



The Sizewell C Project

6.19 Fifth Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 1: Main Text

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

September 2021

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



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	REDUCTION OF ORDER LIMITS	2
2.1	Description of the Reduction of Order Limits.....	2
2.2	Review of the Environmental Assessments	5
3	CONCLUSION	14

TABLES

Table 2.1: Reduction of Order limits at fen meadow habitat sites	3
Table 2.2: Review of environmental assessments	5

PLATES

None provided.

FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Revised Pakenham fen meadow site boundary
Figure 2.2 Revised Halesworth fen meadow site boundary
Figure 2.3 Revised Benhall fen meadow site boundary
Figure 2.4 Revised Sizewell link road site boundary
Figure 2.5 Revised green rail route site boundary.

APPENDICES

None provided.

1 INTRODUCTION

a) Background

- 1.1.1 NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') submitted an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) to the Planning Inspectorate under the Planning Act 2008 for the Sizewell C Project in May 2020 (referred to as the 'Application'). The Application was accompanied by an **Environmental Statement ('ES')** [APP-159 to APP-582].
- 1.1.2 SZC Co. submitted a request to change the Application in January 2021, with 15 changes proposed across the proposed development. This request was accompanied by an addendum to the ES, referred to as the '**First ES Addendum**' [AS-179 to AS-292]. These 15 changes were accepted for examination by the Examining Authority in April 2021 (referred to as the 'Accepted Changes (April 2021)').
- 1.1.3 The **First ES Addendum** also considered any 'Additional Information' submitted by SZC Co. during the pre-examination stage. The 'Additional Information' has been provided to support the Application and assist Interested Parties in their understanding of matters.
- 1.1.4 As a result of the ongoing engagement between SZC Co. and stakeholders, including as part of the process of agreeing common ground and ongoing design development, SZC Co. subsequently identified three further proposed changes ('Proposed Changes 16 to 18'). These changes were accepted for examination by the Examining Authority in August 2021 (referred to as the 'Accepted Changes (August 2021)'). The change request was accompanied by a '**Second ES Addendum**' [REP5-062 to REP5-069].
- 1.1.5 At Deadline 6, SZC Co. submitted a **Third ES Addendum** [[REP6-017](#)] to present corrections to road traffic noise modelling for road links associated with the two village bypass, Sizewell link road, Yoxford roundabout and other highway improvements, and an assessment of any new or different significant effects that are likely to result from these corrections.
- 1.1.6 At Deadline 7, SZC Co. submitted a **Fourth ES Addendum** [REP7-030 to REP7-033] to present an assessment of any new or different significant effects that are likely to result from any Additional Information that has been submitted by SZC Co. over the course of the examination and a further proposed change to the Application to provide for a temporary desalination plant at the main development site (referred to as 'Proposed Change 19'). The Proposed Change 19 was accepted for examination by the Examining

Authority in September 2021 (referred to as the ‘Accepted Change (September 2021)’).

b) Purpose of the Fifth ES Addendum

1.1.7 The purpose of this **Fifth ES Addendum** is to present a review of changes required to environmental assessments as a result of the reduction of the Order limits at the Pakenham, Halesworth, and Benhall fen meadow sites, Sizewell link road, and the green rail route.

1.1.8 There are no other updates required to the environmental assessments presented within the **Environmental Statement (ES)** [APP-159 to APP-582], as updated by the subsequent **ES Addenda** [AS-179 to AS-292, REP5-062 to REP5-069, [REP6-017](#) and REP7-030 to REP7-033], as a result of the submissions made by SZC Co. at Deadline 8.

2 REDUCTION OF ORDER LIMITS

2.1 Description of the Reduction of Order Limits

2.1.1 SZC Co. proposes to reduce the Order limits to remove in part:

- land at Pakenham, Halesworth and Benhall which is within the current Order limits in connection with the proposed provision of fen meadow habitat;
- land on the highway boundary to the B1122 and the Theberton House Estate which is within the current Order limits in connection with the proposed Sizewell link road; and
- land at Aldhurst Farm Cottages, adjacent to Abbey Lane which is within the current Order limits in connection with the proposed green rail route.

2.1.2 These changes are further described in sections below.

a) Reduction of Order Limits at Fen Meadow Sites

2.1.3 The reduction of the Order limits at the fen meadow sites is shown on the following figures in **Volume 2** of this **Fifth ES Addendum**:

- **Figure 2.1** Revised Pakenham fen meadow site boundary;
- **Figure 2.2** Revised Halesworth fen meadow site boundary; and

- **Figure 2.3** Revised Benhall fen meadow site boundary.

- 2.1.4 The hydrological studies reported in the **Fen Meadow Plan Report 1 Baseline Report Part 1** [REP3-051] and **Part 2** [REP3-052] and **Fen Meadow Plan Draft 1** [REP6-026] have allowed SZC Co. to identify with greater certainty the specific location of the proposed areas for the creation of fen meadow habitats, the necessary access routes, compound and buffer areas at Pakenham, Halesworth and Benhall sites. This means that the Order limits can be reduced to exclude land that is not required for these works. The reduction in Order limits across the three sites does not represent a reduction in the extent of fen meadow habitat creation.
- 2.1.5 A summary of the total site areas currently in the Application and the revised site areas taking into account the reductions to the Order limits is provided within **Table 2.1** below.
- 2.1.6 **Figures 2.1 to 2.3** amend the site boundaries of the proposed fen meadow sites presented in the **ES** [APP-159 to APP-582] and the subsequent **ES Addenda** [AS-179 to AS-292]. The Figures identify in green the areas no longer proposed to be included in the Order.

Table 2.1: Reduction of Order limits at fen meadow habitat sites

Site	Site area in the Application	Site area with the revised Order limits
Pakenham	32.8ha	10.4ha
Halesworth	4.7ha	3.4ha
Benhall	12.4ha	7.2ha

- b) **Reduction of Order Limits at Sizewell link road**

- 2.1.7 The reduction of the Order limits at the Sizewell link road is shown on the following figure in **Volume 2** of this **Fifth ES Addendum**:
- **Figure 2.4** Revised Sizewell link road site boundary.
- 2.1.8 As part of the ongoing land acquisition discussions, the owners of the land at Theberton House have requested the removal of this strip of their land

from the Order limits, part of which was included in the Application for the tying-in of the Sizewell link road with the B1122. The strip forms part of the boundary between the owners' land and the highway (B1122).

- 2.1.9 The owners have informed SZC Co. that they wish to retain the land along this boundary to ensure the land can maintain its landscape screening function for the dwelling from the adjacent highway.
- 2.1.10 Following further technical analysis of this land and a site visit with the owners, SZC Co. has concluded that it is feasible to reduce the Order limits by the extent indicated in **Figure 2.4** without this affecting the ability to carry out the proposed construction works for the Sizewell link road.
- 2.1.11 The total site area of Sizewell link road has therefore been revised from 109.5ha to 109.0ha.
- 2.1.12 **Figure 2.4** amends the site boundary of any Sizewell link road figures presented in the **ES** [APP-159 to APP-582] and the subsequent **ES Addenda** [AS-179 to AS-292, REP5-062 to REP5-069].

c) Reduction of Order limits at the green rail route

- 2.1.13 The reduction of the Order limits at the green rail route is shown on the following figure in **Volume 2** of this **Fifth ES Addendum**:
- **Figure 2.5** Revised green rail route site boundary.
- 2.1.14 The current Order limits include a parcel of land highlighted in green on **Figure 2.5** which was expected to be required for construction works in connection with the green rail route in the Application.
- 2.1.15 SZC Co. has been engaging with the owners of this land to acquire the necessary land interests privately. As part of those discussions, and as a result of further technical and design work, it has become apparent that this land is no longer required for the Project. As such, SZC Co. considers that it can remove this area of land from the Order limits.
- 2.1.16 The total site area of the green rail route has therefore been revised from 23.0ha to 21.5ha.
- 2.1.17 **Figure 2.5** amends the site boundary of any green rail route figures presented in the **ES** [APP-159 to APP-582].

2.2 Review of the Environmental Assessments

- 2.2.1 A review of whether the reduction of the Order limits affects the conclusions on likely significant environmental effects has been undertaken by EIA specialists across all technical assessments reported within the **ES**, as summarised in **Table 2.2** below.

Table 2.2: Review of environmental assessments

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
Conventional Waste and Material Resources With reference to Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-193], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].	The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline nor change the quantities of waste generated and materials required by the proposed development. Therefore, the reduction of the Order limits results in no change to the conclusions of the assessments reported within Volume 2, Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-193], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].
Socio-economics With reference to Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-195], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].	The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline nor the workforce estimates during construction or operation. Therefore, the reduction of the Order limits results in no change to the conclusions of the assessments reported within Volume 2, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-195], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].
Transport With reference to Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-198], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181 and REP7-030].	The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline nor the traffic flows associated with the proposed development during construction or operation. As such, the reduction of the Order limits results in no change to the conclusions of the assessments reported within Volume 2, Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-198], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181 and REP7-030].

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Noise and Vibration</p> <p>With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-202], • Volume 2, Appendix 11D of the ES [APP-206], • Volume 6, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-451], • Volume 9, Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-545], and • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181], [AS-185], [AS-188], and [REP7-030]. 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline for noise and vibration. The reduction in the Order limits moves construction activities further away from residential receptors (e.g. from Honey Pot Cottage, Honey Pot Lodge, Watering Farm and Willow Tye at the Benhall fen meadow site, from Old Hall Farm and properties along Fen Road and Broadway Road at the Pakenham fen meadow site, from Theberton House at the Sizewell link road and Aldhurst Farm Cottage at the green rail route). With mitigation in place, as set out in the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 8.11(E)), the residual effects at these properties from construction noise were assessed as minor adverse (not significant) in the ES [APP-202], [APP-206], [APP-451], [APP-545], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181], [AS-185], [AS-188], and [REP7-030]. The reduction of the Order limits results in no change to this conclusion.</p>
<p>Air Quality</p> <p>With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 12 of the ES [APP-212], • Volume 2, Appendix 12D of the ES [APP-214], • Volume 6, Chapter 5 of the ES [APP-454], • Volume 9, Chapter 5 of the ES [APP-548], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181], [AS-185], [AS-188], and [REP7-030]. 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline for air quality. The reduction in the Order limits moves construction activities further away from residential receptors, as explained above. With mitigation in place, as set out in the CoCP (Doc Ref. 8.11(E)), the residual effects at these properties from construction dust were already assessed as negligible (not significant) in the ES [APP-212], [APP-214], [APP-454], [APP-548], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181], [AS-185], [AS-188], and [REP7-030]. The reduction of the Order limits results in no change to this conclusion.</p>

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Landscape and Visual</p> <p>With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 13 of the ES [APP-216], • Volume 2, Appendix 13G of the ES [APP-217], • Volume 6, Chapter 6 of the ES [APP-457], • Volume 9, Chapter 6 of the ES [APP-551], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181], [AS-185], [REP5-069] and [REP7-030]. 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline for landscape and visual impact assessment.</p> <p>With regards to the fen meadow sites, whilst the reduction in the Order limits moves construction activities further away from some visual receptors (including residential receptors, as explained in this table above). Volume 2, Appendix 13G of the ES [APP-217] and Volume 1, Chapter 2 of the First ES Addendum [AS-181] already concluded that there are no significant landscape and visual effects associated with the establishment of the fen meadow sites. This conclusion remains valid.</p> <p>With regards to the reduction of the Order limits at the Sizewell link road, a strip of trees previously proposed to be removed will now be retained, which presents an improvement of the proposals from a landscape perspective. However, Volume 6, Chapter 6 of the ES [APP-457] already accounted for the area to the east, including Theberton House, being screened by a retained tree belt. As such, whilst additional trees will be retained, the conclusion of the assessment that no significant effects occur remains unchanged.</p> <p>With regards to the reduction of the Order limits at the green rail route, the reduction does not materially alter the impacts on landscape character and visual receptors established within Volume 9, Chapter 6 of the ES [APP-551].</p>

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology</p> <p>With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 14 of the ES [AS-033], • Volume 2, Appendix 14D of the ES [APP-265], • Volume 6, Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-461], • Volume 9, Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-555], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, AS-188, REP5-064, REP7-030]. 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline assessment for terrestrial ecology and ornithology.</p> <p>With the reduced land-take, additional areas of existing vegetation will be retained at the fen meadow sites and Sizewell link road. The area removed from the Order limits at the green rail route is agricultural land and, therefore, has limited ecological value. The effects of establishing fen meadow and the construction of the Sizewell link road on existing ecological receptors were assessed as not significant within the ES [AS-033, APP-265, APP-461], as updated by subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, REP5-064, REP7-030]. Whilst additional existing vegetation will be retained, this conclusion remains unchanged. There is also no change to the area of fen meadow to be provided as a result of the reduction to the Order limits, and therefore no change to the operational effects of the proposed development [AS-033, APP-265, AS-181, REP5-064, REP7-030].</p>

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Amenity and Recreation With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 15 of the ES [APP-267], • Volume 2, Appendix 15J of the ES [APP-270], • Volume 6, Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-464], • Volume 9, Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-558], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, REP7-030]. 	<p>There is no material change to the assessment conclusions of transport, noise and vibration, air quality and landscape and visual effects, as a result of the reduction of the Order limits. Furthermore, the reduction of the Order limits does not impact on the public rights of way proposals. As such, the reduction in the Order limits does not alter the baseline nor give rise to any discernible change in the amenity and recreation impacts set out within the ES [APP-267, APP-270, APP-464, APP-558], as updated by subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, REP7-030].</p>

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Terrestrial Historic Environment</p> <p>With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 16 of the ES [APP-272], • Volume 2, Appendix 16F of the ES [APP-275], • Volume 6, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-467], • Volume 9, Chapter 9 of the ES [APP-560], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, AS-188, REP7-030]. 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline assessment for terrestrial historic environment.</p> <p>With a reduced land-take, the reduction of the Order limits decreases the extent of ground disturbance which could impact on heritage assets. With the implementation of a written scheme of investigation, the effects on archaeology were assessed as not significant within the ES [APP-272, APP-275, APP-467, APP-560], as updated by subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, AS-188, REP7-030]. This conclusion remains unchanged. In addition, with no material change to the significance of noise and vibration and landscape and visual effects, the reduction of the Order limits also does not alter the baseline nor give rise to any discernible change in the magnitude of impacts on built heritage assets, compared to those set out within the ES [APP-272, APP-275, APP-467, APP-560], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, AS-188, REP7-030].</p>

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Soils and Agriculture</p> <p>With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 17 of the ES [APP-277], • Volume 2, Appendix 17B of the ES [APP-278], • Volume 6, Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-470], • Volume 9, Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-563], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, AS-185, REP7-030]. 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline assessment for soils and agriculture.</p> <p>Whilst the reduction of the Order limits at the fen meadow sites will reduce the extent of grazing land affected, the effects were already concluded as not significant within the ES [APP-277, APP-278], as updated by subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030]. This conclusion remains unchanged.</p> <p>The reduction of the Order limits at the Sizewell link road does not reduce agricultural land-take. Therefore, there is no change to the Sizewell link road assessment within the ES [APP-470], as updated by subsequent ES Addenda [AS-185, REP7-030]. The reduction of the Order limits at the green rail route removes 1.5ha of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land from the site boundary of the proposed development. Whilst this is an improvement, it does not change the overall effects of the green rail route, as set out within Volume 9, Chapter 10 of the ES [APP-563].</p>
<p>Geology and Land Quality</p> <p>With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 18 of the ES [APP-280], • Volume 2, Appendix 18D of the ES [APP-296], • Volume 6, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-473], • Volume 9, Chapter 11 of the ES [APP-566], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030] 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline nor give rise to any discernible change in the geology and land quality impacts to those set out within the ES [APP-280, APP-296, APP-473, APP-566], as updated by subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030]. There is no change to the source-receptor-pathways considered within the conceptual site model for the proposed development or physical impacts on soils.</p>

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Groundwater and Surface Water With reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2, Chapter 19 of the ES [APP-297], • Volume 2, Appendix 19D of the ES [APP-309], • Volume 6, Chapter 12 of the ES [APP-476], • Volume 9, Chapter 12 of the ES [APP-570], • Subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030] 	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter the baseline nor give rise to any discernible change in the groundwater and surface water impacts to those set out within the ES [APP-297, APP-309, APP-476, APP-570], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030]. There is no material change to drainage proposals, flood risk or water quality impacts identified within the ES.</p>
<p>Marine Environmental Assessments With reference to Volume 2, Chapters 20 to 24 of the ES [APP-311 to APP-337] as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].</p>	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not impact on the marine environment. Therefore, there is no change to the baseline or effects on the marine environment reported within Volume 2, Chapters 20 to 24 of the ES [APP-311 to APP-337], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].</p>
<p>Radiological Considerations With reference to Volume 2, Chapter 25 of the ES [APP-340], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [REP7-030].</p>	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not include works to any facilities associated with activities or processes which involve the handling of radioactive items or material. Therefore, there is no change to the baseline or assessment presented within Volume 2, Chapter 25 of the ES [APP-340], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [REP7-030].</p>

Technical Assessment	Review of whether new or materially different likely significant effects would arise as a result of the reduction of the Order limits
<p>Climate Change With reference to Volume 2, Chapter 26 of the ES [APP-342] as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].</p>	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not result in a change to the quantities of resources required or waste generated as a result of the proposed development, and therefore, has no discernible impact on the greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed development. Furthermore, there is no change to the climate change resilience of the proposed development or in-combination climate impacts, as described within Volume 2, Chapter 26 of the ES [APP-342], and updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].</p>
<p>Major Accidents and Disasters With reference to Volume 2, Chapter 27 of the ES [APP-344] as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030].</p>	<p>The reduction of the Order limits does not alter major accident or disaster hazards or proposed mitigation assessed within Volume 2, Chapter 27 of the ES [APP-344], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP7-030]. Therefore, there is no change to the assessment.</p>
<p>Health and Wellbeing With reference to Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346] as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP6-017, REP7-030].</p>	<p>As no discernible change to the baseline or assessments of socio-economics, transport, noise and vibration, air quality and radiological effects have been identified, the assessment of effects on health and wellbeing also remain as set out within Volume 2, Chapter 28 of the ES [APP-346], as updated by the subsequent ES Addenda [AS-181, REP6-017, REP7-030].</p>

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1.1 A review of whether the proposal to reduce the Order limits at the fen meadow sites at Pakenham, Halesworth and Benhall, Sizewell link road and the green rail route affects the conclusions on likely significant environmental effects has been undertaken. The review concluded that the reduction of the Order limits does not alter the conclusions of any of the environmental assessments reported within the **ES**, as updated by the subsequent **ES Addenda**. The reduction of the Order limits minimises the Sizewell C Project's land take, reduces its impacts and is a positive improvement to the Application. However, the overall conclusions on the likely significant environmental effects presented within the **ES**, as updated by the subsequent **ES Addenda**, remain unchanged.