



The Sizewell C Project

9.10.4 Statement of Common Ground - Environment Agency

Revision: 3.0
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

October 2021

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



SIGNATURES

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed between SZC Co. and The Environment Agency on the day specified below.

Signed: 

Print Name: Simon Barlow

Job Title: Project Manager - Sizewell C Nuclear New Build

Date: 12.10.2021

Duly authorised for and on behalf of The Environment Agency

Signed: 

Print Name: Carly Vince

Job Title: Chief Planning Officer

Date: 12.10.2021

Duly authorised for and on behalf of SZC Co.

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Revision history / Record of comments

Revision	Amendment	By	Date
1.0	Original SZC Co draft	Katy McGuinness	14/07/2018
2.1	Environment Agency, draft scoring for issue SZC Co	Cameron Sked	27/11/2020
2.2	SZC Co removal of cross-out matters in issue table	Katy McGuinness	27/11/2020
2.3	SZC Co update	Katy McGuinness / Steve Mannings	02/02/2021
2.4	SZC Co update	Steve Mannings	24/03/2021
2.5	Environment Agency update	Cameron Sked	30/04/2021
2.6	Final (2nd draft) version for submission at Deadline D2	Steve Mannings / Cameron Sked	28/05/2021
2.7	Update for Deadline D7	Steve Mannings / Cameron Sked	03/09/2021
2.8	Update for Deadline D10	Steve Mannings / Cameron Sked	12/10/2021

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Status of the SoCG	1
1.2	Purpose of this document	1
1.3	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.4	Structure of this Statement of Common Ground	4
2.	POSITION OF THE PARTIES	4

TABLES

Table 2:1: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Land Quality	7
Table 2:2: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Groundwater & Surface Water	8
Table 2:3: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Terrestrial (inc Freshwater) Ecology	100
Table 2:4 Position of the Parties - SZC Co and Environment Agency: Coastal Geomorphology & Hydrodynamics	16
Table 2:5: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Marine Water Quality	22
Table 2:6: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Marine Ecology	27
Table 2:7 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Flood Risk Assessments	34
Table 2:8 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Water Framework Directive Assessment	40
Table 2:9: Position of the Parties – SZC Co and Environment Agency: Eels Regulations Assessment	57
Table 2:10: Position of the Parties – SZC Co and Environment Agency: Waste & Materials Management	58
Table 2:11: Position of the Parties – SZC Co and Environment Agency: Potable & Non Potable Water Supply	57

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG.....	57
---	----

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Status of the SoCG

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of the application for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') to the Planning Inspectorate (hereafter referred to as the 'Examining Authority' ('ExA')) under the Planning Act 2008 ('the Application') for the proposed Sizewell C Project.
- 1.1.2 This updated draft (Version 2.8) of the SoCG for submission at Deadline 10 has been prepared by NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited ('SZC Co.') as the Applicant and The Environment Agency and was agreed on 12th October 2021.

1.2 Purpose of this document

- 1.2.1 The purpose of this SoCG is to set out the position of the parties on all relevant matters relating to the Application, including construction and operation of the nuclear power station and its associated development.
- 1.2.2 This SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the 'Guidance for the Examination of Applications for Development Consent' published in March 2015 by the Department of Communities and Local Government (hereafter referred to as 'DCLG Guidance').
- 1.2.3 Paragraph 58 of the DCLG Guidance states:

'A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence.'
- 1.2.4 The aim of this SoCG is therefore to provide the ExA with a clear position of the extent and status of discussions, and areas of agreement and disagreement, between the parties in relation to the Application.
- 1.2.5 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the DCO application. All documents are available on

the Planning Inspectorate website
<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/the-sizewell-c-project/>).

1.3 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.3.1 SZC Co. has submitted an application for development consent to construct and operate a new nuclear power station, Sizewell C, along with the associated development required to enable construction and operation.
- 1.3.2 The Environment Agency is a statutory consultee, as a prescribed consultee by Applicants under S.42 of the Planning Act 2008, or by the Planning Inspectorate as a consultation body in relation to any EIA scoping.
- 1.3.3 The Environment Agency regulates certain activities that have the potential to harm the environment and people. It decides if relevant environmental permits and other consents and licences should be issued and, if so, what conditions should be applied. It monitors compliance with the permit / licence conditions and takes enforcement action if appropriate.
- 1.3.4 The Environment Agency is a competent authority for the purposes of certain EU Directives and it also maintains an overview of risks to people and the environment from flooding and coastal erosion.
- 1.3.5 The Environment Agency's regulatory, licensing and advisory powers and duties derive (inter alia) from key Acts and Regulations, including:
- Environment Act 1995;
 - Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016;
 - Water Resources Act 1991;
 - Flood and Water Management Act 2010;
 - Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 and Keeping and Introduction of Fish Regulations 2015;
 - The Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008) and secondary legislation made under the PA2008;

- The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017; and
 - The Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017.
- 1.3.6 The Environment Agency's responsibilities align to the terrestrial environment within England. In addition, for regulating emissions to the marine environment, they apply within 3 nautical miles and for Environmental Permitting Regulations up to 12 nautical miles of the coastline.
- 1.3.7 Collectively SZC Co. and the Environment Agency are referred to as 'the parties'.
- 1.3.8 Matters of interest to the Environment Agency which are detailed in Section 2 of this SoCG are as follows:
- Proposed development on the main development site.
 - Proposed development on the associated development sites, including:
 - the northern park and ride at Darsham
 - the southern park and ride at Wickham Market
 - the two village bypass
 - the Sizewell link road
 - the freight management facility
 - the green rail route and other rail improvements
 - and other highway improvements.
 - Land quality
 - Groundwater and surface water; including water quality
 - Terrestrial (incl. freshwater) ecology
 - Coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics
 - Marine water quality
 - Marine ecology

- Flood Risk Assessments (FRA)
- Climate change allowance
- Flood emergency response and contingency plan
- Water Framework Directive (WFD) Assessment
- Eels Regulations Assessment
- Habitats Regulations Assessment
- Waste and Materials Management
- Potable and non-potable Water Supply

1.3.9 In addition, other DCO application documents of interest to the Environment Agency comprise:

- Draft DCO (including the Requirements and DML)
- Deed of Obligation
- Code of Construction Practice
- Mitigation Route Map

1.4 Structure of this Statement of Common Ground

1.4.1 Chapter 2 provides schedules which detail the matters that are agreed between the parties and those where disagreement remains.

1.4.2 **Appendix A** provides a summary of engagement carried out.

2. POSITION OF THE PARTIES

2.1.1 The position of the parties in relation to all matters of interest to the Environment Agency are briefly described in a series of tables as follows:

- Land Quality (Table 2.1)
- Groundwater & Surface Water (Table 2.2)
- Terrestrial (inc Freshwater) Ecology (Table 2.3)

- Coastal Geomorphology & Hydrodynamics (Table 2.4)
- Marine Water Quality (Table 2.5)
- Marine Ecology (Table 2.6)
- Flood Risk Assessment (Table 2.7)
- Water Framework Directive Assessment (Table 2.8)
- Eels Regulations Assessment (Table 2.9)
- Waste & Materials Management (Table 2.10)
- Potable & Non Potable Water Supply (Table 2.11)

2.1.2 In order to provide the ExA with additional clarity, the position of the parties in relation to each of the matters identified has been colour-coded as follows:

	No significant areas of disagreement identified in respect of DCO application and/or change submission(s) and any additional information that has since been provided.
	Technical work / engagement ongoing. Potential significant areas of disagreement remain. [Does not apply to final version]
	Significant areas of disagreement remain between the parties.
	Matters which relate to environmental permits (and other consents and licences). As an environmental regulator the EA will assess the environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions once these are available.

- 2.1.3 The tables only cover those matters of interest to the Environment Agency.
- 2.1.4 The position of the parties in relation to the Draft DCO (including the Requirements and DML), Deed of Obligation, Code of Construction Practice (COCN) and Mitigation Route Map is described for each topic area.
- 2.1.5 The position of the parties takes into account all information submitted by SZC Co up to and including Deadline 9 on 30th September 2021, other than where specified in this document. Where the position of the parties relies on any other information that has been provided by SZC

Co, whether submitted to the ExA following this date, or is yet to submitted to the ExA, this has also been specified. Key engagement activities that are ongoing, or are planned, to resolve areas of disagreement are also identified.

Table 2.1 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Land Quality

Comments	Matter	Doc Ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
PW_LQ1	The mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Parts A, B and C of the Code of Construction Practice .	8.11(A)						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
PW_LQ2	The securing mechanisms to control impacts on geology and land quality on the main development site as detailed in the Mitigation Route Map including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Requirement 5 (PW: Surface and foul water drainage) - Requirement 8 (MDS: Temporary construction-related development) - Requirement 11 (MDS: Approved buildings, structures and plant) - Compliance with Building Regulations, Approved Document C - Nuclear Site Licence - Radioactive Substances Regulations Environmental Permit - COMAH and Hazardous Substances Consent 							No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_LQ4	The assessment of impacts on geology and land quality for the construction and operation of Sizewell C as detailed in section 18.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 18 and Appendices 18B (risk assessment) and 18C (impact assessments) for the main development site and Appendix 18D for the off-site developments.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed

Table 2:2: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Groundwater & Surface Water

Ref.	Matter	Doc ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
PW_GW1	The methodology for the assessment of impacts on groundwater and surface water as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 60 of the ES and section 19.3 of Volume 2 Chapter 19 for the main development site assessment.	6.2 6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
PW_GW2	The mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Parts A, B and C of the Code of Construction Practice .	8.11(E)						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
PW_GW3	The securing mechanisms to control impacts on groundwater and surface water on the main development site as detailed in the Mitigation Route Map including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Deemed Marine Licence Conditions - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Requirement 5 (PW: Surface and foul water drainage) - Requirement 7 (MDS: Water Monitoring and Response Strategy)) - Requirement 8 (MDS: Temporary construction-related development) - Requirement 11 (MDS: Approved buildings, structures and plant) - Requirement 14 (MDS: Landscape works) - Requirement 16 (MDS: Removal and reinstatement) - Compliance with Building Regulations, Approved Document C - Nuclear Site Licence - Construction WDA Permit - Operational WDA Permit - Radioactive Substances Regulations Environmental Permit - COMAH and Hazardous Substances Consent - Compliance with REPIR 	8.12(E) 3.1(I)						No areas of disagreement. EA concerns raised at Deadline 2 were in connection with proposed eel/fish control structures on the diverted Sizewell drain. These would be secured as per summary explanation in Deadline 6 Submission - 9.62 Written Submissions Responding to Actions Arising from ISH7: Biodiversity and Ecology - Parts 1 and 2 (15-16 July 2021) - Revision 1.0 [REP6-002] Appendix A Water Monitoring Summary Note.	Agreed
MDS_GW1	The numerical modelling as detailed in Volume 2 Appendix 19A , to predict the potential change in the water environment resulting from the	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed

Ref.	Matter	Doc ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
	development aspects for the construction and operational phases of the development.								
MDS_GW2	The conceptual site model (CSM) as detailed in in Volume 2 Appendices 19B and 19B1 used to create the numerical groundwater flow model.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_GW3	The surface water conceptualisation model as detailed in Volume 2 Appendix 19E , which describes the baseline hydrology, geomorphology, water quality and ecology and conceptualises how the site functions, and how it would be impacted by the proposed development.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_GW4	The baseline environment for the main development site as detailed in section 19.4 of Volume 2 Chapter 19 and Appendices 19A, 19B and 19B1 of the ES, and in Appendix 19D for the off-site development areas (including off-site sports facilities at Leiston, fen meadow compensation sites south of Benhall and east of Halesworth and, if required, the marsh harrier habitat improvement area (Westleton).	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_GW5	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 19.5 and 19.7 of Volume 2 Chapter 19 for the main development site and Appendix 19D for the off-site developments.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_GW6	The assessment of impacts on groundwater and surface water for the construction and operation of Sizewell C as detailed in section 19.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 19 for the main development site and Appendix 19D for the off-site developments.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_GW7	Proposed realignment works and outline design of Sizewell drain diversion as detailed in Appendix 19C .	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_GW8	The original water monitoring and response strategy for the Sizewell Marshes SSSI, as described in Appendix 19F . Updated within the January PINS submission as Appendix 19F Version 2 to provides further detail on securing the Monitoring Plan and DCO and permitting regime interfaces.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_GW9	The residual effects conclusions as detailed in section in section 19.7 of Volume 2 Chapter 19	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed

Table 2:3: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Terrestrial (inc Freshwater) Ecology

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
PW_TE1	The overarching methodology for the assessment of impacts on terrestrial ecology and as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6J of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.2) [APP-170]..	6.2						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
PW_TE2	The mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Parts A, B and C of the Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 8.11 (A)) [AS-273].	8.11(A)						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
PW_TE3	The securing mechanisms to control impacts on terrestrial ecology on the main development site as detailed in the Mitigation Route Map including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - DCO Articles 14 -16 (Rights of Way) - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Requirement 4 (PW: Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring Plan) - Requirement 5 (PW: Surface and foul water drainage) - Requirement 8 (MDS: Temporary construction-related development) - Requirements 9 (MDS: Construction lighting) 	8.12(A) 3.1 (B)						All matters agreed subject to the EA being reinstated as a named consultee on DCO Requirement 12C(1) – Main Development Site SSSI Crossing which is agreed between the parties. It is agreed that this will be reflected in Draft DCO Revision 11 that is to be submitted at Deadline 10.	Agreed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requirement 15 (MDS: Permanent operational lighting) - Requirement 14 (MDS: Landscape works) - Deemed Marine Licence Conditions - Protected species licences 								
PW_TE4	<p>The securing mechanisms to control impacts on terrestrial ecology on the associated development sites as, relevant and detailed in the Mitigation Route Map including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Requirement 4 (PW: Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring Plan) - Requirement 5 (PW: Surface and foul water drainage) - Requirement 18 (Rail works) - Requirement 19 (AD: Site clearance) - Requirement 20 (AD: Buildings and structures) - Requirement 22 (Highway works) - Requirement 23 (AD: Landscape planting) - Requirement 24 (AD: Removal and reinstatement) - Protected species licences 	8.12(A) 3.1 (B)						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
Main Development Site									
MDS_TE1	The overarching methodology for the assessment of impacts on terrestrial ecology as detailed in Volume 1	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed

	Appendix 6J (Doc Ref. 6.2) [APP-170]) of the ES and section 14.3 of Volume 2 Chapter 14 (Doc Ref. 6.3) [AS-033].								
MDS_TE2	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 14.5 of Volume 2 Chapter 14 ([AS-033] and referenced appendices (e.g. Appendix 14C6A Water Vole Mitigation Strategy) for the main development site and Appendix 14D for the off-site developments.	6.3						The EA's position is that a triple span crossing is still preferred over the single span bridge proposed by the applicant. However, it is agreed that environmental impacts would be reduced to acceptable levels in the applicant's optimised single span crossing design (including removal of the drainage pipe below the temporary construction deck), as shown in the revised plans presented in "Chapter 2.5 Main Development Site: Permanent & Temporary Beach Landing Facility & SSSI Crossing Plans – Plans Not For Approval . Rev 3. Part 2 of 2" (Doc Ref. 2.5(B)) submitted at D7. The updated details would be secured under Requirement 12C.	Agreed
MDS_TE4	The baseline for <i>plants and habitats</i> as detailed in sections 14.7a) and b) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 and Appendix 14B1 and 14B1 (and associated Annexes) of the ES.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_TE5	The assessment of impacts on <i>plants and habitats</i> as detailed in section 14.7c) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 and Appendix 14A3 and 14B1 (Plants and habitats synthesis report) of the ES.	6.3						No areas of disagreement. The EA's concerns at Deadline 2 were in relation to lack of recognition in the ES of impacts on ecological habitats for fish and invertebrates caused by the applicant's original single span bridge proposals, that could lead to habitat fragmentation. These concerns have been addressed by the applicant's optimised design for the SSSI crossing – see MDS_TE2.	Agreed
MDS_TE6	The proposed mitigation measures and monitoring to mitigate impacts on <i>plants and habitats</i> as detailed in section 14.7d) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 and Appendices 14B1 and 14C11 (Deptford Pink) of the ES.	6.3						No areas of disagreement. See MDS_TE5	Agreed
MDS_TE7	The baseline for <i>invertebrates</i> as detailed in section 14.8a) and b) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 and Appendix 14A4 of the ES.	6.3						No areas of disagreement. See MDS_TE5. In addition, the applicant has committed to carry out WFD-compliant aquatic invertebrate surveys, where conditions allow.	Agreed

MDS_TE8	The assessment of impacts on <i>invertebrates</i> as detailed in section 14.8c) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 of the ES.	6.3					No areas of disagreement. See MDS_TE5 & MDS_TE7.	Agreed
MDS_TE9	The proposed mitigation measures and monitoring to mitigate impacts on <i>invertebrates</i> as detailed in section 14.8d) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 and Appendix 14C4 (fen meadow) of the ES.	6.3					No areas of disagreement. See MDS_TE5 & MDS_TE7.	Agreed
MDS_TE10	The baseline for <i>freshwater fish</i> as detailed in section 14.9a) and b) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 of the ES.	6.3					No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_TE11	The assessment of impacts on <i>freshwater fish</i> as detailed in section 14.9c) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 of the ES.	6.3					No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_TE12	The proposed mitigation measures and monitoring to mitigate impacts on <i>freshwater fish</i> as detailed in section 14.9d) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 of the ES.	6.3					No areas of disagreement. See MDS_TE10	Agreed
MDS_TE25	The baseline for <i>mammals</i> as detailed in section 14.14a) and b) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 and Appendix 14A9 (and associated annexes) of the ES.	6.3					No areas of disagreement. See MDS_TE10	Agreed
MDS_TE26	The assessment of impacts on <i>mammals</i> as detailed in section 14.14c) of Volume 2 Chapter 14 of the ES.	6.3					No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_TE27	The proposed mitigation measures and monitoring to mitigate impacts on <i>mammals</i> as detailed in section 14.14d): - Appendices 14C6A and 14C6B for water voles,	6.3					No areas of disagreement. See MDS_TE10	Agreed

	- Appendices 14C10 for otters, of Volume 2 Chapter 14 of the ES.								
Two village bypass									
2VBP_TE1	The baseline environment as detailed in section 7.4 of Volume 5 Chapter 7 and Appendix 7A of the ES.	6.6						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
2VBP_TE2	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 7.5 and 7.7 of Volume 5 Chapter 7.	6.6						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
2VBP_TE3	The assessment of impacts on terrestrial ecology for the construction and operation of the two village bypass as detailed in section 7.6 and 7.8 of Volume 5 Chapter 7.	6.6						SZC Co. Comment Evidence within submitted DCO documents demonstrating that the mammal passage in the eastern culvert is above the level of the 1 in 100 year event with 35% climate change allowance has been highlighted (19/09/21) for consideration. EA Comment We agree that mammal passage mitigation is achievable. Detailed designs are subject to requirements.	Agreed
Sizewell link road (SLR)									
SLR_TE1	The baseline environment as detailed in section 7.4 of Volume 6 Chapter 7 of the ES.	6.7						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
SLR_TE2	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 7.5 and 7.7 of Volume 6 Chapter 7.	6.7						No areas of disagreement. See SLR_TE1	Agreed
SLR_TE3	The assessment of impacts on terrestrial ecology for the construction and operation of the SLR as detailed in section 7.6 and 7.8 of Volume 6 Chapter 7.	6.7						No areas of disagreement. See SLR_TE1	Agreed

Table 2.4: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Coastal Geomorphology & Hydrodynamics

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
MDS_CGH1	The overarching methodology for the assessment of impacts on Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6P and section 20.3 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 of the ES.	6.3						<p>SZC Co Comment: Although some scenarios remain to be tested the overarching methodology used for modelling (XBeach) is agreed as appropriate and the output to date are not disputed. All modelled scenarios tested to date demonstrate that maintenance of the SCDF is viable.</p> <p>EA comment We are supportive of the overarching approach to modelling, as well as many of the conclusions of the assessment, but it is our view that there are a small number of gaps in the work done to date which affect our level of confidence in the conclusions (see other lines below for further details specific to individual elements of the assessment). We understand from discussions with the applicant that work is ongoing to address some of these areas, which we welcome, however this will not be completed until after the close of the DCO Examination.</p>	Not Agreed
MDS_CGH2	The construction mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Part B section 12 of the Code of Construction Practice .	8.11(E)						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_CGH3	The securing mechanisms to control impacts on coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics as detailed in the Mitigation Route Map including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Deemed Marine Licence Conditions, in particular Conditions 11, 17, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 49. 	8.12(F) 3.1(J) 9.31(B) 9.12 (C)						<p>SZC Co Comment: TR544 (D2 and D3) and TR545 (D3) have been provided to the EA (as requested in comment). Securing mechanism is CPMMP to be certified during examination. In relation to the EA's comments on DML Conditions 40 & 41 we will put this request to the MMO, as the competent authority, and respond at Deadline D8. EA added to list of consultees with whom MMO must consult. DML update to be provided at D9</p> <p>EA Comment: EA continue to request to be named consultees on the following DML conditions</p> <p>Condition 17: CPMMP</p>	Agreed

								<p>Condition 40: The proposed condition links to the Coastal Change Management Plan. On this basis, we request the condition is amended to include the Environment Agency as consultee of the detailed information.</p> <p>Condition 41: The proposed condition links to the Coastal Change Management Plan. On this basis, we request the condition is amended to include the Environment Agency as consultee of the detailed information.</p> <p>These matters would be agreed if included in D10 submission</p>	
MDS_CGH4	The baseline characterisation of the Greater Sizewell Bay's (GSB) coastal geomorphology and hydrodynamics relevant to the proposed Sizewell C marine infrastructure as detailed in section 20.4 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A section 3 of the ES.	6.3						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_CGH5	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 20.5 and 20.12 of Volume 2 Chapter 20. In particular the proposed Coastal Monitoring and Mitigation Plan as defined in Condition 17 of the Marine Licence.	6.3 9.31(B) 9.12 (C) 10.5						<p>SZC Co Comment:</p> <p>TR544 (D2 and D3) and TR545 (D3) have been provided to the EA. The updated CPMMP was submitted at D5. Principles of mitigation agreed (mitigation by way of SCDF, its recharge and by-pass); details to be confirmed in CPMMP.</p> <p>SZC Co understand the Environment Agency concerns relate only to the sustainability of the SCDF. All modelled scenarios to date (including for RCP8.5) show maintenance of the SCDF is viable throughout operation and decommissioning. Even if that were not the case, other mitigation including sediment by-passing is proposed to mitigate impacts in coastal geomorphology.</p> <p>EA Comment:</p> <p>We are supportive of the mitigation measures proposed, namely maintenance of the SCDF via recharge, recycling or bypassing in order to maintain a longshore transport corridor across the site, as well as the use of the CPMMP to ensure an adaptive management approach developed in consultation with the Marine Technical Forum. However, it is our view that the modelling has not incorporated the full range of reasonable worst case scenarios (see other lines below for further details specific to individual elements of the</p>	Not Agreed

							assessment), meaning we are unable at this time to conclude that the mitigation approach will be viable for the full duration of the operational and decommissioning phases.	
MDS_CGH6	The assessment of impacts associated with the hard coastal defence feature as described in section 20.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3 9.31(B) 9.12 (C)					<p>SZC Co Comment:</p> <p>1D and 2D modelling was provided at D2 and D3, respectively, and EA provided feedback at D5. EA requested modelling to be extended to beyond 2099 and include assessment using RCP8.5 climate change scenarios. These will be provided at Deadline 7.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates maintenance of SCDF is viable under all scenarios tested to date, including RCP8.5.</p> <p>EA comment:</p> <p>We are pleased to see that modelling has been extended to 2140 and includes the adaptive design under the RCP8.5 sea level projection and we are in agreement with a number of the conclusions in the assessment. However, at this point in time it is our view that the latest modelling work has not yet considered the full range of reasonable worst case scenarios; specifically it does not include additional more severe storm events, or further consideration of the risk posed by one or more storms occurring sequentially without a safe operating window in between for delivery of mitigation measures. We understand from discussions with the applicant that work is ongoing to address some of these areas, which we welcome, however this will not be completed until after the close of the DCO Examination.</p> <p>We do note however that the CPMMP represents an important mechanism to identify and address coastal changes beyond those predicted by the modelling and assessment work, and that this approach is in line with best practice for addressing uncertainty.</p>	Not Agreed
MDS_CGH7	The assessment of impacts associated with the soft coastal defence feature as described in section 20.7 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3 9.31(B) 9.12 (C)					<p>SZC Co Comment:</p> <p>1D and 2D modelling was provided at D2 and D3, respectively, and EA provided feedback at D5. EA requested modelling to be extended to beyond 2099 and include assessment using RCP8.5</p>	Not Agreed

							<p>climate change scenarios. These will be provided at Deadline 7.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates maintenance of SCDF is viable under all scenarios tested to date, including RCP8.5.</p> <p>The SCDF is intended to release material during storms, which will redistribute along adjacent beaches. Impacts from the SCDF itself are considered negligible or beneficial</p> <p>EA comment:</p> <p>We are pleased to see that modelling has been extended to 2140 and includes the adaptive design under the RCP8.5 sea level projection and we are in agreement with a number of the conclusions in the assessment. However, at this point in time it is our view that the latest modelling work has not yet considered the full range of reasonable worst case scenarios; specifically it does not include additional more severe storm events, or further consideration of the risk posed by one or more storms occurring sequentially without a safe operating window in between for delivery of mitigation measures. We understand from discussions with the applicant that work is ongoing to address some of these areas, which we welcome, however this will not be completed until after the close of the DCO Examination..</p> <p>We do note however that the CPMMP represents an important mechanism to identify and address coastal changes beyond those predicted by the modelling and assessment work, and that this approach is in line with best practice for addressing uncertainty.</p>	
MDS_CGH8	The assessment of impacts associated with the beach landing facility as described in section 20.8 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3					<p>SZC Co Comment:</p> <p>1D and 2D modelling was provided at D2 and D3, respectively, and EA provided feedback at D5. EA requested modelling to be extended to beyond 2099 and include assessment using RCP8.5 climate change scenarios. These will be provided at Deadline 7.</p> <p>BLF modelling was provided at PDB. Updated modelling of SCDF as detailed above includes the pared back BLF to road transition and is beneficial.</p>	Agreed

								Modelling demonstrates maintenance of SCDF is viable along entire length including BLF	
								EA comment No areas of disagreement	
MDS_CGH9	The assessment of impacts associated with the nearshore outfalls as described in section 20.9 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_CGH10	The assessment of impacts associated with the offshore cooling water infrastructure as described in section 20.10 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_CGH11	The assessment of combinations of spatially and temporally overlapping marine components as described in section 20.11 of Volume 2 Chapter 20.	6.3 9.31(B) 9.12 (C)						SZC Co Comment: 1D and 2D modelling was provided at D2 and D3, respectively, and EA provided feedback at D5. EA requested modelling to be extended to beyond 2099 and include assessment using RCP8.5 climate change scenarios. These will be provided at Deadline 7. Modelling demonstrates maintenance of SCDF is viable under all scenarios tested to date, including RCP8.5. Environment Agency concerns appear to be solely based on the viability of maintaining the SCDF which is independent of any other element of the project. EA comment: Whilst we are comfortable with the assessments relating to a number of the components of coastal and marine infrastructure (e.g. the BLFs and cooling water infrastructure), we cannot at this time agree with the full assessment of cumulative impacts owing to our residual concerns around the modelling of the coastal defences (see CGH6 & CGH7 for more detail). We recognise that further work is planned to address some of these concerns, which we welcome, however the results of this work will not be available until after the close of the DCO Examination.	Not Agreed
MDS_CGH12	The residual effects of impacts associated with the hard coastal defence feature as described in	6.3 9.31(B) 9.12 (C)						SZC Co Comment: 1D and 2D modelling was provided at D2 and D3, respectively, and EA provided feedback at D5. EA requested modelling to be extended to beyond	Not Agreed

	section 20.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.						<p>2099 and include assessment using RCP8.5 climate change scenarios. These will be provided at Deadline 7.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates maintenance of SCDF is viable under all scenarios tested to date, including RCP8.5.</p> <p>EA comment:</p> <p>As described in our comments on CGH6, we are comfortable with the approach to the assessment and with a number of the conclusions presented in the latest iteration of the modelling work. However, at this point in time it is our view that the assessment has not yet considered the full range of reasonable worst case scenarios; specifically it does not include additional more severe storm events, or further consideration of the risk posed by one or more storms occurring sequentially without a safe operating window in between for delivery of mitigation measures. We understand from discussions with the applicant that work is ongoing to address some of these areas, which we welcome, however this will not be completed until after the close of the DCO Examination.</p> <p>We do note however that the CPMMP represents an important mechanism to identify and address residual effects beyond those predicted by the modelling and assessment work, and that this approach is in line with best practice for addressing uncertainty.</p>	
MDS_CGH13	The residual effects of impacts associated with the soft coastal defence feature as described in section 20.7 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3 9.31(B) 9.12 (C)					<p>SZC Co Comment:</p> <p>1D and 2D modelling was provided at D2 and D3, respectively, and EA provided feedback at D5. EA requested modelling to be extended to beyond 2099 and include assessment using RCP8.5 climate change scenarios. These will be provided at Deadline 7.</p> <p>Modelling demonstrates maintenance of SCDF is viable under all scenarios tested to date, including RCP8.5.</p> <p>EA comment:</p> <p>As described in our comments on CGH7, we are comfortable with the approach to the assessment and with a number of the conclusions presented in the latest iteration of the modelling work. However, at this point in time it is our view that the assessment has not yet considered the full range of reasonable worst case scenarios; specifically it</p>	Not Agreed

								<p>does not include additional more severe storm events, or further consideration of the risk posed by one or more storms occurring sequentially without a safe operating window in between for delivery of mitigation measures. We understand from discussions with the applicant that work is ongoing to address some of these areas, which we welcome, however this will not be completed until after the close of the DCO Examination.</p> <p>We do note however that the CPMMP represents an important mechanism to identify and address residual effects beyond those predicted by the modelling and assessment work, and that this approach is in line with best practice for addressing uncertainty.</p>	
MDS_CGH14	The residual effects of impacts associated with the beach landing facility as described in section 20.8 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_CGH15	The residual effects of impacts associated with the nearshore outfalls as described in section 20.9 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_CGH16	The residual effects of impacts associated with the offshore cooling water infrastructure as described in section 20.10 of Volume 2 Chapter 20 and Appendix 20A.	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

Table 2:5: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Marine Water Quality

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
MDS_MWQ 1	The overarching methodology for the assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6Q and section 21.3 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 of the ES.	6.3	Many of the issues discussed in our remit will fall into the permitting regime.	It would be helpful if the Environment Agency could identify any exceptions that need to be agreed for the DCO. Our engagement within the examination can then target these aspects.	As at D7			EA Comment Matters falling into permitting regime identified in subsequent matters within this section	
MDS_MWQ 2	The construction mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Part B section 12 of the Code of Construction Practice .	8.11(E)	Many of the issues discussed in our remit will fall into the permitting regime.	As per MDS_MWQ1	As at D7			EA Comment Matters falling into permitting regime identified in subsequent matters within this section	
MDS_MWQ 3	The securing mechanisms to control impacts on marine water quality and sediments on the main development site as detailed in the Mitigation Route Map including: - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Deemed Marine Licence Conditions, in particular Conditions 11, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 48 and 49. - WDA (Operational) Permit	8.12(E) 3.1(I)	EA consider amendments are required to DCO/DML					No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_MWQ4	The baseline environment as detailed in section 21.4 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 and Appendices 21A-21F , including: - physical environment (incl. Appendix 21A); - temperature;	6.3	Many of the BEEMS reports in Appendices have been submitted as part of ongoing environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will	As per MDS_MWQ1	As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- salinity (incl. Appendix 21A);- dissolved oxygen (incl. Appendix 21D);- SSC;- nutrient status;- un-ionised ammonia (incl. Appendix 21F);- Priority and other substances (incl. Appendix 21A and B);- sediment quality (incl. Appendix 21D and E);;- trace metal concentrations in the water and sediment; and- polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and contaminants.		assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.						
MDS_MWQ5	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 21.5 and 21.7 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 .	6.3	<p>Many of the of the mitigation measures will be considered as part of ongoing environmental permits determination.</p> <p>As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions(where appropriate) once these are available.</p>	As per MDS_MWQ1	As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
/MDS_MWQ6	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments from dredging activities as described in section 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 .	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_MWQ7	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments during construction of the Beach Landing Facilities as described in section	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21								
MDS_MWQ8	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments during construction of the Combined Drainage Outfall as described in section 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 .	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_MWQ9	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments during construction of the Fish Recovery and Return (FRR) outfalls as described in section 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 .	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_MWQ10	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments during construction of the cooling water intake and outfalls as described in section 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 .	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_MWQ11	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments from discharges from the CDO during construction as described in section 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 and Appendices 21E and 21F .	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.	The construction permitting strategy is under discussion with the EA. No construction permit applications have been submitted to date. In lieu of these can the EA please confirm if it intends to comment on construction related impacts in the examination.	As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MW12	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments from discharges from the CDO during commissioning as described in section 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 and Appendices 21E and 21F .	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	

			applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.						
MDS_MWQ13	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments from discharges during operations from the FRR as described in 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 .	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MWQ14	The assessment of impacts on marine water quality and sediments from discharges during operations from the cooling water outfall as described in 21.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 21 .	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MWQ15	The residual effects from construction impacts on marine water quality and sediments as detailed in section 21.8 of Volume 2 Chapter 21	6.3	EA to confirm whether impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MWQ16	The residual effects from commissioning impacts on marine water quality and sediments as detailed in section 21.8 of Volume 2 Chapter 21	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	

			consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.						
MDS_MWQ17	The residual effects from operational impacts on marine water quality and sediments as detailed in section 21.8 of Volume 2 Chapter 21	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.	As at D7	As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	

Table 2:6: Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Marine Ecology

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
MDS_MEF1	The overarching methodology for the assessment of impacts on marine ecology and fisheries as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6R and section 22.3 of Volume 2 Chapter 22 of the ES.	6.14 6.3 9.110 9.67(A)	The Environment Agency has concerns with some of the methods being used to produce predicted numbers of impinged fish at SZC. We also have concerns with some of the methods and stock areas being used to assess the impact of that impingement on some species of relevance under the WFD and the EIA Regs. We consider assessments should be revised to take account of these concerns.		As at D7			SZC Co remains in disagreement with Environment Agency on methods used for assessment of impacts on fish, in particular use of EAV vs EAV/SPF and scale of assessment and CIMP bulk overflow issue. LVSE mitigation has been conceded to 1:1.. These methods have been agreed with the MMO but not agreed with EA & NE. SZC Co. is not intending to carry out any further work.	Not Agreed
MDS_MEF2	The construction mitigation, management and monitoring measures detailed in Part B section 12 of the Code of Construction Practice .	8.11(E)						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
MDS_MEF4	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 22.5 of Volume 2 Chapter 22 and referenced appendices.	6.3 3.1(J) 8.17(H) 9.89(B) 9.57						SZC Comment: Provision of measures for fish (as described) in the Deed of Obligation agreed. DML Conditions 50 and 51 secure fish monitoring. SZC Maintains position on not installing an AFD system. EA Comment	Not Agreed

	In particular the fish monitoring plan (ML Condition 50).						Although the Environment Agency are unable to advise on the engineering and safety considerations stated with the AFD report, we wish to highlight some concerns regarding the environmental evidence used to preclude the deployment of AFD at Sizewell C and consider further evidence is required.	
							We consider that the scale and impact of impingement of fish has not been quantified with certainty. We do welcome that the applicant has however committed to provide additional mitigation to help offset impacts to fish from the operation of SZC. This is secured by the DCO/DML and Deed of Obligation.	
MDS_MEF5	<p>The securing mechanisms to control impacts on marine ecology and fisheries on the main development site as detailed in the Mitigation Route Map including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DCO Article 3 (Scheme design) - Requirement 2 (PW: CoCP) - Deemed Marine Licence Conditions, in particular Conditions 11, 17, 18, 21, 24, 35, 39, 40, 44, 45, 4, 49 and 50. <p>WDA (Operational) Permit</p>	8.11(E) 8.12(E) 3.1(I)					<p>SZC Comment: EA has been added as named consultees on DML conditions they have requested. DML Conditions and DoO are not disputed</p> <p>EA Comment: We consider that the scale and impact of impingement of fish has not been quantified with certainty. We do welcome that the applicant has however committed to provide additional mitigation to help offset impacts to fish from the operation of SZC. This is secured by the DCO/DML and Deed of Obligation.</p>	Not Agreed
MDS_MEF6	The baseline for <i>plankton</i> as detailed in sections 22.6b of Volume 2 Chapter 22 and Appendices 22A	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination.		As at D7		No further work considered necessary for the examination.	

	(phytoplankton) and 22B (zooplankton) of the ES.		As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.						
MDS_MEE7	The assessment of impacts on <i>plankton</i> as detailed in section 22.6 c) and d) of Volume 2 Chapter 22 and Appendix 22G of the ES.	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MEF8	The proposed mitigation measures and monitoring to mitigate impacts on <i>plankton</i> as detailed in section 22.12 of Volume 2 Chapter 22 .	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MEF9	The residual effects for <i>plankton</i> as detailed in section	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	

	22.13 of Volume 2 Chapter 22		permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.						
MDS_MEF10	The baseline for <i>benthic ecology</i> as detailed in section 22.7 b) Volume 2 Chapter 22 and Appendix 22C of the ES.	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MEF11	The assessment of impacts on <i>benthic ecology</i> as detailed in section 22.7 c) and d) of Volume 2 Chapter 22 and Appendix 22I of the ES.	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	

			these are available.						
MDS_MEF12	The proposed mitigation measures and monitoring to mitigate impacts on <i>benthic ecology</i> as detailed in section 22.12 of Volume 2 Chapter 22 of the ES.	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MEF13	The residual effects for <i>benthic ecology</i> as detailed in section 22.13 of Volume 2 Chapter 22	6.3	Impacts will be consented via environmental permits determination. As an environmental regulator EA will assess these in environmental permit applications and consult on draft decisions (where appropriate) once these are available.		As at D7			No further work considered necessary for the examination.	
MDS_MEF14	The baseline for <i>fish</i> as detailed in section 22.8 b) of Volume 2 Chapter 22 and Appendix 22D of the ES.	6.3	The Environment Agency has concerns with some of the data and methods being used to produce predicted numbers of impinged fish at SZC. We also have concerns with some of the methods and	As per MDS_MEF1	As at D7			SZC Co Comment: As per MDS_MEF1	Not Agreed

			stock areas being used to assess the impact of that impingement on some species of relevance under the WFD and the EIA regs. We consider assessments should be revised to take account of these concerns.						
MDS_MEF15	The assessment of impacts on <i>fish</i> as detailed in section 22.8c) and d) of Volume 2 Chapter 22 and Appendices 22I and 22L of the ES.	6.3	The Environment Agency has concerns with some of the methods being used to produce predicted numbers of impinged fish at SZC. We also have concerns with some of the methods and stock areas being used to assess the impact of that impingement on some species of relevance under the WFD and the EIA regs. We consider assessments should be revised to take account of these concerns.		As at D7			SZC Co Comment: As per MDS_MEF1	Not Agreed
MDS_MEF16	The proposed mitigation measures and monitoring to mitigate impacts on <i>fish</i> as detailed in section 22.12 of Volume 2 Chapter 22 of the ES.	6.3 3.1(J) 8.17(H) 9.89(B)	The Environment Agency has concerns with some of the methods being used to produce predicted numbers of impinged fish at SZC. We also have concerns with some of the					SZC Co Comment: Provision of measures for fish (as described) in the Deed of Obligation agreed. DML Conditions 50 and 51 secure fish monitoring. EA Comment: As per MDS_MEF5	Not Agreed

			methods and stock areas being used to assess the impact of that impingement on some species of relevance under the WFD and the EIA regs. We consider assessments should be revised to take account of these concerns.						
MDS_MEF17	The residual effects for <i>fish</i> as detailed in section 22.13 of Volume 2 Chapter 22	6.3	The Environment Agency has concerns with some of the methods being used to produce predicted numbers of impinged fish at SZC. We also have concerns with some of the methods and stock areas being used to assess the impact of that impingement on some species of relevance under the WFD and the EIA Regs. We consider assessments should be revised to take account of these concerns.	As per MDS_MEF1	As for MDS_MEF17			SZC Co Comment: SZC Co assessments show no impacts on fish. However, provision of mitigation measures for fish (as described) are agreed with the EA and secured in the Deed of Obligation. DML Conditions 50 and 51 secure fish monitoring. EA Comment: As per MDS_MEF5	Not Agreed

Table 2:7 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Flood Risk Assessments

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed	
			D2	D7	D10					
Main development site										
MDS_FRA1	The methodology for the assessment of impacts on on-site and off-site flood risk as detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed	
MDS_FRA2	The methodology for the application of climate change allowance presented in section 4 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed	
MDS_FRA3	The baseline for areas at risk for each flood risk source presented in section 5 of the Flood Risk Assessment .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed	
MDS_FRA4	The assessment of on-site flood risk at the main platform area resulting from all sources of flood risk as presented in section 7 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed	
MDS_FRA5	The assessment of on-site flood risk at the SSSI crossing area resulting from all sources of flood risk as presented in section 8	5.2A 5.2A_Ad	The current design of the SSSI crossing (January 2021 accepted change) is acceptable from					No areas of disagreement It is agreed between the parties that optimised SSSI Crossing design has increased dimensions and that hydraulic performance is captured	Agreed	

	of the Flood Risk Assessment .		a flood risk perspective, but this must be reassessed when the design changes.					within envelope of flood risk assessment. The 'Future Adaptation of the SSSI Crossing on the DCO Submission', Appendix J to [REP5-120] , is accepted.	
MDS_FRA6	The assessment of on-site flood risk at the Temporary Construction Area resulting from all sources of flood risk as presented in section 9 of the Flood Risk Assessment .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_FRA7	The assessment of on-site flood risk at the Land East of the Eastlands Industrial Estate Flood Risk area resulting from all sources of flood risk as presented in section 10 of the Flood Risk Assessment .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_FRA8	The assessment of off-site impact on coastal flood risk resulting from the development as presented in section 11.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad	The floodplain would experience a 0.24m increase in flood depths at tank traps, this must be addressed.					<p>SZC Comment: SZC Co. has received agreement from RSPB for minor increase in residual off-site flood risk within Minsmere (see d10 version of SoCG with RSPB & SWT).</p> <p>EA Comment: The applicant has correctly assessed the off-site impact of coastal flood risk resulting from the development. We accept the conclusions of the Embedded Flood Risk Mitigation Measures report that no further mitigation measures are feasible. The ExA should decide whether the remaining offsite impacts are acceptable.</p>	Agreed
MDS_FRA9	The assessment of off-site impact on flood risk from breach of defences resulting from the development as presented in section	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	11.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment .								
MDS_FRA10	The assessment of off-site impact on fluvial flood risk resulting from the development as presented in section 11.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_FRA11	The assessment of off-site impact on reservoir flood risk resulting from the development as presented in section 11.6 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
MDS_FRA12	The accurate description of residual risk as presented in the Flood Risk Emergency Plan, as provided in the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.2A 5.2A_Ad	The EA is specifically agreeing that the content is based on appropriate information rather than making a judgement on safety. The Emergency Planner and Examining Authority will need to determine whether the Flood Response Emergency Plan is adequate to ensure the safety of the site and occupants in a breach flood event.					No areas of disagreement	Agreed

Two village bypass									
2VBP_FRA20	The methodology for the assessment of impacts on on-site and off-site flood risk as detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.5 5.5Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
2VBP_FRA21	The methodology for the application of climate change allowance presented in section 5 of the Flood Risk Assessment .	5.5 5.5Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
2VBP_FRA22	The baseline for areas at risk for each flood risk source presented in section 4 of the Flood Risk Assessment .	5.5 5.5Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
2VBP_FRA23	The assessment of on-site flood risk at the Two Village Bypass crossing resulting from all sources of flood risk as presented in section 7.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.5 5.5Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
2VBP_FRA24	The assessment of on-site flood risk to the proposed Two Village Bypass carriageway, during the operational phase and after construction is complete, as presented in the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.5 5.5Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
2VBP_FRA25	The assessment of impact on off-site flood	5.5	Landowner agreement to					No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	risk from all sources of flooding resulting from the Two Village Bypass crossing as presented in section 7.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum.	5.5Ad	increased flood risk has been provided to EA. It is for the Examining Authority to determine whether this approach is sufficient in absence of compensatory flood storage.					EA Comment The applicant has correctly assessed the impact of off-site flood risk resulting from the Two Village Bypass crossing. The increased flood depth, hazard and velocity has been accepted by the landowner. It is for the Examining Authority to decide whether further mitigation or flood storage compensation is required.	
2VBP_FRA26	The accurate description of residual risk as presented in the Flood Risk Emergency Plan, as provided in the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum.	5.5 5.5Ad						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
Sizewell link road									
SLR_FRA26a	There are discrepancies between the crossing designs shown in the modelling report and what is represented in the hydraulic model.	5.6 5.6Ad 5.6Ad(A)	There are discrepancies between the crossing designs shown in the modelling report and what is represented in the hydraulic model, particularly at crossings SW1 and SW2. It is unclear whether this is perhaps due to the crossing designs not yet being finalised, but if this is the case then a robust explanation is required to support the conclusions of the fluvial modelling.					No areas of disagreement	Agreed

SLR_FRA27	The methodology for the assessment of impacts on on-site and off-site flood risk as detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.6 5.6Ad 5.6Ad(A)						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
SLR_FRA28	The methodology for the application of climate change allowance presented in the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.6 5.6Ad 5.6Ad(A)						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
SLR_FRA29	The baseline for areas at risk for each flood risk source presented in section 4 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.6 5.6Ad 5.6Ad(A)						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
SLR_FRA30	The assessment of on-site flood risk at the Sizewell Link Road crossings resulting from all sources of flood risk as presented in section 7.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.6 5.6Ad 5.6Ad(A)	Increased flood risk is shown onsite, on land upstream of SLR crossings SW3, SW6 and SW7. Further details are provided in the Written Representation.					No areas of disagreement EA Comment The applicant has clarified that the increased flood risk at crossings SW3 and SW7 is within the development boundary and considered to be acceptable. The increased flood risk at crossing SW6 was a mapping error, and inspection of modelling cross-sections shows that the water remained within the channel in all flood events.	Agreed
SLR_FRA31	The assessment of impact on off-site flood risk from all sources of flooding resulting from the Sizewell Link Road crossings as presented in section 7.3 of the Flood Risk Assessment and as updated by the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum .	5.6 5.6Ad 5.6Ad(A)						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

SLR_FRA32	The accurate description of residual risk as presented in the Flood Risk Emergency Plan, as provided in the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum.	5.6 5.6Ad 5.6Ad(A)						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
-----------	---	--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------	--------

Table 2:8 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Water Framework Directive Assessment

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
Methodology									
WFD1-1	The methodology for the WFD compliance assessment as detailed in Part 1 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
Main development site									
WFD2-1	The screening assessment presented in section 2.3 of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-2	The scoping of impacts of project activities on water body quality elements presented in section 2.4b) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-3	The scoping of impacts of project activities on INNS presented in section 2.4c) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-4	The scoping of impacts of project activities on RBMP improvement or mitigation measures presented in section 2.4d) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	Compliance Assessment.								
WFD2-5	The baseline for quality elements at risk for each water body presented in section 2.5 of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Invertebrates at good in the Leiston Beck, fish at good in the Ore & Alde Updated WFD addendum has made changes	Noted.				No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-6	The assessment of impacts resulting from initial site preparation presented in section 2.5h) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	This will be reassessed once the outstanding information on the coastal defence features has been provided.					No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-7	The assessment of impacts resulting from earthworks for platform development presented in section 2.5i) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-8	The assessment of impacts resulting from the construction of marine structures presented in section 2.5j) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-9	The assessment of impacts resulting from the discharge of foul, surface and any other water presented in section 2.5k) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

WFD2-10	The assessment of impacts resulting from the discharge of commissioning water via the CDO presented in section 2.5l) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Hydrazine concentration confirmed as 15µg l ⁻¹ . Assessment of this concentration is being undertaken as part of the WDA permit.					SZC Comment The assessment in the WFD part 2 utilised 30µg l ⁻¹ . Prior to DCO submission the discharge concentration was revised to 15µg l ⁻¹ as it was determined that this better reflected the expected discharge concentrations (see TR306 Revision 5) however not in time for the WFD compliance assessment to be updated. It should be noted that the assessment using 15µg l ⁻¹ gives rise to much smaller areas over which the PNECs are exceeded (more than 50% reduction for both surface and seabed concentrations). See clarification in columns for D2 & D7. No further action required for examination.	
WFD2-11	The assessment of impacts resulting from the presence of the power station presented in section 2.5m) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD2-12	The assessment of impacts resulting from the presence of the permanent	8.14	Invertebrate connectivity in the Leiston Beck. Disagreement that					No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	SSSI crossing presented in section 2.5n) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.		the new SSSI crossing design (January 2021 accepted change) reduces fragmentation to an acceptable level. Comprehensive evidence provided to SZC Co on this issue. Awaiting further design optimisation for the SSSI crossing to reduce this impact to an acceptable level. We understand width can be reduced to approximately 15m and soffit height will be increased, and await confirmation at Deadline 4.					It is agreed that environmental impacts would be reduced to acceptable levels in the applicant's optimised single span crossing design (including removal of the drainage pipe below the temporary construction deck), as shown in the revised plans presented in "Chapter 2.5 Main Development Site: Permanent & Temporary Beach Landing Facility & SSSI Crossing Plans – Plans Not For Approval . Rev 3. Part 2 of 2" (Doc Ref. 2.5(B)) submitted at D7. The updated details would be secured under Requirement 12C.	
WFD2-13	The assessment of impacts resulting from the presence of marine structures presented in section 2.5o) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	This will be reassessed once the outstanding information on the coastal defence features has been provided.					SZC Co Comment: EA concerns resolved through further engagement.	Agreed
WFD2-14	The assessment of impacts resulting from the presence of coastal defence structures presented in section 2.5p) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	This will be reassessed once the outstanding information on the coastal defence features has been provided.	Noted.				No areas of disagreement	Agreed

WFD2-15	The assessment of impacts resulting from cooling water discharge presented in section 2.5q) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	WDA	Noted.				No further work required for examination.	
WFD2-16	The assessment of impacts resulting from the cooling water system intake presented in section 2.5r) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Potential for deterioration of the fishery in the Ore & Alde and the Blyth TraC waterbodies. Uncertainty around actual entrapment losses from LVSE, EAV, Bulk CIMP sample data and appropriateness of some stock units.					EA Comment: We disagree with the assessment of potential impacts to fish, however the applicant has committed to provide additional mitigation to help offset impacts to migratory and non-migratory fish from the operation of SZC. This will be achieved by improving eel and fish passage in the waterbodies adjacent to SZC (Ore & Alde and Blyth) for migratory species. For non-migratory fish, funding will be released if a deterioration is observed in these waterbodies. This is secured by the DCO/DML and Deed of Obligation.	Agreed
WFD2-17	The assessment of impacts resulting from the discharge of trade effluent from the FRR system presented in section 2.5s) of Part 2 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	It may change if the LVSE impingement factor or other factors used in assessing entrapment losses change.	WDA				EA Comment: Environmental Permitting consideration No further action required for examination.	

Associated development sites (all)									
WFD3-1	The summary of embedded control measures presented in section 3.3 of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
Northern park and ride									
WFD3-2	The screening assessment presented in section 3.4b) of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-3	The scoping of impacts of project activities on water body quality elements presented in section 3.4c)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-4	The scoping of impacts of project activities on RBMP improvement or mitigation measures presented in section 3.4c)iii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-5	The scoping of impacts of project activities on protected areas presented in section 3.4c)iv of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
Southern park and ride									

WFD3-6	The screening assessment presented in section 3.5b) of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-7	The scoping of impacts of project activities on water body quality elements presented in section 3.5c)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-8	The scoping of impacts of project activities on RBMP improvement or mitigation measures presented in section 3.5c)iii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-9	The scoping of impacts of project activities on protected areas presented in section 3.5c)iv of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
Two village bypass									
WFD3-10	The screening assessment presented in section 3.6b) of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-11	The scoping of impacts of project activities on water body quality elements	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	presented in section 3.6c)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.								
WFD3-12	The scoping of impacts of project activities on RBMP improvement or mitigation measures presented in section 3.6c)iii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-13	The scoping of impacts of project activities on protected areas presented in section 3.6c)iv of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-14	The baseline for quality elements at risk presented in section 3.6d)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-15	The assessment of impacts resulting from the construction of watercourse crossings presented in section 3.6d)iii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-16	The assessment of impacts resulting from the operation of watercourse crossings presented in section 3.6d)iv of	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.								
Sizewell link road									
WFD3-17	The screening assessment presented in section 3.7b) of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-18	The scoping of impacts of project activities on water body quality elements presented in section 3.7c)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-19	The scoping of impacts of project activities on RBMP improvement or mitigation measures presented in section 3.7c)iii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-20	The scoping of impacts of project activities on protected areas presented in section 3.7c)iv of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-21	The baseline for quality elements at risk presented in section 3.7d)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

WFD3-22	The assessment of impacts resulting from the construction of watercourse crossings presented in section 3.7d)iii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Awaiting confirmation of discussions between SZC and IDB to identify if acceptable mitigation can be secured to offset loss of watercourses and fragmentation.					No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-23	The assessment of impacts resulting from the operation of watercourse crossings presented in section 3.7d)iv of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Awaiting confirmation of discussions between SZC and IDB to identify if acceptable mitigation can be secured to offset loss of watercourses and fragmentation.					No areas of disagreement	Agreed
Yoxford and other highway improvements									
WFD3-24	The scoping assessment presented in section 3.8b) of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-25	The scoping of impacts of project activities on water body quality elements presented in section 3.8c)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-26	The scoping of impacts of project activities on RBMP improvement or mitigation measures presented in section 3.8c)iii of Part 3 of the WFD	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

	Compliance Assessment.								
WFD3-27	The scoping of impacts of project activities on protected areas presented in section 3.8c)iv of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
Freight Management Facility									
WFD3-28	The screening assessment presented in section 3.9b) of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-29	The scoping of impacts of project activities on water body quality elements presented in section 3.9c)ii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-30	The scoping of impacts of project activities on RBMP improvement or mitigation measures presented in section 3.9c)iii of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
WFD3-31	The scoping of impacts of project activities on protected areas presented in section 3.9c)iv of Part 3 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

Cumulative effects									
WFD4-1	The methodology for the assessment of cumulative effects as detailed in section 4.1b) and section 4.4b) of Part 4 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Cumulative effects cannot be concluded while outstanding components of the WFD assessment are not agreed.					<p>EA Comment:</p> <p>Through the Environmental Permitting Regime, we will need to complete an in-combination assessment to ensure WFD compliance, this will include consideration of impacts associated with operational and construction related permits, such as the water discharge activity, and combustion activity permits. We will only be able to complete this when we have determined these permits.</p> <p>No further work considered necessary for the examination.</p>	
WFD4-2	The assessment of project wide effects presented in section 4.3 of Part 4 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Cumulative effects cannot be concluded while outstanding components of the WFD assessment are not agreed.	As per WFD4-1				As for WFD4-1	
WFD4-3	The assessment of cumulative effects with other projects presented in section 4.4 of Part 4 of the WFD Compliance Assessment.	8.14	Cumulative effects cannot be concluded while outstanding components of the WFD assessment are not agreed.	As per WFD4-1				As for WFD4-1	

Table 2.9 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Eels Regulations Assessment

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
EEL-1	The methodology for the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment as detailed in section 2 of the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment .	6.3 22O Ad Ch						No areas of disagreement.	Agreed
EEL-2	The baseline information presented in section 3 of the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment .	6.3 22O Ad Ch	EA are awaiting proposals from SZC. EA consider Requirements for monitoring, mitigation/compensation should be secured via a DCO requirement/DML Condition and S106 Agreement. Strategic advice on types of mitigation/compensation has been provided					EA Comment: We consider that the scale and impact of entrainment has not been quantified with certainty. The applicant has however committed to provide additional mitigation to help offset impacts to eels from the operation of SZC. This will be achieved by improving eel and fish passage in the waterbodies adjacent to SZC (Ore & Alde and Blyth) for migratory species. This is secured by the DCO/DML and Deed of Obligation.	Agreed
EEL-3	The potential onshore construction and operational components that could impact upon eels identified in section 4.2 of the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment .	6.3 22O Ad Ch	Clarity is required on the securing mechanisms for the proposed water control structures and associated eel pass designs.					No areas of disagreement	Agreed
EEL-4	The potential offshore construction and operational components that could impact upon eels identified in section 4.3 of the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment .	6.3 22O Ad Ch	Potential impact of entrapment is not agreed					EA Comment: We consider that the scale and impact of entrainment has not been quantified with certainty. The applicant has however committed to provide additional mitigation to help offset impacts to eels from the operation of SZC. This will be achieved by improving eel and fish passage in the waterbodies adjacent to SZC (Ore & Alde and Blyth) for migratory species. This is secured by the DCO/DML and Deed of Obligation.	Agreed
EEL-5	The assessment of the impacts of onshore activities on eels in section 5.2 of the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment .	6.3 22O Ad Ch	Clarity is required on the securing mechanisms for the proposed water control structures and					No areas of disagreement	Agreed

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
			associated eel pass designs.						
EEL-6	The assessment of the impacts of offshore activities on eels in section 5.2 of the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment .	6.3 22O Ad Ch	Potential impact of entrapment is not agreed					EA Comment: We consider that the scale and impact of entrainment has not been quantified with certainty. The applicant has however committed to provide additional mitigation to help offset impacts to eels from the operation of SZC. This will be achieved by improving eel and fish passage in the waterbodies adjacent to SZC (Ore & Alde and Blyth) for migratory species. This is secured by the DCO/DML and Deed of Obligation.	Agreed
EEL-7	The scope of mitigation and monitoring requirements identified in section 6.2 of the Eels Regulations Compliance Assessment .	6.3 22O Ad Ch	EA are awaiting position from SZC. EA consider Requirements for monitoring, mitigation/compensation should be secured via a DCO requirement/DML Condition and S106 Agreement.					EA Comment: We consider that the scale and impact of entrainment has not been quantified with certainty. The applicant has however committed to provide additional mitigation to help offset impacts to eels from the operation of SZC. This will be achieved by improving eel and fish passage in the waterbodies adjacent to SZC (Ore & Alde and Blyth) for migratory species. This is secured by the DCO/DML and Deed of Obligation.	Agreed

Table 2.10 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Waste & Materials Management

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Comments	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
M&W_1	The methodology for the assessment of material and waste impacts as detailed in Volume 1 Appendix 6D and Volume 2 Chapter Section 8.3 of the ES.	6.2 6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
M&W_2	The baseline environment, including material use and current waste generation and operational waste management facilities, as detailed in section 8.4 of Volume 2 Chapter 8 of the ES.	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
M&W_3	The proposed primary, secondary and tertiary mitigation measures to mitigate impacts as detailed in section 18.5 7 of Volume 2 Chapter 8 including the Waste Managment Strategy , the outline Site Waste Management Plan (Appendix 8A) , the Materials Managment Strategy (Appendix 3B) and part B section 13 and part C section 12 of the CoCP .	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
M&W_4	The assessment of impacts of material resource use and waste generation as a result of the Sizewell C Project as detailed in section 8.6 of Volume 2 Chapter 8 .	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
M&W_5	The residual effects conclusions as detailed in section 8.7 of Volume 2 Chapter 8	6.3	KPIs not yet agreed as per Volume 2 Chapter 8 Conventional Waste Management 8.7.4 (p45)					No areas of disagreement EA Comment: EA confirmed at Deadline 9 that [REP7-021] Conventional Waste and Material Resources - Appendix 8A of the Environmental Statement: Waste Management Strategy Addendum - Revision 1.0 satisfies our original concerns about the lack of KPI in the Waste Management Strategy.	Agreed
M&W_6	Requirement 2 (PW:CoCP) to secure the control of impacts associated with waste and material resources.	3.1						No areas of disagreement	Agreed
M&W_7	The borrow pit risk assessment as detailed in the ES Appendix 18E .	6.3						No areas of disagreement	Agreed

Table 2.11 Position of the Parties - SZC Co. and Environment Agency: Potable & Non Potable Water Supply

Ref.	Matter	Book ref.	Position of Parties in SOCG at relevant Deadlines					Further Action / Additional Information	Agreed / Not Agreed
			D2	D7	D10				
WS-1	Potable water supply							EA Comment: Many of the environmental impacts will be considered and controlled/monitored by permits, to be submitted to the Environment Agency under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016. These permits have not yet been submitted.	
WS-2	Non-potable water supply							No areas of disagreement	Agreed

APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT ON THE SOCG

- A.1.1. The preparation of this SoCG has been informed by a programme of discussions between SZC Co. and the Environment Agency following submission of the DCO application. The relevant meetings are summarised in **Table 2:1:** and **Table 2:2.**

Table 2:1: SOCG meetings held between SZC Co. and the Environment Agency

Date	Scope of the Meeting
17 June 2020 15 July 2020 10 August 2020 15 September 2020 13 October 2020 12 January 2021 9 February 2021 9 March 2021 12 April 2021 11 May 2021	Joint SZC / EA L4 meeting on the DCO and permit applications.
1 June 2020 1 July 2020 29 July 2020 26 August 2020 9 September 2020 22 September 2020 7 October 2020 21 October 2020 4 November 2020 18 November 2020 2 December 2020 16 December 2020 13 January 2021 27 January 2021 10 February 2021 24 February 2021	Regular DCO Progress and SoCG Meetings

Date	Scope of the Meeting
10 March 2021	
21 April 2021	
5 May 2021	
19 May 2021	
16 June 2021	
9 July 2021	
28 July 2021	
11 Aug 2021	
25 Aug 2021	
8 Sept 2021	
22 Sept 2021	
8 October 2021	

Table 2:2: Technical meetings held between SCZ Co. and the Environment Agency

Date	Meeting Scope
13 February 2020	MDS and AD FRAs
12 May 2020	Water level management
7 July 2020	Water level management
8 July 2020	Groundwater / surface water modelling
5 August 2020	MDS and AD FRAs and FREPs
10 September 2020	Water level management
16 October 2020	MDS and AD FRAs and FREPs
23 November 2020	MDS and AD FRAs and FREPs
14 December 2020	MDS and AD FRAs and FREPs

Date	Meeting Scope
17 December 2020	LEEIE drainage design strategy
11 January 2021	Water Supply
25 January 2021	Two village bypass design review
8 February 2021	Water Supply
18 February 2021	Construction water discharge consenting meeting
18 February 2021	Adoptable Highways (AD6) Preliminary Design
19 February 2021	Construction water abstractions (groundwater) consenting
22 February 2021	Construction FRAPs
1 March 2021	WFD construction consenting
8 March 2021	Water Supply
8 March 2021	MDS and AD FRAs and FREPs
15 March 2021	Marine Technical Forum – BLF detailed coastal processes modelling & update on 1 D modelling of proposed SCDF
15 March 2021	Eels Regulations Compliance
16 March 2021	Terrestrial Ecology Monitoring & Mitigation Plan (TEMMP)
16 March 2021	Water Framework Directive Compliance
18 March 2021	Adoptable Highways (AD6) Preliminary Design
12 April 2021	Water Supply
20 April 2021	Adoptable Highways (AD6) Preliminary Design
22 April 2021	MDS FRA and FREP

Date	Meeting Scope
2 July 2021	Marine Technical Forum – Coastal Geomorphology/1D & 2D storm modelling
21 July 2021	Meeting on mitigation & compensation measures for loss of watercourses on SLR
31 Aug 2021	Meeting with EA and NWL to discuss ongoing WINEP abstraction sustainability studies and clarify EA's current position in respect of potential abstraction sustainability caps.
20 Sept 2021	Meeting with EA technical and legal team to discuss the proposed mitigation fund for fish passage in the DoO.
11 Oct 2021	Meeting with EA on Coastal Geomorphology assessments