



The Sizewell C Project

9.101 Written Summaries of Oral Submissions made at Issue Specific Hearing 12: Community (15 September 2021)

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

September 2021

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



CONTENTS

1	ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 12: COMMUNITY	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Agenda Item 2: Community, Amenity and Recreational Impacts	1
1.3	Agenda Item 3: Potential Adverse effects on Human Health and Living Conditions of Residents through construction and operation	11
1.4	Agenda Item 4: Effects on Public Rights of Way and Non-Motorised Users and understanding of implications for people with protected characteristics.	17
1.5	Agenda Item 5: Cumulative Impacts on Health and Well Being	22
1.6	Agenda Item 6: Monitoring and Controls	25
1.7	Agenda Item 7: Any Other Matters	26

TABLES

None provided

PLATES

None provided

FIGURES

None provided

1 ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 12: COMMUNITY

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This document contains the Applicant's written summaries of the oral submissions made at Issue Specific Hearing 12 (ISH12) on Community, held on 15 September 2021.

1.1.2 In attendance at ISH12 on behalf of the Applicant were:

- Hereward Phillpot QC of Francis Taylor Building (Counsel) (HPQC);
- John Rhodes of Quod (Planning Manager (Strategic));
- Andrew Hunt of Quod (Socio-economics Lead);
- Mike Humphrey of Quod (Socio-economics Specialist);
- Dr Andrew Buroni of Savills (Health and Wellbeing Lead);
- Andy Langley of Atkins (SZC Civil Site Establishment Engineering Lead);
- Philip Brashaw of LDA Design (Recreation and Amenity Specialist);
- Alister Kratt of LDA Design (Landscape Architect and Masterplan Lead);
- Kirsty McMullen of KMC Planning Ltd (Transport Planning Lead);
- Mike Brownstone of Resound Acoustics (Technical Lead – Noise);
- Rupert Thornely-Taylor of Rupert Taylor Ltd (Technical Expert – Noise).

1.1.3 Where further information was requested by the Examining Authority (ExA), this is contained separately in the Applicant's **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH12** (Doc Ref. 9.105).

1.2 Agenda Item 2: Community, Amenity and Recreational Impacts

(i) Community Safety - Policing of development through construction and operation of the proposed development.

1.2.1 The ExA asked the Suffolk Constabulary to outline any remaining concerns it had following its Deadline 7 submissions on community safety. The Suffolk Constabulary confirmed that progress had been made since

Deadline 7 and that discussions were continuing on a number of matters including audit and governance.

1.2.2 In response, HPQC explained that an updated draft of the Deed of Obligation was submitted at Deadline 7 which incorporated a number of changes including within Schedule 16 (Transport and Public Rights of Way). In Schedule 16 the Transport Review Group is now defined as including Suffolk Constabulary as a member and changes have also been made to improve and enhance the governance process. The detailed issues raised by Suffolk Constabulary about the drafting of the draft Deed would be discussed with them outside the examination, and any response required would then be provided in writing.

1.2.3 Mr Hunt explained that SZC Co. and the Suffolk Constabulary now have agreement on the core element of funding, including an agreement on contributions to an additional off-site facility for the Constabulary in Leiston. Additionally, Mr Hunt confirmed that the principles around how funding should be profiled are broadly agreed upon (that this should follow the profile of the non-home-based workforce, with some lead-in time) but it was acknowledged that the details around monitoring and draw-down of any contingency funding need to be finalised (though there is broad agreement on key performance indicators identified by the Constabulary). However, there is agreement on the main elements of mitigation and there are no significant differences on the contingency.

(ii) Progress on Community Cohesion and Community Safety identified in the Local Impact Report and Statement of Common Ground

1.2.4 The ExA asked what the latest position was the issue of community cohesion and community safety as identified in the LIR and SoCG.

1.2.5 Both Suffolk County Council (SCC) and East Suffolk Council (ESC) agreed that these concerns had now fallen away on the basis that the necessary funding had been agreed, the funding would be applied to the purposes as set out in the Deed of Obligation (and that these purposes are consistent with the impacts identified) and the governance measures would be approved by the Community Safety Group.

1.2.6 HPQC agreed with this summary. It was agreed that this updated position would be reflected in the SoCGs submitted at Deadline 8.

(iii) Timing of provision of accommodation campus, associated health and welfare facilities and caravan park

- 1.2.7 ESC and SCC outlined their concerns that the reasonable endeavours obligation to deliver the accommodation campus in accordance with the Implementation Plan did not provide sufficient certainty.
- 1.2.8 In response, HPQC explained that the drafting mechanism to ensure sufficient certainty around delivery remains the subject of ongoing and active discussion between SZC Co. and the Councils. HPQC added that the reasonable endeavours obligation operates from the outset, and therefore before any trigger event that may be identified is reached. It is a separate and meaningful obligation in its own right, and it would not be right to say that the adoption of an additional set of controls using trigger events would remove the benefit of the reasonable endeavours obligation. Long stop triggers would provide additional comfort.
- 1.2.9 Mr Hunt explained that SZC Co.'s position on this is set out in **SZC Co's Response to ExQ2** (Cl.2.2) [\[REP7-056\]](#) and **Appendix 3B to SZC Co's Response to ExQ2** [\[REP7-057\]](#). Both the caravan park and the accommodation campus are an important part of SZC Co.'s workforce management and support the efficient and productive delivery of the Sizewell C Project, as well as being primary mitigation, so it is strongly in the project's interest to deliver them when they are needed early in the construction phase.
- 1.2.10 Mr Hunt set out that triggers for the project accommodation (and the release of mitigation should the project accommodation be delayed) should be related to the level of non-home-based (NHB) workforce, and that although described as a solution for a temporary effect, it is in fact full mitigation (in that it is derived from the same per-bedspace rate as the 'core' element of the Housing Fund). The project accommodation would be delivered in a phased manner relative to the build-up of the workforce.
- 1.2.11 Mr Hunt added that there would be financial consequences for SZC Co. if the accommodation campus and caravan park are not delivered on time and in line with projected levels of NHB workforce – if the NHB workforce is more dispersed this would result in additional transport costs, potential need for payment for travel time and consequential productivity losses meaning that SZC Co. has a very strong incentive to deliver the campus in line with increasing demand. However, there are limits on how quickly they can be built and the updated **Implementation Plan** submitted at Deadline 2 [\[REP2-044\]](#) sets out the earliest realistic delivery dates. The **Implementation Plan** [\[REP2-044\]](#) shows (at **Plate 1**) the LEEIE caravan

park being online by the end of Q4 of Year 1 and the accommodation campus by the end of Q3 of year 3.

1.2.12 Mr Hunt noted that:

- Monitoring will not be limited to 6-monthly workforce surveys – the Project will collect induction information at on-boarding of workforce. This does set out the proportion of NHB workforce, but does provide a useful source of information on rates of workforce growth and forecast workforce.
- The Project will also be able to readily report on how construction is progressing, including construction of project accommodation, to aid the Council in timing of delivery of bedspaces through the Housing Fund.
- In theory, the time between the Implementation Plan's dates for delivery of project accommodation could be as much as 9 months, but in reality it is likely to be significantly less (on average, 6 months). As the Implementation Plan sets out a more ambitious timescale of delivery for the accommodation campus than the assessment at **Volume 2, Chapter 9** of the ES [[APP-195](#)], this lag is no more significant than has been assessed.
- The Housing Fund will be front-loaded with £2 million released in the first year for private market supply measures to build resilience early. The Applicant is confident that the Housing Fund can be delivered effectively and delivered early, and start to build in mitigation that can be supplemented if necessary through contingency payments. One of the concerns, particularly on the caravan site was around licencing and enforcement, so the intention is that funding can be used flexibly to deal with those issues.

1.2.13 Mr Rhodes explained that the Housing Contingency Fund drafting would be added at the next deadline and confirmed that there would be an absolute commitment to deliver both the accommodation campus and the caravan park using long stop milestones. He also confirmed that the long stop dates for the key transport infrastructure (e.g. Sizewell Link Road, Green Rail Route and the MBIF) set out in SZC Co.'s **Response to the ExA's commentary on the draft DCO and other documents** [[REP7-058](#)] at e-page 22 would also be drafted as firm commitments.

(iv) Assessment of displacement of visitors and additional visitors: effects on amenity and recreational

- 1.2.14 In response to concerns raised regarding the adequacy of the assessment or visitor displacement to amenity and recreational areas including the AONB, Mr Brashaw summarised the method of assessment by reference to **Volume 1 Chapter 6 Appendix 6K of the ES**, at paragraphs 1.3.9 to 1.3.13 [[APP-171](#)].
- 1.2.15 Potential changes to the numbers of people visiting recreational resources in Volume 2 Chapter 15 of the ES [[APP-267](#)] accounted for:
- Displaced people who may wish to avoid the area around Sizewell C during construction.
 - Construction workers who may visit outdoor informal recreational resources in their free time.
 - Visitors who may be attracted to the area to view the construction site.
- 1.2.16 The potential for displaced people was informed by observation and questionnaire surveys undertaken at seven locations within the vicinity of the construction site in summer and winter 2014, at seven locations and following a method prepared in consultation with the RSPB, SWT, SCC, ESC (formerly Suffolk Coastal District Council), Natural England and the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Partnership. The results are presented in **Volume 2 Appendix 15A of the ES** [[APP-268](#)]. It was also informed by additional surveys undertaken at RSPB Minsmere, at the request of the RSPB, in 2015, presented in **Volume 2 Appendix 15B of the ES** [[APP-269](#)].
- 1.2.17 The potential for displacement is explained at paragraphs 15.6.30 to 15.6.39 of **Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES** [[APP-267](#)]. The assessment of displacement is based on two main findings from the surveys:
- Approximately 29% of questionnaire respondents said that they would stop using the area around Sizewell C during construction, and are assumed to displace to alternative locations for the purpose of the assessment.
 - Respondee named locations to where they would be displaced. These locations can be seen on **Figures 15.9 and 15.10 of Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES** [[APP-267](#)].
- 1.2.18 The approach to displacement assumed in the assessment is highly precautionary – i.e. more people are assumed than are likely to occur. It

assumes that all 29% of visitors surveyed in the **2014 Sizewell C Visitor Surveys** (Volume 2, Chapter 15, Appendix 15A of the ES) [APP-268] who said they would stop using the area around Sizewell C during construction would in fact be displaced. Surveys of this nature tend to be pessimistic (i.e. a lower percentage would actually displace), for reasons explained in **Responses to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) - Volume 3 - Appendices Part 1 of 7 Chapter 6, Appendix 6A Response to AR.1.12 [REP2-108]** (paragraph 3.3.3 on pdf page 553).

1.2.19 In response to a question at the ISH12, Table 15.6 of **Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267]** shows the locations where respondents to the **2014 Sizewell C Visitor Surveys** (Volume 2, Chapter 15, Appendix 15A of the ES) [APP-268] said that they would be displaced. 514 respondents submitted questionnaire surveys and out of these 95 people named 182 locations to where they are likely to visit instead. For example, one person said that they would displace to Woodbridge.

1.2.20 The potential for use of recreational resources by construction workers is explained at paragraphs 15.6.40 to 15.6.52 of **Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267]**. The potential for construction workers to visit informal outdoor recreational resources leading to increased numbers is influenced by a number of factors including:

- Whether construction workers are additional to the area, or existing residents.
- The relatively short peak of construction when the greatest numbers of construction workers additional to the area would be present.
- Construction workers would favour formal/organised sport and gym use to outdoor informal recreation activities.
- Work commitments are a significant reason for not undertaking recreation activity.
- A proportion of shifts will be during the day with 'time off' during the hours of darkness when outdoor informal recreation at European sites would be less attractive.
- The majority of non-home based construction workers would be living alone and not with families (including those staying at the accommodation campus and caravan site). The majority of non-home based construction workers would return home at weekends/at the end of their working period when they are more likely to, for example, go for walks and cycle than during their working periods.

- The majority of non-home based construction workers would not have dogs (including all in the accommodation campus and caravan site) and would not undertake regular daily dog walks.
- Approximately 2,000 construction workers in private rental and tourist accommodation who are additional to the area would be spread over a wide area, diffusing effects.

1.2.21 The potential for additional people was factored into the AR assessment for each receptor in **Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES** [\[APP-267\]](#) (significant effects), and in **Volume 2, Appendix 15G of the ES** [\[APP-270\]](#) (non-significant effects) including those within the AONB. Numbers of potential additional people at recreational resources were not calculated in the amenity and recreation ES chapters where judgements were based on professional judgement. This is different to the Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (sHRA) where numbers of additional visits to European sites were estimated, because SZC Co. felt that a more 'scientific' approach was necessary for the sHRA (see Statement on Recreational Disturbance Numbers [\[REP7-087\]](#) for SZC Co.'s position on numbers of displaced people and construction workers in the sHRA).

1.2.22 As explained in paragraph 15.3.7 of **Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES** [\[APP-267\]](#), changes to the experience people have when using recreational resources due to increases in the numbers of people using them was one of the factors considered in reaching a judgement on the effects on recreational receptors. The other factors were:

- physical changes to resources (e.g. changes to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) through diversions or temporary or permanent closures; and
- changes to views, noise, air quality and traffic movements.

1.2.23 In response to the RSPB's suggestion that alternative green space should be delivered, Mr Rhodes explained the conservative nature of the assessment for both visitors and construction workers – including the assumption that all those who may be displaced would in fact be displaced to a European site, even if they gave a different location nearby and even if they specified no location.

1.2.24 He stated that SZC Co. is grateful for the positive feedback received on the draft Monitoring and Mitigation Plans ([\[REP5-105\]](#) and [\[REP5-122\]](#), which the parties recognise have the potential to be effective. SZC Co. will respond positively to the limited suggestions received to enhance the plans. The construction workers assessment is particularly conservative given nature of their likely recreation and the short peak of construction.

Nevertheless, whilst not named as a 'SANG', the Aldhurst Farm proposals provide a greater area for open access and recreation than would be required by NE's SANG Guidance for residential development, even if the workforce was permanent and even if workers had the same recreational behaviour as permanent residents. Account should also be taken of the extensive enhancement of linkages and rights of way to which the applicant is committed and which are the type of measures supported by Natural England's latest SANG Guidance published in August 2021. In combination with other measures to which the applicant is committed (sports provision and RAMS payments), SZC Co. is not aware what more it can do to address and satisfy the concerns that have been expressed.

1.2.25 Mr Kratt pointed to Table 13.4 and Table 13.7 in the LVIA assessment which set out the anticipated effects on the AONB, and explained that the natural beauty and special qualities indicators (agreed with ESC/SCC) on which the assessments are based, incorporate criteria including judgements on tranquillity, relative tranquillity and amenity which had been fully assessed based on agreed definitions.

1.2.26 Mr Kratt committed to providing a note on the benefits of the project for Deadline 9 that would be provided through the lifetime of the project, which would address the project's response to amenity and the AONB. The benefits are structured under three headings: (1) embedded mitigation: within the design for the construction phase and operational phase; (2) management: of effects arising during construction and over the operational life of the project; and (3) legacy outcomes including the longer-term management of wider estate and the naturalisation of the landscape.

(v) Assessment of amenity and recreational effects on the AONB

1.2.27 In response to comments relating to the holistic nature of mitigation, Mr Kratt noted that ESC and SCC acknowledged that there was now broad agreement on the package of mitigation including addressing residual effects via Natural Environment Improvement Fund, costed at £12million. Mr Kratt noted that the extent, scale and nature of the Natural Environment Improvement Fund was holistic in terms of its reach and scope. Mr Kratt confirmed that his role had included direction on the structure and geography of the Fund to ensure it formed part of a wider coordinated strategy connected to the proposed work on the SZC Co. estate and with other Funds and initiatives.

1.2.28 Mr Kratt made the following points addressing the holistic approach and the inclusion of the AONB in the thinking: (1) the Natural Environment Improvement Fund's governance structure is set out in Deed of Obligation and that the AONB Partnership will administer the Fund; (2) the scope of

the Fund in terms of geography, is large (and includes areas of the AONB impacted by the SZC Co. proposal) and allows for holistic planning; (3) it is envisaged that the governance structure of the Natural Environment Improvement Fund will endorse the AONB management plan objectives and support holistic outcomes and coordinated planning; (4) the Public Rights of Way Strategy and funding is agreed with SCC (and ESC) and is based on consultation outcomes and is significant in its reach; (5) there will be a legacy benefit of 9.5km new rights of way resulting in improved connectivity across a large area and especially north south.

1.2.29 Mr Brshaw explained that the Applicant recognised the importance of the need to address tranquillity in the assessment and design process very early in the pre-application stage, particularly in relation to the AONB. A method for assessing the effects on tranquillity was developed for the Sizewell C Project and formed the basis of the assessment and drew on a new method for assessing tranquillity in relation to the character of sound (referred to as the Natural Tranquillity Method) developed by consultants Sharps Redmore.

1.2.30 Mr Brshaw pointed out that Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council have agreed that the methodology for the assessment of impacts on amenity and recreation including tranquillity, as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6K of the ES [\[APP-171\]](#) is robust and appropriate (Initial Statement of Common Ground Table 4.1 Reference AR2 [\[REP2-076\]](#)).

1.2.31 Mr Brshaw pointed out that at Deadline 2, ESC stated:

"ESC acknowledges that an appropriate assessment of noise impacts on tranquillity at amenity and recreation receptors has been completed, in that the inputs (noise levels and observation scores) and outputs (tranquillity scores and conclusions) presented in Chapter 15 the ES are in line with ESC's expectations. The assessment in Chapter 15 necessarily balances various impacts on these receptors, not just noise."

(East Suffolk Council - Responses to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1), NV.1.5 [\[REP2-176\]](#))

1.2.32 Mr Brshaw explained that the five factors that were taken into account to assess tranquillity in the amenity and recreation chapter (at paragraph 15.3.37 of **Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES** [\[APP-267\]](#)) were:

- Noise (including the noise level and the character of the sound (i.e. the balance between 'natural' sound and 'human made' sound)).
- Visual (the degree to which the view is of predominantly 'natural' or 'human made' built elements).

- Transport (interaction with vehicles).
- Air quality (air borne emissions and dust)
- People (potential increases in people (e.g. crowding or more intensive use of PRow).

- 1.2.33 The results of the tranquillity assessment in **Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES** [APP-267] were then used to inform the overall assessment of effects on the AONB in the Volume 2 Chapter 13 of the ES (LVIA) [APP-216] where relative tranquillity was one of the factors within the natural beauty and special quality indicators of the AONB.
- 1.2.34 Mr Humphrey explained that the Tourism Fund is agreed with ESC, and it takes into account an understanding of local sensitivities and is based on the findings from quantitative work (see **Appendix 9F to Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES** [APP-196]) which set out that knowledge of the Project and the area is important in determining people's behaviour to visit certain locations and certain areas in the future.
- 1.2.35 The Tourism Fund for Sizewell C is 5 times larger than at Hinkley Point C – in part to account for the difference between the environment and visitor base of the areas.
- 1.2.36 In terms of the RSPB resilience fund – this is not a compensation fund, but is much like the Tourism Fund in that it is intended to encourage sustainability of visits. As such, scaling the fund based on partial displacement rates is not appropriate.
- 1.2.37 The RSPB, National Trust and the AONB Partnership would be part of the governance board for the Tourism Fund which has the express interest of delivering changes to perception through marketing and promotional activities and would help to reduce the risk of reduced paying visitors in that way.
- 1.2.38 HPQC explained that at the last deadline the Tourism Fund had been quantified in the draft Deed of Obligation at £12million for the purposes of mitigating potential impacts on tourism and that this would be complementary to other funding such as the Natural Environment Improvement Fund.

1.3 Agenda Item 3: Potential Adverse effects on Human Health and Living Conditions of Residents through construction and operation

(i) Night time rail operation

- 1.3.1 In response to ESC's comments on the breadth and scope of the Rail Noise Mitigation Strategy ('RNMS') and, in particular, the questions surrounding installation of acoustic barriers along the East Suffolk Line ('ESL'), Mr Rhodes explained that discussions are ongoing regarding the augmentation of the RNMS. Regarding the barriers, Mr Rhodes explained that, whilst Network Rail could not support erection of noise barriers on its land, discussions were taking place as to whether within the RNMS a process could be added whereby for each potential location identified in ESC's Deadline 7 response [[REP7-107](#), electronic page 13], a feasibility assessment is carried out with any agreed improvements to be funded by SZC Co. Mr Rhodes also explained that it is likely that in most cases the people who would benefit from the barriers would be the same landowners whose agreement would be necessary for the erection of the barriers, so the fact that barriers would be on third party land would not necessarily be an issue.
- 1.3.2 HPQC noted that the ES does not depend on the delivery of barriers – rather, what is being committed to is a process whereby if it is subsequently agreed to be both desirable and achievable they would be put in place.
- 1.3.3 Mr Rhodes also advised that SZC Co. was happy to respond positively to the other suggestion made recently by ESC that it should commit to a process which may lead to the relaying of track on the East Suffolk Line. In those circumstances, land ownership was not a factor as the line is owned by Network Rail. A commitment to the work which is already in progress will be added to the draft RNMS.
- 1.3.4 In response to comments from ESC, Mr Rhodes advised that the erection of barriers was not necessary to avoid SOAEL. Whilst SZC Co. is seeking to mitigate and minimise noise as far as practical, the policy requirement is to avoid SOAEL, not to avoid any noise greater than LOAEL.
- 1.3.5 Mr Brownstone agreed and explained that SZC Co. has adopted a more precautionary approach than HS2 to setting SOAEL for railway noise and did not seek to rely on the caveat in the World Health Organisation

guidance¹ that the internal 45dB L_{AFmax} level should not be exceeded more than 10 to 15 times per night to avoid sleep disturbance.

- 1.3.6 Although the Noise Mitigation Scheme (NMS) is a 'fall-back' position to be employed after all other options have been exhausted, which is consistent with policy, the NMS applies at a level where a standard double-glazed window is no longer sufficient to achieve an internal noise level of 45dB L_{AFmax} .
- 1.3.7 Mr Brownstone committed to discuss with the Applicant Mr Kemp of ESC's suggestion of a 'cut-down' insulation element of the NMS, whereby properties exposed to railway noise levels of between 60 and 70dB L_{AFmax} could be offered ventilation only to allow them to keep their existing windows closed. These properties are below both the SOAEL of 77dB L_{AFmax} (free-field) and the level at which a significant adverse effect is considered to occur (70dB L_{AFmax} (free-field)), but above the 60dB L_{AFmax} LOAEL.
- 1.3.8 Councillor Sanders of Woodbridge Town Council raised a point about the unsprung mass of rail freight wagons compared with that of the nuclear flask wagons that were previously used on the line. The point was raised in relation to a comment made by Mr Thornely-Taylor at ISH8, where he stated that the vibration caused in the past by the passage of nuclear flask trains would be greater as they did not have effective suspension, and that unsprung mass was key. Mr Thornely-Taylor had noted at ISH8 that the Sizewell C trains will have modern bogies and proper suspension and therefore low unsprung mass. Councillor Sanders noted that the flask wagons did have bogies with suspension.
- 1.3.9 In response, Mr Thornely-Taylor noted that a similar point had been raised by Woodbridge Town Council and had been asked in the Examining Authority's Third Round of Questions (at NV.3.8). Mr Thornely-Taylor stated that, as will be explained in the Applicant's response to NV.3.8, the primary factor is the unsprung mass of the wagon. This is the weight of the wheelset - the axle and two wheels - plus any other components that are not supported by the primary suspension, which lies between the axle box and the bogie frame. The flask wagons, although they had bogies (as do most freight wagons) had very stiff primary suspension and high unsprung mass compared to the wagons that are proposed for the Sizewell C project, which have an unsprung mass of around 1.3 tonnes per axle.
- 1.3.10 The nuclear flasks that were transported by rail from Sizewell A using FNA wagons, and Mr Thornely-Taylor noted that these had Y25 bogies, which have very stiff primary suspension when fully loaded, because they are

¹ World Health Organisation Guidelines for Community Noise (1999)

fitted with double helical springs; the inner springs acting when the wagon is loaded. Additionally there is a Lenoir link friction damper connected across each axle box, which can transfer part or all of the body load to the axles.

- 1.3.11 Mr Thornely-Taylor indicated that he did not have the unsprung mass figures for the flask wagons to hand but would supply the figure for the flask wagons as part the written submissions from ISH12. **Post hearing note: the figure is 1.764 tonnes.** Details of other major differences between the bogie designs of the two types of wagon are included in the Applicant's response to NV 3.8
- 1.3.12 This explains why vibration from SZC Co. trains will not be as great as was observed by residents during the operation of nuclear flask trains.
- 1.3.13 Mr Thornely-Taylor noted that many people attended the test train runs in August 2020 when wagons similar to those proposed for the Sizewell C project were hauled on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line, and they will have noticed the low level of trackside vibration when the wagons were not passing over joints in the track.
- 1.3.14 HPQC passed on to Dr Buroni to respond to the specific health concerns raised. Dr Buroni summarised the health concerns raised at the hearing, including risk of road traffic accident and injury, noise related sleep disturbance, health impacts from changes in local air quality (including a study from Imperial College London on dementia and transport noise) and general fear and anxiety.
- 1.3.15 Dr Buroni explained that the concerns raised are potential hazards; further explained the difference between a hazard (something with the potential for harm) and risk (the likelihood of harm); and how the Hazard-Exposure-Receptor concept is applied through planning to remove, reduce and manage risk to the environment and health. No party has found any gap or flaw in the Health and Wellbeing assessment, no countervailing evidence has been provided by any party, and all of the health concerns raised by Interested Parties at Issue Specific Hearing 12 are included in the assessment.
- 1.3.16 Dr Buroni then explained the danger of misapplying the concept of hazard and risk and the use of a selective evidence base inappropriately. As an example, Dr Buroni explained the Imperial College London observational study on dementia and noise raised by Councillor Sanders. Dr Buroni explained that the study demonstrated varying associations between rail and road with different forms of dementia. However, no causal mechanism was offered, the limitations were clearly set, and the study cannot be

applied to assess risk. Dr Buroni explained that at most, this reinforces the appropriate evidence base applied within the assessment, and accords with that of the Environmental Health Officer's own approach and findings on the health effects of road and rail noise. For clarity, the Environmental Health Officer confirmed the precautionary approach applied, that noise impacts fall below the guidance levels protective of health, and has not indicated any significant health impact from changes in noise.

1.3.17 Dr Buroni expanded the point to explain how a similarly robust health evidence base has been applied for all of the other health pathways assessed.

1.3.18 Dr Buroni was later corrected on one of the health concerns raised by an Mr Cussack, namely how the risk of road traffic accidents was incorrectly inferred for the impact on emergency response (i.e. ambulance response times). Dr Buroni apologised, and explained how emergency response times have also been investigated and while transport delay will not be significant, an Emergency Response Post is included with the Deed of Obligation to support emergency teams and improve emergency response times locally.

(ii) Saturday working at the Associated Development sites

1.3.19 In response to the ExA's question relating to whether Saturday working at the Associated Development sites would be necessary, Mr Langley stated that all works are covered by the COCP in terms of controls, monitoring and mitigation as outlined in the COCP and Construction method Statement. With regard to SZC Co.'s response to **ExQ2 NV.2.1** [[REP7-056](#)], Mr Langley explained that there are significant advantages to Saturday working and clarified that SZC Co. would not want to limit Saturday works to maintenance activities as there may be other quiet works that could be carried out at this time and that having this flexibility would be important. Mr Langley explained that by working on Saturdays (albeit limited to certain quieter activities) delivery can be sped up. Mr Langley committed to providing in writing more detail on the time savings brought about by Saturday working.

1.3.20 *[Please see the Applicant's **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH12** (Doc Ref. 9.105).]*

(iii) Whether extent of construction period and rural nature of the location has properly assessed health impacts of construction and associated activities including traffic

1.3.21 Dr Buroni explained that scope and focus of health assessment has been carried out robustly and agreed through two formal scoping exercises,

through consultation, and ongoing engagement with the Health Working Group. All health concerns have been fully scoped into the assessment, no gaps, flaws or countervailing evidence have been raised by any party.

- 1.3.22 In response to ESC's comments on the process within the Noise Monitoring and Management Plan ('NMMP') regarding the enforcement of noise controls, Mr Rhodes explained that there had been a lot of positive engagement between ESC and SZC Co. and that there were shared views on how the process should work. He stated that SZC Co. had agreed to a lower trigger for main site construction works in the NMMP for the purposes of identifying works which may require a Bespoke Noise Plan; such that more than 50% of the main site construction was likely to be covered by such plans, which would need to be agreed by ESC. The process for approving and enforcing those plans had been drafted to be as effective as possible and he welcomed ESC's comments that the approvals and dispute resolution process are acceptable and possibly even an improvement on the statutory alternative under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act. In response to ESC's concern that it may nevertheless prefer the s.61 process for enforcement, Mr Rhodes pointed out that the enforcement powers under the Control of Pollution Act are not disapplied. SZC Co. will discuss these issues further with ESC but, properly understood, the draft NMMP provisions involve all the enforcement powers of the Control of Pollution Act.
- 1.3.23 In response to Interested Parties' comments on the Property Price Support Scheme, Mr Rhodes explained that this had not been submitted to the ExA as it is not considered to be a planning consideration to which weight should be attached but that any concerns would be taking into account by SZC Co.
- 1.3.24 Mr Brownstone confirmed that SZC Co.'s position on the application of the guidance in Annex E.5 of BS5228² in terms of controlling construction noise at the main development site in the evening period was set out in response to question NV.2.0 in the Examining Authority's second set of questions [[REP7-054](#), electronic page 1] and in its written submissions following ISH8 in section 1.6(b)(iii) [[REP7-071](#), electronic page 13]. In summary, SZC Co.'s position is that setting construction noise thresholds relative to a low background noise level is overly-restrictive.
- 1.3.25 Mr Brownstone stated that a discussion was due to be imminently held with ESC to discuss whether the eligibility thresholds in the NMS for the main development site could be reduced in recognition of the duration of the works. Subject to agreeing two points, SZC Co.'s view was that such a change was reasonable. The two points that required agreement were that

² British Standard BS5228-1: 2009+A1: 2014 Code of Practice for noise and vibration control at open construction sites – Noise

the change would only apply to construction at the main development site, since the Associated Development sites were not of a similar duration, and that the temporary rehousing thresholds in the NMS for the main development site would not be similarly reduced, since they were linked to short-term events and the high noise levels necessary to trigger eligibility for temporary rehousing were not likely to occur over the long periods of time.

1.3.26 The reduced noise thresholds for the eligibility of insulation for the main development site in the NMS were likely to be linked to the Category A values in BS5228-1 and would be approximately 10dB lower than the current values in the NMS.

1.3.27 In response to points raised by Interested Parties in relation to rat-running, Ms McMullen explained that this has been addressed in a number of ways through mitigation. The Construction Worker Travel Plan has a parking permit system for those workers who live within the A12 corridor and for those who live outside there is the park and ride which together acts as embedded mitigation to reduce trips on the existing local network. In addition, there is a Contingency Fund available for the Transport Review Group ('TRG') to draw down on and this can be used to address unmitigated significant adverse impacts on rural roads. Finally, Ms McMullen pointed out that proposed updates to the Traffic Incident Management Plan ('TIMP') in relation to scenario planning were provided at Deadline 7 [[REP7-062](#)] with the updated TIMP itself to be submitted at Deadline 8.

(iv) How has regard been paid to the protection of residential gardens from construction activities, and the subsequent operation of the site

1.3.28 In response to ESC's comments that there are no construction noise mitigation options for gardens, Mr Brownstone made the following points:

- the relevant British Standard defines what it regards as a noise sensitive premises to include gardens, so they are already taken into account in the applicable criteria;
- the CoCP and NMMP include measures that are intended to mitigate noise levels generally, and will benefit both internal parts of receptors and their outdoor areas;
- the bespoke mitigation plan which forms part of the NMMP process requires SZC Co. to discuss and agree mitigation with ESC when the noise levels are above 55dB, which is an appropriate limit for gardens;

- it is not agreed that an operational noise limit is appropriate and the reasons for this are set out in section 1.7 of SZC Co.'s written submissions following ISH8 [\[REP7-071\]](#), electronic page 15.

1.3.29 In any event, if an operational noise limit was to be considered necessary, the values discussed at ISH8 were night-time limits, so would not be relevant to the protection of gardens during the daytime and were highly likely to be set at a value that is below the criterion routinely applied to garden areas.

1.4 Agenda Item 4: Effects on Public Rights of Way and Non-Motorised Users and understanding of implications for people with protected characteristics.

(i) Suffolk Coast Path alignment

1.4.1 In response to SCC's comments on the permanent realignment of PRoW E-363/021/0 to the east of the hard sea defence Mr Brashaw explained that SZC Co. has undertaken design work recently which has identified that, through the **Coastal Process Management and Mitigation Plan (CPMMP)** [\[REP5-059\]](#), PRoW E-363/021/0, the Suffolk Coast Path, the future England Coast Path and Sandlings Walk (which are proposed to follow the same route along the coast through the main development site and are, hereafter, referred to as the Coast Path) will not be eroded during the lifetime of Sizewell C, and SCC's concerns can now be alleviated. SZC Co. will update the CPMMP to confirm a commitment to monitor and retain the Coast Path. There is no reason, based on SCC's concerns, that the Coast Path should not be on the alignment proposed by SZC Co.

1.4.2 Mr Brashaw explained that the Coast Path is proposed to run along the flatter land east of the hard sea defence, where the landscaped hard sea defence will screen lower level buildings and structures within the power station, allowing people to enjoy the coastal landscape and minimise intrusion by the power station. This is similar to the existing Coast Path and coastal defence alongside Sizewell B. This design approach is described at paragraph 6.12.7 and illustrated on Figures 6.14 and 6.15 of the **Design and Access Statement** submitted at Deadline 5 [\[REP5-070\]](#).

1.4.3 SZC Co will also provide an alternative informal footpath along the top of the hard sea defence, which will be within the permanent coastal margin (permanent accessible coastline which is being established by Natural England) which will be available to use at all times.

1.4.4 The proposed Coast Path route east of the hard sea defence will be at a higher elevation than the current elevation of the PRoW and Coast Path

within the main development site, and the existing PRoW and Coast Path to the north and south of the main development site. In extreme storm events it is possible that the PRoW and Coast Path to the north and south would be eroded whilst the proposed permanent Coast Path within the main development site would not. The longer route to the north and south is, therefore, likely to become unusable before the route within the main development site has potential to be eroded.

- 1.4.5 In terms of temporary closure of the Coast Path, Mr Brashaw explained that it would be kept open at all times other than when unsafe to do so. There is the potential for the inland diversion to include a section along Eastbridge Road. This is part of Sandlings Walk which is an already promoted route and it is notable that there have been no recorded accidents on Eastbridge Road in the last 20 years.
- 1.4.6 In response to an Interested Party's comment on whether a risk assessment has been undertaken for use of the Coast Path during construction by horse riders, Mr Brashaw committed to providing a response in writing.
- 1.4.7 *[Please see the Applicant's **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH12** (Doc Ref. 9.105).]*
- 1.4.8 Mr Brashaw noted that ExQ.3.0 asks about equestrians having to dismount to ensure safe crossing underneath the permanent BLF, and explained that riders will be able to ride along the coast and pass the permanent BLF when the deck is in place, without dismounting if they wish to do so, by following the Coast Path which will pass across the access road to the BLF, and not under the deck. The **Rights of Way and Access Strategy** submitted at Deadline 8 (Doc. Ref. 6.3 15I(D)) has been revised to make this clearer.
- 1.4.9 HPQC explained that the Rights of Way Plan which shows the Coast Path alignment includes an annotation in the notes which states that the alignment will be fixed under Requirement 12B which secures the detailed design of the Hard Coastal Defence Feature which is to be approved by ESC. However, Requirement 6A provides that no new or diverted public right of way may be carried out until a Public Right of Way Implementation Plan has been approved by SCC. HPQC explained that SZC Co. would give further consideration as to whether the final alignment should be subject to the approval of SCC or ESC, and whether this should be reflected in a change to the wording of one of those two requirements to clarify their scope (or alternatively in a new requirement simply dealing with the alignment of that right of way).

(ii) Temporary closures of the Coast Path and diversion inland

- 1.4.10 Mr Brashaw explained that SZC Co. has sought to minimise temporary closures of the Coast Path and the need for temporary inland diversions (which would pass along the section of Eastbridge Road referred to by Suffolk County Council), and will continue to do so throughout the pre-construction and construction phases. As noted in **Volume 1 Chapter 2 of the ES Addendum [AS-181]** further detailed design work, which has been carried out since the submission of the Application, has identified measures which would enable the Coast Path to remain open during construction, except in rare circumstances where it is considered unsafe to do so. This has enabled potential closures to be significantly reduced from the assumption within the original DCO that it would be closed for approximately six months during construction of the permanent BLF (Description of Construction (paragraph 3.4.56 of **Volume 2, Chapter 3 of the ES [APP-184]**))
- 1.4.11 It would therefore now remain open for substantially more of the construction period than assumed in the submitted Application. However, shorter term temporary closures and inland diversions during the construction phase remain possible, which includes diversion onto the section on Eastbridge Road between the northern end of the accommodation campus and Eastbridge, a length of approximately 740m (see Figure 15I.2 of the **Rights of Way and Access Strategy [REP7-023]** (a further revision will submitted at Deadline 8 (Doc. Ref. 6.3 15I(D))).
- 1.4.12 The Coast Path would be inspected and maintained weekly during any activity which would affect the condition of the footpath and thereafter annually to identify areas for repair when no works are taking place. This inspection would also occur after significant storm and flood events, as this could impact the surfacing of the path.
- 1.4.13 If closures do occur, advance notification of any closures, and of the alternative inland route, will be publicised through a number of means which will be agreed with stakeholders.
- 1.4.14 Some of the people who are aware of the diversion and continue to walk this section of the Coast Path will be aware that they need to walk on Eastbridge Road, and chose to do so.
- 1.4.15 Walkers would be diverted onto a section of Eastbridge Road which is already a promoted long-distance walk – the Sandlings Walk. Sandlings Walk is a 96km long distance walking route between Ipswich and Southwold which links the remaining fragments of Sandlings Heath, following PRow, local roads and the accessible coastline.

- 1.4.16 For the majority of the construction phase the Sizewell C Project is likely to lead to fewer walkers on this section of Eastbridge Road because use by walkers of Sandlings Walk would cease for the majority of the construction phase:
- Sandlings Walk currently runs along this section of Eastbridge Road. For the duration of the construction phase (except when the Coast Path within the main development site is temporarily closed) Sandlings Walk would be diverted northwards along the coast north of the main development site and west along PRow E-363/020/0 to Eastbridge, avoiding this section of Eastbridge Road north of the campus, as shown on Figure 15l.1 in the **Rights of Way and Access Strategy** [[REP7-023](#)].
- 1.4.17 The safety risks to pedestrians on Eastbridge Road is low. There have been no recorded accidents in the last 20 years. There is no need to mitigate for this low risk. However, SZC Co. has agreed to monitor pedestrian use to identify if temporary closures of the Coast Path during construction lead to increase in walkers on Eastbridge Road, and if this leads to risks to pedestrian safety, and to implement mitigation measures which would be put in place should this occur.
- 1.4.18 In addition, SCC has defined the off-road footpath as an improvement within the PROW Fund in the Deed of Obligation Schedule 16 paragraph 16. Therefore, should Suffolk County Council consider an off-road solution is appropriate, funds have been provided to promote that. SZC Co. note SCCs legacy wish.
- (iii) *Bridleway 19*
- 1.4.19 Mr Brashaw confirmed that SZC Co. is proposing a new safe off-road route and that there is a commitment through the drafting of the DCO that the Bridleway 19 diversion will be in place before the existing route is stopped up. Mr Brashaw committed to providing an answer in writing to explain this more fully, and to explain how users of the existing Bridleway 19 route would be safe from construction activities before the diversion is available, and how users of the diversion would be safe, due to both lying within the construction site. HPQC added that SZC Co. would also set out in a written note the detail of what the public rights of way improvements will be so that the ExA can better understand what the financial contributions are expected to deliver.
- 1.4.20 *[Please see the Applicant's **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH12** (Doc Ref. 9.105).]*

- 1.4.21 In response to a concern raised by an Interested Party regarding the adequacy of Pegasus crossings for horse riders at the roundabout on the B1122 at the entrance to the main development site, Mr Brashaw committed to responding in writing regarding the suggestion of an underpass instead. Mr Brashaw pointed out that the Pegasus crossings have been agreed with Suffolk County Council through the Rights of Way and Access Strategy [[REP7-023](#)].
- 1.4.22 *[Please see the Applicant's **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH12** (Doc Ref. 9.105).]*
- 1.4.23 In response to a concern expressed by Suffolk County Council that Bridleway 19 would be diverted onto Eastbridge Road, Mr Brashaw stated that this is not the case. The northern end of Bridleway 19 stops at Eastbridge Road. SZC Co. would be providing a permanent safe off-road route for users of Bridleway 19 (E-363/019/0) and Bridleway 13 (E-363/013/0) within Aldhurst Farm, where they currently run along the carriageway of Lover's Lane (see Figures 15l.1, 15l.2 and 15l.3 of the **Rights of Way and Access Strategy**).
- (iv) B1122 in the early years*
- 1.4.24 In response to concerns raised about road safety issues arising in the early years before the Sizewell Link Road has been constructed, Ms McMullen explained that SZC Co. is intending to append a set of outline plans for the B1122 early years scheme to the final Deed of Obligation. Constructive meetings are being held with stakeholders, including a meeting with Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council and SCC last week. The scheme currently includes a pedestrian crossing and footway improvements in Theberton, as well as village gateways for Theberton and Middleton Moor. A reduction in speed limits in Middleton Moor and Theberton have been suggested by the parish councils and would be supported by SZC Co. but it will be necessary to liaise with Suffolk County Council on this. In terms of the scheme delivery, all of the works would be within the highway boundary and would not require any third-party land, they would be fully funded by SZC Co. and they would not be subject to a further consent process. SZC Co. will enter into a S278 agreement with SCC to deliver the scheme.
- 1.4.25 Mr Rhodes added that the consequence of delaying the construction of the main site until the Sizewell Link Road was complete would be a circa two-year delay to delivery of urgent national infrastructure. He agreed that the link road should be provided as early as practical but suggested that the environmental effects during that early year period were not so severe on the B1122 communities that the entire project should be delayed. He noted that this was also the position of the public authorities. SZC Co.'s approach

to transport caps is aimed to mitigate impacts in the early years, along with the commitment to noise mitigation and to other local measures and it is also relevant to recognise that the link road will bring transformative long term, lasting legacy benefit for the B1122 communities.

- 1.4.26 HPQC explained that there should be no doubt that appropriate mitigation measures can be devised in detail pursuant to the mechanisms set out in the Deed of Obligation/DCO. There is no difficulty in principle for the implementation of road safety measures as they are not novel, no third-party land is required, and no separate consents are required as the powers for SCC already exist and/or equivalent powers are provided for within the DCO, and funding for the implementation of these measures is provided under the Deed of Obligation. HPQC submitted that the mitigation package should be treated as a material consideration with significant weight attached to it in the planning balance.

(v) Other rights of way

- 1.4.27 In response to a comment by the RSPB regarding the location of Sandlings Walk to clarify whether this will be relocated from the Applicant's to RSPB land as stated in their Deadline 6 Submission - Comments on any additional information/submissions received by D5 [REP6-046] (paragraph 3.2), Mr Brashaw committed to providing a response at a future examination deadline.
- 1.4.28 In response to a request made by Suffolk County Council that the route of Sandlings Walk should be designated a formal public right of way as a legacy benefit of the Project rather than a permissive footpath, Mr Brashaw explained that SZC Co.'s proposals with regard to Sandlings Walk are set out in the Rights of Way and Access Strategy [REP7-023]. Mr Brashaw committed to providing a response in writing regarding the permissive path status of Sandlings Walk and whether it would be possible to provide this as a formally designated public right of way.
- 1.4.29 *[Please see the Applicant's **Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH12** (Doc Ref. 9.105).]*

1.5 **Agenda Item 5: Cumulative Impacts on Health and Well Being**

(i) Suitability of assessment and understanding of the broader effects on health and well being including any effects of economic displacement and provision of social care and community health provision

- 1.5.1 Mr Humphrey explained that estimates of temporary population increase, and an assessment of subsequent demand on services has been considered and is set out within **Volume 2, Chapter 9** of the ES [APP-195].

This is underpinned by a series of detailed project assumptions in **Appendices 9A to 9D of Volume 2, Chapter 9** of the ES [\[APP-196\]](#) which set out how that temporary increase in population has been addressed, how it's been modelled in terms of its size, location, and its net additionality. Those calculations and assumptions on net additionality have helped SZC Co. to work with the local authorities to develop a position on impacts on public services and the appropriate level of mitigation for them.

1.5.2 This is mainly set out in **Schedule 5** of the **Draft Deed of Obligation** [\[REP7-040\]](#) which is agreed with ESC and SCC and covers several aspects of demand for adult social care, children and young people's services, outreach in terms of community services, school places, and resilience within schools. This represents a comprehensive and precautionary package that is related to the net additional population (which is necessary to bring with us to deliver the project) quantitatively.

1.5.3 Dr Buroni explained that the Sizewell C Project's benefits may actually help reduce demand on social care services (by increasing employment, and the proportion of working age residents – as c. 70% of SCC's spend on adult social care is on older people). SZC Co. considers that it is not the role of the planning system or the Sizewell C Project to mitigate for underlying issues of recruitment and retention of workforce in the care sector which is fragile due to low pay, anti-social hours and high turnover. SZC Co. recognises that there is potential for workers in these sectors to seek employment on the Sizewell C Project. This is a positive benefit for the workers, and a normal part of labour market churn that all employers are subject to.

1.5.4 Dr Buroni explained that, nonetheless, given the importance of the sector, SZC Co. has committed to providing funding of £100,000 for resilience measures to support resilience in workforce planning within SCC's Adult Social Care and Children's Services including support for recruitment, training and retention of staff as set out through the Public Services Resilience Fund at Schedule 5 of the Draft Deed of Obligation [\[REP7-040\]](#). This is agreed with SCC. In addition, as set out in Schedule 5 of the Draft Deed of Obligation [\[REP7-040\]](#), SZC Co. has agreed: a fund of up to c. £2.5m to provide resilience to the ability for SCC to commission Home Care services in an area which SCC consider may be sensitive to change around the Sizewell C Project; and funding for any uplift in demand for Community Health Visitor services.

(ii) Whether a sufficiently holistic view has been taken to bring together an understanding of the cross-topic concerns on health and well being and as such sufficient/appropriate mitigation has been identified

- 1.5.5 Mr Humphrey explained that the economic effects of the Sizewell C Project are substantially beneficial, even without the enhancement that is committed to at **Schedule 7** of the **Draft Deed of Obligation** [REP7-040]. As a direct result of the Project, there would be the creation of a range of job roles and local people would be able to gain skills.
- 1.5.6 The addition of skills, and the opportunity that is being afforded to young people leaving education and moving into the workplace is a once in a lifetime opportunity for people to gain skills and sustainable employment and long term employment on the project, and it will help to reverse the current productivity declines which being led by the pandemic and Brexit and other interventions in the market.
- 1.5.7 **Schedule 7** of the **Draft Deed of Obligation** [REP7-040] sets out measures to reach those furthest from the labour market to get them into work, and to encourage people to stay in the area have long term jobs.
- 1.5.8 This is a demonstrable benefit, and the 'fleet effect' of Hinkley Point C can already be seen in action in terms of the apprenticeship strategy, which is working with local colleges to make sure that the people going through the pipeline of education and further education have the ability to gain employment at the end of their education.
- 1.5.9 SZC Co. does understand that labour market churn is a concern and has included some significant interventions within **Schedule 7** of the **Draft Deed of Obligation** [REP7-040] to address those for example through the Sizewell C Jobs Service.
- 1.5.10 Mr Humphrey summarised the extensive mitigation/funds drafted into the Deed of Obligation and concurred with SCC that there was broad agreement with SCC on this.
- 1.5.11 Dr Buroni was asked to respond to a concern raised regarding the lack of dentistry capacity locally, and a broader point raised by Mrs Pilkington on the impact on local health care capacity. On the former, Dr Buroni explained how there is a lack of local dentist capacity, where calling every dentist within 20 miles of the site would indicate none are accepting any NHS patients; only one was putting people on a waiting list; and the pandemic has only exacerbated the issue.
- 1.5.12 Even if there was capacity, non-home-based staff will not be giving up their home dentists and seeking to enrol or book routine check-ups around the

project, and at most, would only seek emergency dental work, most of which would not be through an NHS appointment, but paid privately by the individual. On this basis, there is no impact on local NHS dentistry, and in the rare instance an emergency dental procedure is required, it is paid privately.

- 1.5.13 Dr Buroni went on to explain the Sizewell C Health care offering, and how it is open to both home and non-home based staff alike, including health screening, Nurse and GP led services, pharmacy, physio, sexual health and a range of occupational health care services. The service is proven effective, not only in internalising public health care demand for the non-home-based staff, but affording significant complementary public health care, freeing up GP spaces and reducing cost to public health teams.
- 1.5.14 Dr Buroni ran through the insignificant residual impact on local health care, and the voluntary health care planning contributions and further explained the additional voluntary contribution offered to address the delay in NHS budget allocation for dependents, irrespective of net additionality.
- 1.5.15 Dr Buroni further expanded on the funded Health and Wellbeing Officer post, and how the post in combination with ongoing engagement with health stakeholders is to not only test the mitigation in place, but ensure the provision evolves and adapts to local public health priorities as they may change, and to align with health promotion initiatives and campaigns.
- 1.5.16 Dr Buroni discussed how the Hinkley Health provision not only weathered the pandemic, but built in local health care resilience, where PPE sanitizer and even food was shared with Nursing Homes, Emergency Services and Hospitals; the construction teams laid the foundation to an emergency mortuary, and the construction staff were channelled into community support.
- 1.5.17 Dr Buroni concluded that the offering at Sizewell builds on and surpasses that of Hinkley, redefines DCO best practice, and supports post pandemic economic recovery.

1.6 Agenda Item 6: Monitoring and Controls

(i) Latest position on Community Fund, Public Services Resilience Fund and Natural Environment Funds

- 1.6.1 This agenda item was not covered and SZC Co. committed to providing an update in writing.
- 1.6.2 ***[Please see the Applicant's Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH12 (Doc Ref. 9.105).]***



SIZEWELL C PROJECT –
WRITTEN SUMMARIES OF SZC CO.'S SUBMISSIONS
AT ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 12

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

1.7 Agenda Item 7: Any Other Matters

1.7.1 None.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED