East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarms

Applicants' Responses to Examining Authority's Written Questions

Volume 18 – 1.18 Transportation and Traffic

Applicants: East Anglia ONE North Limited and East Anglia TWO Limited
Document Reference: ExA.WQ-1.D1.V1_18
SPR Reference: EA1N_EA2-DWF-ENV-REP-IBR-001085 Rev 01

Date: 2nd November 2020
Revision: Version 01
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Applicable to East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO

Revision Summary				
Rev	**Date**	**Prepared by**	**Checked by**	**Approved by**
001	02/11/2020	Paolo Pizzolla	Lesley Jamieson / Ian Mackay	Rich Morris

Description of Revisions			
Rev	**Page**	**Section**	**Description**
001	n/a	n/a	Final for Deadline 1

This document is supported by the following appendices:

Appendix number	Title
1	Overview Scale of Outline Landscape Mitigation Plan
2	East Anglia ONE Substation Detailed Design Document
3	Email Correspondence with Whale and Dolphin Conservation
4	Ecological Mitigation Works
5	Email Correspondence with Suffolk Wildlife Trust
6	Illustrative Open Trench and Trenchless Onshore Cable Route
7	Onshore Crossing Schedule
8	Environment Agency Flood Zones
9.1	EA1N Annotated Viewpoint 1
9.2	EA1N Annotated Viewpoint 3
9.3	EA1N Annotated Viewpoint 4
9.4	EA1N Annotated Viewpoint 5
9.5	EA1N Annotated Viewpoint 8
9.6	EA1N Annotated Viewpoint 14
9.7	EA2 Annotated Viewpoint 1
9.8	EA2 Annotated Viewpoint 2
9.9	EA2 Annotated Viewpoint 3
9.10	EA2 Annotated Viewpoint 4
9.11	EA2 Annotated Viewpoint 5
9.12	EA2 Annotated Viewpoint 8
10	Landfall Indicative HDD Working Area
11	Landfall HDD Cross Sections
12	Suffolk Seascape Sensitivity to Offshore Wind Farms Final Report
13	Tourism Impact Review
14	Junction Locations

Glossary of Acronyms

AA	Appropriate Assessment
AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
ADD	Acoustic Deterrent Devices
AEOI	Adverse Effect on Integrity
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load
AIS	Air Insulated Switchgear
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
ALO	Agricultural Liaison Officer
ANO	Air and Navigation Order
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
APP	Application Document
AST	Assured Shorthold Tenancies
ATC	Automatic Traffic Counts
BCT	Bat Conservation Trust
BEIS	Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy
BMV	Best and Most Versatile
BoR	Book of Reference
BT	British Telecom
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CCS	Construction Consolidation Sites
Cd	Candela
CfD	Contract for Difference
CIA	Cumulative Impact Assessment
CIEEM	Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management
CION	Connection and Infrastructure Options Note
COCP	Code of Construction Practice
dB	Decibels
DCO	Development Consent Order
DML	Deemed Marine Licence
DMO	Destination Management Organisation
DMRB	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges
EA	Environment Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EM	Explanatory Memorandum
EMP	Ecological Management Plan
ES	Environmental Statement
ESC	East Suffolk Council
ESCA	European Subsea Cables Association
ESDAL	Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads
ETG	Expert Topic Group
ExA	Examining Authority
ExQs	Examining Authorities First Written Questions
FID	Final Investment Decision
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GEART	Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic
GIS	Gas Insulated Switchgear
GLVIA	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
Ha	Hectares
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling

HE	Historic England
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
ICPC	International Cable Protection Committee
IPSIP	In Principle Site Integrity Plan
Km	Kilometres
kV	Kilovolt
LAT	Lowest Astronomical Tide
LCA	Landscape Character Assessment
LCT	Landscape Character Type
LiDAR	Light Detection and Ranging
LIQ	Land Interest Questionnaire
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
LMP	Landscape Management Plan
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LSE	Likely Significant Effects
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
M	Metres
MCA	Marine Coastguard Agency
MCTC	Manual Classified Turning Counts
MHWS	Mean High Water Sprints
MMMP	Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol
MMO	Marine Management Organisation
MoD	Ministry of Defence
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt Hours
NALEP	The New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership
NATS	National Air Traffic Service
NCTA	National Coastal Tourism Academy
NE	Natural England
NGET	National Grid Electricity Transmission
Nm	Nautical Miles
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OAMP	Outline Access Management Plan
OCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
OFTO	Offshore Transmission Owner
OLEMS	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Strategy
OMLP	Outline Management and Landscape Plan
ORJIP	Offshore Renewables Joint Industry Programme
OTP	Outline Travel Plan
PD	Procedural Decision
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Impact Report
PEMP	Project Environmental Management Plan
PIL	Persons with an interest in Land
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PRoW	Public Right of Way
PS	Policy Statements
PTP	Port Travel plan

PVA	Population Viability Analysis
RAG	Red Amber Green
RLoS	Radar Line of Sight
RR	Relevant Representation
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
RTD	Red Throated Diver
RWS	Rijkswaterstaat
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SCCAS	Suffolk County Council Archaeology Service
SCHAONB	Suffolk Coats and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
SLVIA	Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
SNS	Southern North Sea
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoS	Secretary of State
SPA	Special protected Area
SPR	ScottishPower Renewables
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
STEM	Science, Technology and Engineering and Mathematics
SuDS	Sustainable Urban Drainage System
SZC	Sizewell C
TCE	The Crown Estate
TH	Trinity House
TMZ	Transponder Mandatory Zone
TP	Temporary Purchase
TPO	Tree Purchase Order
TWT	The Wildlife Trust
UK	United Kingdom
UKCP	United Kingdom Climate Projections
UXO	Unexploded Ordinance
VP	Viewpoint
WQ	Written Question
WR	Written Representation
WSI	Written Scheme of Investigation
ZTV	Zone of Theoretical Visibility

Glossary of Terminology

Applicants	East Anglia TWO Limited / East Anglia ONE North Limited
Cable sealing end compound	A compound which allows the safe transition of cables between the overhead lines and underground cables which connect to the National Grid substation.
Cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound	A compound (which includes a circuit breaker) which allows the safe transition of cables between the overhead lines and underground cables which connect to the National Grid substation.
Construction consolidation sites	Compounds associated with the onshore works which may include elements such as hard standings, lay down and storage areas for construction materials and equipment, areas for vehicular parking, welfare facilities, wheel washing facilities, workshop facilities and temporary fencing or other means of enclosure.
Construction operation and maintenance platform	A fixed offshore structure required for construction, operation, and maintenance personnel and activities.
The Councils	East Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council
Development area	The area comprising the onshore development area and the offshore development area (described as the 'order limits' within the Development Consent Order).
East Anglia ONE North project	The proposed project consisting of up to 67 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure.
East Anglia TWO project	The proposed project consisting of up to 75 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure.
East Anglia TWO windfarm site	The offshore area within which wind turbines and offshore platforms will be located.
European site	Sites designated for nature conservation under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive, as defined in regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and regulation 18 of the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. These include candidate Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Community Importance, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas.
Generation Deemed Marine Licence (DML)	The deemed marine licence in respect of the generation assets set out within Schedule 13 of the draft DCO.
Horizontal directional drilling (HDD)	A method of cable installation where the cable is drilled beneath a feature without the need for trenching.
HDD temporary working area	Temporary compounds which will contain laydown, storage and work areas for HDD drilling works.

Inter-array cables	Offshore cables which link the wind turbines to each other and the offshore electrical platforms, these cables will include fibre optic cables.
Jointing bay	Underground structures constructed at intervals along the onshore cable route to join sections of cable and facilitate installation of the cables into the buried ducts.
Landfall	The area (from Mean Low Water Springs) where the offshore export cables would make contact with land, and connect to the onshore cables.
Link boxes	Underground chambers within the onshore cable route housing electrical earthing links.
Meteorological mast	An offshore structure which contains metrological instruments used for wind data acquisition.
Mitigation areas	Areas captured within the onshore development area specifically for mitigating expected or anticipated impacts.
Marking buoys	Buoys to delineate spatial features / restrictions within the offshore development area.
Monitoring buoys	Buoys to monitor *in situ* condition within the windfarm, for example wave and metocean conditions.
National electricity grid	The high voltage electricity transmission network in England and Wales owned and maintained by National Grid Electricity Transmission
National Grid infrastructure	A National Grid substation, cable sealing end compounds, cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound, underground cabling and National Grid overhead line realignment works to facilitate connection to the national electricity grid, all of which will be consented as part of the proposed East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North project Development Consent Order but will be National Grid owned assets.
National Grid overhead line realignment works	Works required to upgrade the existing electricity pylons and overhead lines (including cable sealing end compounds and cable sealing end (with circuit breaker) compound) to transport electricity from the National Grid substation to the national electricity grid.
National Grid overhead line realignment works area	The proposed area for National Grid overhead line realignment works.
National Grid substation	The substation (including all of the electrical equipment within it) necessary to connect the electricity generated by the proposed East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North project to the national electricity grid which will be owned by National Grid but is being consented as part of the proposed East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North project Development Consent Order.
National Grid substation location	The proposed location of the National Grid substation.
Natura 2000 site	A site forming part of the network of sites made up of Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas designated respectively under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive.
Offshore cable corridor	This is the area which will contain the offshore export cables between offshore electrical platforms and landfall.
Offshore development area	The East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North windfarm site and offshore cable corridor (up to Mean High Water Springs).

Offshore electrical infrastructure	The transmission assets required to export generated electricity to shore. This includes inter-array cables from the wind turbines to the offshore electrical platforms, offshore electrical platforms, platform link cables and export cables from the offshore electrical platforms to the landfall.
Offshore electrical platform	A fixed structure located within the windfarm area, containing electrical equipment to aggregate the power from the wind turbines and convert it into a more suitable form for export to shore.
Offshore export cables	The cables which would bring electricity from the offshore electrical platforms to the landfall. These cables will include fibre optic cables.
Offshore infrastructure	All of the offshore infrastructure including wind turbines, platforms, and cables.
Offshore platform	A collective term for the construction, operation and maintenance platform and the offshore electrical platforms.
Onshore cable corridor	The corridor within which the onshore cable route will be located.
Onshore cable route	This is the construction swathe within the onshore cable corridor which would contain onshore cables as well as temporary ground required for construction which includes cable trenches, haul road and spoil storage areas.
Onshore cables	The cables which would bring electricity from landfall to the onshore substation. The onshore cable is comprised of up to six power cables (which may be laid directly within a trench, or laid in cable ducts or protective covers), up to two fibre optic cables and up to two distributed temperature sensing cables.
Onshore development area	The area in which the landfall, onshore cable corridor, onshore substation, landscaping and ecological mitigation areas, temporary construction facilities (such as access roads and construction consolidation sites), and the National Grid Infrastructure will be located.
Onshore infrastructure	The combined name for all of the onshore infrastructure associated with the proposed East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North project from landfall to the connection to the national electricity grid.
Onshore preparation works	Activities to be undertaken prior to formal commencement of onshore construction such as pre–planting of landscaping works, archaeological investigations, environmental and engineering surveys, diversion and laying of services, and highway alterations.
Onshore substation	The East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North substation and all of the electrical equipment within the onshore substation and connecting to the National Grid infrastructure.
Onshore substation location	The proposed location of the onshore substation for the proposed East Anglia TWO / East Anglia ONE North project.
Platform link cable	Electrical cable which links one or more offshore platforms. These cables will include fibre optic cables.
Safety zones	A marine area declared for the purposes of safety around a renewable energy installation or works / construction area under the Energy Act 2004.
Scour protection	Protective materials to avoid sediment being eroded away from the base of the foundations as a result of the flow of water.
Transition bay	Underground structures at the landfall that house the joints between the offshore export cables and the onshore cables.
Transmission DML	The deemed marine licence in respect of the transmission assets set out within Schedule 14 of the draft DCO.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18 Transportation and Traffic					
General					
1.18.1	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.5 of the Traffic and Transport chapter of the ES [APP-074] lists the NPS assessment requirements and paragraph 36 says that "This chapter provides the required level of detail that would be contained within a standalone 'Transport Assessment'. Does this mean that this chapter of the ES is not a formal Transport Assessment? If so, please a) explain why you have not undertaken a formal Transport Assessment; b) explain whether there is any information which would normally be found in a Transport Assessment which is not to be found in this chapter of the ES; and c) if so, where that information may be found within the application documents.	a) It was agreed with the Councils and Highways England during Expert Topic Group (ETG) meetings that rather than produce a standalone Transport Assessment, ***Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport*** of the ES (APP-074) could include the required level of detail that would be contained within a Transport Assessment. The Applicants consider that ***Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport*** of the ES (APP-074) includes the required level of technical input that would be within a standalone Transport Assessment. b) The relevant guidance to preparing a Transport Assessment is contained within the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). The relevant PPG is 'Travel Plans, Transport Assessment and Statements', which notes with regard to Transport Assessments: *" Local planning authorities, developers, relevant transport authorities, and neighbourhood planning organisations should agree what evaluation is needed in each instance"* The scope of the assessment presented within ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074) was discussed and agreed with the Councils and Highways England through the ETG process and the Applicants consider the level of technical input equates to that of a Transport Assessment.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					c) All relevant information in relation to traffic and transport assessment is presented within ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074).
1.18.2	The Applicant	1	2	Both SCC as highway authority and ESC as LPA raise concerns in their RRs [RR-002, 007] about the following matters: - abnormal loads; - the mitigation measures proposed at the A12/A1094 Friday Street junction (40mph speed limit southbound on A12, rumble strips, repositioning of speed camera – a new roundabout is suggested); - the lack of planning obligations; - cumulative impacts; - the scoping out of operations, maintenance and decommissioning activities; - traffic movements; - mitigation compromising other schemes eg Sizewell C; and - Protective Provisions for SCC access as highway authority for inspection and maintenance. • Please explain how these concerns have been addressed.	The Applicants are engaging with the Councils to address their concerns through the development of the Statement of Comment Ground (SoCG) (submitted at Deadline 1). To inform this process a series of clarification notes have been / are being prepared. ***Traffic and Transport: Deadline 1 Clarification Note*** (ExA.AS-8.D1.V1) has been submitted to the Examination at Deadline 1, further notes will be submitted at Deadlines 2 and 3.
ES Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport [APP-074]					
1.18.6	The Applicant	1	2	This application was submitted on 25 October 2019 and since then the Sizewell C Project has now been accepted for examination. In respect of this application a) Has the existing rail network been considered as part of the Transport Assessment? if so, what mitigation measures were considered,	a) ***Table 26.3*** of ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074) outlines that the Applications contain a realistic worst case of all materials being transported by road. Therefore, no assessment of rail impact has been undertaken.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				and why were they not taken forward? b) Have you considered a link road direct from the A12, as listed in Table 26.1 of ES Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport [APP-074] under Phase 3 item 3 Transport improvements and suggestions? If so, where would this be located? and c) Do the current mitigation measures proposed for junctions 1 and 2 (at A12/A1094 and at Yoxford) need to be re-evaluated to ensure that there are no significant effects, particularly in respect of driver delay? If so, what would you now propose; and if not, please explain why not.	This assumption was based on the location of the existing rail head at Leiston which would serve to introduce heavy goods vehicles (HGV) traffic on local routes to the west of Leiston and potentially increase HGV kilometres on local roads to serve the onshore cable route. It was also considered that there are other challenges to overcome such as line upgrades, loading / storage infrastructure, securing train pathways and potential environmental knock-on impacts (e.g. noise) that indicate that rail import is not a proportional approach to mitigation for the scale of the Projects' material demand. These challenges are evidenced in the Sizewell C Transport Assessment (APP-602 of the Sizewell C DCO application) which details the following improvements are required to secure the existing line for material import: • Track replacement for the Saxmunham to Leiston branch line; and • Upgrade of up to eight level crossings. An estimated timescale for these improvements is 18 months. The Applicants have assumed the worst case scenario. Should opportunities arise in the future to utilise rail transport, the Applicants will consider this opportunity. b) ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074) ***Table 26.26***, identifies that for the worst case scenario of the simultaneous construction of East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO (scenario 1) there are no significant impacts with the scale of

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					mitigation measures proposed. The construction of a link road from the A12 would represent a much larger scale of mitigation and would not be proportionate, potentially inducing a greater level of traffic impact to that being mitigated. It is noted that the Sizewell C DCO application proposes a construction link from the A12. This is considered in a clarification note to be submitted to the Examination at Deadline 2. c) A clarification note on potential cumulative effects with Sizewell C is being prepared, which includes details of the potential for impacts upon junctions 1 and 2. The Applicants intend to submit this clarification note to the Examination at Deadline 2.
1.18.7	The Applicant	1	2	Figures 26.1 to 26.7 [APP-306 to APP-312] relate to the Traffic and Transport chapter of the ES. Junction numbers are shown, except for the A1094/B1122 junction which is not numbered, on Figure 26.7 Sensitive Driver Delay Locations [APP-312]. Junctions are also shown which are outside the study area shown on Figure 26.1 Onshore Highway Study Area [APP-306]. To assist understanding of the assessment please a) explain why the study area does not include all the junctions; b) give the A1094/B1122 junction a number to aid identification; and	a) The study area presented on ***Figure 26.1*** (APP-306) was agreed with the Councils and Highways England through the ETG process and serves to define the scale of the assessment for the 'localised' impacts of severance, amenity and road safety. As noted in paragraph 165 of **Chapter 26** (APP-074), the Councils and Highway England requested assessment of a number of junctions for the impact of driver delay that cover a larger geographical are to that agreed for assessing localised impacts. ***Figure 26.7*** (APP-312) outlines those junctions that the Councils and Highways England considered required further assessment which defines the study areas for the impact of driver delay.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				c) add junction numbers to Figure 26.1 Onshore Highway Study Area [APP-306], Figure 26.4 Traffic Count Survey Locations [APP-309] and 26.6 Collision Cluster Locations [APP-311] to assist the reader.	b) The A1094 / B1122 was not identified by the Councils as requiring a driver delay impact assessment, so was not assigned a junction notation. c) ***Figure 26.1*** (APP-306), ***26.4*** (APP-309) and ***26.6*** (APP-311) have been updated to show the junctions. As on ***Figure 26.7*** (APP-312), junctions that are sensitive due to capacity issues are numbered as within the ES (APP-074); however the A1094/B1069 and the A1094/B1122 have been numbered as 'A' and 'B' respectively. These up[dated figures are provided in ***Appendix 14*** of this response..
1.18.8	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraph 61 you say in respect of rules taken from the GEART *"Rule 2: Include any other specifically sensitive areas where traffic flows are predicted to increase by 10% or more (or where the number of HGVs is predicted to increase by 10% or more)."*. How has your assessment considered sensitive areas and the lower threshold of 10%?	The assessment presented within ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074) has identified sections of the highway (known as links) that are considered to be specifically sensitive areas due to the characteristics of the highway environment and the likely user groups. These highway links are assigned a high sensitivity value and are described in ***Table 26.13*** of ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074) and depicted graphically on ***Figure 26.5*** (APP-310). The Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (GEART) Rule 1 and 2 screening is applied utilising the forecast traffic flows presented within ***Table 26.23*** of ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074). The lower 10% Rule 2 threshold has been applied to high sensitivity links; for example links 2 and 3 have increases in traffic flows of less than 30% (GEART Rule 1 threshold for non-sensitive areas), but as the links are identified to be of high sensitivity, and the increases in traffic flows (or HGV component) are greater than 10% they are screened in for further assessment.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18.9	The Applicant and SCC	1	2	Paragraph 136 says that you have agreed with SCC that the road safety review *"should examine …. the rate of collisions per length of road in miles …"* and in paragraph 137 you say that *"Collision rates have been calculated in billion vehicle miles …"*. It is not clear where the methodology of assessing collisions per length of road in miles originates. a) Please explain. b) Does the highway authority have a view?	It was agreed with the Councils through the ETG process that the road safety assessment would include a comparison between the rate of collisions occurring on the roads within the onshore highway study area and national averages for comparable roads. This analysis allows a judgment as to whether the number of collisions along a road is higher or lower than would be expected for similar roads nationally. Paragraph 137 of ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074) outlines that for comparison purposes, national collision rates have been taken from data published by the Department for Transport within Road Casualties Great Britain (September 2017). Road Casualties Great Britain expresses collision rates in 'billion vehicle miles'. Collision rates for the roads within the onshore highway study area have therefore also been calculated in billion vehicle miles to allow a comparison.
1.18.10	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 3 (and paragraph 202 of the Project Description [APP-054]) indicates that no decision has yet been taken regarding a preferred base port for offshore construction and operation, and Table 26.1 of that document lists as a suggestion under Phase 3 "use more sea-borne traffic to reduce pressure on rural roads". Given the involvement of the port of Lowestoft with the construction of offshore wind farms such as Dudgeon, Galloper, Greater Gabbard and East Anglia ONE, and parent company investment there, please a) summarise your current position regarding your choice of preferred base port or	a) The Applicants' position regarding the choice of base port remains as presented within ***Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport*** (APP-074). No decision has yet been made regarding a preferred base port for the offshore construction and operation of the Projects. Please see the Applicants' response to question 1.17.4. b) Ports could provide a source for materials and components required for the onshore construction of the Projects. c) With regards to the onshore construction phase, paragraph 184 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines that a worst case assumption has been adopted whereby it is assumed that 100% of HGV traffic could

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				ports; b) explain whether, and if so how, ports might be used for onshore construction; and c) explain how your current position has informed your assumptions about traffic generation in the study area, both for onshore and offshore construction and operations; and consider whether the assessment you have undertaken is sufficiently flexible and robust to provide the worst case scenario in respect of onshore traffic and transport impacts.	come from the north and also 100% could come from the south via the A12. This assessment approach allows complete flexibility for the Projects to source materials either from the north or the south via the A12, or a combination of both, and therefore does not fix the supply chain origin. With regards to the onshore operational phase, ***Section 26.6.2*** of ***Chapter 26*** (APP-074) outlines the potential operational activities and concludes that given the activities listed no significant traffic impacts are identified. With regards to offshore construction and operation, as noted in part a) of this response, no decision has been made with regard to a preferred base port. Therefore, as outlined at paragraph 3 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074), such facilities would be provided or brought into operation by means of one or more planning applications or as port operations with permitted development rights.
1.18.11	The Applicant	1	2	Given the need for port access, a) should the study area (shown in Figure 26.1 [APP-306]) have been extended to include the trunk road network around Lowestoft and/or Ipswich? And b) are there any other road links, for which no traffic flows are available, which are likely to have a medium or high sensitivity assessment?	In response to parts a) and b), the Applicants would offer the following clarification. The extent of the onshore highway study area has been agreed with the Councils and Highways England through the ETG process. Paragraph 16 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) notes that: *"Routes that extend outside of the onshore highway study area are routes where construction traffic has dissipated and / or include roads with negligible sensitive receptors. When combined these parameters do not represent significant impacts on the highway network."*

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					A proportional approach to developing the study area has been adopted in consultation with the Councils. This determines that the traffic magnitude of effect outside of the study area would not lead to significant impacts
1.18.12	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 7 states that Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) has been used, and the figures given in Table 26.12, from various sources, are AADT. a) Please confirm that all these flows are for the same base year. b) In view of its relevance as a measure of 7am to 7pm construction traffic, please explain why you have not used 12-hour figures.	a) The base years presented within ***Table 26.12*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) vary in accordance the relevant data source. The commissioned automatic traffic counts (ATCs) were conducted in 2018, the SCC ATCs and SCC Manual Classified Turning Counts (MCTCs) were conducted in 2017 and the Sizewell C baseline forecasts are for a 2025 base year. As noted in paragraph 129, it has been agreed with SCC (through an ETG meeting) that the traffic counts commissioned by the Applicants are representative of existing traffic flows and have therefore been utilised for the Projects' impact assessment (with the exception of link 3 which has utilised SCC's data). b) Daily traffic flows have been utilised to undertake a proportional screening exercise applying the GEART Rule 1 and 2 thresholds. They are an easily understood metric, accepted by Councils and Highways England and evident in previous DCO applications of a similar nature (e.g. East Anglia Three and Norfolk Vanguard). The GEART recognises that traffic forecasting is not an exact science and prescribes thresholds are of a sufficient banding based on accepted fluctuations in daily traffic. All links that have been screened in have been subject to a more detailed assessment, using traffic metrics

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response

appropriate to the impact under consideration as set out below:

Impact	Traffic data	Notes
1) Pedestrian Amenity	18 hour flow	As directed by the GEART
2) Severance	Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)	As directed by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)
3) Road Safety	AADT + various	Time periods to be assessed are dictated by the nature of the collisions
4) Driver Delay	Peak hour	The busiest hour for a sensitive junction (combining background and development flows) has been assessed

It is therefore considered that the application of 12 hour flows would be an academic exercise that would not materially change the assessment outcomes.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18.13	The Applicant	1	2	Appendix 26.16 [APP-542] is titled "Traffic Movements Assigned to the Highway Network". Please confirm that these are total numbers of construction related vehicles and state the time period(s) to which they relate, eg peak hour, 12-hour, AADT.	Paragraph 216 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) confirms that ***Appendix 26.16*** (APP-542) details the assigned total daily peak two-way vehicle movements (i.e. arrivals and departures) of all materials, personnel and plant during the peak combined month when distributed across the highway network.
1.18.14	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.1 (Public Consultation relevant to Traffic and Transport) lists Junction Improvements at Sizewell C under Phase 2 and notes the use of train and a village bypass scheme under "Phase 3 Transport improvements and suggestions". The Sizewell C Project has now been accepted for examination. Bearing in mind the package of mitigation measures outlined in paragraphs 295-305 (section 26.6.1.10.2) and the likely consenting and construction timelines, to what extent have you considered integrating your proposed transport improvements with those proposed by the adjacent Sizewell C project?	The Applicants and NNB Generation Company (SZC) Limited will engage regularly with each other during design and construction of their respective projects so that any potential interface between them can be considered at an early stage, recognising it is in the interests of both the Applicants and SZC, as well as the wider community, that all projects be coordinated as far as reasonably practicable.
1.18.15	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.1 (Public Consultation relevant to Traffic and Transport) lists as a concern under Phase 3 *"concerns that contractors on East Anglia ONE did not follow agreed routes"* and item 1 of Table 26.4 refers to a strategy for HGV access. Please explain how your HGV strategy will work in practice and address this concern satisfactorily and	***Section 2.2.3*** of the ***Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan*** (OCTMP) (APP-586) includes details of measures to ensure that HGVs use the agreed routes. In summary measures include: advanced signing, providing drivers with delivery instructions and ensuring the Projects' traffic is distinguishable from other traffic. ***Section 4*** provides details of how this will be monitored and enforced.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				effectively.	Prior to commencement of the onshore construction of the Projects a final detailed CTMP will be produced in accordance with the OCTMP standards as secured by Requirement 28 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023). The CTMP will then have to be implemented.
1.18.16	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.1 (Public Consultation relevant to Traffic and Transport) lists as a concern under Phase 3 *"serious concern over the proposed landfall access from Thorpeness Road … even with the use of a marshalling system …"* and Table 26.4 refers to removing traffic from the B1353 by using a temporary haul road south from Sizewell Gap, but it will still be necessary to cross the B1353. Please explain how this concern has been addressed.	Historically, an access was proposed to the landfall location from the B1353 within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR). Due to the width of the road along the B1353 a strategy was proposed within the PEIR to use pilot vehicles to guide traffic along the road, referred to as 'the marshalling system' by IPs. Following consultation feedback, particularly relating to driver delay impacts (e.g. holding back of traffic streams to permit a HGV under escort to pass), the Applicants amended the access strategy to remove the access from the B1353 and the corresponding requirement for a marshalling system. To allow vehicles to access the landfall location, as outlined within ***Table 26.4*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) vehicles would instead access from the Sizewell Gap and travel along the temporary haul road. To allow vehicles to access to the south of the B1353, a haul road crossing is proposed which would be signal controlled giving priority to public highway traffic. This allows construction vehicles to efficiently cross the B1353 but not to access or egress on to it, therefore, addressing driver delay concerns.
1.18.17	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraphs 14, 15, 16 and 44 to 47 refer to the strategic road network, and to Figure 26.1 Onshore Highway Study Area [APP-306] and Figure 26.3 Existing Highway Network [APP-308], and state that	The extent of the onshore highways study area has been agreed with the Councils and Highways England through the ETG process. During these ETG discussions, Highways England

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				the extent of the study area has been agreed with SCC and HE. Paragraphs 77, 90, 92, 165, 312 and 403 refer to or infer consultation with HE, paragraphs 103 and 104 say that the A12 is a trunk route and the main connection between Great Yarmouth and Ipswich, paragraph 125 refers to HE Heavy Routes, and paragraphs 166 to 171 and table 26.16 refer to junctions which are outside the study area shown on Figure 26.1 [APP-306]. • Please explain this approach and HE's role given that there are no trunk roads in or near the study area as shown on Figure 26.1 [APP-306] (the A12 between the A14 and Lowestoft having been detrunked in 2001 and the A12 north of Lowestoft having become the A47 in 2017). In particular, please explain the current status of Heavy Load Route HR100, given that the Heavy and High Routes shown in your Appendix 26.6 [APP-532] appear to have last been reviewed back in July 2007 by the then Highways Agency.	advised that it would wish to see a 'screen line' assessment which detailed the Projects' traffic flows through junctions 4 and 5 to understand if significant impacts are likely. Following its review of screen line assessment contained in the PEIR, Highways England confirmed that it would not require further assessment of impacts upon the strategic road network. The Projects' traffic flows have not increased since PEIR (depicted in ***Figure 26.7*** (APP-312)) and Highways England have confirmed that no further assessment of the strategic road network is required. HR100 is a designated heavy route from Lowestoft Port to the existing Sizewell A and B Nuclear Power Stations. Whilst it is noted that all of this route is located within the administration area of SCC, the Heavy Route designation is administered nationally by Highways England on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. The Applicants have engaged with Highways England who have confirmed HR100 is still a valid (Heavy Haul) route.
1.18.18	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 17 refers to construction accesses and Figure 26.2 [APP-307] shows the proposed construction access points for the onshore cable construction. a) Please explain the factors determining the choice of construction access points. b) Is there scope for the fuller use of haul roads in order to reduce the number of	a) ***Section 2.1*** of the ***Outline Access Management Plan*** (OAMP) (APP-587) describes the Projects' 'Access Strategy'. This section of the ***OAMP*** explains in detail the factors determining the choice of access location. In summary, the access strategy applies a hierarchical approach (informed by the SCC HGV route hierarchy) to selecting delivery routes and seeks to avoid and reduce

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				construction access points and to reduce the impact of construction vehicles on surrounding roads?	the impact of HGV traffic upon the most sensitive communities. b) ***Section 2.1*** of the ***OAMP*** (APP-587) describes the Projects' 'Access Strategy'. This section of the ***OAMP*** explains in detail how the use of the haul road has allowed the communities to be avoided. The strategy represents a balance of minimising points of access, but not to the extent so as to induce adverse impacts by concentrating traffic on a limited number of local roads.
1.18.19	The Applicant and SCC	1	2	Paragraphs 18 and 19 mention temporary alterations to the highway (listed in Table 26.2) and that it is anticipated that these would be completed before construction starts on the relevant section of the cable route. Please a) explain why and under what circumstances construction might start before completion of these alterations; b) state for how long these temporary alterations would be needed; and confirm that there are no other offsite locations which in your view would require highway improvements in connection with this project.	a) The following response considers each of the three highways alterations (listed in ***Table 26.2*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074)): • Improvements are proposed to the junction of the A12 and A1094 to address road safety impacts identified within ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074). Construction could commence prior to completion of these works if it could be demonstrated that the Projects' traffic would not lead to significant impacts. This could include, a period where construction traffic flows are forecast as being much lower than the peaks assessed or where traffic would not be required to use the junction. • Localised widening and vegetation clearance is proposed at the junction of the A1094 and B1069. ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines that this mitigation is required to facilitate Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) movements associated with the delivery of the Projects' transformers. It is therefore reasoned that the mitigation would not be

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					required until such point as the transformers are required in the construction programme. • Potential alterations to the A12 Marlesford Bridge structure. ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines that this potential mitigation could be required if AILs associated with the delivery of the Projects' transformers were to pass over this structure. ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines two potential ports for the import of the transformers: Lowestoft and Felixstowe. Should the load come from Lowestoft the AILs would not pass over the Marlesford Bridge and therefore no alterations would be required. If the load were to come from Felixstowe, the load would pass over the Marlesford Bridge. Should the Felixstowe option be taken forward, further investigations would be undertaken and the requirement for mitigation agreed with the Councils. If mitigation is required it is reasoned that the works would not be required until such point as the transformers are required in the construction programme. b) The offsite highway improvements detailed ***Table 26.2***, ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) would be reinstated post construction unless agreed to left in situ by the Councils. With regards to other locations where offsite highway improvements may be required, paragraph 22 of the ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines the requirement for a series of localised footway improvements to address potential impacts upon pedestrian amenity. Further details are set out in ***section 26.6.1.8*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					(APP-074) and ***section 3.1*** the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586). These works would be permanent.
1.18.20	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.2 states that "Potential structural alternations [sic] " are required to Marlesford Bridge on the A12 to facilitate the movement of AIL vehicles over this bridge. a) What structural alterations do you envisage? b) Do you yet know whether these alterations will be required? c) How will it be possible and what is the business case for these structural alterations to be temporary rather than permanent? And which access routes will be utilised by AIL?	The scope or scale of structural alterations has not been determined at this stage due to AIL route and load variables (see response to Q1.18.19). If the A12 South is identified as the preferred AIL haul route, there are a broad range of interventions available ranging from temporary load bearing solutions to, at the top end of the scale, bridge alterations. Bridge alterations may be more permanent in nature. These will be determined pre-construction and the necessary technical approvals will be acquired from SCC.
1.18.21	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 22 mentions localised footway improvements. a) Is it intended that these are also temporary, or will they be permanent? b) If permanent, how are they secured in the DCO?	Paragraph 22 of the ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines the requirement for a series of permanent localised footway improvements to address potential impacts upon pedestrian amenity. Further details are set out in ***section 26.6.1.8*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) and ***section 3.1*** the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586). This is secured in Requirement 28 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023) which requires a CTMP to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant highway authority and this must be in accordance with the ***OCTMP***.
1.18.22	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.3 Realistic Worst Case Scenarios refers to peak traffic generation and a 7am to 7pm delivery window. Please explain how this traffic is assigned to a model which uses AADT flows rather than 12-hour flows.	With reference to the Applicants' response to Q1.18.12b) the model assigns the Projects' traffic demand to a baseline AADT network.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18.23	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.3 Realistic Worst Case Scenarios makes brief reference at Construction item 7 to intermodal freight transfer (rail, maritime) where you state that potential gains have been disregarded for the purposes of your assessment: in particular, section 26.3 Scope makes reference only to the onshore highway study area. There appears to be no other mention of the rail network or how it might be used and/or modified to deliver this project. a) Why is this, and b) what assumptions have been made regarding the use of possible or likely ports and railheads both during construction and maintenance, including emergency maintenance?	a) ***Table 26.3*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines that the Application contains a realistic worst case of all materials being transported by road. This is to ensure that maximum HGV demand is assigned to the highway network ensuring the full magnitude of effects is assessed. This assumption was based on the location of the existing rail head at Leiston which would serve to introduce HGV traffic on local routes to the west of Leiston and potentially increase HGV kilometres on local roads to serve the onshore cable route. It was also considered that there are other challenges to overcome such as line upgrades, loading / storage infrastructure, securing train pathways and potential environmental knock-on impacts (e.g. noise) that indicate that rail import is not a proportional approach to mitigation for the scale of the Projects' material demand. These challenges are evidenced in the Sizewell C Transport Assessment (APP-602 of the Sizewell C DCO application) which details the following improvements are required to secure the existing line for material import: • Track replacement for the Saxmunham to Leiston branch line; and • Upgrade of up to eight level crossings. An estimated timescale for these improvements is 18 months.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					The Applicants have assumed the worst case scenario. Should opportunities arise in the future to utilise rail transport, the Applicants will consider this opportunity. b) The Applicants' response to Q1.18.10 sets out the assumptions that have informed the assessment with regard to possible port locations of other origins for material import. With regards to the transformers, ***Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport*** of the ES (APP-074) identifies that the load would either be imported though Felixstowe or Lowestoft ports.
1.18.24	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.3 Realistic Worst Case Scenarios item 8 refers to the haul road. Please explain how use of ground stabilisation would reduce the length of the haul road and HGV movements.	***Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport*** of the ES (APP-074) adopts a worst case assumption that the entire haul road would be constructed from imported stone aggregate. This approach ensures the assessment presented within the ES (APP-074) generates a worst case in terms of construction traffic movements. Alternatives to a haul road such as ground stabilisation, the use of tracked vehicles, or running on the formation would reduce the length of the haul road where imported stone would be required and consequently there would be fewer HGV movements. The length of the haul road itself would not reduce. The commercial benefits of reducing material demand will be inherent in the procurement of the Projects' contractors, ensuring that tenderers are incentivised to minimise material import and associated haulage costs.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18.25	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.4 item 7 covers road closures and says that in terms of embedded mitigation advance signing would be implemented to assist drivers in finding alternative routes and that works would be staggered. a) Where is this commitment secured? b) Would you also provide information to satellite navigation companies to assist users in determining the best routes for their journeys in real time?	a) ***OAMP*** (APP–587) paragraph 45 states *"The detailed design of traffic management at accesses and crossings will be undertaken prior to construction and agreed with SSC in accordance with the requirements set out within the draft DCO"*. A final Access Management Plan is secured by Requirement 16 of the draft DCO (APP-023). b) All street works will be notified to SCC under the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. This will ensure that details of the street works are agreed with SCC and captured on the national street gazetteer and will be available to satellite navigation providers.
1.18.26	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.6 lists the relevant local planning policies at the time the application was submitted. Have there been any material changes since that time?	The Suffolk Coastal District Local Plan was adopted on 23rd September 2020. The former Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Core Strategy and Development Management Policies have been superseded by the new Adopted Suffolk Coastal Local Plan. However, there are no material changes to the policies set out in ***Table 26.6*** of the ES (AAP-074).
1.18.27	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraphs 74 and 75 mention HGV movements on rural roads and the associated collision risk. Have the existing collision records been examined and, if so, a) what mitigation is being considered; and b) how would such mitigation be secured?	Through the ETG process the approach to assessing the potential impacts upon road safety (impact 3) was agreed with the Councils and Highways England. The approach involves detailed consideration of collision clusters and collision rates utilising Police (Stats 19) records to determine user groups (including HGVs) and causation factors. This is detailed within ***section 26.5.4*** of the ES (APP-074). a) ***Section 26.6.1.10*** of the ES (APP-074) details a full assessment of all identified collision clusters and high collision rate routes, and determines the requirement for mitigation. The A12 / A1094 'Friday Street' junction was

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					assessed as being subject to significant adverse impacts and the following mitigation is proposed: • A reduction in the posted speed limit in advance of the junction from 50mph to a 40mph; • Provision of enhanced warning signage to better highlight the junction to approaching drivers; • Provision of 'rumble strips' and associated slow markings, to provide an audible and visual warning of the hazard to approaching drivers; and • A commitment in ***section 2.3.2*** of the ***Outline Traffic Plan*** (APP-588), to manage employee traffic demand through the junction during peak periods. General road safety 'embedded' mitigation is captured in S***ection 2.2.6*** of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586). b) Friday Street mitigation is secured under Schedule 1 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023) as Work No.36. General road safety measures are detailed within the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) and would therefore be secured under Requirement 28 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023).
1.18.28	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 81 says that AIL may come from either Felixstowe or Lowestoft and that SCC and HE have advised that Lowestoft is preferred in order to avoid the Farnham Bends. We also note that in paragraph 82 you state that *"the bend at Farnham is negotiable by the AIL vehicle, with full carriageway occupation and some kerb overrunning …"*	a) ***Appendix 26.4*** of the ES (APP-530) demonstrates that the AIL can negotiate the route through Farnham. The mitigation measures required to allow the AIL to pass through Farnham are also detailed on drawing number 18.952SPA01 of ***Appendix 26.4*** (APP-530) and include full road occupation, kerb overrunning and the use of steel plates or timber packing for protection.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				Please a) Explain the mitigation measures you propose for Farnham; b) give an update as to which port you intend to select; and c) state whether you have considered using the rail network to transport AIL, for instance to the existing railhead at Leiston (Sizewell Halt); and if not, please explain why not.	b) The Applicants are not able to provide an update upon which port would be used as this is subject to availability at the time of construction. For more information on ports see the Applicants' response to question 1.17.4. *c)* Rail was not considered a viable option as it was considered that the AIL weight (280 tonnes) and gauge (4.4m wide by 4.4m high) could not be accommodated by the rail network.
1.18.29	The Applicant, Network Rail	1	2	Paragraph 83 says that Network Rail has advised that a rail bridge over the A1094 should be avoided. Please a) clarify whether the railway goes over or under the A1094 and b) explain why the bridge should be avoided.	a) The railway goes under the A1094. The bridge is owned and maintained by Network Rail. b) Paragraph 8.1.12 of ***Appendix 26.3*** (APP-529) provides details of conversations with Network Rail and confirms the bridge does not have the structural capacity to accommodate the proposed heavy load.
1.18.30	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 84 says how you propose that AIL would access the onshore substation site. a) If travelling down the B1122 from Yoxford, could the AIL avoid travelling through the A1094/B1069 junction and through Friston by accessing the site using the haul road directly from the A1069? b) Has this route been assessed?	a) ***Appendix 26.4*** of the ES (APP-530) contains an AIL route strategy developed with the objective of having the least environmental impact. b) The route suggested by the ExA would require the strengthening of approximately 2km of haul road to accommodate the AILs and would introduce additional HGV demand to the study area. This is considered disproportionate mitigation to accommodate the two transformer deliveries for the Projects.
1.18.31	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 85 outlines your proposals for arranging the timing and routeing of AIL in the event of a transformer needing to be replaced.	a) National Grid has not identified the requirement for any AILs associated with the National Grid substation works.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				a) You say "any of the transformers" – do you propose that these proposals apply to the NG substation as well as your substation? b) Is there a safe permanent operational access proposed to the substation for use by you and by others eg NG for the lifetime of the project? If so, would this be used?	b) Paragraph 334 of ***Chapter 26*** the ES (APP-074) details that during the operational phase, access to the onshore substation would be via access 13 to the north of Friston (as shown in ***Figure 26.2*** (APP-307). This access would also be available for the National Grid substation.
1.18.32	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.11 is the Impact Significance matrix. Please confirm that a 36 month period has been applied to all your assessments to correspond with the construction period.	The assessment presented within ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) considers the impact of the peak daily traffic flows that would occur within the 36 month construction period. No reduction in impact significance is applied to account for the temporal nature or that average daily flows would be lower than the peaks assessed.
1.18.33	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraph 99 (transboundary impact assessment), you scope out transboundary impacts in respect of the onshore development area. Have offshore traffic and transport impacts been considered, for instance shipping and air traffic? If so, a) where have these impacts been assessed b) what are your conclusions; and c) how have you arrived at your conclusions? If not, please explain why not.	a) Offshore transportation matters are covered in ***Chapter 14 Shipping & Navigation*** of the ES (APP-062) and ***Chapter 15 Civil and Military Aviation and Radar*** of the ES (APP-063) b) Transboundary conclusions on shipping and navigation are covered in ***Section 14.8*** of the ES (APP-062). Transboundary impacts for shipping and navigation receptors include vessels routeing from the UK to the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark that may be impacted by projects within both UK waters and transboundary waters. Given the international nature of shipping this is covered by the cumulative impact assessment in ***Section 14.7.3*** of the ES (APP-062). Impacts are considered to be

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					broadly acceptable or tolerable in line with the agreed, standard Navigational Risk Assessment methodology. Transboundary conclusions on aviation are covered in ***Section 15.8*** of the ES (APP-063). Impacts are considered to be not significant. *c)* Conclusions have been reached through application of standard methodologies for both of these topics as set out in the relevant chapters, with pre-application comments on these set out in ***Appendix 14.1*** (APP-474) and ***Appendix 15.1*** (APP-481).
1.18.34	The Applicant	1	2	Section 26.5 Existing Environment does not appear to include any baseline information on the rail network, or how it might be used to mitigate the impacts of construction and operation of the project. Why is this?	The Applicants' response to Q1.18.23 sets out the rationale for the exclusion of rail as an alternative mode for the import of materials.
1.18.35	The Applicant	1	2	In Table 26.13, a) should link 3b be south of Stratford St Andrew? And b) should link 6c be east or west of Snape?	a) Link 3b is located to the south of Stratford St Andrew. The extents of Link 3b is described within ***Table 26.13*** of the ES (APP-074) and also shown graphically on ***Figure 26.5*** (APP-310). b) Link 6c is located to the east of Snape. The extents of Link 6c is described within ***Table 26.13*** of the ES (APP-074) and also shown graphically on ***Figure 26.5*** (APP-310).
1.18.36	The Applicant	1	2	The ExA note from Table 26.14 (Baseline PIC analysis) that Road Casualties Great Britain 2017 figures have been used and that the severity split in respect of killed or seriously injured (KSI value) for links 5 and 7 is a total of 3 killed or seriously injured	a) The approach to the assessment of road safety was agreed with the Councils and Highways England through the ETG process and considers the impacts of the Projects' traffic upon roads with rates of collisions that are

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				out of a total of 6,, ie 50%. We also note from paragraph 140 that links other than links 5-8 are not considered further as their collision rates are below the national average. However, the KSI values for Lover's Lane/Sizewell Gap (links 11 and 12), the B1122 (links 4 and 14) and the A12 (links 1,2 and 3) are 33.3%, 17.6% and 12.9% respectively, and there is a high proportion of HGV involved on links 4, 14, 9, 15, 11 and 12. Please advise a) why your road safety assessment appears to be based predominantly on collision rates; b) how the National Average collision rate has been arrived at; c) what constitutes a comparable road in paragraph 288 and where the figure of 487 comes from; and d) whether later Road Casualties Great Britain (eg 2018 or 2019) figures are available and, if so, have there been any changes which would alter your assessment conclusions?	higher than national averages or where there are clusters of collisions, known as collision clusters. b) Paragraph 137 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) identifies that national collision rates have been taken from Road Casualties Great Britain, prepared by Department for Transport (September 2017). c) Table RAS20005 of Road Casualties Great Britain provides national average collision rates per billion vehicle miles for different road types. The figure of 487 is taken from Table RAS20005 and is the collision rate in billion vehicle miles for all severities for 'Rural A roads'. The figure of 760 collisions per billion vehicle miles relates to 'Other Rural Roads'. The figure of 813 collisions per billion vehicle miles relates to 'All Roads – A roads'. d) Later versions of Road Causalities Great Britain are now available up until 2019. Later copies continue the general trend of a year on year reduction in collision rates which is the norm when considering technology advancement. However, there is nothing conclusive that would change the assessment conclusions.
1.18.37	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 166 refers to the potential for additional junctions 6 to 15 to be sensitive to changes in traffic. Junctions 6 to 13 are listed and described in Table 26.16 and shown on Figure 26.7 [APP-312], except for junction 9. Where is junction 9 shown and where are junctions 14 and 15 described and shown?	Junction 9 has not been labelled on ***Figure 26.7*** of the ES (APP-312) and is incorrectly labelled as junction 1. Two junctions are therefore shown on the figure. For the avoidance of doubt, the junction 1 that is shown between junctions 8 and 10 should read junction 9 and not junction 1. Paragraph 166 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) incorrectly refers to 15 junctions as being potentially sensitive to changes in traffic. There however only 13 junctions and two further sensitive

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					sections of highway (known as links). These links are described in paragraphs 170 and 171 of the ES (APP-074).
1.18.38	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 177 lists those factors you have taken into account in determining the realistic worst-case traffic demand scenarios for the project. • Bearing in mind that both the East Anglia ONE North and the East Anglia TWO projects have been submitted and accepted for examination at the same time, have likely maximum construction programmes (eg each project proceeding separately at different times, with or without an overlap) been considered?	The proposed East Anglia TWO project cumulative impact assessment considers the cumulative impact with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project against two different construction scenarios (i.e. construction of the two projects simultaneously and sequentially). This assessment is contained within ***Appendix 26.2*** (APP-528) for that project. This is reversed for East Anglia ONE North project and the assessment repeated in ***Appendix 26.2*** (APP-528) for that project.
1.18.39	The Applicant	1	2	With reference to paragraphs 211 and 328, and also paragraph 12 of the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-586] and paragraph 19 of the outline Access Management Plan [APP-587] please: a) provide an update on the three options currently being considered for access to section 3B of the cable route either side of the B1122 to the south of Aldringham; and b) explain what you mean by "appropriately sized vehicles".	a) The Applicants wish to retain all three options for access to section 3b from the B1122 to the South of Aldringham at this stage. b) Paragraph 326 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines that a swept path analysis of HGVs turning between the A1094 and B1069 has been undertaken. The analysis presented within ***Appendix 26.21*** (APP-547) demonstrates that a rigid body tipper HGV could complete this manoeuvre, but an articulated HGV would over-sail into the opposite lane. In this regard, an appropriately sized vehicle would therefore be one that could make this turn without oversailing into the opposite lane, such as a rigid body tipper.
1.18.40	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraph 213 you state with reference to National Grid employees *"These employees would instead access from access 13 … once this access is available."*	Once constructed, access 13 would be available to National Grid personnel and third parties.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				Please confirm that access 13 will be available whenever it is needed by National Grid personnel and by any third parties working on behalf of National Grid.	
1.18.41	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraphs 231, 242, 265, 269 and 273 in respect of pedestrian amenity and in paragraph 284 in respect of severance you state that *"… no mitigation further to that embedded within the design of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project is considered necessary."* What mitigation is embedded within the design of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project in respect of pedestrian amenity and severance, and where is this secured?	***Section 26.3.3*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines the proposed embedded mitigation. In summary this includes: • Measures such as an access strategy and use of haul roads where possible to avoid HGV traffic travelling through sensitive locations such as Friston, Sternfield or Benhall-Green. ***Section 2.2.3*** of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) includes details of measures to ensure that HGVs use the agreed routes. ***Section 4*** of the ***OCTMP*** then provides details of how this will be monitored and enforced. A final CTMP is secured under Requirement 28 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023). • The adoption of an employee to vehicle ratio of 1.5 employees per vehicle. This ratio reduces the overall numbers of personnel vehicle movements. ***Section 2.2*** of the ***Outline Travel Plan*** (OTP) (APP-586) includes details of measures to ensure compliance with this ratio and ***Section 3*** provides details of how this will be monitored and enforced. A final Travel Plan is secured under Requirement 28 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023).
1.18.42	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraph 250 you state "a moderate adverse impact upon Link 4b" (Theberton) in respect of pedestrians, and in paragraph 251 you state that additional mitigation measures are required. Mitigation is set out in paragraph 275 and illustrated in Appendix 26.17 [APP-543]. In paragraph 275 you state that *"where possible"*	a) 'Where possible' in this context refers to where it would be reasonable and proportionate to the impacts under consideration. In determining the mitigation proposed the Applicants have applied these tests.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				permanent footway improvements are proposed for Theberton (link 4b). Please a) clarify what you mean by "where possible"; b) confirm that all these mitigation measures are permanent, and c) state where in the DCO they are secured.	b) Paragraph 275 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) states that mitigation measures would be permanent. c) The localised footway improvements are detailed within the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586). A final CTMP is secured under Requirement 28 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023).
1.18.43	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraph 260 you state a "moderate adverse impact upon Link 6b" (Snape) in respect of pedestrian amenity, and in paragraph 261 you state that additional mitigation measures are required. Mitigation is set out in paragraph 277 and illustrated in Appendix 26.17 [APP-543]. In paragraph 277 you state that "where possible" permanent footway improvements are proposed for Snape (link 6b). Please: a) clarify what you mean by "where possible"; b) confirm that these mitigation measures are permanent, and c) state where in the DCO they are secured.	Please refer to the Applicants' response to Q. 1.18.42.
1.18.44	The Applicant	1	2	In Table 26.24 you state that collision cluster 3 at the junction of A12 and A1094 (links 2,3 and 6) is expected to experience a 49% increase in HGV movements and you consider that *"the change in HGV traffic could potentially lead to significant impacts"* in terms of road safety, assessing the impact as major adverse (paragraph 294). You note in paragraph 296 that it is *"unclear at this stage whether the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power*	A clarification note on potential cumulative effects with Sizewell C is being prepared using data published in its DCO application. The Applicants intend to submit this clarification note to the Examination at Deadline 2.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				Station proposals would come forward or be delivered prior to the commencement of construction" of this project, and propose an independent set of physical mitigation measures (paragraphs 297 and 298). Bearing in mind that the Sizewell C project has now been accepted for examination: a) Where and how would these additional HGV movements be controlled? And b) why do you consider that the proposed mitigation measures are adequate?	
1.18.45	The Applicant	1	2	You note in paragraph 296 that it is *"unclear at this stage whether the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station proposals would come forward or be delivered prior to the commencement of construction"* of this East Anglia project, and propose an independent set of physical mitigation measures (paragraphs 297 and 298) for this junction complemented by the control of employee traffic movements as outlined in the OTP [APP-588] (paragraph 300), concluding (paragraph 301) that these measures are sufficient to result in a minor adverse impact post mitigation. Your proposed mitigation appears to be predicated on managing employee movements during peak hours, please: a) explain why you consider that the measures proposed in paragraph 298 provide adequate physical mitigation; and b) state what monitoring measures you	a) Please refer to Applicants' response to Q1.18.44. b) ***Section 4.1.3*** of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) details a 'near miss' reporting system. Full details of the monitoring processes are set out under ***Section 4.2***.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				propose to ensure that the mitigation measures you propose are effective.	
1.18.46	The Applicant	1	2	In Table 26.24 it says that collision cluster 3 at the junction of A12 and A1094 (links 2,3 and 6) is expected to experience a 49% increase in HGV (Table 26.24) and the Applicant considers that "the change in HGV traffic could potentially lead to significant impacts" in terms of road safety, assessing the impact as major adverse (paragraph 294). The Applicant further notes in paragraph 296 that it is *"unclear at this stage whether the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station proposals would come forward or be delivered prior to the commencement of construction"* of this project, and proposes an independent set of physical mitigation measures (paragraphs 297 and 298) for the A12/A1094 junction complemented by the control of employee traffic movements as outlined in the OTP [APP-588] (paragraph 300). a) Bearing in mind that the Sizewell C project has now been accepted for examination, do you consider that the proposed mitigation at the A12/A1094 junction is adequate? b) Do you think that the downward trend of collisions at the A12/A1094 junction is a reliable basis for the assessment?	a) Please refer to Applicants' response to Q1.18.44. b) ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) notes that the collision rate along the A1094 is just below the national average. Further review of the numbers of collisions along the A1094 has shown a material downward trend occurring annually. This trend is therefore considered within the assessment of road safety impacts along the A1094. However, the assessment of the road safety impacts at the junction of the A12 / A1094 did not draw conclusions from year on year trends and therefore, does not rely on a downward trend in collisions to inform mitigation outcomes.
1.18.47	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraphs 295 and 382 you outline a proposal by EDF Energy to replace the A12/A1094 priority junction with a roundabout junction as part of the mitigation proposals for the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station project.	a) The A12 / A1094 roundabout proposal is part of the overall 'Two Villages Bypass' mitigation scheme proposed for Sizewell C. The Applicants are not in a position to comment on whether the proposed roundabout junction (proposed as part of the mitigation proposals for the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				Please give an update in respect of any discussions you have had with EDF and the highway authority in respect of this proposal. In particular: a) has this proposal been accepted or agreed in principle with the highway authority? b) has the bringing forward of this proposal been considered, such that it is ready for use as mitigation for this project including cost sharing with EDF, given that you propose two separate projects being constructed simultaneously (Scenario 1) and given SCC concerns in respect of the temporary measures you propose? and c) have intelligent traffic signals been considered as a temporary measure to improve junction performance and reduce gap acceptance collisions?	project) is acceptable to the local highway authority. b) The Sizewell C roundabout solution is a major 'off-line' intervention, requiring land acquisition, procurement, planned roadworks and a long construction duration. There is a high risk that this mitigation could not be delivered under the SZC DCO for the Projects' construction start date and the Applicants cannot restrict or constrain the delivery of the Projects by being dependant on the delivery of a roundabout solution by the Sizewell C project which is not yet consented and has not yet secured its necessary financing. Notwithstanding this, the Applicants do not consider a proposed roundabout at this junction to be a necessary or appropriate form of mitigation for the Projects given the minor adverse residual impact on road safety assessed for the Projects at this junction. Furthermore, the design of the proposed roundabout for the Sizewell C project is integrated with a two-village by-pass also proposed as mitigation for the Sizewell C project. c) Whilst the Applicants consider the mitigation measures proposed within the Applications are acceptable at this junction, discussions with the local highway authority are ongoing regarding the merits of installing temporary traffic signals at this junction.
1.18.48	The Applicant	1	2	You state in paragraph 306 that traffic speeds would be reduced at the A12/A1094 junction following implementation of your package of mitigation measures. Would the new 40mph limit be implemented and monitored prior to the start of construction to ensure that this is the case?	There is an existing safety camera provided on the A12 just (~180m) to the north of the junction of the A1094. Data captured from this camera would be sourced from the Police to give an indication of compliance with the change in speed limit following the implementation of the 40mph limit.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18.49	The Applicant	1	2	Has the model referred to in paragraph 312 been calibrated and validated with actual observations of flow, vehicle type, queue length and driver delay?	Paragraph 316 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) outlines that the modelling of junction capacity has been undertaken using 'Junctions 8'. The models have been informed through the use of observed manually classified turning count data. The manually classified turning counts captured details of the numbers of vehicles, types of vehicle and existing queue lengths. The Junctions 8 model outputs have been validated through comparing observed queue length data with modelled queue lengths.
1.18.50	The Applicant	1	2	The ExA has noted that the labels on the swept path analysis diagrams in Appendix 26.21 Swept Path Analysis Sensitive Junctions [APP-547] appear to be incomplete. Please add to each of the drawings in Appendix 26.21 Swept Path Analysis Sensitive Junctions [APP-547] so as to show the vehicle on each arm of each junction and its direction of travel.	The Applicants are unclear what additions the ExA is requesting when it states "*show the vehicle on each arm of each junction and its direction of travel*". The swept path analysis presented in ***Appendix 26.21*** (APP-547) details the path taken by a range of vehicles through two junctions and each swept path is labelled with a description of the direction of travel taken by the vehicle. Please can the ExA provide further clarification of any changes it may require?
1.18.51	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 330 refers to the use of a pilot vehicle for larger articulated vehicles heading for accesses 5 and 6. Please explain how the use of a pilot vehicle would reduce driver delay at the A1094/B1122 roundabout junction such that it can be relied upon as mitigation.	The swept path analysis presented within ***Appendix 26.21*** (APP—547) demonstrates that an articulated HGV would oversail into the opposite lane when turning from the A1094 onto the B1122. If this lane was blocked by an oncoming vehicle the HGV would not be able to make the manoeuvre. The HGV or oncoming driver, may therefore have to reverse which may not be possible with following traffic, leading to driver delay. A pilot vehicle would run ahead of the vehicle it is escorting. At the junction of the A1094 and B1122, the pilot vehicle would stop any oncoming traffic to allow the following HGV to pass any oncoming traffic.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18.52	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 333 refers to occasional repair and maintenance. Could vehicle movements include AIL, for example in the case of transformer or cable failure? If so, which access routes would be used?	The transformers and cables are designed not to fail and should not need to be replaced during the lifetime of the Projects. Any replacement would be due to an unplanned failure / emergency only and would be a rare event. Routine maintenance would not require the replacement or removal of the transformers or cables. It is therefore expected that once the transformers and cables are installed, there would be no requirement for AIL movements for the lifetime of the Projects. Notwithstanding, should there be a requirement for AIL movements, the routes to be used would be agreed with stakeholders through the established processes known as Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads.
1.18.53	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 340 gives two worst case scenarios in combination with the other East Anglia project. a) Is there a third scenario in which there is an overlap in the construction programmes and, if so, could this represent the worst case? And b) if so, will the OTP, OAMP and OCTMP need updating?	a) The proposed East Anglia TWO project cumulative impact assessment considers the cumulative impact with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project against two different construction scenarios (i.e. construction of the two projects simultaneously or sequentially). The simultaneous scenario represents a programme overlap. This assessment is contained within ***Appendix 26.2*** (APP-528). This is reversed for East Anglia ONE North project cumulative impact and the assessment repeated ***Appendix 26.2*** (APP-528) of that project. b) The introductory text for the ***OTP*** (APP-588), ***OAMP*** (APP-587) and ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) confirms that the scope of the plans extents to the Projects being constructed simultaneously.
1.18.54	The Applicant	1		In Table 26.26: a) should the cumulative operational impacts	a) The header at the foot of page 80 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) is incorrect and should read *"Cumulative Operation Impacts with the proposed East Anglia TWO*

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				header (near the foot of page 80) refer to East Anglia TWO? And b) should the following header "Cumulative Construction Impacts with the proposed East Anglia TWO project" (at the top of page 81) be removed?	*project"* not *"Cumulative Operation Impacts with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project"*. b) The header near the top of page 81 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) that reads *"Cumulative Construction Impacts with the Proposed East Anglia TWO Project"* and the following header that reads *"Cumulative Decommissioning Impacts with the proposed East Anglia ONE North project"* should both be removed and replaced with a single header that reads *"Cumulative Decommissioning Impacts with the proposed East Anglia TWO project"*.
1.18.55	The Applicant	1	2	In table 26.27 you state that there is no potential for cumulative driver delay due to highway geometry. Please confirm that: a) this is because no HGV or AIL will travel through the A1094/B1069 and A1094/B1122 junctions as the loads will have previously been broken down into smaller loads which can be transported safely in smaller vehicles without causing any delay to other road users; or b) if this is not the case and HGV are escorted by a pilot vehicle, that there is no cumulative impact with projects other than EA1N and EA2 because vehicles on other projects (such as Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station) will not be using these junctions.	The assessment of driver delay (highway geometry) was requested by the Councils during the ETG process and considers if HGVs can manoeuvre through junctions / links without conflicting with oncoming traffic as a benchmark for significant impact (and therefore likelihood of a cumulative impact). With regards to the junction of the A1094 / B1069, the assessment within ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) shows that there would be no vehicle conflict at this junction and therefore no potential for cumulative impacts. With regards to the junction of the A1094 / B1122, the assessment shows that there would be potential for conflict at this junction. ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) therefore outlines mitigation measures to break loads down and use appropriately sized vehicles that can negotiate the roundabout, or on the limited occasions where loads cannot be broken down, to escort vehicles through the junction. It is therefore considered that the mitigation

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					strategy would ensure that there would be no potential for cumulative impacts at this location. With regards to AILs they would be subject to a separate process known as the Electronic Service Delivery for Abnormal Loads (ESDAL). The ESDAL process would ensure the timing of AIL movements would be co-ordinated and (including the issuing of the required advanced notification to stakeholders) and potential impacts would not be significant.
1.18.56	The Applicant	1	2	Table 26.28 makes reference to planned construction activities at the existing operational Sizewell B Power Station and that the planning application is awaiting decision. Table 26.28 also states in respect of cumulative impacts that there will be no temporal overlap with planned construction activities at Sizewell B during construction. Please a) update the ExA on the current position in respect of whether and if so when consent has been granted for these works by the LPA; b) explain whether there will be temporal overlap; c) if there is temporal overlap, include Sizewell B in your cumulative impact assessment; and d) explain whether there are any other planned construction or decommissioning activities at the Sizewell complex during the	a) A planning application for relocation of Sizewell B facilities was approved on 13th November 2019. On the basis of the information available for that application, these works were scoped out of the cumulative impact assessment as the peak construction period was planned to be prior to the Projects' construction. Since then EDF has explored the possibility to reuse an area of land within the Sizewell A complex. EDF is preparing to submit a planning application to ESC for the relocation of these facilities, consultation on the new proposals closed on 24th August 2020. b) The Transport Assessment for Sizewell B states that construction would commence in 2022 and operational activities would commence in 2027. There could therefore be a temporal overlap with the Projects. c) The worst case assumption regarding this new proposal would be that its construction phase overlaps with that for either of the Projects. This will be considered in the cumulative impact assessment clarification note to be submitted at Deadline 2.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				construction period.	d) New information on the construction of Sizewell C is considered in the cumulative impact assessment clarification note to be submitted at Deadline 2. Please see answer to question 1.9.20 regarding activities at Sizewell A.
1.18.57	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraphs 349 to 352 you list and describe briefly the three assessment scenarios presented by the Sizewell C project in its PEIR, namely i) Early years, a three year period commencing 2022; ii) Peak construction (road option); and iii) Peak construction (rail option). Paragraph 353 then lists three cumulative impact assessment scenarios, combining the East Anglias scenario 1 (construction of both the East Anglia projects simultaneously) with each of the three Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station project options, namely i) early years, ii) peak construction (rail option) and iii) peak construction (road option). In paragraph 354 you say that *"EDF Energy have (sic) embarked upon a Stage 4 consultation exercise … The Stage 4 consultation document … does not contain sufficient information to facilitate a quantitative assessment."*. Please explain a) why this is the case; b) what further information you would need to be able to undertake the necessary assessment; and	The Sizewell Stage 4 consultation document did not contain the level of traffic forecast detail required to inform detailed capacity (driver delay assessments) and road safety. There was also a concern with the 'fluidity' of the information and therefore a qualitive assessment of all transport effects was presented. The Applicants have subsequently reviewed the Sizewell C DCO application data and will submit a cumulative impact assessment note to the Examination at Deadline 2.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				c) whether the Stage 4 (pre-application) consultation for the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station project has introduced any further options	
1.18.60	The Applicant, EDF Energy (Sizewell C New Nuclear), SCC	1	2	Paragraphs 359 to 367 refer to highway improvements proposed in relation to the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station project, which it is not currently envisaged will be available prior to construction work starting on this East Anglia project. Given that the Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station project has been accepted for examination, have any discussions been held between the Applicant, EDF Energy and the highway authority in relation to ways in which these improvements could be ready for use prior to work commencing on the East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO project(s) in order to reduce cumulative impacts?	The Applicants are not reliant on the mitigation measures proposed for Sizewell C and for the purpose of the assessing impacts in ***Chapter 26 Traffic and Transport*** (APP- 074), the Applicants have assumed that the Sizewell C mitigation measures are not in place. There is no requirement therefore for the Sizewell C mitigation measures to be brought forward to accommodate the Projects. However, as outlined in the SoCG with SZC (ExA.SoCG-18.D1.V1), the Applicants and SZC will engage regularly with each other during design and construction of their respective projects so that any interface between the projects can be considered at an early stage, recognising it is in the interests of the Applicants and SZC as well as the wider community that all projects be coordinated as far as reasonably practicable.
1.18.61	The Applicant	1	2	With reference to the previous question and to paragraphs 373 and 374 (Lover's Lane), given that *"mitigation would likely be required prior to commencement of significant construction traffic movements"*, please explain a) what you understand by "significant" in paragraph 373; and b) why the cumulative impacts on Lover's Lane "would not be significant" (paragraph 374), given that you reach a different conclusion in other locations: paragraphs 360, 363 and 367 refer.	A clarification note on potential cumulative effects with Sizewell C is being prepared using data published in its DCO application. The Applicants intend to submit this clarification note to the Examination at Deadline 2.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
1.18.62	The Applicant	1	2	With reference to summary table 26.29, please a) explain why the Sizewell C project appears not to be mentioned other than with reference to junctions 1 and 2; b) provide ratio of flow to capacity (RFC) figures for Junctions 1 and 2 for both the East Anglia projects before and during construction of the proposed roundabouts; and c) provide RFC figures for junction 3, both for the project alone and for the cumulative scenarios.	A clarification note on potential cumulative effects with Sizewell C is being prepared using data published in its DCO application. The Applicants intend to submit this clarification note to the Examination at Deadline 2.
1.18.63	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 401 says that pedestrians, motorists and cyclists have been considered as receptors in the traffic and transport assessment. a) Have motorcyclists and horses and their riders been considered? b) If not, why not; and c) if so, where, and what conclusions have you reached?	The consideration of motorcyclists is inherent in the assessment methodologies adopted for road safety and driver delay impacts noting all road users are considered. The consideration of equestrians is inherent in the assessment methodologies adopted for road safety, and severance impacts noting all road users are considered. In addition, pedestrian and cycle amenity impact serves as a proxy as the assessment considers PRoW that are impacted by construction routes. Further assessment of the Projects' bridleway impact is contained in the ES ***Chapter 30 Tourism, Recreation and Socio-Economics*** (APP-078). Noting that the consideration of motorcyclists and equestrians is inherent in the impact assessments the conclusions presented in ***Table 26.33*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) are inclusive of these user groups.
Outline Travel Plan [APP-588]					
1.18.64	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraph 28, you state that *"the OTP does not prescribe the routes along public roads to be used*	***Section 26.6.1.3*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) explains how employee trips have been assigned to the onshore highway

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
				by employees to reach the access locations." Please explain why this is the case and how you have assigned these trips to the network.	study area using socio economics data to determine employment origins. This approach has been agreed with the Councils and Highways England during the ETG process.
1.18.66	The Applicant	1	2	Section 3.4 sets out an action plan with allocated responsibilities and section 3.5 sets out measures to be taken by *"the appointed contractor"*. Please explain a) how this will work in practice and b) how compliance by third parties is secured in the DCO.	a) Requirement 28 of the draft DCO provides that a final detailed Travel Plan must be produced, prior to onshore construction of the Projects, and will be in accordance with measures set out in the ***OTP*** (APP-588). The purpose of the action plan is to provide the appointed Contractor with details of the commitments and measures to be implemented throughout the Projects' construction phase. *b)* The final Travel Plan (and associated Action Plan) is secured under Requirement 28 of the **draft DCO** (APP-023). To secure third party compliance, the ***OTP*** (APP-588) explains that the term 'contractor' in relation to contractor responsibilities relates to either a Principal Contractor(s) or sub-contractors(s) and will be defined within the final Travel Plan.
1.18.67	The Applicant	1	2	If both the EA1N and EA2 projects are constructed simultaneously, and the same vehicles are used to transport materials and personnel for both projects, how will you manage this to ensure that monitoring and enforcement is undertaken under the correct DCO?	***Section 1.2*** of the ***OTP*** (APP-588) details the Governance structure to manage the multiple contract arrangements that may arise should the Projects be constructed simultaneously. This entails the appointment of a Travel Plan Co-Ordinator for each contract report to the Applicants' Transport Co-ordinator. The Transport Co-Ordinator would be responsible for: • Assisting and directing the Travel Plan Co-Ordinator in managing the implementation of the final Travel Plan; • Reporting the monitoring of the final Travel Plan to SCC;

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					• Acting as a point of contact for the local community; and • Providing a link between the Travel Plan Co-Ordinator and the Applicants.
1.18.68	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 21 says that *"Contact details for the TPCos and TCo will be submitted to relevant stakeholders …prior to the commencement of construction."* a) Who are the relevant stakeholders? b) Has the inclusion of contact details on a website as well as flyers and posters been considered, to enable easier contact and reporting?	a) It is anticipated that as a minimum, relevant stakeholders would include the Councils, Parish Councils that may be affected, and Highways England. b) ***Section 2.5*** of the ***Outline Code of Construction Practice*** (COCP) (APP- 578) sets out the processes for developing a Stakeholder Communications Plan which includes the commitment to proactive public relations using a combination of communication channels. The final Travel Plan would adopt the communication measures developed in the Communication Plan as a means of communicating traffic and transport effects.
Outline Access Management Plan [APP-587]					
1.18.69	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 14 states that the access strategy is *"informed by the Suffolk Country Council HGV route hierarchy"* (sic). a) Are there any access routes which do not form part of the route hierarchy? b) If so, are any mitigation measures proposed, and how are these secured?	a) Of the 15 links forming the onshore highway study area depicted in ***Figure 26.1*** (APP-306), links 5, 7, 10 and 13 do not form part the Suffolk County Council HGV route hierarchy, a copy of which is provided within ***Appendix 26.6*** (APP-532). *b)* Of the routes that do not form part of the SCC HGV route hierarchy, link 10 has been identified as requiring mitigation in support of the access strategy. ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) paragraph 26.6.1.12.2 identifies HGV mitigation for driver delay at the junction of the link 8 and 10 (A1094 / B1122 roundabout) in the form of consolidated smaller loads and pilot vehicles. ***Section***

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					2.2.4 of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) provides detail of this mitigation. The final CTMP is secured under Requirement 28 of the ***draft DCO*** (APP-023).
1.18.71	The Applicant	1	2	In paragraph 45 do you mean 'Suffolk County Council' (rather than SSC)?	Paragraph 45 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) should read 'SCC' rather than 'SSC'.
Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-586]					
1.18.72	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 26 refers to performance standards. a) Please explain why numbers of HGV are not relevant in securing the required performance standards. b) What guarantee is there for those affected by HGV movements that the input measures proposed will achieve the necessary output standards?	In response to part a) and b) the Applicants would offer the following clarification. The monitoring strategy recognises that monitoring the numbers of HGV's is relevant and this is confirmed in ***Section 4*** of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586). However, the focus of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) is to monitor the implementation of the Action Plan inputs. The HGV numbers and routing compliance will serve to 'audit' the effectiveness of the Action Plan and assist the Applicants and Councils to determine if the timing or scale of the interventions set out in the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) need to be revised.
1.18.73	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraph 38 refers to HGV timings. The ExA note that these are over a 12- hour period (0700-1900) on weekdays and 0700-1300 on Saturdays. Please confirm that the forecast flows have been assigned to a 12- hour and not an AADT model.	Please refer to Applicants' response to Q1.18.12b.
1.18.74	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraphs 42-44 refer to the use of a pilot vehicle at the A1094/B1122 roundabout junction at Aldeburgh for larger articulated vehicles heading for accesses 5 and 6. Please explain how the use of a pilot vehicle would reduce driver delay at the A1094/B1122 roundabout junction such that it can be relied upon as mitigation.	The swept path analysis presented within ***Appendix 26.21*** (APP—547) demonstrates that an articulated HGV would oversail into the opposite lane when turning from the A1094 onto the B1122. If this lane was blocked by an oncoming vehicle the HGV would not be able to make the manoeuvre. The HGV or oncoming driver, may therefore have to reverse which may not be possible with following traffic, leading to driver delay.

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					A pilot vehicle would run ahead of the vehicle it is escorting. At the junction of the A1094 and B1122, the pilot vehicle would stop any oncoming traffic to allow the following HGV to pass any oncoming traffic.
1.18.75	The Applicant	1	2	Paragraphs 50-52 deal briefly with abnormal loads, and paragraph 50 says that AIL movements will be outside the restrictions in the OCTMP and subject to separate agreement with the relevant highway authorities and the police. a) How many AIL movements are envisaged during construction and operation of the project? b) How have the impacts been assessed? c) Will those affected be consulted and/or notified and if so how? d) What offsite highways works will be required? And e) are they those described in section 3.1 for HGV traffic?	a) Paragraph 80 of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) details a total of two AIL transformer deliveries per project (a total of four deliveries simultaneously). There is also potential for a number of smaller AILs (e.g. plant movement and cable drums). This are set out in a clarification note (ExA.AS-8.D1.V1) submitted to the Examination at Deadline 1. b) The transformer AILs are designated 'Special Order Vehicles'[1] and therefore will be subject to a separate assessment and consenting process as directed by the Department for Transport. The smaller AILs will typically be carried on standard vehicles and are included in the HGV figures assessed in the ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP–074) c) ***Section 2.5*** of the ***Outline CoCP*** (APP- 578) sets out the processes for developing a Stakeholder Communications Plan which includes the commitment to proactive public relations using a combination of communication channels. d) ***Table 26.2*** of ***Chapter 26*** of the ES (APP-074) details the off-site highway works required to accommodate the Projects' traffic demand.

[1] *The Road Vehicles (Authorisation of Special Types) (General) Order 2003 (SI 1998) STGO 2003 limits gross weight of an AIL to 150 tonnes, axle weight to 16,500kg, length to 30m and/or width to 6.1m, above which a Special Order is required from Highways England.*

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to			ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
					e) ***Section 3.1*** of the ***OCTMP*** sets out further offsite highway works required to mitigate amenity impacts.
1.18.76	The Applicant	1	2	Section 4.2 refers to a monthly monitoring report produced by the TCo and CTMPCos,but does not explain what the objective of the report is or who is able to view it. Please explain this process further.	The purpose of the monitoring report (as outlined in paragraph 72 of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586)) is to identify effective / ineffective measures and the requirement for any remedial action to achieve the agreed targets. It is intended that in compiling the reports the Contractor will be able to see whether they are complying with their targets and actions, whether there are any emerging issues and ensure that any emerging issues can be rectified early through amendments to the plan. The Councils will be able to request a copy of this monthly monitoring report.
1.18.77	The Applicant	1	2	Section 4 sets out your proposals for monitoring and enforcement. Will the highway authority have access to the HGV data to monitor traffic movements, or will this information only be provided when a breach is reported? Please explain the process further.	***Section 4.2*** of the ***OCTMP*** (APP-586) outlines that a monthly monitoring report will be produced. The monitoring report will include details such as the results of surveys and monitoring. The Councils will be able to request a copy of this monthly monitoring report.
1.18.78	The Applicant	1	2	**Relationship with Sizewell** Please explain what impacts, if any, there will be on both the existing and future emergency planning/ evacuation arrangements for the operational Sizewell B Power Station complex, the construction and operation of the proposed Sizewell C New Nuclear Power station and the decommissioning of the Sizewell A power station as a result of the construction and operation of this project, for both EA1N alone, EA2 alone and in combination with each other.	The Applicants are progressing SoCGs with the following parties: • SZC in relation to the proposed Sizewell C New Nuclear Power Station: – There are three areas of overlapping Order limits onshore within the highway boundary. The Applicants and SZC recognise that all projects involve works at these locations and will engage regularly with each other during design and construction of their respective projects so that any interface between the projects can be considered at an early stage, recognising it is in the interests of the Applicants and SZC as well as the wider

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to	ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
			community that works at these locations be coordinated as far as reasonably practicable – There one area of overlapping Order limits offshore which relate to cooling water infrastructure and the Projects' offshore export cables. It is agreed within the SoCG however that the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Projects and the proposed SZC project can be undertaken without unreasonable hinderance. • EDF Energy Nuclear Generation Limited in relation to the proposed Sizewell B Nuclear Power Station: – The Applicants will liaise with EDF to ensure that necessary and reasonable information held by the Applicants on the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Projects is made available to EDF at the appropriate time, for inclusion and accommodation in the Sizewell B onsite emergency plan. • Magnox Limited and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority in relation to the Sizewell A licenced nuclear site: – It is noted there are no direct onshore or offshore interactions between the Projects' Order limits and the Sizewell A Site and the Projects have no impact on the Sizewell A Site's nuclear site licence held by Magnox or activities undertaken or managed by Magnox or the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority within the Sizewell A Site (including at the Sizewell A Site's cooling water infrastructure).

ExA. Question Ref.	Question addressed to	ExA. Question	Applicants' Response
			• Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) in relation to its statutory remit which includes the independent regulation of nuclear safety at licensed nuclear sites in the UK: – A SoCG has been progressed with ONR and submitted at Deadline 1. ONR confirm within the SoCG that there are no outstanding matters of disagreement relating to nuclear safety within the draft SoCG at the time of writing.