UK Government

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
3-8 Whitehall Place
London
SW1A 2AW

www.gov.uk/desnz

To:

Our Ref: EN010012

Sizewell C Limited
Marine Management Organisation
Office for Nuclear Regulation
Suffolk County Council

10 November 2026

Dear Sir or Madam,

Regulation 4 of the Infrastructure Planning (Changes To, And Revocation Of, Development Consent Orders) Regulations 2011 ("the 2011 Regulations")

Application to make a Non-Material Change to The Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022 (S.I. 2022/853) ("the Application")

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

1. Following completion of the consultation on 28 October 2026, the Secretary of State has commenced consideration of the Application by Sizewell C Limited ("the Applicant").

2. There are matters that the Secretary of State requests the Applicant, the Marine Management Organisation, the Office for Nuclear Regulation, and Suffolk County Council to provide updates or information on, as appropriate.

Consultation Responses

3. The **Applicant** is requested to comment on all responses provided, which have been published on the Sizewell C page of the National Infrastructure Planning website:

   https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010012

4. If the Applicant's response requires updates to Application documents, these should be supplied, and the response should clearly state where updates have been made. Tracked change versions of amended documents should also be supplied.

All Changes

5. The **Applicant** is requested to provide clarity on all documents with tracked changes submitted as part of the Application so that all tracked changes are accurately captured and previous document versions are clearly identified.

6. As the statutory regulator for nuclear safety and security matters relevant to the Application, the **Office for Nuclear Regulation** is requested to comment on the Application documents. The Application documents can be viewed here:

   https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010012/documents

Change 1

7. The **Applicant** is requested to explain why ISO 9613 is used for the construction activity noise assessment and not BS 4142 (as recommended by East Suffolk Council in its consultation response), including a comparison and comments on the noise standards used for other activities taking place over the construction period such as the park and ride facilities.

8. The **Applicant** is requested to update the Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate ("LEEIE") barrier plan to include the acoustic barrier which is proposed along part of the northern boundary of the Integrated Reinforcement Yard, and stipulate which receptors this barrier is intended to mitigate potential impacts on.

9. The **Applicant** is requested to confirm the intended use of the westernmost part of the LEEIE outside of the acoustic barriers during the remainder of the construction works and revised construction activity periods, and confirm whether this use will change as a result of the Application.

10. **Suffolk County Council** is requested to review Appendix A of the Environmental Compliance Report that states that there will be a "*net increase in HGVs (+66 two-way HGVs per day) and AILs (+36 two-way AILs per day) between LEEIE and the Temporary Construction Area as a result of the Revised Construction Use*" and provide an updated consultation response, taking into account this information, as required.

11. The **Applicant** is requested to comment on any impact pathways between Change 1 and the Pontins caravan pitches planning application (DC/25/3078/FUL) and designated sites. The **Applicant** is also requested to provide evidence that the necessary controls are included as appropriate in each application, noting that the shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment ("HRA") for DC/25/3078/FUL states "*the potential for construction workers to result in increased recreational disturbance pressure has been comprehensively assessed as part of the DCO Shadow HRA for the Sizewell C Project, and any necessary mitigation and monitoring measures have been legally secured by the DCO. Because mitigation has been legally secured and given that the temporary use of the Proposed Development by*

construction workers will not result in a net increase in the overall construction workforce, there is no increase in risk of disturbance due to recreational pressure to these European sites beyond that assessed in the DCO Shadow HRA."

Change 2

12. The Environmental Compliance Report states that there may be noticeable changes in the north-western corner of Leiston since trains will be using the Green Rail Route and the route through Leiston to the LEEIE. The **Applicant** is requested to clarify the level of effect at this location in the day compared to that assessed in the Environmental Statement ("ES"), noting the statements made on night-time restrictions in the Environmental Compliance Report.

13. The **Applicant** is requested to confirm the number of train movements assessed in the ES and those resulting from Change 2 and explain how this aligns with the submitted Rail Noise Management Plan (rev 5) and any associated impacts on road traffic, and severance effects, including level crossing closures.

Changes 1 and 2

14. The **Applicant** is requested to provide a clear comparison of predicted noise levels including the duration of activities of the revised construction works and the revised construction activity against that assessed in the ES. The **Applicant** is also requested to confirm if there are predicted cumulative effects from the revised construction activities with other parts of the development, in addition to the Marine Tunnel Segment Storage Yard and Change 2 assessed in the Environmental Compliance Report.

15. The Secretary of State notes that the noise assessment exceedance criteria in the ES and Environmental Compliance Report include duration, which is built into the magnitude determination. The ES noise chapter states that *"As a general rule, major and moderate effects are considered to be significant and minor and negligible effects are considered to be not significant. However, professional judgement is also applied, where appropriate. In addition to considering these tables, other project-specific factors, such as the number of receptors affected and the duration and character of the impact need to be considered where these have a potential bearing on significance*." The ES human health chapter also states that *"Community level impacts are more typically non-auditory health effects and, depending on the nature of the sound, magnitude of change, timing, and duration, can result in health and wellbeing effects such as annoyance, sleep disturbance, reductions in academic performance, and hypertension*."

16. The **Applicant** is requested to further justify why any predicted changes to the level, character and duration of noise effects over the construction period resulting from Changes 1 and 2 are considered not to alter the assessment of significance in the ES within the noise and human health chapters.

Change 4

17. In light of Suffolk County Council's consultation response that the proposed changes to the Public Rights of Way plans do not align with the approved detailed highway designs, the **Applicant** and **Suffolk County Council** are requested to provide updates on agreement between both parties on the proposed changes sought in the Application to the Order's provisions relating to Public Rights of Way.

Draft Order

18. The **Applicant** is requested to provide a Microsoft Word version of the draft Amendment Order that was submitted in the Application.

DEADLINE FOR RESPONSE

19. The deadline for responses is **23:59 on 1 December 2026**.

20. Responses should be submitted **by email only** to: sizewellc@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

21. Responses will be published on the Sizewell C project page of the National Infrastructure Planning website **as soon as possible after the 1 December 2026**: https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010012

22. This letter is without prejudice to the Secretary of State's consideration of whether to make the proposed non-material change to the Order. Nothing in this letter is to be taken to imply what the eventual decision might be or what final conclusions the Secretary of State may reach on any particular issue which is relevant to the determination of the application.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

John Wheadon

Head of Energy Infrastructure Planning Delivery & Innovation

Department of Energy Security & Net Zero