ <a href="#">AS-170</a> ], notes that a temporary sheet pile wall at a minimum level of 7.3m AOD would be installed around the construction area prior to the removal of any existing secondary defences (i.e. the ~10mAOD man-made defence behind the primary defence, which consists of the shingle beach and sand dunes). The primary defence would not be altered as part of this work and would remain in situ during the construction of the temporary

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>sheet pile wall. Therefore, the construction workers installing the sheet pile wall would be protected by the primary defence.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.1.7 – 3.1.10 of the <b>MDS FREP</b> summarise the risks to construction workers during the construction phase, including the installation of the temporary sheet pile wall. To address the risk to construction workers, the risk management measures set out in Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 of the <b>MDS FREP</b> will be implemented for the whole of the construction phase, including construction of the temporary sheet pile wall. Mitigation measures summarised in the <b>MDS FREP</b> include updating the FREP to the specific construction activities, registering for relevant warnings (Environment Agency and Met Office), developing an emergency access and egress plan for any works in the floodplain and identifying appropriate designated evacuation points for each element of the construction works (within Flood Zone 1).</p> <p>As the potential risks during construction of the temporary sheet pile wall are most closely aligned to those associated with construction of the beach landing facility, the measures set out in paragraph 3.4.14 of the <b>MDS FREP</b> are also relevant to mitigating the risk during the construction of the temporary sheet pile wall. These measures ensure that construction workers would not be located in an area at increased risk during a significant event. Once a warning related to a potential coastal flooding event is received, this part of the site would be closed down, and any staff on the landward element would evacuate through the rest of the site, towards a temporary refuge / muster point set up on Goose Hill.</p> <p>The most significant event that could affect the construction workers during construction of the temporary sheet pile wall would be related to coastal flooding. Lead times for coastal / tidal events are usually longer than for fluvial events, for example a few days in advance, and as such it is considered that there would be time once a warning is issued to ensure the emergency plan can be implemented and construction workers removed from the site.</p> <p>On this basis, SZC Co. considers the measures summarised in the <b>MDS FREP</b> are sufficient to mitigate the risk to construction workers installing the temporary sheet pile wall. Further details will be confirmed with the construction contractor for the proposed main development area prior to commencement of construction.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		This will be captured as part of the Flood Risk Activity Permit (FRAP) application process which will include detailed construction arrangements and sequencing.
FR.2.4	Environment Agency	<b>SSSI Crossing – Adaptive Design</b> Appendix J [REP5-120] This document sets out a change to the height of the future adaptive design required for the SSSI crossing from the initially proposed height of 10.5m AOD to a height of 8.6m AOD. It also provides an initial design solution. Are you satisfied that this is an acceptable change to the adaptive design?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.5	Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board	<b>Main Development Site (MDS) – Water Management Zone (WMZ) Summary</b> Appendix D [REP5-120] provides details of the WMZ infiltration basins for the site. Provide any relevant comments including any areas where the information provided needs further clarification.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.6	Environment Agency	<b>Main Development Site FRA- Additional Hydrological Review.</b> Appendix I [REP5-120] this document is submitted in response to issues raised by the Environment Agency with respect to hydrology comments on the MDS FRA. Does the submitted information address your concerns?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.7	Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency	<b>Main Development Site – Temporary Marine Outfall (TMO)</b> The Applicant has submitted a technical note (Appendix E) [REP5-120] concerning the Temporary Marine Surface Water Outfall. Provide any relevant comments on the justification for and operation of the TMO.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
FR.2.8	The Applicant	<b>Water Monitoring and Response Strategy (WMRS) [AS-236]</b> The EA [REP2-136] comments that the WMRS would benefit from inclusion of the rationale for the groundwater monitoring locations selected and how these will be used to ensure effective ongoing monitoring. In addition, they also suggest additional detail is given on how the monitoring plan can be used to assess water level on specific ecology. Provide a response on these points.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Table 2.1 of the Water Monitoring Plan (Doc Ref. 9.87) submitted at Deadline 7 sets out the rationale for inclusion of groundwater monitoring locations for future monitoring. The selection of monitoring locations was informed by the assessment of potential change undertaken to support the DCO application.</p> <p>The use of monitoring points that formed part of the baseline monitoring programme allows for direct comparison of the future water environment with baseline conditions at the selected locations. It is not within the scope of the Water Monitoring Plan to assess ecological effects. The Water Monitoring Plan is intended to ensure there is adequate data to allow comparison of the future water environment with baseline conditions and to enable existing water levels to be maintained in respect to potential impacts from the proposed development.</p> <p>It is recognised that the water environment is a key factor in maintaining suitable conditions to support the ecological assemblages in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI and other designated sites. It is not, however, the sole controlling factor in maintaining suitable conditions to prevent ecological change, and thus this wider context is considered by the Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (TEMMP) [REP5-088], an updated version of which is due to be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>The scope of the Water Monitoring Plan is therefore to ensure collection of adequate data to assess whether there is a change in the water environment relative to baseline conditions. Based on the assessment carried out, and reported in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 19</b> of the <b>ES</b> [APP-297] as updated by subsequent ES Addenda ([AS-181] and Doc Ref. 6.14), it is not anticipated that there will be a change associated with the proposed development activities. The Water Monitoring Plan sets out how the data will be collected to demonstrate this.</p>
FR.2.9	The Applicant	<b>Water Levels Monitoring and Mitigation Plan (WLMMP)</b>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		In response to Suffolk Friends of the Earth [REP2-463] in Table 15.2 [REP3-042] a WLMMP was stated to be submitted at Deadline 5. When will this be submitted?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The Water Monitoring Plan referred to in Table 15.2 [REP3-042] was originally intended to be submitted at Deadline 5. It has now been submitted at Deadline 7. The Water Monitoring Plan has been circulated to Environment Agency, Natural England, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board, RSPB, Suffolk Wildlife Trust, and Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth prior to Deadline 7 and feedback requested. The Water Monitoring Plan submitted at Deadline 7 has been scoped to consider the concerns of Interested Parties raised prior to and during Examination, whilst reflecting the outcome of the assessment reported in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 19</b> of the <b>ES</b> [APP-297], based on the numerical modelling reported in <b>Volume 2, Appendix 19A</b> of the <b>ES</b> [APP-298]. The Water Monitoring Plan specifically accounts for the concerns raised by Interested Parties and addressed in Appendix B of REP3-043.
FR.2.10	Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board, East Suffolk Council	<b>Ancillary Construction Area (ACA) (or LEEIE) Drainage Strategy Technical Note.</b> Appendix B [REP5-120] sets out the drainage design for the ACA. Provide any comments you have in relation to the strategy set out in this document.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.11	The Applicant, Environment Agency	<b>Sizewell Marshes SSSI - Soil Water Monitoring</b> Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth during ISH7 and in their submission [REP5-271] questioned the suitability of the soil water level monitoring undertaken in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI. Provide a response to their expressed concerns and also comment on the suitability of the assessments undertaken for the Project.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	A response to the concerns expressed by Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth is provided in Appendix 4A to these responses. The water level monitoring in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI commenced in 2011 when it was agreed with stakeholders including the Environment Agency, Natural England, East Suffolk Council, East Suffolk IBD, RSPB, and Suffolk Wildlife Trust. The monitoring programme has been actively managed since inception to ensure the data collected is

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		representative and provides a robust basis for conceptualisation of the groundwater and surface water environment. The assessment of potential change in the water environment in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI has been carried out using a bespoke numerical model developed to represent real world conditions. This model has been agreed with the Environment Agency in Point 4.0 of <a href="#">REP2-135</a> to be " <i>a sound evidence base to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment</i> ".
FR.2.12	Environment Agency, East Suffolk Internal Drainage Board	<b>Sizewell Drain Water Management Control Structure</b> Appendix C [REP5-120] does the submitted document provide the degree of certainty that the outline design options for the proposed control structure on the realigned Sizewell Drain, demonstrates the ability to enable fine tuning of water levels in the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, subject to the required Land Drainage Consent?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.13	Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency	<b>Sizewell Link Road Flood Risk Assessment Addendum Revision 2.0 [REP5-045]</b> Please provide comments of acceptability and coverage following the submission of this revision.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.14	Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency	<b>Sizewell Link Road Preliminary Drainage Design Note</b> Appendix F [REP5-120] provides an initial assessment of the drainage design for the Sizewell Link Road. Provide any comments you have on this note.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.15	Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency	<b>Two Village Bypass Preliminary Drainage Design Note</b> Appendix G [REP5-120] provides an initial assessment of the drainage design for the Two Village Bypass. Provide any comments you have on this note.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.16	Suffolk County Council, Environment Agency	<b>Yoxford Roundabout Updated Drainage Strategy</b> Appendix H [REP5-120] provides an updated assessment of the drainage strategy for Yoxford roundabout. Provide any comments you have on this updated strategy.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
FR.2.17	The Applicant	<b>Outline Drainage Strategy (ODS) [REP2-033]</b> Written Representation [REP2-384] NJ Bacon Farms, asked about the impact of drainage of inland water. In response in Paragraph 20.4.15 [REP3-042] states that a drainage and irrigation specialist has been instructed to understand existing drainage/irrigation infrastructure, and to agree a mitigation/reinstatement strategy for irrigation and drainage infrastructure. Explain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Given the links to the wider drainage strategy contained in the ODS should this role and development of any required mitigation/reinstatement strategy for irrigation and drainage infrastructure not be part of the ODS? and</li> <li>(ii) Is the mitigation /strategy something the Applicant intends to submit into the Examination and if so at what Deadline?</li> </ul>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	(i) The purpose of the Drainage Strategy is to describe the principles and approaches for managing surface water and foul water drainage within the redline boundary, in the context of managing quantity and quality aspects, and the related mitigation of impacts within the redline boundary and to the wider environment. The Drainage Strategy does therefore set the framework for consideration of sources of surface water entering the main development site and associated development sites, for consideration within sustainable drainage design solutions within the redline boundary. However, the appointed irrigation/drainage specialist is specifically tasked with looking at existing agricultural infrastructure and identifying mitigation solutions unique to each holding, in the context of



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>holding specific discussions and reaching agreement. This is therefore a distinct and separate remit that provides an important interface between the potential impacts from changes to the drainage system on individual land holdings and the drainage solutions developed within the redline boundary.</p> <p>(ii) The mitigation/reinstatement strategy is being developed on an individual basis with landowners and will form part of a suite of arrangements to manage the impacts of the construction of the project on landholdings (and retained land). This work is on-going and will continue to be developed and updated at all stages of the project. It is not intended to submit the details of this on-going work into the Examination.</p>
FR.2.18	The Applicant, Environment Agency, Natural England	<p><b>Flooding – Landowner Consents</b></p> <p>In response to ExQ1 FR.1.14 the EA [REP2-136] raised a concern over flood risk to land. They requested that the landowners should be consulted, and their legal easements sought for increase flood depths. Please provide an update on the progress with respect to EA guidance on thresholds and what action has been taken negotiating with relevant landowners and Natural England.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Engagement with landowners and Natural England is on-going, including sharing details of the anticipated flooding risk to land. This has been in accordance with the issue of coastal inundation flooding of the area close to the tank traps in the 1 in 200 year event in 2090 (taking account of climate change) raised by the Environment Agency in their Written Representation [<a href="#">REP2-135</a>]. Subsequent discussions with the Environment Agency have provided clarification that all affected landowners should be consulted during Examination with the aim of reaching agreement from the landowner to the minor residual flood impacts. The levels of increased flooding have been confirmed as minimal (to land that will already suffer from significant flooding), include a small number of non-contiguous pockets of additional flood extent (with associated flood depth of less than 0.04m and usually no more than 0.01m) and also show no appreciable change in flood duration. This residual increase in flood risk, after the application of primary mitigation, is not considered to be significant. Due to the low significance and specific characteristics of the future flooding, SZC Co. does not believe it would be possible or proportionate to secure easements or any other interest in the land.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
FR.2.19	The Applicant	<b>Northern Park and Ride Flood Risk</b> Darsham Parish Council [REP2-051] express concern that the Applicant have proposed a storage basin with overflow to existing watercourses running under the railway. The underlying geology prevents natural drainage within the site and is likely to lead to existing water courses being overwhelmed in heavy rain. They state that the Applicant does not appear to acknowledge the potential flood risk to the railway (due to run-off from the NPR). Has this been considered in the Flood Risk Assessment of the Northern Park and Ride?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Within the <b>Northern Park and Ride Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> [APP-115] all potential sources of flooding to the site have been considered, including the presence of the existing ordinary watercourse bordering the site to the west and flowing under the railway line. Paragraph 4.4.3 includes an assessment of the potential surface water flow route and flood risk associated with this existing watercourse. The <b>Northern Park and Ride FRA</b> acknowledges in paragraph 5.4.1 that the proposed development would increase runoff if not attenuated; however, it notes that the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> at <b>Appendix 2A, Volume 2</b> of the <b>ES</b> [REP2-033] sets out measures to address this. A summary of the drainage strategy is provided in paragraph 5.6.2 of the <b>Northern Park and Ride FRA</b> , which notes that: <i>"The proposed development would include sustainable drainage for the lifetime of the site to manage any additional surface water run-off from it. A combination of infiltration and controlled discharge methods are proposed for the discharge of surface water run-off. Controlled discharge would be at the greenfield run-off rate to the local ordinary watercourses."</i> SZC Co. has undertaken further work to validate and develop the drainage design for the northern park and ride that was originally submitted as part of the Application. The <b>Northern Park and Ride Drainage Design Note</b> [REP6-024] submitted at Deadline 6, provides clarification on the proposed drainage from the site. It provides details of additional data, including ground investigation and infiltration testing to validate the Drainage Strategy, a description of how the proposed concept drainage infrastructure is evolving, and demonstrates that the

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Project continues to provide satisfactory drainage without unacceptable adverse impact on the water environment, both in terms of flood risk and pollution.</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.1.12 and 7.1.13 of the <b>Northern Park and Ride Drainage Design Note</b> [<a href="#">REP6-024</a>] acknowledge the existing flood risk along the western boundary and that this may affect discharge during an event, such that the position of the attenuation features and levels of outfall connections to the watercourse would need to be set to ensure no risk of flooding within the site or increase of flood risk to 3rd party land (for example railway land to the west). A subsequent site visit on 3 August 2021 has confirmed that there is a clear fall in level to the watercourse and that the outfall would be achieved.</p> <p>As such, SZC Co. has considered the potential impact of the proposed development on off-site receptors including the railway line. The drainage design will mitigate any impact as a result of the proposed development by restricting runoff rates to match the existing situation, ensuring no increase in discharge rates into the existing watercourse during an event, as well as taking into account the constraints that the existing features present to the siting and function of the proposed drainage system, which will be incorporated into the detailed drainage design.</p>
FR.2.20	The Applicant	<p><b>Extreme Storm Surges</b></p> <p>Mr. Jones [REP2-489] questions whether enough consideration has been given the possibility of extreme storm surges in the flood risk assessment of the Main Development Site. Explain what consideration has been given to the possibility of such extreme weather events in the flood risk assessments.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Within the <b>MDS FRA</b> [<a href="#">AS-018</a>] SZC Co. has considered both extreme sea levels and wave conditions to assess the risk of overtopping of coastal defences and inundation of the main development site. The extreme sea levels at Sizewell C were derived based on a comprehensive analysis of tide gauge records for Lowestoft, including the interaction of astronomical tides and meteorological surges.</p> <p>Following derivation of the extreme water levels, a joint probability analysis with extreme waves was undertaken. The derived combinations of the extreme water levels and extreme waves were then adopted within the <b>MDS FRA</b> [<a href="#">AS-018</a>] to</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>inform both the wave overtopping calculations and subsequent coastal inundation and tidal breach modelling. The wave overtopping calculations represent the worst-case combination of high wave conditions coinciding with the peak of the surge event at high tide.</p> <p>Based on the above, SZC Co. considers that the extreme storm surge events have been appropriately considered in the flood risk assessment for the Main Development Site.</p>
FR.2.21	The Applicant	<p><b>Pakenham (Additional Land) – Changes to Hydrology</b></p> <p>Clarke &amp; Simpson, on behalf of their clients [REP3-118], set out that any hydrological changes will have adverse impact on farming in the immediate area. How will creation of fen meadow habitat at Pakenham be managed to minimise any impact on the hydrology?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The proposals for the creation of fen meadow at Pakenham are detailed in the <b>Fen Meadow Plan Draft</b> [<a href="#">REP6-026</a>].</p> <p>No direct off take of water from the Pakenham Stream is proposed and no water control structures would be placed in the Stream. Furthermore there will be no offtake of water from the site drainage system, and no water control structures are proposed.</p> <p>The only disruption to the hydrology of the land will occur directly within the fields affected by the proposed works, where it is proposed to block / disrupt the field drains. The boundary drains would be expected to constrain any hydrological effects to within the fields affected by the proposed works.</p> <p>As a result no effects on the hydrology of the surrounding farmland or SSSI are expected.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>HW.2</b>	<b>Health and wellbeing</b>	
HW.2.0	The Applicant, SCC	<p><b>Severance Fear and Intimidation</b></p> <p>In light of the concern expressed at the ISH for Transport regarding the approach taken to the assessment on severance and Fear and Intimidation and the Question raised at TT.2.27.</p> <p>(i) Please advise whether it is regarded that the guidance has been properly used in understanding the implications for severance and the potential for fear and intimidation.</p> <p>(ii) If the ExA concludes that the Guidance has not been properly followed what the implications could be for the assessment and the weight the ExA should apply to the evidence presented to date.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Please refer to the response to TT.2.27. In addition, the methodology used by SZC Co. for fear and intimidation has been agreed with SCC; this will be set out in the updated version of the <b>Statement of Common Ground with SCC and ESC</b> to be submitted at Deadline 8.
HW.2.1	The Applicant, SCC	<p><b>Severance</b></p> <p>(i) In light of the concerns expressed by a number of Parish Councils please advise of the progress of the work that has developed on the schemes at Wickham Market, Little Glemham and Marlesford and elsewhere along the proposed transport corridor.</p> <p>(ii) Are any of the schemes likely to be presented to the Examination setting out the details of proposed mitigation?</p> <p>(iii) It is noted that a number are referred to in the draft obligation, but this does not include precise detail of what mitigation might be forthcoming,</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) Please refer to the response to CU.2.1 for details on the agreed local transport schemes that is reflected in the latest draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) submitted at Deadline 7.</p> <p>(ii) Refer to (i) that the agreed position on the local schemes is set out in the draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) in terms of the scope of the works. It has been agreed that the local schemes will be delivered by SZC Co. and therefore</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>SZC Co. will need to progress the detailed design of the schemes and gain technical approval by SCC as well as enter into a S278 agreement with SCC for SZC Co. to deliver the schemes on the public highway.</p> <p>(iii) Agreement has now been reached with SCC with regards to the schemes that will be delivered by SZC Co. and the proposed phasing of these schemes as well as an agreed package of transport contributions that will be made by SZC Co. The agreed position is set out in the draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).</p>
HW.2.2	Applicant, ESC, SCC	<b>Dust Monitoring and Particulate Matter</b> <p>(i) In light of the advice from Public Health England in responses to FWQ AQ.1.35 and AQ.1.42 can you confirm that the Dust Management Plans will include sources of dust emissions; the location of sensitive health receptors; monitoring standards and guidelines; and a reporting schedule which allows for timely intervention if elevated concentrations are recorded.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. is committed to preparing a Dust Monitoring and Management Plan (DMMP) prior to commencement of construction, to include monitoring locations that are protective of sensitive receptor locations from potential sources of emissions, frequencies, duration and further details on already agreed commitments to the use of dust mitigation measures, standards and guidelines. This is secured through the Code of Construction Practice and would be submitted to ESC for approval. Additional information on this theme is provided in responses to <b>EXQ2 AQ.2.2-2.5</b>.</p>
HW.2.3	Applicant, Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG, West Suffolk CCG	<b>Health and Wellbeing Working Group</b> <p>Please advise on the progress in respect of</p> <p>(i) Availability and calculation of a contingency fund to support mitigation and monitoring of affects which materialise above the levels identified as referred to by the CCG in [REP5-214] further response to HW.1.1</p> <p>(ii) Whether a method has been agreed to monitor journey times and if this were to identify increases a contingency fund has been agreed?</p> <p>(iii) The latest in respect of governance arrangements for the Health and Wellbeing Working Group</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) <b>Volume 2, Chapter 28</b> (Health and Wellbeing) of the <b>ES</b> [<a href="#">APP-346</a>], does not identify significant impacts on local healthcare services despite taking a conservative approach, assuming no offsetting of demand on local healthcare services due to home-based workers using the "Sizewell Health" occupational health facility. Therefore, the residual healthcare contribution is voluntary, rather than being required to address a significant impact.</p> <p>The chapter concluded (paragraphs 28.6.101-28.6.103 [<a href="#">APP-346</a>]), that following the implementation of the occupational health service, the change in healthcare demand directly attributable to the non-home-based workers would be negligible and the potential change in healthcare demand attributable to any dependants or family members of non-home-based workers would be minor. It is anticipated that workers who bring families are most likely to be on long-term contracts and would buy properties or take private rented sector accommodation during this time. As such, they would not represent a net addition to the existing number of council tax paying households/population, and there would be little to no material change in net healthcare demand. Overall, the magnitude of impact on health and wellbeing would be low. In the context of a uniformly high sensitivity receptor and highly valued asset, the resultant effect is considered minor adverse, which is not significant. However, similarly to Hinkley Point C, a voluntary contribution is to be provided to address the minor residual impact from the non-home-based workforce and support local health care capacity and resilience with a contribution for non-home-based staff dependents until the NHS Budget Allocation accounts for the indirect net population gain.</p> <p>SZC Co. and the CCG have made significant progress in terms of the residual healthcare fund and SZC Co.'s proposed contribution is set out in the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)). This is not yet fully agreed with the CCG but which will be discussed further in a meeting on 9 September 2021. Rather than include a contingency element, this includes an amount of resilience, representing around a 20% uplift to address uncertainty, enabling a proactive rather than reactive approach. SZC Co. has also agreed to the CCGs request to fund staffing and proposes supporting one full time role up to peak construction and 50% of a full time role for the remainder of the construction phase.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(ii) SZC Co.'s transport modelling does not predict significant journey time delays. Extensive transport mitigation is proposed to avoid journey time delays, including new roads and highway improvements, use of rail and sea transport, support for Suffolk Constabulary for AIL escorting and road safety, transport management plans and the various funds set out in Schedule 16 of the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)). The latter includes a contingent fund which the Transport Review Group will be able to draw down on to address any effects arising during the construction period. This is directed to ensuring that the construction of Sizewell C does not generate effects greater than those forecast in the Transport Assessment (i.e. to ensure the efficient and effective operation of the highway network). A fund (contingent or otherwise) for journey time delays is not justified and not proposed.</p> <p>(iv) Discussions to finalise the detail of the governance arrangements for the Health and Wellbeing Working Group are ongoing and will be progressed further on the 9th September 2021. Changes already made to the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) in response to the CCGs comments include increasing the number of CCG members of the group from two to four; adding in the option to invite other</p> <p><b>(v)</b> parties which may include but not be limited to representatives from Primary Care, Ipswich &amp; East Suffolk Alliance, Healthwatch Suffolk, East of England Ambulance Service and NHS England; and changing the chair of the group to a CCG representative rather than the Director of Public Health as previously proposed.</p>
HW.2.4	Applicant ((i) only), Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG, West Suffolk CCG	<p><b>Onsite Occupational Health facility</b></p> <p>(i) Has agreement been reached regarding the specification and procurement of the Occupational Health Facility?</p> <p>(ii) Are you content with the mechanisms to secure the provision and timing of delivery of the onsite OH facility?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>(i) As set out in Schedule 5 of the <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)), the occupational health service specification will be in accordance with <b>Volume 2, Appendix 28A</b> – Health Technical Note 1 – Occupational Health Service</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Description [<a href="#">APP-347</a>]. The specification builds upon the proven provision at Hinkley Point C, and constitutes an adaptive occupational health provision, which the Health Working Group will be updated on over the course of the construction phase. Such engagement will be applied to monitor the effectiveness of the provision, contrasted against routinely collected public health and health care data. Where appropriate SZC Co. will refine, align and support wider public health initiatives and priorities as they become apparent.</p> <p>The <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) sets out that the occupational health facility will be provided for the "<i>Construction Period</i>" which is defined as "<i>the period between (i) the Commencement Date; and (ii) date of receipt of fuel for Unit 2</i>". SZC Co. has recently clarified to the CCG that the occupational health service would not sit within the campus (and therefore not be available until the campus is built); the facility will sit on the main development site to provide convenient access to workers during their working day and will open upon on or by the Commencement Date.</p> <p>Procurement of the facility will be a commercial matter for SZC Co., but as set out in row HWd of the Statement of Common Ground [<a href="#">REP5-097</a>] with the CCG '<i>The Parties have agreed that SZC Co. will work collaboratively with the CCG to inform the design and procurement of service</i>' and this matter is '<i>Agreed as far as it can be for the purposes of the Examination</i>'.</p> <p>SZC Co. has agreed with SCC both parties would prefer HWHW services to be contracted out from Sizewell Health to SCC, as this presents greater synergy with local public health and health care. This is reflected in the updated <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) definition of the occupational health service with a footnote noting that wording needs to be refined at D8 to allow for a scenario where this is not practicable e.g. because SCC do not have the capacity to provide this service, or it is not at a reasonable market rate when compared to other providers offering the same level of service provision.</p>
HW.2.5	Applicant, Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG, West Suffolk CCG	<p><b>Quality of Data</b></p> <p>In response to HW.1.11 and subsequent WR can you advise of the latest position in respect of whether the data used to support the assessment has now been fully</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		agreed, or whether work is ongoing. In the event work is ongoing what timeframe do you anticipate coming to a conclusion on this matter?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	As set out in rows HWa and HWb of the <b>Statement of Common Ground</b> [ <a href="#">REP5-097</a> ] with the CCG, the methodology and baseline are agreed. Row HWb records that <i>'The CCG raised concerns about historic baseline data utilised (specifically, GP patient List sizes), however this has been provided for context, rather than to infer spare capacity. CCG now content with baseline noting that it has not been used to infer spare capacity and that all communities and healthcare services are considered sensitive'</i> . Work is ongoing on the exact scope and quantum of the voluntary residual healthcare contribution - for further detail see response to HW.2.3 (i) above. SZC Co. anticipates that further progress will be made in the next meeting on 9th September 2021 and is aiming to conclude this by Deadline 8.
<b>HE.2 Historic environment (terrestrial and marine)</b>		
HE.2.0	ESC, SCC, Historic England	<b>MDS: Requirement 3: Archaeology and Peat</b> Noting discussions at ISH1 on 6 July 2021 and the subsequent submission by the Applicant [ <a href="#">REP5-106</a> ], are you content with the inclusion of the term 'general accordance' in Requirement 3 [ <a href="#">REP5-029</a> ]?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response is required from SZC Co.
HE.2.1	Historic England	<b>MDS: Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation</b> Please review and comment on amendments made at [ <a href="#">REP3-022</a> ]. Are you satisfied that your comments made in December 2020 and in WR [ <a href="#">REP2-138</a> ] have been adequately addressed?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response is required from SZC Co.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
HE.2.2	The Applicant, SCCAS	<p><b>MDS: Lower Abbey Farm</b></p> <p>Have site specific mitigation proposals been agreed with SCCAS in respect of Lower Abbey Farm?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. assumes that this question refers to lands east and south-east of Lower Abbey Farm, also referred to as MDS Area 4 (ExQ HE.1.6 and HE.1.9 <a href="#">[REP2-100]</a>).</p> <p>Mitigation is currently under discussion with SCCAS and broad areas and general methods for a combination of set-piece excavation and strip, map and sample investigation have been agreed in principle. Detailed proposals for mitigation will be set out in a site-specific WSI, in line with the provisions set out in the Overarching WSI <a href="#">[REP3-022]</a>.</p> <p>This work will be secured by Requirement 3: Peat and Archaeology in the DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1(G))</p>
HE.2.3	SCC	<p><b>MDS: SSSI Crossing</b></p> <p>Confirmation was provided at ExQ1 HE.1.10 <a href="#">[REP5-120]</a> that the SSSI crossing site will be subject to a site-specific Written Scheme of Investigation. Does this allay the concerns raised at <a href="#">[REP3-084]</a>?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response is required from SZC Co.
HE.2.4	The Applicant, Historic England	<p><b>MDS: Evaluation Trenching</b></p> <p>Historic England - Noting the response made by the Applicant to ExQ1 HE.1.5 <a href="#">[REP5-120]</a>, are you satisfied with the proposed approach for when pre-determination investigation has not been possible?</p> <p>Applicant – Please confirm the securing mechanism for this approach?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Any outstanding evaluation fieldwork will be secured by Requirement 3 in the <b>DCO</b> - Project Wide: Archaeology and Peat (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).</p> <p>Part (1) of the requirement states:</p> <p><i>"No part of any terrestrial works, may be commenced until a site-specific written scheme of investigation for <u>each phase of archaeological investigation</u> relating to</i></p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>that part has, following consultation with Historic England, been submitted to and approved by Suffolk County Council."</i></p> <p>The phrase '<i>each phase of archaeological investigation</i>' (underlining added above for emphasis) is to enable any further evaluation fieldwork, such as trial trenching, to be completed ahead of mitigation being agreed and undertaken.</p> <p>The <b>Overarching Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation</b> [<a href="#">REP3-022</a>] includes detail on evaluation as well as mitigation fieldwork to ensure that all work that may be required is included. This has been agreed with SCC.</p>
HE.2.5	National Trust	<p><b>MDS: Coastguard Cottages</b></p> <p>Noting the response of the Applicant to ExQ1 HE.1.16 [REP2-100], are you in agreement that important views from the observation tower will remain unaffected and that the proposed development will not prevent the appreciation of the historic interest of the observation tower?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response is required from SZC Co.
HE.2.6	The Applicant, SCCAS	<p><b>MDS: Peat Strategy</b></p> <p>Please confirm where differences remain in terms of the proposed Peat Strategy (Appendix 16G of [APP-275]).</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>It is confirmed that the <b>Peat Strategy</b> [<a href="#">APP-275</a>] sets out an agreed approach to the mitigation of disturbance to the peat deposits within the main development site by investigation.</p> <p>SZC Co. understands that SCCAS is concerned to ensure that flexibility is included for extending investigation areas should exceptionally well-preserved structural or similar remains be discovered. This is addressed by section 6.2.4 of the <b>Peat Strategy</b> [<a href="#">APP-275</a>] which sets out the detail required for the peat archaeological written scheme of investigation. 6.2.4.1 requires this to include '<i>Provision for extension of excavation areas to investigate any areas comprising exceptional survival of archaeological remains</i>'.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		The peat archaeological written scheme of investigation will be submitted to and approved by SCCAS, as secured by part (3) of Requirement 3 in the <b>DCO</b> - Project Wide: Archaeology and Peat (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)).
HE.2.7	The Applicant	<b>Two Village Bypass: Farnham Manor</b> Please expand on the statement that the primary architectural interest is inherent in the standing building and does not relate to the wider landscape (paragraph 9.4.59 of [APP-432]).
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Farnham Manor comprises a standalone historic farmhouse and estate centre. The architecturally significant element of this structure comprises the surviving elements of the 17 <sup>th</sup> or 18 <sup>th</sup> century timber-framed house, which presently forms the east elevation of the house. The extensive west and south wings on the house are later, and are of limited architectural value, concealing the overall form and structure of the older parts of the house in views from outside. The special architectural interest of the house in terms of its overall form and external appearance is experienced almost solely from the garden of the house to the east, although structural detail can be experienced in close views from the south and north elevations and presumably from inside the building. This ability to appreciate and experience the architectural value of the building does not relate or depend on any perceptual links to the area outwith the immediate surroundings of the house.  The perceptual links to the wider farmsteading, however, contribute to historical value, allowing the functional and tenorial links between these structures to be read, although as noted in previous responses, this contribution is limited because of the extent of modern change of use and ownership, with consequent alteration, reconstruction, and extension of not only Farnham Manor but also the associated structures.
HE.2.8	SCC, ESC	<b>Sizewell Link Road: Hill Farmhouse</b> Noting the response made at [REP3-044], do you concur that in respect of the historic interest the construction and operation of the SLR would result in a minor adverse effect which would not be significant?

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response is required from SZC Co.
HE.2.9	SCCAS	<b>Sizewell B Relocated Facilities: Pillbox Field</b> Please provide a response to ExQ1 HE.1.18 [REP3-046].
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response is required from SZC Co.
HE.2.10	The Applicant, SCC, ESC, Historic England	<b>Enhancement to Proposed Mitigation Schemes</b> Please provide an update on discussions regarding potential enhancement of mitigation schemes for the below assets: (i) Theberton Hall (ii) Abbey Cottage (iii) Farnham Hall (iv) Hill Farmhouse (v) Barrow Cemetery Group (FMF site)
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Landscape mitigation has been designed in line with the Design Principles set out in Chapter 5 and 8 of the <b>Main Development Site Design and Access Statement</b> [REP5-070] and the <b>Associated Development Design Principles</b> [REP3-023]. These design principles explicitly consider historic landscape character and have been consulted upon with East Suffolk Council. The compliance of the proposed mitigation with these design principles is secured by Requirements 14 and 22A of the <b>draft DCO</b> (Doc Ref. 3.1(G)), which explicitly require approval of detailed landscape proposals for the Main Development Site, Two Village Bypass and Sizewell Link Road by ESC. Mitigation measures currently under discussion with ESC and Historic England for the specific heritage assets noted by the Examining Authority comprise: (i) As set out in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan for the Sizewell Link Road [REP5-076], broadleaf planting would be used to screen the line of the Sizewell Link Road through the arable field that was formerly part of the parkland around Theberton Hall. (ii) The design response to the site entrance is set out at sections 8.8.2-8.8.7 of Part 2 of the <b>Main Development Site Design and Access Statement</b> [REP5-

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><a href="#">073</a>]. This response stresses the reduction in width of the access road at the completion of the construction period, the use of a form and planting scheme/verge treatments that better reflects the rural surroundings of the scheme and also that the access route would not be lit during the operational period.</p> <p>(iii) Amendments have been made to planting schemes in the <b>Two Village Bypass Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</b> to better respond to local historic landscape context and reinforce connectivity with Foxburrow Wood. Following a meeting with Farnham Environment Residents and Neighbours association (FERN) on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2021, SZC Co. is reviewing landscaping proposals along the western side of the two village, bypass within the current order limits, to provide additional screening and potential noise reduction. SZC Co. is preparing a more detailed landscaping scheme to present and discuss with FERN.</p> <p>(iv) Mitigation planting for Hill Farmhouse, Middleton Moor (LB 103064) comprises the reinstatement and planting up of the hedgerow to the east of the Title Road junction to the south-west of the asset and the provision of new hedgerow to the northern side of the Sizewell Link Road. These are illustrated at page 14 of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan for the Sizewell Link Road [<a href="#">REP5-076</a>]. Seen through the existing hedgerows, this will present a screen that is entirely in accord with the existing historic landscape character.</p> <p>(v) Provision of interpretation and outreach works to enhance understanding of and virtual access to these assets as part of the outreach strategy set out in Section 8 of the Overarching WSI [<a href="#">REP3-022</a>].</p>
<b>Landscape impact, visual effects and design</b>		
LI.2.0	The Applicant	<p><b>Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</b></p> <p>On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised NPPF. In respect of design, the thrust of the changes sees the inclusion of policies to achieve high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places. The wording for conserving and enhancing Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty has been modified to ensure specifically development within their settings should be limited and sensitively located, where permitted, which avoids or minimises adverse impacts on designated areas.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide comment on amended paragraph 176 of the NPPF and confirm how the complies.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Paragraph 176 of the 2021 NPPF replaces Paragraph 172 of the 2019 NPPF. Paragraph 176 is shown below (excluding footnote 59, which remains unchanged to the previous footnote 54). The additional text is shown in <b>red</b>. The remainder of Paragraph 172 has now been moved to Paragraph 177 and so is not shown here.</p> <p><i>176. "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within <b>all</b> these designated areas should be limited, <b><u>while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.</u></b>"</i></p> <p>It is apparent that the policy relating to limiting development is unchanged.</p> <p>The NPPF 2021 is considered by the Applicant to be an important and relevant matter for the purposes of decision making, but it is not the principal policy for the determination of this application. The additional text in the NPPF complements the principal policy set out in Section 5 of NPS-EN-1, which provides the primary policy basis for determination of the application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Paragraph 5.9.8 of NPS EN-1 states "<i>Projects need to be designed carefully, taking account of the potential impact on the landscape. Having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints <u>the aim should be to minimise harm to the landscape</u>, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate.</i>"</li><li>- Paragraph 5.9.12 of NPS EN-1 confirms "<i>the duty to have regard to the purposes of nationally designated areas also applies when considering applications for projects outside the boundaries of these areas which may</i></li></ul>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>have impacts within them. The aim should be to avoid compromising the purposes of designation and <u>such projects should be designed sensitively given the various siting, operational, and other relevant constraints.</u></i></p> <p>Policy SCLP10.4 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (East Suffolk Council, 2020) states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <i>"Development within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, <u>or within its setting</u>, will be informed by landscape and visual impact assessment to assess and identify potential impacts and to <u>identify suitable measures to avoid or mitigate these impacts.</u>"</i></li></ul> <p>Planning Practice Guidance contains similar text to that now included in Paragraph 176 of the NPPF. PPG Reference ID: 8-042-20190721: <i>"How should development within the setting of National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty be dealt with?"</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <i>"<u>Land within the setting of these areas often makes an important contribution to maintaining their natural beauty, and where poorly located or designed development can do significant harm. This is especially the case where long views from or to the designated landscape are identified as important, or where the landscape character of land within and adjoining the designated area is complementary. Development within the settings of these areas will therefore need sensitive handling that takes these potential impacts into account.</u>"</i></li></ul> <p>The application therefore has been developed within a policy framework that is very similar to the wording of NPPF Paragraph 176. There is considered to be no material change in the policy test or emphasis. SZC Co considers that the development that is proposed within the setting of the AONB has been sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas, and that there is a clear and compelling case in the public interest to justify the development.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		All emphases in quotations within this response are the Applicant's own.
LI.2.1	SCC, ESC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, National Trust, Stop Sizewell C, TASC	<b>Additional Construction Visualisations</b> Additional illustrative day and night-time construction photomontage visualisations are to be produced from four Representative Viewpoints [REP5-117]. Please comment on the suitability of the selected locations.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.2	The Applicant	<b>Design Council – Additional Design Review</b> The importance of the nationally designated landscape is fully acknowledged by the ExA. As such, it is not unreasonable to expect thorough and detailed reviews of the proposed design to have occurred during both pre-application and examination phases. If further reviews are to be undertaken consideration should be given to whether a wider review, rather than just the accommodation campus, would be beneficial.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	SZC Co. considers the design review undertaken by the Design Council (as recorded in Appendix B of the <b>Main Development Site Design and Access Statement</b> – [REP5-075]) is of sufficient scope, thoroughness and quality to provide assurance to the Examining Authority that the project represents good design and has been subject to a proper independent review. The proposed approach to design governance including matters explored in the hearing (ISH 5) has evolved to provide a robust ongoing approach to design review which is outlined in LI.2.3.  SZC Co notes that the <b>Local Impact Report (LIR)</b> [REP1-045] prepared by SCC/ESC outlines a sound understanding/appreciation of the proposed design and its contextual response and while not all matters relating to design are agreed, does not suggest that a further review is required at this stage. Responses of consultees to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) LI. 1.1 do not identify a need for a wider review but do identify the benefits of design review

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>as part of the ongoing process, to which SZC Co. has responded positively. Further information can be found in SZC Co.'s response to ExQ2 LI.2.3.</p> <p>SZC Co. has reached agreement with ESC and SCC over the scope, scale and governance arrangements for the Natural Environment Fund, which provides an appropriate response to the residual impacts on the landscape.</p> <p>It is also worth noting that SZC Co. has agreed the scale of the Environment Trust, which will be secured separately to the Deed of Obligation. SZC Co. continues to work with the Councils and other stakeholders to finalise the detail (which will be secured through a separate legal agreement) including matters relating to governance. The Trust will have available to it £1.5 million per year of construction and the first 20 years of operation, and £0.75 million per year of the remaining operational phase. Further details will be provided to the community in the coming few months.</p>
LI.2.3	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<b>Design Review Panel</b> Please provide an update regarding discussions on the proposed role of a design review panel.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	SZC Co. has discussed the role of design review panels with ESC following the Issue Specific Hearing on Landscape and Visual Impact and Design (ISH5) on the 13 <sup>th</sup> July 2021. SZC Co. prepared an outline of the anticipated design review process and its relationship to design guardianship (client side); officer consideration (ESC side); and how this will relate to the Design Principles and Requirements. The approach has been agreed with East Suffolk Council and further information can be found within Schedule 2 of the draft <b>Deed of Obligation</b> (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)).
LI.2.4	ESC, SCC	<b>Design Review Panel</b> Paragraph 1.4.18 of [REP5-110] confirms that the design review panel would be used to provide independent support for the processing of design submissions

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		defined by the requirements. Are you content with the proposed timing of the role?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.5	The Applicant	<b>Design Guardianship Role</b> The proposed retention of key members of the design team in a 'design guardianship' role is noted [REP5-110]. Please confirm what consultation on this role has been and what the securing mechanism for the role would be?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	SZC Co. has outlined how the design guardianship role will operate in the Design Governance Framework referred to at <b>Question LI.2.3</b> , which has been drafted for ESC's consideration.
LI.2.6	The Applicant, Pro Corda, English Heritage Trust	<b>Leiston Abbey – Landscape Strategy/Masterplan</b> Noting the responses made in respect of ExQ1 LI.1.124 [REP3-046], please provide an update of discussions regarding a proposed whole site landscape strategy/masterplan.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The focus of the mitigation for Leiston Abbey (second site) is the heritage asset for English Heritage and the resilience fund measures for Pro Corda. These are now agreed with Pro Corda and are close to agreement with English Heritage (to be finalised in a meeting on 12th September 2021). The landscape strategy/masterplan is a relatively small piece of work which would sit within English Heritage's remit, taking into account the heritage designation and all users of the site (heritage and Pro Corda visitors). This would consider access, including where best to place signage to direct visitors around the site and inform a bid into the Natural Environment Fund to mitigate the residual landscape and visual impacts of the Sizewell C Project and/or conserve and enhance landscape character.  The <b>Draft Deed of Obligation</b> , Schedule 8 (Doc Ref. 8.17(F)) sets out the approach as follows: <i>"On or before the Commencement, SZC Co shall pay to East Suffolk Council for onward payment to Historic England the sum of [] to be applied as a contribution towards development and implementation of a landscape and access masterplan for the Second Leiston Abbey Site, to be led by the English</i>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<i>Heritage Trust, and in consultation with Pro Corda Trust, taking into account each parties use of and responsibility for the site."</i> SZC Co. understands that all parties are in agreement that this joined up approach would be a helpful, albeit minor part of the mitigation proposed.
LI.2.7	ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, Stop Sizewell C, TASC	<b>SSSI Crossing – Design Amendment</b> Please review the amended SSSI crossing design [REP5-010] and provide comment.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.8	The Applicant	<b>SSSI Crossing – Design Amendment</b> Please confirm what assessment has been undertaken in respect of potential landscape and visual impact(s) due to the amended design of the SSSI crossing [REP5-010]. In addition, please provide visualisations which clearly depict the proposed sheet pile barrier.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The amended design of the SSSI Crossing is within the parameters of the SSSI Crossing as described and assessed in the ES Addendum [<a href="#">AS-181</a>]. As such SZC Co. determined that a further ES addendum/LVIA update was not necessary or required.</p> <p>Consideration has been given to landscape and visual matters in the design development of the amended design of the SSSI Crossing.</p> <p>The amended design incorporates sloping embankments and the seaward slopes would accommodate planting to integrate the crossing with the adjoining landscape of Goose Hill and the local water course corridor, and over time as planting becomes established, filter views to vehicles using the crossing from locations to the east.</p> <p>During the construction and operational phases, sections of sheet pile wall would be visible (to a maximum height of 1m) where it forms part of the crossing</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>structure directly beneath the crossing) and taper to transition to ground level along the toe of the sloping embankments. At this point, the sheet pile wall would be installed so that the top edge would be covered in substrate/soil to support the integration of the proposal with its immediate landscape context. Figure 4.1 (Zoom in of SSSI Crossing Illustrative View) illustrates the SSSI crossing during the operational phase once planting is established and illustrates this integration.</p> <p>Figure 4.2(SSSI Crossing Illustrative View) is also submitted at Deadline 7. This is a revision to Figure 1.1 submitted as PDA-006 and Figure 2.11 submitted as REP5-057.</p> <p>Other previous drawings that illustrate the SSSI Crossing (PDA-005 and as part of REP5-010) have also been updated and are submitted at Deadline 7 (Drawing Ref Nos SZC-SZ0100-XX-000-DRW-100205 and SZC-SZ0100-XX-000-DRW-100207).</p> <p>The proposed changes to the design of the SSSI crossing would not change the level of significance of the effects as assessed and described on visual receptor groups; visual receptors using key routes; visual receptors at specific viewpoints; landscape and seascape character types; the natural beauty and special qualities of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB; and Suffolk Heritage Coast.</p> <p>The proposed design retains the proposal to plant vegetation on the seaward slopes during the construction phase that could be retained into the operational phase, allowing better establishment and earlier screening function. The amended SSSI crossing is set at a higher level than previously and incorporates sufficient resilience such that there is no foreseeable need to adapt the bridge during its service life. This ensures that new planting proposed at the top of the SSSI crossing (once the haul road is removed) can be retained in perpetuity.</p>
LI.2.9	The Applicant, ESC, Natural England, The AONB	<b>Alternative Outage Car Park Note</b> Please review and comment on the content of the SCC submission [REP5-171].

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	Partnership, Stop Sizewell C, TASC	
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. notes and welcomes Suffolk County Council's re-confirmation at Paragraph 1 that it agrees there may be occasions where a single outage car park will be inadequate. This reflects SCC's statement in Paragraph 4.37 of its <b>Written Representation</b> [<a href="#">REP2-189</a>].</p> <p>Paragraph 2 is noted, although for the ExA's benefit the reference SCC provided to their Written Representation in that note should have been [<a href="#">REP2-189</a>].</p> <p>At Paragraph 3, SCC seeks an indication of the level of likelihood of two (or three) outages happening in parallel. The Sizewell complex will have three active reactors (one at Sizewell B and two at Sizewell C). Assuming that planned outages are staggered and the typical schedule for each reactor over an 18-month period is 2-months outage and 16-months no outage, then each reactor would be in a planned outage 11% of the time. Applying this to the likelihood of double or triple concurrent outages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <i>Double outage:</i> Two of the three reactors would be in a planned outage for 4 months out of 18, or 22% of the time. This means that there is a 22% chance in any given 18-month period that a forced outage on the other reactor would clash with a planned outage on one of the first two reactors. Forced outages happen randomly and the likelihood of a double outage clash needs to be planned for.</li><li>- <i>Triple outage:</i> By contrast, the likelihood of two reactors going into a forced outage at the same time as a planned outage on the other reactor is far lower. This is because two randomly occurring events would need to happen at the same time as the 11% chance that the other reactor is already in a planned outage. The compound probability of a triple outage is significantly less likely.</li></ul> <p>A response to Paragraph 4 is set out in Response to Question LI.2.10 below and is not repeated here.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Whilst SCC is correct in Paragraph 5 that only relevant staff would be involved in forced outages, as would be the case in any repair for any work, they offer no advice as to the number of outage staff that would entail. This is because clearly it is a specialist matter that SCC cannot reliably advise on and it depends on the maintenance or repair that needs to be made. In some cases staff numbers can be very substantial (up to 1,000) in order to complete the work as soon as reasonably possible. For example, in its current unplanned outage, Sizewell B has required up to approximately 1000 outage workers on site. This number of workers were on site for approximately 3 months of the outage.</p> <p>In Paragraph 6, SCC seek details relating to the environmental assessment of a clash between outages. This is set out in Section 1.8 of the Applicant's <b>Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH5</b> <a href="#">[REP5-117]</a>.</p> <p>Paragraph 7 appears to contradict SCC's own assertion in Paragraph 1 that there may be occasions where a single outage car park will be inadequate. Mr Lavelle is clear at Paragraph 1.5.24 of <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at ISH5</b> <a href="#">[REP5-110]</a> that both an operational car park and an outage car park will generally be full to almost overflowing during a single outage.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees with SCC's view at Paragraph 8 that an off-site permanent facility is not appropriate.</p> <p>The "Sizewell C Transport Strategy Hierarchy" that SCC refers to in Paragraph 9 sets out SZC Co's process for minimising road-based traffic, followed by other measures where necessary. The scale of traffic generated by coincident outages would be significantly less than the peak construction impacts which have already been assessed and so this hierarchy is not considered relevant to double outages. It has no meaningful link with how SZC Co. will respond at short notice to a randomly occurring event to safely bring the power station back online as soon as possible, which requires on-site car parking.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 9 also advocates car sharing and direct bus services for both operational and outage staff. The implication of this paragraph when read in the context of Paragraph 10 is that SCC assert these measures could remove the need for an outage car park altogether. In the light of that, the Applicant is unclear why SCC chose to not object to the Sizewell B outage car park on greenfield AONB land at Pillbox Field (planning application reference DC/19/1637/FUL1), if indeed it does consider the above measures are a realistic alternative. Clarification from SCC on this apparent inconsistency would be welcomed.</p> <p>SCC suggests an alternative proposal in Paragraphs 10-18 and SZC Co. responds to these points collectively below.</p> <p>As SZC Co. understands it, SCC employs farmers/contractors and their plant (i.e., tractors) to support snowploughing on a call-off basis during each winter season. Whilst on the face of it this seems to be a relatively straightforward and sensible approach for that undertaking, the same would not apply for an outage car park. The reasons for this are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Outages can last longer than 28 days:</i> Forced outages can last for longer than 28 days and the temporary car park would require planning permission in accordance with Class B of Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the <b>General Permitted Development Order</b> (2015, as amended). It is noted that the current extension of permitted development rights (Class BA) to a total of 56 days per calendar year, which was created in response to the pandemic, will expire at the end of 2021 and is therefore not relevant.</li><li>• <i>Setting up a temporary facility takes time:</i> This point is recognised by SCC in Paragraph 18 and this time would count towards the 28-day limit, as does removing the facility, thereby reducing the remaining permitted time available for use of the space as a temporary car park. The same would</li></ul>

---

<sup>1</sup> East Suffolk Council Planning Website: <https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=externalDocuments&keyVal=PQ5NVGQXJJ100>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>apply to the bus terminus and substantial associated facilities and structures required at the power station site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Highway safety:</i> Development permitted by Class B does not require highway safety to be taken into account. The Applicant is unsure whether SCC is advocating the temporary use of local farmland for large numbers of coaches and 600 cars that will inevitably need to pass each other and other vehicles on roads that are not designed for such use? The ExA may recall the difficulties experienced when sending a single coach down a local rural road on the Accompanied Site Visit and it met a single car travelling in the opposite direction.</li><li>• <i>Ecological considerations:</i> SZC Co. will need to accord with all relevant legislation and regulations. As the farmland would not be in temporary use as a car park for the majority of the time, there is a realistic prospect that protected species may inhabit the site and therefore the Applicant would need to satisfy itself through surveys that there is no risk of harm before installing temporary structures. It is an offence to proceed without a protected species licence when one is required.</li><li>• <i>Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017:</i> Linked to the point above, the development would be part of Sizewell C, which is a Schedule 1 development under the EIA Regs. Permitted development rights would not apply unless the LPA has adopted a negative Screening Opinion. Whilst a Screening Opinion could be sought in advance, it is not feasible to expect the Applicant to take a judgement call at very short notice on whether there has been a material change in circumstance on that site. If there was then the Screening Opinion would be out of date, permitted development rights would be removed and the temporary use of that land without planning permission would be unlawful.</li><li>• <i>Planning permission for an intermittent development of this nature could not be pre-emptively secured in advance:</i> Whilst time-limited planning permissions that require removal after a pre-defined period are commonplace, it would not satisfy the necessary tests to permit a scheme that is developed and then demolished as and when it is needed (Paragraph 56, National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and Regulation 122,</li></ul>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010). Clearly applying for a new planning permission each time a forced outage occurs would take too long. An application for a 600-space car park in the Countryside is considered to be unlikely to gain planning permission as it is likely to conflict with <b>Suffolk Coastal Local Plan</b> (September 2020)<sup>2</sup>. SZC cannot be dependent on such uncertainty.</p> <p>The objective of a forced outage is to safely bring the NSIP back online as soon as possible. Relying on adequate temporary arrangements being in place off-site in a timely manner is not a realistic prospect for the reasons demonstrated above.</p> <p>SZC Co. also notes and agrees with Page 103 of ESC's <b>Comments on any additional information/submissions received by D5</b> [REP6-032]. SZC Co. agrees with the reasoning put forward by ESC on Page 103, as local planning authority. SZC Co. also considers that the alternative put forward by SCC would be unlikely to be acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>SCC's proposals are unclear. There is no reasonable alternative to the proposed on-site outage car parking and that exceptional circumstances exist in accordance with Paragraph 5.9.10 of NPS EN-1.</p> <p>The outage car parking proposed by SZC Co. falls entirely within the nominated site boundary for Sizewell C. Paragraph 2.4 of the <b>Appraisal of Sustainability: Site Report for Sizewell (November 2009)</b> states: "The site includes land in the Goose and Kenton Hills to provide for an access road and other facilities which may be located outside the nuclear power station boundary. The Goose and Kenton Hills are former areas of heathland although land use is now principally</p>

---

<sup>2</sup> East Suffolk Council – Suffolk Coastal Local Plan (September 2020). <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Planning-Policy-and-Local-Plans/Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/Adopted-Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/East-Suffolk-Council-Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan.pdf>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>commercial forestry.” The Government was fully aware that this area may be developed for an access road and ancillary facilities. There should not therefore be an in-principle objection to the development of an ancillary facility, such as an outage car park, in this location because the purpose of the Government’s selection exercise was to rule out sites which were unacceptable in principle.</p> <p>The Applicant also refers the ExA to Mr Philpott QC’s written summary of his oral submission made at ISH5, particularly Paragraphs 1.5.6 – 1.5.9 [<a href="#">REP5-110</a>]. Those matters have still not been addressed by SCC.</p>
LI.2.10	The Applicant	<p><b>Outage Car Park</b></p> <p>Noting the content of paragraph 4 of SCC’s Alternative Outage Car Park note [<a href="#">REP5-171</a>], please provide further detail as to why, if an outage clash occurs, clashes would continue until another forced or unplanned outage.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Where a forced outage occurs within a few months before a planned outage, the two outages for the relevant reactor may be combined for efficiency purposes where it is economically and environmentally responsible to do so. A decision to combine the outages would occur on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The decision to combine the outages is based on a consideration of both the reduced power-station downtime (and therefore the reduced loss of electricity generation) and the remaining operational life of the nuclear fuel. This is because a planned outage typically includes refuelling.</p> <p>Once a planned outage period is shifted, future planned outages would then resume an 18-month cycle to gain the most benefit from the nuclear fuel. The Applicant respectfully confirms that SCC is wrong in its assumption that further outages are likely to be moved by the operator for the reasons they cite at Paragraph 4 [<a href="#">REP5-171</a>]. This is because:</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delaying a future planned outage to avoid a clash would be a major commercial risk, with a significant cost to the operator if a restart was delayed.</li> <li>SZC Co. would seek to make efficient use of nuclear fuel. Bringing forward a future planned outage to avoid a clash, without the presence of another forced outage to influence that decision, is not considered to be environmentally or economically responsible.</li> </ul>
LI.2.11	The Applicant	<b>Outage Car Park</b> Please explain why a softer palette of surface finish materials is proposed for the outage car park (paragraph 8.8.18 of REP5-073)]?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The surface materials specified for the Outage Car Park and Permanent Car Park reflect differing operational requirements associated with the type and frequency of use.</p> <p>With regards to the outage car park proposals, cellular grass/aggregate paving modules are widely used in parking areas particularly where temporary/intermittent vehicle occupancy is expected and is a more sustainable alternative to asphalt and concrete surfacing.</p> <p>Cellular grassed paving would integrate the car park more effectively with the surrounding landscape when not in use and offers other environmental benefits in terms of managing surface water infiltration, long lifespan and low maintenance demands.</p>
LI.2.12	The Applicant	<b>Power Export Connection</b> Please provide a response on the suggestion by SCC for an additional Requirement to enable the final form of the power export connection to be subject to post-consent approval [REP5-176].
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	In the document referred to above, SCC expressed the view that <i>"the Applicant appeared to agree with a number of points made by SCC's consultants, AFRY, that</i>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>there were fewer technical impediments to the use of alternatives to pylons than had been the case previously."</i></p> <p>Mr Young in fact commented that since discussions began with SCC some time ago, there is now a greater degree of common ground than there was at the outset. SZC Co confirms that there was no change in position at ISH5 from that previously submitted to the ExA in writing and discussed offline with SCC.</p> <p>On the subject of an alternative form of power export connection, SZC Co. has provided substantial information to show its consideration of alternative proposals and considers the broad proposal put forward by SCC to be neither workable nor achievable. A full explanation of the option evaluation process for the power export connections is given in the Technical Recommendation Report <b>Appendix 5E</b> of SZC Co's <b>Response to ExQ1s</b> [<a href="#">REP2-108</a>]. Responses to the questions raised specifically on the potential suitability of Gas Insulated Lines (GIL) are detailed in SZC Co's response to question ExQ1 LI.1.51 [<a href="#">REP2-100</a>].</p> <p>A Requirement for post-consent approval, as suggested by SCC, is considered to be neither necessary nor reasonable.</p> <p>The Applicant refers the ExA to Mr Philpott QC's contribution to <b>Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at ISH5</b> [<a href="#">REP5-110</a>], particularly Paragraphs 1.5.6 – 1.5.9. Those matters have still not been addressed by SCC.</p>
LI.2.13	The Applicant	<p><b>Turbine Halls and Operational Service Centre</b></p> <p>The amendment to Detailed Built Development Principle 56 [REP5-070] in respect of the discussion and agreement of the colour palette with ESC is noted. However, as commented on by SCC [REP5-172], please explain on how this Principle fulfils the statement made at paragraph 6.17.9 of [REP5-070] in respect of the identification and range of colours and hues for the turbine halls. Is it intended to submit these details into Examination?</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The cladding material above the base 'plinths' will use a material to be agreed (likely to be anodised aluminium). The colour of the material illustrated in the Design and Access Statement and chosen for the application is the paler end of the bronze anodising colour range (a straw colour). At this stage, there is no further material to submit to the Examining Authority but further design development will take place post granting of the DCO. This will include the cladding panels and their profiles which will be agreed with the local planning authority as part of the agreed design governance process. The precise colours of finishes within that pale bronze (straw) anodising range would also be subject to review and agreement with the local planning authority. Samples, mock-ups and prototypes would be used to demonstrate design and finishes as part of the process of agreement with the local planning authority. To further satisfy SCC's comments, we suggest some amendments to be made to Design Principle 56 in the Design and Access Statement. The proposed additional wording is shown underlined below –</p> <p><i><u>The turbine halls cladding (material above the base plinth) will provide a responsive surface treatment which changes in colour and tone, subject to surrounding lighting and climatic conditions and shall be made of an agreed material and panel profile/s. The colour palette and panel profile shall be discussed and agreed with East Suffolk Council as part of pre submission discussion/ design review and align with the colour information and study outcomes recorded in the Design and Access Statement Section 7:11 and within a range of light to darker bronze. The information shall include details of the manufacturer's maintenance specification for external facing cladding.</u></i></p> <p>Design Principle 56 indicates the preferred colour range for the turbine hall cladding being selected from light to darker bronze anodised aluminium cladding explored in section 7.11 of the Design and Access Statement. The present preference at this stage of design, is the paler end of the bronze anodised range illustrated in rendered model views Figure 7:45/7.46.</p> <p>This revised additional wording to the Design Principle will be included in the final version of the Design and Access Statement to be submitted at Deadline 10.</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
LI.2.14	The Applicant	<p><b>Interim Fuel Store</b></p> <p>The parameters of the Interim Fuel Store, content of Requirement 12 [REP5-029] and the response to ExQ1 LI.1.12 [REP3-046] are noted. Nonetheless, given the prominence, scale and longevity of this structure the submission of additional detail into examination, including colour and finish, would be beneficial. Please provide a response.</p> <p>Please also confirm whether the design of the Interim Fuel Store at Hinkley Point C has been finalised?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The Interim Spent Fuel Store (ISFS) is required at both Hinkley Point C and Sizewell C 10 years post operation. For SZC this need date is defined as 2042. The design of the ISFS has not been finalised, but design principles have been defined to provide design control and ensure an appropriate design outcome. At Hinkley Point C the design of the ISFS is at RIBA stage 1, which is the definition of the project brief and user requirements capture. Concept design of the structure including structural appearance has not yet commenced. In the case of SZC there is no information available to share at this time beyond that already contained in the DCO submission and expressed in revised Design Principles as agreed at Deadline 1 with the local authorities. SZC Co. suggest that additional certainty to be provided with further enhancement of the Design Principle 57 of the Main Development Site Design and Access Statement. The proposed additions are shown below underlined:</p> <p><b>Interim spent fuel store 57</b></p> <p><i>The external treatment of the interim spent fuel store will seek to comprise a simple form with minimal external projections and a colour which responds to its setting as far as is reasonably practicable, taking into account the operational and nuclear safety requirements of the building. Reserved Matters applications shall include details of the available colour options, including an explanation of how the proposed colour choice has responded to the building's setting. <u>The design shall have regard to the AONB and its immediate landscape context, acknowledge the</u></i></p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p><u>long design life of the building in its material selection and design response, recognising its elevated status relative to other ancillary buildings.</u></p> <p><u>This revised additional wording to the Design Principle will be included in the final version of the Design and Access Statement to be submitted at Deadline 9.</u></p>
LI.2.15	Emma and Justin Dowley	<p><b>Borrow Pits</b></p> <p>Appendix D of [REP5-117] provides information regarding construction and post-construction activities. Please confirm if the supplementary information provides the additional detail requested at [REP2-344]?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.16	The Applicant	<p><b>Borrow Pits</b></p> <p>Please respond to the query raised by Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council at [REP5-286] regarding the removal of the bunds, acoustic fencing and perimeter fencing.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Once the three borrow pits have been backfilled they will have the capacity to act as a stockpile and provision is made in the Application for that to occur up to 5m above existing ground level. This is explained in ES Volume 2 Appendix 3D, <b>Construction Method Statement</b>, Paragraphs 3.4.41 – 3.4.43 [<a href="#">REP5-048</a>].</p> <p>The approximate extent of acoustic fencing is shown on the <b>Construction Parameter Plans</b> at [<a href="#">REP2-008</a>].</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> [<a href="#">REP5-079</a>] confirms that 'solid barriers or landscaping, or a combination of the two, will be installed as early as is practicable in the construction process and retained for as long as needed to maximise</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>potential acoustic screening. All such structures will be appropriately maintained over the course of the project to maintain effective acoustic performance’.</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> [<a href="#">REP5-079</a>] confirms that all works areas, which would include the borrow pit fields, will be ‘fully secured with appropriate hoardings or fences’. This may be separate to acoustic fencing.</p> <p>The <b>Construction Method Statement</b> confirms that all temporary structures, which would include temporary works related to the borrow pits, would be removed by the end of the final phase of construction as part of the restoration of the Temporary Construction Area. This is set out in Paragraph 3.4.62 [<a href="#">REP5-048</a>].</p>
LI.2.17	The Applicant	<p><b>Dome Design</b></p> <p>Paragraph 2.11.10 of the Design and Access Statement [REP5-070] refers to the discolouration and aging of Sizewell A structure. Paragraph C.3.3 of the Concrete Note (Appendix C of [REP5-117]) states that the concrete for the proposed domes would be inert and stable with regards to natural weathering and weathering effects would be minimal. Does this mean that the concrete domes would not be subject to a similar aging and weathering process evident at Sizewell A?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>The concrete domes would not be subject to a similar aging and weathering process evident to that which is Sizewell A for the reasons set out below.</p> <p>Sizewell A does not have a concrete dome. The discolouration and aging process at Sizewell A has occurred predominantly on its vertical surfaces and the angular nature of the building makes the weathering more visible. This is because different surfaces face different climatic conditions and weather at different rates. By contrast, the dome geometry at Sizewell C would be subject to a less prominent form of weathering owing to its shape alone.</p> <p>Concrete technology has advanced significantly since the 1960s and quality controls have significantly improved. This means that the concrete shade/colour is</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>now more uniform and more durable, making it more resistant to aging and discolouration. SZC Co. welcomes ESC's comment on Page 95 of <b>Comments on any additional information/submissions received by D5</b> [<a href="#">REP6-032</a>] that the "very little shade variation" they have observed on the concrete structures at Hinkley Point C is "reassuring". SZC Co. confirms that this has indeed been aided by rigorous quality control process, which would be replicated at Sizewell.</p> <p>The concrete for Sizewell C, replicated from HPC, will contain a significant proportion of cement replacement material (GGBS - ground granulated blast furnace slag) which will serve to provide a lighter shade of grey concrete compared to that shown at Sizewell A. This lighter shade can be achieved without adversely affecting the structural properties of the concrete and SZC Co. welcomes ESC's acceptance [<a href="#">REP6-032</a>] of the rationale against applying colour pigmentation to the concrete that was set out in Paragraphs 1.12.6 – 1.12.10 of <b>Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH5</b> [<a href="#">REP5-117</a>].</p> <p>The shape, composition, durability and rigorous quality control processes proposed by SZC Co. will ensure that the appearance of the concrete structures at Sizewell C will neither age nor weather like Sizewell A.</p>
LI.2.18	The Applicant	<p><b>Dome Information</b></p> <p>As requested at the ISH5 on 13 July 2021, please provide photographic examples of concrete domes in-situ.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. have provided two examples of concrete domes from EDF Saint Alban, France which was commissioned in 1989 and Seabrook Station, Gulf of Main, USA which was commissioned in 1986, these can be found in Appendix 4B.</p>
LI.2.19	The Applicant	<p><b>Leiston Sports Facility</b></p> <p>Appendix 13G [APP-217] states that the proposed sports facility at Leiston was scoped out of the assessment as only minor changes to the character and fabric of the site would occur. Noting the need for construction lighting and the long-term use of flood lighting, please signpost where in the Lighting Management Plan</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>[APP-182] and/or the Technical Note on Indicative Lighting Modelling [REP3-057] specific regard is given to this proposed development.</p> <p>In addition, please confirm the following details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) Proposed height of flood lighting</li><li>(ii) Proposed lighting provision and illuminance</li><li>(iii) Height of surrounding trees</li></ul>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>As recorded in Appendix 13G of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment [APP-217] there is the potential for views to the proposed sports pitches site including at night during construction (should task or other lighting be required) and during operation when floodlights are in use. Any lighting would be seen in the context of the existing Leiston Leisure Centre and Alde Valley Academy, which includes floodlighting at the (former) southern surfaced pitch and lighting columns in the car park (adjacent to Leiston Leisure Centre). None of the effects described would result in significant adverse effects during construction or operation (including at night).</p> <p>Requirement 12A of the draft DCO requires SZC Co. to submit details of the layout, scale and external appearance of the sports facilities and associated landscape for approval to East Suffolk Council, this will include the lighting. SZC Co. note that the principles as set out in section 1.3 of the Lighting Management Plan would apply to the sports facilities, notably to adopt the lowest possible mounting height to achieve the levels required; specification of luminaires with good optical control that is designed for each individual application; aiming all luminaires into the area to be lit from the perimeter; ensuring all luminaires are at zero degrees to the horizontal and avoid any tilt; making use of manufactures supplied custom louvers if required; and providing local control for the lighting so it may be switched off when not required.</p> <p><u>Proposed height of flood lighting/ Proposed lighting provision and illuminance</u></p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>For sports lighting, the levels of lighting required generally depends upon the ball or object size being used and the speed it can travel at.</p> <p>Based upon the MUGA pitches being used for "General training, recreational and school sports – class III" level for five a side football, the appropriate lighting levels as set out by Sports England and in the CIBSE Lighting Guide 4: Sports Lighting is between 75 lux and 120 lux average horizontal illuminance with a uniformity of 0.6 (60%) at ground level. For the proposed area to be lit, luminaires mounted no higher than 8m should be appropriate.</p> <p>For the full size 3G pitch it has been assumed it will only be used for "General training, recreational and school sports – class III" but as hockey may be played on this pitch, and therefore the use of a smaller ball, the lighting levels set out by Sports England and in the CIBSE Lighting Guide 4: Sports Lighting is 200 lux average horizontal illuminance with a uniformity of 0.7 (70%) at ground level. For the proposed area to be lit, luminaires mounted no higher than 15m should be appropriate.</p> <p>The lighting source for the MUGAs and full size pitch will be LED and selected to give the highest possible colour rendering required for sports.</p> <p><u>Height of surrounding trees</u></p> <p>To the south of the site, the hedgerow /tree line along the north side of Grimsey's Lane includes blackthorn and hawthorn up to approximately 4m in height with lime, elm and sycamore up to approximately 16m tall south of the two proposed MUGA pitches.</p> <p>To the south side of Grimsey's Lane is a hedgerow comprising wild plum and managed to a uniform height of approximately 2.5-3m tall. It contains a single</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>hedgerow oak of approximately 14m tall. South of Grimsey's Lane is a triangular single species oak plantation at a height of approximately 10m</p> <p>To the east of the site is a tree line with mature oak and ash between approximately 18 and 20+m tall with some hawthorn shrubs. To the north of this tree line is a mature ash based woodland.</p> <p>Tow the west of the site, along the rear of properties along Quakers Way, and defining the western side of the existing car park and access is a gappy hedge between 2 and 4m tall with mature poplars, Italian alders oak, elm and sycamore of varying height (between approximately 7m and 20m tall). Trees immediately west of the car park are between 13m and 20m tall.</p>
LI.2.20	The Applicant	<p><b>Navigation and Aviation Lighting</b></p> <p>Please confirm whether it is intended to submit full details of navigation and aviation lighting into the examination? Is it necessary to consult with the Civil Aviation Authority in respect of the wording of Requirement 5B [REP5-029]?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Full details of navigation and aviation lighting are not planned to be submitted into the Examination. Lighting details will be implemented in accordance with Requirements 5B, 9 and 15 of the draft <b>Development Consent Order</b> [<a href="#">REP6-006</a>] as appropriate.</p> <p>In accordance with The Air Navigation (Restriction of Flying) (Nuclear Installations) Regulations 2016), nuclear power stations are afforded an element of protection from aviation activity through the establishment of a Restricted Area (RA) encompassing each individual site. This information was specifically requested by the MoD for their purposes and Requirement 5B is the appropriate</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		information to submit to the MoD. It is not therefore considered necessary to consult the Civil Aviation Authority on the wording of Requirement 5B.
LI.2.21	Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council	<b>Dark Skies</b> Please advise when the Dark Skies report, as discussed in [REP3-138], is to be submitted into examination.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.22	ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, National Trust	<b>Design and Access Statement –Overarching Design Principles and Detailed Built Development Principles</b> Several amendments and additions have been made to Tables 5.1 and 5.3 of the DAS [REP5-070]. Please review and comment on the amendments and additions.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.23	ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, National Trust	<b>Design and Access Statement –Overarching Design Principles</b> In respect of Overarching Design Principles 17-21 [REP5-070], are you satisfied that the proposed design of the MDS meets the objectives of these principles?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.24	ESC, SCC, Natural England, The AONB Partnership, Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council, Stop Sizewell C, TASC	<b>Design and Access Statement – Accommodation Campus Design Principles</b> Please review and comment on the revised design principles contained within Table A.1 [REP5-075].
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.25	The Applicant	<b>Design and Access Statement – Accommodation Campus Design Principles</b> Please comment on the suggested amendments to the design principles in Table A.1 of [REP5-075] made by ESC at [REP5-143].

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>ESC's suggested amendments to the design principles given at [REP5-143] related to those set out in Table A.1 at [APP-587] and [REP2-040] and were responded to in the design principles set out in Table A.1 of [REP5-075].</p> <p>Towards the end of [REP5-143] it is stated that '<i>having now reviewed the submission from the Applicant, ESC can confirm that we are satisfied with the proposed amendments to the Key Design Principles for the Accommodation Campus and are pleased to note that all of our suggested additions have been incorporated</i>'. It is understood that no further amendments to the Accommodation Campus design principles are necessary in relation to ESC's feedback.</p>
LI.2.26	The Applicant, ESC	<p><b>Design and Access Statement – Accommodation Campus Design Principles</b></p> <p>Principle 13 in Table A.1 [REP5-075] refers to the colour of buildings and the consideration to be given to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Guidance on the Selection and Use of Colour in Development document. In contrast, Detailed Built Development Principle 56 in Table 5.3 [REP5-070] includes the need for the agreement of ESC in respect of cladding colours for the turbine halls. Whilst noting the content of Requirement 17 [REP5-029], what consideration has been given to a similar level of involvement of ESC in respect of the colour finish of the accommodation campus buildings?</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Requirement 17 at [REP-029], requires a statement of compliance with the design principles set out at [REP5-075] to be submitted and agreed before work on the Accommodation Campus commences. In addition, there is a commitment from SZC Co. to enter into an agreement on a design governance framework to provide reassurance on the delivery of good design and the use of a design review panel. This framework is currently being discussed with ESC and will include reference to the use of a design review panel, the design guardianship role and the role and status of design principles (see responses at LI.2.3 and LI.2.5 for further details).</p> <p>The implementation of the design governance framework, along with pre-application discussions with planning officers will ensure that the design principles, including principle 13 on the use of colour within the Accommodation Campus, are actively discussed with ESC as part of a formal design review process and that an appropriate approach is agreed in advance of the statement of compliance submission.</p>



**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		In addition to the above, Principle 13 in Table A.1 [REP5-075] will be amended in the Final version of the DAS to be submitted at Deadline 10 to read: <i>Building colour palette to be discussed and agreed with East Suffolk Council and to include consideration of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Guidance on the Selection and Use of Colour in Development document.</i>
LI.2.27	The Applicant	<b>Design and Access Statement – Emergency Equipment Store</b> Please confirm why reference to the emergency equipment store has been removed from paragraph A.31.5 [REP5-075]?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	The Emergency Equipment Store at Upper Abbey Farm no longer forms part of the application and was removed at Deadline 2. This is shown at Table 2.7 of [ <a href="#">REP2-037</a> ] as the Emergency Equipment Store and as Parameter Zone 1M linking to the relevant plans in the Deadline 2 Cover Letter [ <a href="#">REP2-001</a> ].
LI.2.28	The Applicant	<b>Associated Development Sites – Reinstatement</b> Paragraph 6.70 [REP1-045] refers to former Associated Development Sites being reinstated to a higher quality or enhanced manner. Please provide a response.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Paragraph 6.70 of <a href="#">REP1-045</a> states: <i>"The Applicant should be required to reinstate the former Associated Development sites on land that they own in an enhanced manner, and where appropriate the Applicant should be seeking to enhance the state of the Associated Development sites being returned to agricultural use so they are of a higher quality than they were if achievable. This principle has not been agreed yet with the Applicant, but if it was implemented, would be a positive impact".</i> Chapter 2 of ES Volumes 3 (Northern P&R) [ <a href="#">AS-240</a> ], 4 (Southern P&R) [ <a href="#">AS-242</a> ], 8 (Freight Management Facility) [ <a href="#">APP-511</a> ] explain the proposals for the removal and reinstatement phases for these temporary Associated Development sites. It is important to note that SZC Co. do not own the relevant Associated Development sites and will only be requiring them on a temporary basis. Therefore, any commitment about the quality of the land to be returned would require agreement with the landowners.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Due to the length of time from site clearance through to operation and finally removal and reinstatement of the facilities on these sites, SZC Co. cannot commit to enhancing the land upon completion of the works. The soil will be stored on the site in bunds, in accordance with the Outline Soil Management Plan found at Appendix 17C of Volume 2, Chapter 17 of the ES [<a href="#">REP3-018</a>], and then reused during the reinstatement works. If SZC Co. was committed to enhancing the land upon its return to agricultural use, this may involve the importation of soils which would involve a greater number of HGV movements and require additional controls to ensure soils are managed so that they would align with existing soil conditions. Therefore, in accordance with the details in the descriptions of development for the park and rides and the freight management facility, and the Outline Soil Management Plan, the land on each site will be restored to a condition suitable for agricultural use before being returned to the landowner.</p> <p>SZC Co. indicates landscape proposals at the park and ride sites and the freight management facility, such as enhancement of existing hedgerows and new hedgerows/tree belts that would be retained (subject to landowner agreement) following reinstatement of the sites. SZC Co. considers that these would enhance the state of the associated development sites when they are returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>Requirement 24 of the draft DCO (<a href="#">Doc Ref. 3.1(F)</a>) further controls the reinstatement works of these sites. It requires SZC Co. to submit a scheme for the land restoration works to be approved by East Suffolk Council, and the land must be restored in accordance with these approved details.</p>
LI.2.29	The Applicant	<b>Associated Development Sites – Requirement 22A</b> Requirement 22A [REP5-029] includes Work Nos.11 and 12. Should Work Nos. 9,10 and 13 also be included within Requirement 22A?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	Requirement 20 (Associated Development sites: Buildings and Structures) secures the landscape works set out in the approved plans (Schedule 7). A Statement of Compliance would then be submitted for approval to ESC that includes further landscape details that demonstrate how the landscape AD Design Principles have been complied with. Requirement 20 has been updated in Deadline 7 to make this point clearer.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
LI.2.30	The Applicant, SCC, ESC	<b>Associated Development Sites – Requirement 22A</b> SCC [REP5-176] considers they should be the discharging authority for Requirement 22A as the proposed landscaping is on highway land. Are discussions regarding this matter underway?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	SZC Co. have been discussing this requirement with both SCC and ESC. ESC consider that they are the appropriate discharging authority for this requirement, as they are able to look at the landscape proposals in a comprehensive manner and ensure that any proposals are considered with an appropriate planning balance. SCZ Co. agrees with ESC and has therefore not made any change to the requirement to the effect SCC have requested. It should also be noted that SCC would be a consultee on the discharge of the detailed landscape proposals and ESC would be obliged to have proper regard to any representations that are made in respect of the landscape proposals. ESC would therefore be in the best position to determine the application. SCC, as the highway authority, would separately have to agree the proposed highway works, drainage and landscape buffer associated with the highway as part of the details that need to be approved as part of Article 21 of the DCO. This is considered to be a more appropriate place for SCC to define their requirements for the highway landscape works.
LI.2.31	The Applicant	<b>Two Village Bypass – Mollett’s Partnership</b> Mollett’s Partnership have requested the following additional mitigation measures: (iv) A bund parallel to the route of the proposed Two Village Bypass to screen their business and parts of property (v) Visual and screening noise attenuation fencing around the eastern construction compound (vi) Additional soft and hard landscaping to absorb the bypass into its setting Are these requests considered necessary in terms of mitigation?
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	SZC Co. met with the Mollett’s Partnership on 21 <sup>st</sup> July 2021 as part of an ongoing series of engagement to discuss their requests for additional mitigation measures. SZC Co. are meeting again with Mollett’s Partnership on 2nd September and will meet with them again in the next couple of weeks.

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Whilst SZC Co. considers that the scheme as currently proposed in the DCO provides sufficient landscape and visual mitigation to integrate the proposals into the surrounding landscape, SZC Co. is preparing a scheme of enhancements to address the concerns that have been raised, in conjunction with the concerns raised by FERN and highlighted at LI.2.33 below. A comprehensive scheme for this stretch of the two village bypass, within the order limits, that considers the provision of a bund to provide additional noise and visual screening, as well as additional soft landscape is currently being worked up for further discussion with Mollett's Partnership and ESC. Maximising screening within the order limits will ensure that SZC Co. can secure and deliver the additional landscaping screening as part of Requirement 22A of the DCO [REP6-006].</p> <p>Noise attenuation fencing around the eastern construction compound can be provided under the <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> [<a href="#">REP5-078</a>] – see Part C, Table 3.1 – Erection of Physical Barriers.</p>
LI.2.32	The Applicant	<p><b>Two Village Bypass – Landscape Design and Mitigation</b></p> <p>Noting the responses to ExQ1 LI.1.106 [REP3-046], please provide an update regarding discussions relating to offsite planting and habitat creation.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. met with ESC and SCC on 6<sup>th</sup> August 2021 to discuss landscape and environmental matters along both Sizewell link road and the two village bypass. At this time, SCC have not identified any specific additional enhancements required along the two village bypass. However, discussions are ongoing with both ESC and SCC in relation to the enhancements to the current proposals that are being proposed to address concerns raised by local residents. SZC Co. are continuing to develop the proposals and will provide an update at Issue Specific Hearing 13.</p>
LI.2.33	The Applicant	<p><b>Two Village Bypass – Additional Landscaping</b></p> <p>FERN included a plan illustrating possible additional bunds and planting [REP5-197]. Please provide an update in respect of any additional landscaping proposed for the Two Village Bypass.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>SZC Co. met with representatives of FERN on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2021 to discuss their requests for additional mitigation measures as part of an ongoing series of</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>engagement to discuss their requests for additional mitigation measures. SZC Co. are meeting again with FERN on 26<sup>th</sup> August.</p> <p>The plan supplied by FERN illustrating possible additional bunds and planting [REP5-197] was prepared by SZC Co. as the basis of discussion at that meeting. Whilst SZC Co. consider that the scheme as currently proposed in the DCO provides sufficient landscape and visual mitigation to integrate the proposals into the surrounding landscape, SZC Co. is preparing a scheme of enhancements to address the concerns that have been raised, in conjunction with the concerns raised by Mollett's Partnership and highlighted at LI.2.31 above. A comprehensive scheme for this stretch of the two village bypass, that considers revision of the embankment design associated with the Foxburrow Wood footbridge, the provision of bunds to provide additional noise and visual screening, as well as additional soft landscape is currently being worked up for further discussion with FERN and ESC. These potential additional landscaping options will fall within the current order limits and can be discharged through the detailed design stage. Maximising screening within the order limits will ensure that SZC Co. can secure and deliver the additional landscaping screening as part of Requirement 22A of the DCO [REP6-006].</p>
LI.2.34	The Applicant	<p><b>Southern Park and Ride – Lighting</b></p> <p>Several of the initial concerns expressed by Marlesford Parish Council in respect of light spill remain [REP5-237]. Please comment on the suitability of the proposed use of low-level down lit lighting.</p>
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	<p>Lighting columns below 6m were considered within the Southern Park and Ride site during the initial design phase. However, a reduction in column height would require additional lighting columns within the site. This is because lower lighting columns reduce the spread of light and thus, more lighting columns would be required to ensure adequate levels of lighting for the safe operation of the park and ride facility. There are also practical implications of lower lighting columns given that buses will be using the site.</p> <p>The use of "low-level down-lit lighting (close to the ground)" advocated by Marlesford Parish Council would significantly increase the number of lighting columns required. Regardless of whether 6m high columns or lower level lighting</p>

**ExQ2: 03 August 2021****Responses due by Deadline 7: 03 September 2021**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		is used, the same uniform lighting levels would need to be achieved across the site to achieve appropriate lighting levels for the intended use. The proposed lighting design, controlled by the measures in the <b>Associated Development Design Principles</b> [REP2-041], would ensure that light fittings are chosen to limit light spill, using LED-based fittings with zero-degree tilt and demountable shields where appropriate. Therefore, it is considered that the 6m high columns proposed in the Application would be the most appropriate for the safe operation of the site.
LI.2.35	Marlesford Parish Council	<b>Southern Park and Ride – Landscaping</b> Please provide further detail as to why the proposed planting growth rates is over optimistic [REP5-237].
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	No response from SZC Co. is required.
LI.2.36	The Applicant	<b>Freight Management Facility– Landscape Design and Mitigation</b> Noting the responses to ExQ1 LI.1.106 [REP3-046], please provide an update regarding discussions relating to offsite planting and habitat creation.
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	ExQ1 LI.1.106 does not relate to the freight management facility. ExQ1 LI.1.80 relates to mitigation at the freight management facility, but all parties asked to respond to the question identified that beyond a lighting strategy, no further mitigation was required. SZC Co. are therefore unsure which ExQ1 the ExA requires an update in relation to and would appreciate clarification.
LI.2.37	The Applicant	<b>Sizewell Link Road – Pretty Road Bridge Design</b> In the event that Change 18 [REP5-002] is accepted into examination, please provide additional visualisations of the proposed Pretty Road overbridge, ensuring that it is at a larger scale than that included at [REP5-041].
	SZC Co. Response at Deadline 7	See <b>Figure 4.3</b> which provides a visualisation of the proposed change that is comparable to the visualisation of the Pretty Road Bridge provided ExQ1 LI.1.93 [REP2-105] for the current design.