

Sea Link

Volume 6: Environmental Statement

Document: 6.2.2.13

Part 2 Suffolk

Chapter 13

Suffolk Onshore Scheme Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN020026

Version: A

March 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 Regulation 5(2)(a)

Page intentionally blank

Contents

| | | |
|-------------|--|----------|
| 13. | Suffolk Onshore Scheme Inter-Project Cumulative Effects | 1 |
| 13.1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 13.2 | Assessment of cumulative effects | 2 |
| 13.3 | Assessment of total cumulative effects | 146 |
| 13.4 | Summary of total cumulative effects | 186 |
| 13.5 | References | 189 |

Table of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 13.1 Study Areas for environmental topics | 3 |
| Table 13.2 Major Developments Short List to be considered in the Inter-Project Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) | 5 |
| Table 13.3 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - Sizewell C - main development site (ID1) | 12 |
| Table 13.4 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - A12 Bypass (ID292) | 15 |
| Table 13.5 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Yoxford Roundabout (ID 293) | 18 |
| Table 13.6 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - Sizewell Link Road (ID 295) | 21 |
| Table 13.7 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA – Sizewell C Northern park and ride (ID 296) | 24 |
| Table 13.8 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA – Sizewell C Southern park and ride (ID 297) | 26 |
| Table 13.9 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA – Sizewell C Rail (ID 298) | 28 |
| Table 13.10 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarms (ID 5) | 31 |
| Table 13.11 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarms (ID 6) | 34 |
| Table 13.12 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - High Lodge Leisure (ID 221) | 37 |
| Table 13.13 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Croft Farm land and buildings (ID 228) | 40 |
| Table 13.14 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Park Farm Solar Farm (ID 233) | 42 |
| Table 13.15 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Brightwell Lakes (ID 240) | 44 |
| Table 13.16 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Residential Development, Darsham Station (ID 245) | 46 |
| Table 13.17 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA – Solar Farm Parham, Suffolk (ID 248) | 49 |
| Table 13.18 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Proposed reservoir, Grange Farm (ID 263) | 51 |
| Table 13.19 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities (ID 270 and ID 271) | 56 |
| Table 13.20 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Town Farm Solar Farm (ID 277 and ID 278) | 59 |
| Table 13.21 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - UKZ139 BC Wissett Solar Farm (ID 279) | 62 |
| Table 13.22 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Brundish Manor Solar Farm (ID 285) | 64 |
| Table 13.23 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID 287) | 66 |
| Table 13.24 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Norwich to Tilbury (ID 288) | 69 |
| Table 13.25 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Cockfield Hall Estate (ID 307) | 76 |
| Table 13.26 Landscape and Visual CEA | 84 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 13.27 Ecology and Biodiversity CEA | 93 |
| Table 13.28 Cultural Heritage CEA | 100 |
| Table 13.29 Water Environment CEA | 104 |
| Table 13.30 Agriculture and Soils CEA | 107 |
| Table 13.31 Traffic and Transport CEA | 112 |
| Table 13.32 Noise and Vibration CEA | 122 |
| Table 13.33 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism CEA | 125 |
| Table 13.34 Health and Wellbeing CEA | 134 |
| Table 13.35 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Landscape and Visual | 147 |
| Table 13.36 Sequential Cumulative Visual Assessment | 155 |
| Table 13.37 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Ecology and Biodiversity | 162 |
| Table 13.38 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Cultural Heritage | 165 |
| Table 13.39 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Water Environment | 167 |
| Table 13.40 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Agriculture and Soils | 168 |
| Table 13.41 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Traffic and Transport | 168 |
| Table 13.42 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Noise and Vibration | 178 |
| Table 13.43 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism | 179 |
| Table 13.44 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Health and Wellbeing | 183 |

13. Suffolk Onshore Scheme Inter-Project Cumulative Effects

13.1 Introduction

- 13.1.1 This chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) presents how the inter-project cumulative effects assessment has considered the potential significant cumulative effects that may arise from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme with 'other developments'. A description of inter-project cumulative effects and the methodology is presented in **Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Assessment Methodologies**. The methodology used for the assessment in this chapter follows relevant guidance within the Planning Inspectorate's 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment' (Planning Inspectorate, 2024).
- 13.1.2 The Order Limits, which illustrate the boundary of the Proposed Project, are illustrated on **Application Document 2.2.1 Overall Location and Master Key Plan** and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme Boundary is illustrated on **Application Document 2.2.2 Suffolk Location Plan**.
- 13.1.3 This chapter should be read in conjunction with:
- **Application Document 6.2.1.4 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 4 Description of the Proposed Project;**
 - **Application Document 6.2.1.5 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 5 EIA Approach and Methodology;** and
 - **Application Document 6.2.1.6 Part 1 Introduction Chapter 6 Scoping Opinion and Consultation.**
- 13.1.4 This chapter is supported by the following figures:
- **Application Document 6.4.2.13 Suffolk Onshore Scheme Inter-Project Cumulative Effects;**
 - **Application Document 6.4.2.1.11A Cumulative Schemes (Major Projects) Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Sizewell C;**
 - **Application Document 6.4.2.1.11B Cumulative Schemes (Major Projects) Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility – East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two Offshore Wind Farms;**
 - **Application Document 6.4.2.1.11C Cumulative Schemes (Major Projects) Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility – LionLink Offshore Interconnector;**
 - **Application Document 6.4.2.1.11D Cumulative Schemes (Major Projects) Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility – All Schemes Merged;**
 - **Application Document 6.4.2.1.12 Landscape Context and Designations and Landscape Character – District with scoped in cumulative schemes; and**

- **Application Document 6.4.2.1.13 Representative Viewpoint Locations and Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility - Sea Link and Friston Scenario 1 with scoped in cumulative schemes.**

1.1.1 This chapter is supported by the following appendices:

- **Application Document 6.3.2.13.A Appendix 2.13.A Descriptions of Other Developments;**
- **Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Assessment Methodologies;**
- **Application Document 6.3.1.5.B Appendix 1.5.B Inter-Project Cumulative Effects Initial Long List; and**
- **Application Document 6.3.1.5.C Appendix 1.5.C Inter-Project Cumulative Effects Short List.**

13.2 Assessment of cumulative effects

13.2.1 The approach to this assessment, including reference to the guidance and data sources used to compile the relevant lists, is explained in **Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodologies.**

Stage 1

Review of the Zone of Influence (ZOI)

- 13.2.2 The first step in identifying the long list of other developments was to establish the Zone of Influence (ZOI) for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. **Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodologies** describes how the ZOI has been defined based upon the largest study area of the Suffolk Onshore technical chapters (**Application Documents 6.2.2.1 to 6.2.2.11**) and doubling that area to identify a long list of 'other developments'. These study areas take into account environmental influences such as landscape and visual amenity originating at distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and the mobile nature of some protected species rather than the maximum area over which the Suffolk Onshore Scheme could result in potential effects.
- 13.2.3 An overall cumulative assessment ZOI of 20 km has been used. This is based upon the largest topic study area, which is that for ecology and biodiversity, this being identified as extending 10 km from the proposed Order Limits. Doubling this distance, to account for the (assumed) study areas of other developments results in a ZOI of 20 km being established for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.
- 13.2.4 This ZOI was reviewed to take account of any changes in the proposed study areas and any updates to the proposed order limits since the Statutory Consultation stage. The study areas applied to the various technical assessments are summarised in **Table 13.1**. The rationale for the extents of these individual study areas is explained in **Application Documents 6.2.2.1 to 6.2.2.11**. These study areas were presented in the Scoping Report and discussed with stakeholders as relevant. The long list of other developments presented in **Application Document 6.3.1.5.B Appendix 1.5.B Inter-Project Cumulative Effects Initial Long List** is also displayed in **Application Document 6.4.2.13.1 Suffolk Onshore Scheme Long List Developments** and

includes additional developments not previously identified at the Statutory Consultation stage.

Table 13.1 Study Areas for environmental topics

| Environmental Topic | Study areas |
|---|---|
| Landscape and Visual | 3 km from the Order Limits surrounding the proposed Saxmundham Converter Station and Friston Substation, and 1 km from the Order Limits around the proposed landfall (denoted as the high-water mark), and HVDC and HVAC cable corridors. This excludes the construction access routes and the re-stringing works under Friston Scenario 2 as neither of these aspects are considered to have any potential to lead to a significant landscape and visual effect. |
| Ecology and Nature Conservation | 10 km from the Order Limits for internationally important wildlife sites, 5 km for nationally important wildlife sites, 2 km for locally important wildlife sites. Impacts on internationally important wildlife sites also consider functionally-linked land up to 20 km from such sites depending on species of interest. |
| Cultural Heritage | 500 m from the Order Limits for baseline, and 2 km from main above ground infrastructure for impacts on setting. |
| Water Environment | 500 m from the Order Limits. |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | Geology: 250 m from the Order Limits. Hydrogeology: 500 m from the Order Limits. |
| Agriculture and Soils | 2 km. |
| Traffic and Transport | 3.5 to 8 km. |
| Air Quality | Construction dust – 250 m from the Order Limits. Trackout – 50 m of the routes used by construction vehicles on the public highway, 250 m from the bellmouths. Construction vehicle emissions – 200 m of the affected road network. Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) emissions – 200 m of the proposed construction compounds. Back-up Generator Emissions – 200 m from the Converter Station and Substation boundary. |
| Noise and Vibration | 300 m from works locations for construction noise, 100 m from works locations for construction vibration, shared construction traffic routes, and 1 km from sources of operational noise. |
| Socio-economics, recreation and tourism | For the assessment socio-economics, recreation and tourism effects, the study area is defined at varying geographic levels according to the likely spatial extent of the effect under consideration (as set out in Application Document 6.2.2.10 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 10 Socio-economics, Recreation, and Tourism). As a result, the following study areas have been adopted: |

| Environmental Topic | Study areas |
|----------------------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60-minute travel area from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme Boundary for economic impacts*; • 1 km from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme Boundary for Local communities affected by severance; • 500 m from Suffolk Onshore Scheme Boundary for residential properties, business premises, visitor attractions, community facilities, open space, development land and PRow and recreational routes; and • *For cumulative economic impacts, professional judgement has been used to determine which cumulative schemes are assessed, as only comparable major infrastructure projects are anticipated to lead to potential significant cumulative socio-economic effects. |
| Health and Wellbeing | For the assessment of health effects, the study area is defined based on the geographic extent of other topics for each environmental aspect of relevance to health and wellbeing, including, landscape and visual, traffic and transport, air quality, noise and vibration, and socio-economics, recreation and tourism. These study areas are set out above and are considered sufficient to identify health receptors which could be impacted by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme cumulatively with other developments. |

Stage 2

- 13.2.5 Table 13.2 below presents the short list of other developments considered during Stage 1 and 2 of each technical inter-project cumulative effects assessment. This list has been kept under review throughout the preparation of the ES and has been updated as required. Given the need to finalise the ES, only those developments identified up to the end of November 2024 have been considered. The planning reference for each development on the short list can be found within **Application Document 6.4.2.13.2 Suffolk Onshore Scheme Short List Developments**. These developments have been identified in line with the guidance presented in **Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodologies**. **Application Document 6.4.2.13.2 Suffolk Onshore Scheme Short List Developments**, displays the boundaries of the developments on the short list as well as the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme Boundary.

Table 13.2 Major Developments Short List to be considered in the Inter-Project Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA)

| ID | Other Development | Development Description | Tier ¹ | Distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (km) |
|-----|---|--|-------------------|---|
| 1 | Sizewell C – main development site ² | <p>The main development site encompasses the area required for construction and operation the Sizewell C - main development site. It comprises permanent facilities for the operation of the power station as well temporary facilities mostly used to help facilitate the construction of the development, as well as road alterations, ecological mitigation areas, accommodation and recreational facilities.</p> <p>In addition to the main development site, there are a number of associated developments. These are listed in separate rows below under IDs 292, 293, 294 and 295).</p> | 1 | 2.4 |
| 292 | A12 Bypass (also known as the 'two village bypass') | A new, permanent, single carriageway bypass of Stratford St Andrews and Farnham. The bypass will form a new section of the A12, to help facilitate HGV transport during the construction and operational phases of the Sizewell C project as well as for public use. | 1 | 4.7 |
| 293 | Yoxford roundabout | A new roundabout at the existing A12 and B1122 junction at Yoxford, 100m north of the existing A12/ B1122 junction. | 1 | 5.55 |

¹ The developments have been categorised into tiers which descend from Tier 1 (most certain) to Tier 3 (least certain) and reflect a diminishing degree of certainty which can be assigned to each development.

² For the purpose of this assessment, the various components of the Sizewell C DCO have been considered separately (i.e. the main development site, A12 bypass (two village bypass), the park and rides, Yoxford roundabout, the Sizewell link road and the rail link, as well as the offsite ecological mitigation) based on the ZOI presented in Table 2.14.2, as some of these components are distant from each other and therefore have different receptors. Further consideration of the development brought forward as part of the Sizewell C DCO as a whole will be included, as appropriate, within the cumulative assessment to be presented in the ES. For instance, cumulative effects associated with the number of construction workers or indirect effects associated with construction traffic would apply to the whole project, not one aspect of it, and may require a larger ZOI to be considered. Given the scale and nature of the Sizewell C development, cumulative effects that arise when considering the development as a whole, have the potential to be significant.

| ID | Other Development | Development Description | Tier ¹ | Distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (km) |
|-----|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------|---|
| 295 | Sizewell link road- | A new, permanent, single carriageway road to bypass the villages of Middleton Moor and Theberton to facilitate movement of Sizewell C HGV construction and will prevent development related HGV congestion on the existing B1122. The new road will be open to the public. The scheme includes provision of a new 15- 20m bridge across the East Suffolk Rail Line and Pretty Road. | 1 | 4.59 |
| 296 | Sizewell C Northern park and ride | <p>The Sizewell C northern park and ride would be situated to the west of the A12, to the east of the East Suffolk line and to the north of Darsham rail station. Access to the site would be via a new temporary three arm roundabout, with works to Willow Marsh Lane and the temporary realignment of the A12 via the roundabout. The park and ride includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,250 car parking spaces; • 10 van spaces; • 80 motorbike spaces; • Bus terminus and associated shelters; and • Cycle parking for 20 bikes. | 1 | 6.68 |
| 297 | Sizewell C Southern park and ride | <p>The Sizewell C southern park and ride would be located to the north-east of Wickham Market. Access to the site would be off the slip road from the B1078 which leads to the northbound A12. The park and ride includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1,250 car parking spaces; • 10 van spaces; • 80 motorbike spaces; • Bus terminus and associated shelters; | 1 | 8.26 |

| ID | Other Development | Development Description | Tier ¹ | Distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (km) |
|-----|---|---|-------------------|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle parking for 20 bikes; • a Traffic Incident Management Area (TIMA) to enable HGV emergency parking; and • a postal consolidation building. | | |
| 298 | Sizewell C related rail improvements and rail extension route | <p>Sizewell C is proposing to move large volumes of freight via rail and included the following infrastructure within its DCO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a temporary rail extension of the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line to a terminal within the main development site (ID1) for construction materials; and • rail track upgrades and works on up to eight level crossings would be required on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line to accommodate the additional freight trains. | 1 | 0.83 |
| 5 | East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm | A proposed 208 km ² wind farm developed by Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) consisting of 67 turbines with a combined electricity generation capacity of 800 MW, an extension of the existing East Anglia ONE array. It is part of the East Anglia Hub which includes three arrays off the coast of Suffolk. | 1 | There is an overlap between the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and the East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm Order Limits |
| 6 | East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm | A proposed 255 km ² wind farm developed by Scottish Power Renewables (SPR) consisting of 75 turbines with a combined electricity generation capacity of 900 MW. The | 1 | There is an overlap between the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and |

| ID | Other Development | Development Description | Tier ¹ | Distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (km) |
|-----|---|---|-------------------|--|
| | | subsea export cable is 57 km from the Suffolk Coast. | | the East Anglia Two Offshore Windfarm Order Limits |
| 221 | High Lodge Leisure | <p>The redevelopment of the golf course and vacant paddock land at the existing High Lodge Leisure. The new development will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 170 holiday lodges; • 3 tree houses; • New facilities building; • Maintenance and housekeeping building; and • Car parking and associated road works. | 1 | 7.56 |
| 228 | Croft Farm land and buildings | The conversion of agricultural land and part of an agricultural building into a 30 caravan capacity site with associated facilities such as toilets, showers and reception facilities. | 1 | 1.67 |
| 233 | Park Farm Solar Farm | Erection of a solar photovoltaic (PV) array, with a total export capacity of up to 21 MW. Each of the solar panels will be mounted on a fixed panel system. Relevant associated infrastructure includes such as transformers, private switchgear and Distribution Network Operator switchgear | 1 | 10.41 |
| 240 | Residential Development, Brightwell Lakes | Up to 2000 residential properties and mixed use area of employment, such as a school, green infrastructure, outdoor play areas, a sports ground and public footpaths and cycleways. | 1 | 21.47 |
| 245 | Residential Development, Darsham Station | 110 residential properties over 7.28ha developed by Scott Properties. | 1 | 6.56 |

| ID | Other Development | Development Description | Tier ¹ | Distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (km) |
|------------|---|--|-------------------|---|
| 248 | Solar Farm, Parham, Suffolk | Development of a 74ha photovoltaic solar farm and associated infrastructure, developed by Low Carbon Park 3. | 1 | 6.98 |
| 263 | Proposed reservoir, Grange Farm | Proposed reservoir on land. (Decision – EIA not required). | 1 | 7.08 |
| 266 | Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | 250mm diameter water pipeline running 7.7 km between Lodgewood Water Tower, Peasenhall to Saxmundham Water Tower, being developed by Essex and Suffolk Water. Not EIA Development | 3 | 6.97 |
| 270 271 | The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities | Multiple new facilities will be relocated within the Sizewell complex on adjoining land from north of the existing Sizewell B Nuclear Power Station to west of Sizewell A Nuclear Power Station as well as land to the west of Sizewell B outside the nuclear site licence boundary. The rationale for the relocation of these facilities is to enable the construction of Sizewell C. | 1 | 4.76 |
| 277 | Town Farm Solar Farm | 21 MW photovoltaic solar farm developed by BSR Energy. It will also include associated infrastructure including transformers, private switchgear and Distribution Network Operator switchgear. | 1 | 3.79 |
| 279 | UKZ139 BC Wissett Solar Farm | 27 MW photovoltaic solar farm to be developed by Pathfinder Clean Energy. The solar farm will cover 87.5 ha of farmland and includes solar panels and associated infrastructure including security equipment, switchgear and transformers. A 10 MW energy storage system across 10 containers will also be included. | 3 | 17.1 |
| 285 | Brundish Manor Solar Farm | a 45 kW photovoltaic solar array to be developed by Greensmart Renewables Ltd. It includes 180 photovoltaic solar panels and associated infrastructure. | 1 | 15 |

| ID | Other Development | Development Description | Tier ¹ | Distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (km) |
|-----|--|---|-------------------|---|
| 287 | LionLink (Formerly known as EuroLink) Offshore Interconnector | A 1.8 GW Multi-Purpose Interconnector connecting the Netherlands and the UK developed by NGV, to increase transfer in offshore wind electricity generation and improve grid capacity in both countries to achieve this. | 3 | 13.96 |
| 288 | Norwich to Tilbury | An onshore network re-enforcement involving 180 km of Overhead Lines (OHL) along with a 400 kV capacity substation. | 2 | 29.36 |
| 291 | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | A 44 ha development which is to include 800 dwellings, a new primary school, community facilities and employment land along with the provision of appropriate green infrastructure and open space. | 3 | 0 |
| 305 | Sizewell A Power Station | Demolition of the Turbine Hall and Electrical Annex at Sizewell A nuclear licensed site. 15,340 square metres of internal floorspace will be removed. | 1 | 4.7 |
| 307 | Cockfield Hall Estate | Full detailed planning application for the creation of a water body to be used for irrigation of new forestry plantations, habitat creation, sustainable drainage and recreational use as part of the wider tourism development. | 1 | 7.09 |
| 321 | Marsh View Farm | The installation of an array solar photovoltaic panels in a field to the rear of the farmhouse at Marsh View Farm, Westleton Road, Darsham. | 1 | 6.14 |
| 520 | A12 Major Road Network Improvement Scheme, Seven Hills to Woods Lane | EIA Scoping request for the A12 Major Road Network (MRN) Improvement Scheme (Seven Hills to Woods Lane), comprising of improvements to seven roundabout junctions along the A12 between the A14 and Woods Lane, improvements to a number of associated minor road junctions, widening of the A12 at Woodbridge to dual carriageway; and improvements to facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and bus users. | 3 | 16.4 |

- 13.2.6 The tables below provide a summary of Stage 1 and 2 of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme inter-project CEA. These tables provide details for the 'other developments' listed above and identify which of the topic-specific ZOIs the 'other development' falls within and evaluates if the 'other development' should be taken forward to Stage 3 and 4 of the assessment for each topic.
- 13.2.7 It should be noted that Nautilus was removed from the short list in January 2025. This decision was primarily based on the lack of sufficient information about Nautilus in order to conduct a meaningful cumulative effects assessment for the Onshore Schemes. The only publicly available documents for Nautilus are the non-statutory consultation documents on the National Grid Ventures website and a brochure summarising the consultation feedback. Based on this information, there are still five possible site options, six potential landfall options, and several cable route corridors.
- 13.2.8 National Grid Ventures has not undertaken any assessment of Nautilus, and there is no available data on key potential impact sources such as construction traffic or compound locations. Additionally, there is no Scoping report on the Planning Inspectorate website to aid in assessing potential cumulative effects. Due to the lack of available information, the assessment team would need to make a large number of assumptions in respect of this development which would limit the ability to make any conclusions about the potential for significant cumulative effects.
- 13.2.9 In summary Nautilus will not be included in the inter-project cumulative effects assessment for the Onshore Schemes. It is however acknowledged that the Offshore corridor of Nautilus and the Proposed Project will inevitably cross and text has been retained to reflect this, as relevant. It should be noted that although Nautilus is not considered further in this document, there is consideration given to potential co-location with Nautilus in the **Application Document 7.13 Coordination Document** as that document deals with co-location principles in general and does not rely on any other project detail.

Table 13.3 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - Sizewell C - main development site (ID1)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | Yes | The scale of Sizewell C main development site is not dissimilar and combined theoretical visibility therefore has potential for significant effects. However, the Sizewell C main development site is located in a Landscape Character Area (LCA) which is otherwise scoped out of the assessment for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The Sizewell C main development site will affect Minsmere-Walberswick Special Protection Area (SPA) including through disturbance and loss of habitat for SPA birds. Mitigation and compensation for this has been built into the DCO. However, white-fronted goose associated with the SPA could be using functionally-linked habitat (e.g. farmland, wetlands) within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme leading to the potential for cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: While the Sizewell C main development site is large in nature, it will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant effects would be expected on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>There are no shared onshore water environment receptors or pathways as Sizewell C main development site is located in a separate hydrological catchment to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell C main development site is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative impacts.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell C main development site is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | There is potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across several shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Proposed Project as a result of construction traffic associated with the Sizewell C main development site. Note, construction trips associated with other elements of Sizewell C including the Northern park and ride (ID296) and Southern park and ride (ID297) have been considered as part of the assessment of the Sizewell C main development site. The potential for significant effects to arise as a result of the Sizewell C main development site has been informed by the Environmental Statement which informed the Sizewell C DCO Submission. | Yes |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Vehicles associated with the Sizewell C main development site share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Project, such as the A12. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | Yes | Yes | There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Sizewell C main development site relevant to operational noise or construction noise. There are however, shared construction traffic routes. | Yes |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | Sizewell C main development site and associated schemes (A12 Bypass, Yoxford Roundabout, Sizewell Link Road, Northern Park and Ride, Southern Park and Ride and Sizewell Rail developments) have the potential for cumulative socio-economic, recreation and tourism effects from construction and operational workforce availability, accommodation capacity, GVA and social infrastructure. | Yes |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | <p>Sizewell C main has no residual significant effects from changes in air quality, traffic and transport, or landscape and visual, and there are no shared noise sensitive receptors between the Sizewell C main development site and the Proposed Development relevant to operational or construction noise.</p> <p>Sizewell C main development site has residual beneficial significant effects from changes in socio-economic factors. Therefore, there is potential for there to be cumulative effects on health and wellbeing linked to health impacts from changes in employment and income generation.</p> | Yes |

Table 13.4 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - A12 Bypass (ID292)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline 2 Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | The scale and nature of the development is unlikely to result in a significant cumulative effect with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Whilst there is the potential for combined theoretical visibility it would be limited due to landform and intervening vegetation. Whilst it is considered unlikely that this would give rise to potential significant cumulative effect this is carried through to stage 3 for further assessment. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The road will cut through areas of woodland but will not affect habitat used by Minsmere-Walberswick SPA birds and will therefore not trigger cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Bypass will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant impacts are expected on the setting of historic assets assessed as part of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Bypass development is partially located in the catchment of the River Fromus and so there is a shared receptor. However, given the scale and nature of the developments and the limited direct interaction with the river, a significant cumulative effect on this watercourse is unlikely and so this is not taken to Stage 3.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline 2 Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Bypass is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Bypass is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | <p>The development is expected to be complete and operational in advance of the construction phase of the Proposed Project (particularly the expected peak of construction in 2030). Therefore, the potential for cumulative effects as a result of the development (construction traffic) is expected to be limited. Nonetheless, construction trips associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) are considered under ID1.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the development would increase the capacity of the highway network (reducing traffic levels on the existing A12 through Farnham and Stratford St Andrews in the vicinity of the bypass). However, to provide a worst-case assessment, it has been assumed that construction traffic associated with Sizewell C main development site (ID1) and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would both use the A12 instead of the A12 bypass.</p> <p>This chapter (under ID1) considers the cumulative impacts associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) as a whole and all associated additional construction traffic.</p> | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development are covered under ID1. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The development is expected to be complete and operational well in advance of the peak construction phase (2029) of the Proposed Project. As such, there is not expected to be any potential for cumulative effects as a result of construction traffic associated with the</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline 2 Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | <i>development. There are therefore no shared noise sensitive receptors with the A12 Bypass development.]</i> | |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |

Table 13.5 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Yoxford Roundabout (ID 293)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The small-scale nature of the development combined with the lack of intervisibility and no shared receptors would not result in significant cumulative effects on landscape character or visual amenity with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The small scale nature of this development and the extensive separation from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme Boundary means cumulative effects are not likely. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Yoxford Roundabout will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme study area. Likewise, the extensive separation from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means that no cumulative effects on setting of assets are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared onshore water environment receptors or pathways as the Yoxford roundabout development is located in a separate hydrological catchment and so no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Yoxford roundabout is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology and so no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Yoxford roundabout development site is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | <p>The development is expected to be complete and operational in advance of the construction phase of the Proposed Project (particularly peak construction in 2030). As such, the potential for cumulative effects as a result of the development (construction traffic) is expected to be limited. Nonetheless, construction trips associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) have been considered within this chapter.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the development would increase the capacity of the highway network which is likely to benefit the Proposed Project as construction traffic travelling to/from the north via the A12 would utilise the improved Yoxford Roundabout.</p> <p>This chapter considers the cumulative impacts associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) as a whole and all associated additional construction traffic.</p> | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The development is expected to be complete and operational well in advance of the peak construction phase (2029) of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Given this, there is not expected to be any potential for cumulative effects as a result of construction traffic noise and vibration associated with the development. In addition, no shared noise sensitive receptors have been identified with the Yoxford Roundabout development.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |

Table 13.6 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - Sizewell Link Road (ID 295)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | The Sizewell link road is located within the same LCA as the Suffolk Onshore Scheme albeit with substantial geographical separation. Despite there being no shared visual receptors with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and whilst significant cumulative effects are unlikely, given the scale of the development it has been taken forward for assessment to fully establish the potential cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The Sizewell link road does not pass through any designated sites and given the extensive separation from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, cumulative effects are not expected. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell link road will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the extensive separation from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant effects are expected on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell link road is located in a separate hydrological catchment to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, so there are no shared receptors or pathways and no potential for significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell link road is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology and therefore there is no potential for significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell link road development site is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | <p>The development is expected to be complete and operational in advance of the construction phase of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (particularly peak construction in 2030). As such, the potential for cumulative effects as a result of the development (construction traffic) is expected to be limited.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the development would increase the capacity of the highway network (reducing traffic levels on the existing B1122 in the vicinity of the Sizewell link road). However, to provide a worst-case assessment, it has been assumed that construction traffic associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) would use the B1122 instead of the link road.</p> <p>This chapter considers the cumulative impacts associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) as a whole and all associated additional construction traffic.</p> | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Sizewell Link Road development and no cumulative noise or vibration effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |

Table 13.7 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA – Sizewell C Northern park and ride (ID 296)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The relatively small-scale nature of the northern park and ride development combined with the lack of intervisibility and lack of shared receptors would ensure that there are no significant cumulative effects on landscape character or visual amenity.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The northern park and ride does not have any direct impacts upon any designated sites, and due relative distance from the Suffolk Onshore Boundary, cumulative effects are not expected. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The northern park and ride will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The northern park and ride is located in a separate hydrological catchment to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. There are no shared receptors or pathways and there is no potential for a significant cumulative effect.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The northern park and ride is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology there is no potential for a significant cumulative effect.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell C Northern park and ride development site is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | The potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Proposed Project as a result of construction traffic associated with the Northern park and ride have been considered as part of the assessment of the Sizewell C main development site (ID1). | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the northern park and ride development and no cumulative noise or vibration effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |

Table 13.8 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA – Sizewell C Southern park and ride (ID 297)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The relatively small-scale nature of the southern park and ride development combined with the lack of intervisibility and lack of shared receptors would ensure that there are no significant cumulative effects on landscape character or visual amenity.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The southern park and ride does not have any direct impacts upon any designated sites, and due to the relative distance from the Suffolk Onshore Boundary, cumulative effects are not expected. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The southern park and ride will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the extensive separation from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means that no significant cumulative effects on the setting of assets is expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The southern park and ride is located in a separate hydrological catchment to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. There are no shared receptors or pathways and no potential for a significant cumulative effect.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The southern park and ride is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and there is no potential for a significant cumulative effect.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell C Southern park and ride development site is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | The potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Proposed Project as a result of construction traffic associated with the Southern park and ride have been considered as part of the assessment of the Sizewell C main development site (ID1). | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the southern park and ride development and no cumulative noise or vibration effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |

Table 13.9 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA – Sizewell C Rail (ID 298)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | The rail upgrade works will be within the context of the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line and would be unlikely to result in cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The rail upgrade works will be within the context of the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line and would be unlikely to result in combined effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <p><i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The rail upgrade works will be within the context of the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line and would be unlikely to result in combined effects with the Proposed Project.]</i></p> <p>The rail extension route will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project.]</p> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The rail extension route is located largely outside of the ZOI for water environment for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion The rail upgrade works will be within the context of the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line and the works are located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology for the</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | <i>Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore no significant cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | |
| Agriculture and Soils | Yes | Yes | The development has the potential for the removal of land from agricultural use and the disturbance of soil resources, and therefore has the potential for a cumulative effect. | Yes |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | <p>The rail upgrade works will be within the context of the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line and would be unlikely to result in combined effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Nonetheless, construction trips associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) have been considered.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the development would reduce the overall number of HGV movements associated with the construction of the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) on the highway network. However, to provide a worst-case assessment, the HGV trips considered in the assessment of the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) exclude the use of any rail freight upgrades.</p> <p>This chapter considers the cumulative impacts associated with the Sizewell C main development site (ID1) as a whole and all associated additional construction traffic.</p> | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site as a whole are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The rail upgrade works will be within the context of the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line and</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | <i>would be unlikely to result in combined effects with the Proposed Project.</i> <i>The rail extension route has no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Operation of the rail route by Sizewell C would therefore not likely have any cumulative effects.]</i> | |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development site are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The cumulative impacts associated with Sizewell C main development are covered under ID1. | No (already captured as part of ID1) |

Table 13.10 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarms (ID 5)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | Similar scale and type of onshore development to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and also has shared visual receptors and shared LCAs. Therefore, there is the potential for significant cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | There is the potential for cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme including the disturbance of birds associated with Sandlings SPA and loss of functionally linked habitat for species associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | Yes | Yes | The East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to the overlap in Order Limits around Friston although these impacts are currently being mitigated as archaeological works for East Anglia One has commenced. There is also the potential for the project to result in impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project as a result of the Friston Substation. | Yes |
| Water Environment | Yes | Yes | The East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm scheme is of a similar type and scale of development as the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, with shared water environment receptors and potential impact pathways within the ZOI. | Yes |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | Yes | Yes | The nature of the East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm development is such that significant effects on geology and hydrogeology are not anticipated and significant contamination sources have not been | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | identified within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. In addition, legislation and planning requires that for new development, risks to human health and controlled waters from potential contamination are appropriately mitigated. Therefore, cumulative adverse effects in relation to geology and hydrogeology are unlikely. Furthermore, each development will be bound by its own Code of Construction Practice (CoCP), and in turn a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) where applicable, and it is assumed each development will apply best practice construction methods to minimise impacts from contamination on ground conditions and groundwater. | |
| Agriculture and Soils | Yes | Yes | The development has the potential for the removal of land from agricultural use and the disturbance of soil resources, and therefore has the potential for a cumulative effect. | Yes |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | <p>There is potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across several shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Proposed Project as a result of construction traffic associated with East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm. The potential for significant effects to arise as a result of East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm has been informed by the Environmental Statement which informed the East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm DCO Submission.</p> <p>Further to the above, there is also potential for cumulative effects on several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) as a result of the construction phases of both the Proposed Project and East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm which have therefore been considered.</p> | Yes |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Construction vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | Yes | Yes | There is potential for significant cumulative effects from construction noise, construction vibration, and operational noise from the East Anglia ONE development. | Yes |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | There is potential for cumulative socio-economic, recreation and tourism effects from construction and operational workforce availability, accommodation capacity, GVA and social infrastructure. Further to the above, there is also potential for cumulative effects on several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) as a result of the construction phases of both the Proposed Project and East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm which have therefore been considered. | Yes |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | There is potential for there to be cumulative effects on health and wellbeing linked to landscape and visual amenity, and traffic and transport impacts. These cumulative effects may have impact on mental health due to community severance and reduced visual amenity, as well as physical health such as physical activity and respiratory health particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions. | Yes |

Table 13.11 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarms (ID 6)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | The development is of a similar scale and type of onshore development, shared visual receptors and shared LCAs, therefore the potential for significant cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | There is the potential for cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme including the disturbance of birds associated with Sandlings SPA and loss of functionally linked habitat for species associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | Yes | Yes | The East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm scheme has the potential to result in physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to the overlap in Order Limits around Friston although these impacts are currently being mitigated as archaeological works for East Anglia One has commenced. There is the potential for the project to result in impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project as a result of the Friston Substation. | Yes |
| Water Environment | Yes | Yes | Similar type and scale of development with shared water environment receptors and potential impact pathways within the ZOI. | Yes |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | Yes | Yes | The nature of the East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm development is No such that significant effects on geology and hydrogeology are not anticipated and significant contamination sources have not been identified within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Legislation and planning require that for new development, risks to human health and controlled | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | waters from potential contamination are appropriately mitigated. On this basis cumulative adverse effects in relation to geology and hydrogeology are unlikely. Furthermore, each development will be bound by its own CoCP, and in turn a CEMP where applicable, and it is assumed each development will apply best practice construction methods so as to minimise impacts from contamination on ground conditions and groundwater. | |
| Agriculture and Soils | Yes | Yes | The development has the potential for the removal of land from agricultural use and the disturbance of soil resources, and therefore has the potential for a cumulative effect. | Yes |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | <p>There is potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across several shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Proposed Project as a result of construction traffic associated with East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm. The potential for significant effects to arise as a result of East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm has been informed by the Environmental Statement which informed the East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm DCO Submission.</p> <p>Further to the above, there is potential for cumulative effects on several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) as a result of the construction phases of both the Proposed Project and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm which have therefore been considered.</p> | Yes |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Construction vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Project. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Noise and Vibration | Yes | Yes | There is potential for significant cumulative effects from construction noise, construction vibration, and operational noise from the East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm development. | Yes |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | There is potential for cumulative socio-economic, recreation and tourism effects from construction and operational workforce availability, accommodation capacity, GVA and social infrastructure. Further to the above, there is potential for cumulative effects on several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) as a result of the construction phases of both the Proposed Project and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm which have therefore been considered. | Yes |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | There is potential for there to be cumulative effects on health and wellbeing linked to landscape and visual amenity, and traffic and transport impacts. These cumulative effects may have impact on mental health due to community severance and reduced visual amenity, as well as physical health such as physical activity and respiratory health particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions. | Yes |

Table 13.12 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter-Project CEA - High Lodge Leisure (ID 221)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | Yes | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Not likely to have a significant cumulative effect due to lack of shared receptors, limited combined theoretical visibility and distance.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Not likely to have a significant cumulative effect with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme as habitats of golf course and paddock are likely to be of low value for species associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The High Lodge Leisure scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, and the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Not likely to have a significant cumulative effect due to the scale and nature of the development and lack of shared receptors.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: High Lodge Leisure is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The High Lodge Leisure site is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | There is potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme as a result of operational traffic associated with this development. | Yes |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Construction vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Project. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the High Lodge Leisure development and no cumulative noise or vibration effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The High Lodge Leisure development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | There is potential for there to be cumulative effects on health and wellbeing linked to traffic and transport impacts. These cumulative effects may have impact on mental health due to community severance, as well as physical health such as physical activity and | Yes |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | respiratory health particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions. | |

Table 13.13 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Croft Farm land and buildings (ID 228)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | Due to the difference in scale and nature of development and limited intervisibility, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects. | No |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Due to the small scale of the development and it primarily consisting of redeveloping buildings, cumulative effects are unlikely. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Croft Farm scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme should mean there are no significant impacts on assets which were examined as part of the setting assessment for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Due to the limited scale and nature of development, and given that there are no shared receptors, significant cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Croft Farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | Yes | Yes | The development has the potential for the removal of land from agricultural use and the disturbance of soil resources, and therefore has the potential for a cumulative effect. | Yes |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | Given the limited size and nature of the development significant cumulative effects on the highways network are unlikely. No transport documents were submitted with the planning application which suggests that few construction/ operational trips are expected to be generated. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Given the scale, nature and location of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Croft Farm land and buildings development and so no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Croft Farm land and buildings development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the difference in scale and nature of development, and the low likelihood of cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, noise and vibration, and air quality effects, there are unlikely to be cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.14 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Park Farm Solar Farm (ID 233)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | <i>Note: The planning permission for this development has been quashed due to decision-making omissions in respect of the impact on the Grade II* Listed Loudham Hall. Therefore, it is unclear whether this development is expected to come forward.</i> | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are not likely to be any significant cumulative effects due to the lack of shared receptors, the lack of combined theoretical visibility and the extensive separation.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Non-breeding waterfowl and waders associated with SPAs will travel up to 2km from the SPAs to forage or roost on functionally-linked land. Some species will travel further, in some cases up to 15-20 km. However, no relevant functionally-linked land distances associated with SPAs encompass both the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and this project and so no cumulative effects are expected. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Park Farm Solar Farm scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, and the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Significant cumulative effects are unlikely due to difference in scale and nature of development and the lack of shared receptors and pathways.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Park Farm Solar Farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Park Farm Solar Farm Junction is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | No | Yes | Given the size, location and nature of the development, significant cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are unlikely. For example, the Transport Assessment for ID233 identifies a maximum of five HGVs and 20 construction workers per day during the peak construction phase. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Due to the location of the development, it is unlikely to have a significant cumulative effect on air quality.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Park Farm Solar Farm development and no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Park Farm Solar Farm development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative impacts.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the location of development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, noise and vibration, and air quality effects, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.15 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Brightwell Lakes (ID 240)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are not likely to be any significant cumulative effects due to the lack of shared receptors, the lack of combined theoretical visibility and the extensive separation.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Non-breeding waterfowl and waders associated with SPAs will travel up to 2 km from the SPAs to forage or roost on functionally-linked land. Some species will travel further, in some cases up to 15-20 km. However, no relevant functionally-linked land distances associated with SPAs encompass both the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and this project and so no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brightwell Lakes scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, and the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, means no significant impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Significant cumulative effects are unlikely due to difference in scale and nature of development and the lack of shared receptors and pathways.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brightwell Lakes development is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brightwell Lakes development is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | No | Yes | There is potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme as a result of operational traffic associated with this development. | Yes |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Project, such as the A12. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Brightwell Lakes development and so no significant noise or vibration effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brightwell Lakes development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | There is potential for there to be cumulative effects on health and wellbeing linked to air quality, and traffic and transport impacts. These cumulative effects may have impact on mental health due to community severance, as well as physical health such as physical activity and respiratory health particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions. | Yes |

Table 13.16 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Residential Development, Darsham Station (ID 245)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Despite being in the same LCA as part of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, this is a large LCA and there is sufficient geographic separation to be unlikely for significant cumulative effects on the LCA to result. There are no shared visual receptors and the small-scale nature of the residential development combined with the lack of combined visibility are not expected to result in significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Darsham Station does not affect habitats suitable for birds associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA and therefore presents no potential for cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Darsham Station residential scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, and the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Significant cumulative effects are unlikely as there are no shared receptors or pathways within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme ZOI.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Darsham Station Residential Development is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Darsham Station Residential Development is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | There is potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme as a result of operational traffic associated with this development. | Yes |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Project, such as the A12. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Darsham Station development and so no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Darsham Station development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | There is potential for there to be cumulative effects on health and wellbeing linked to traffic and transport impacts. These cumulative effects may have an impact on mental health due to community | Yes |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | severance, as well as physical health such as physical activity and respiratory health particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions. | |

Table 13.17 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA – Solar Farm Parham, Suffolk (ID 248)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Not likely to have a significant cumulative effects due to lack of shared receptors, no combined theoretical visibility and distance.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The scale and nature of this development combined with its relative distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means cumulative effects are not expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Parham Solar Farm scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, and the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, means no significant impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Significant cumulative effects are unlikely as there are no shared receptors or pathways within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme ZOI.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Parham Suffolk Solar Farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Solar Farm Parham development is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | The development is expected to have a short construction phase (16 weeks) and will generate a low level of vehicle trips in both the construction and operational phases. Given this, there is not expected to be any potential for cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Given the nature and scale of the development, only a small number of construction vehicles is anticipated (see above). Given this, and the fact that the Proposed Project anticipates only negligible effects, there is not expected to be any potential for cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Parham Solar Farm scheme and so no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Solar Farm Parham development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, and noise and vibration, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.18 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Proposed reservoir, Grange Farm (ID 263)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Significant cumulative effects are not expected given the lack of shared receptors, the lack of combined theoretical visibility and the separation.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Non-breeding waterfowl and waders associated with SPAs will travel up to 2 km from the SPAs to forage or roost on functionally-linked land. Some species will travel further, in some cases up to 15-20 km. However, no relevant functionally-linked land distances associated with SPAs encompass both the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and this project and so no cumulative effects are expected. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Grange Farm reservoir scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme (which will result in a limited visual impact), and the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant cumulative effects on the setting of assets are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Significant cumulative effects are unlikely as there are no shared receptors or pathways within the ZOI.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The proposed reservoir at Grange Farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The proposed reservoir at Grange Farm is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | Given the limited scale and nature of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely. The proposed works involves a balanced cut and fill earth moving exercise, using the naturally occurring clay beneath the site. No soil will leave or be brought onto site. No transport or traffic impacts are therefore expected. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Given the scale, nature and location of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Grange Farm development and significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Grange Farm development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, noise and vibration, and air quality effects, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.18 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation (ID 266)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | The development whilst different in scale and nature is in close proximity to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme with shared LCAs and combined theoretical visibility. However, the temporary nature of effects associated with the water pipeline is not considered likely to give rise to significant cumulative effects. | No |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | If works were to take place simultaneously with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, it is possible that cumulative effects could arise through temporary loss of functionally linked land for SPA birds. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | Yes | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Main scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and no significant cumulative effects are expected. Likewise, the nature of the scheme should mean there are no significant effects on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | Yes | The Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation development works are located in the headwaters of the River Fromus, so there is a common receptor within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme ZOI. However, given the scale of the developments and the extensive separation between the works and water environment receptors, potential cumulative effects are considered unlikely. | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The proposed Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative Effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The proposed Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | Given the limited scale and nature of the development, significant cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are unlikely. The highway response to the planning application states that the impact of the development would mainly be temporary. However, there are no further details available to inform an assessment. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Given the scale, nature and location of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation development and significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | The Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects. | No |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The development is expected to be complete in advance of the peak construction phase (2029) of the Proposed Project, with limited operational traffic expected. Due to the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, noise and | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | vibration, and air quality effects, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | |

Table 13.19 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities (ID 270 and ID 271)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | Yes | The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities development is located in an LCA which is not assessed for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to lack of theoretical visibility. There are no shared visual receptors and therefore combined theoretical visibility is considered to be extremely limited, such that there are no likely cumulative significant effects. | No |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | The relocation of facilities at Sizewell may affect Minsmere-Walberswick SPA including through disturbance and loss of habitat for SPA birds. Mitigation and compensation for this has been built into the project. However, it is possible that white-fronted geese associated with the SPA could be using functionally-linked habitat (e.g. farmland or wetlands) within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme leading to the potential for cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell B relocation scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, and the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant cumulative effects on the setting of assets are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities development is in a different hydrological catchment and so there are no shared receptors or pathways and no potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell B relocated facilities are located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative Effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities are located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | The development comprises the relocation of buildings in preparation for Sizewell C and will therefore be completed prior to the Sizewell C main development site (ID1). The construction traffic forecasts associated with the Sizewell B Relocated Facilities are nonetheless accounted for by Sizewell C (ID1) which has been assessed during peak construction to provide a robust position in terms of traffic and transport. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The development is expected to be complete in advance of the peak construction phase of the Proposed Project, with limited operational traffic expected. As such, there is not expected be any potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The development is expected to be complete in advance of the peak construction phase (2029) of the Proposed Project. As such, there are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Sizewell B Relocated Facilities development and no cumulative effects are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | <i>tourism for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The development is expected to be complete in advance of the peak construction phase (2029) of the Proposed Project, with limited operational traffic expected. Resultantly, due to the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, noise and vibration, and air quality effects, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | N/A |

Table 13.20 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Town Farm Solar Farm (ID 277 and ID 278)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | The Town Farm Solar Farm is located in the same LCA as the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and there could be limited areas of combined theoretical visibility. Whilst it is considered unlikely that this would give rise to potential significant cumulative effect this is assessed further at Stage 3/4. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Effects that may arise cumulatively with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are disturbance of birds associated with Sandlings SPA and loss of functionally linked habitat for species associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Town Farm Solar scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, as well as the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, means no significant effects on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | Yes | Whilst there is a shared receptor, the River Fromus, given the difference in the nature and scale of the developments, cumulative significant effects are considered unlikely. | No |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Town Farm solar farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Town Farm Solar Farm is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | The development is expected to have a short construction phase (16 weeks) and will generate a low level of vehicle trips in both the construction and operational phases. The development is also expected to be complete and operational in advance of the construction phase of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Given this, there is not expected be any potential for cumulative effects. | No |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | The development is expected to be complete and operational well in advance of the peak construction phase of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, with limited operational traffic expected. As such, there is not expected be any potential for cumulative effects. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Town Farm Solar Farm development and so there is no potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Town Farm Solar Farm development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant traffic and transport, noise and vibration, and air quality effects, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. It is noted that there could be limited areas of combined theoretical visibility between the Town Farm Solar Farm | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|----------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, however this is unlikely to significantly impact visual amenity and therefore unlikely to lead to a significant cumulative health and wellbeing effect. | |

Table 13.21 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - UKZ139 BC Wissett Solar Farm (ID 279)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Not likely to have a significant cumulative effect due to lack of shared receptors, no combined theoretical visibility and distance.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Effects that may arise ‘cumulatively with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are disturbance of birds associated with Sandlings SPA and loss of functionally linked habitat for species associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Wissett Solar Farm scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, as well as the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means no significant effects on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project are predicated.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: No significant cumulative effects as there are no shared receptors or pathways.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The UKZ139 BC Wissett solar farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Wisset solar farm is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | No | Yes | The development is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips in both the construction and operational phases. The development is also located a significant distance (17km) away from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Given this, there is not expected be any potential for cumulative effects. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Given the location of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Wissett Solar Farm development and so there is no potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Wisset Solar Farm development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, and noise and vibration, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.22 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Brundish Manor Solar Farm (ID 285)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4? |
| | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Not likely to have a significant cumulative effect due to lack of shared receptors, the lack of combined theoretical visibility and extensive spatial separation.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Not likely to have a significant cumulative effect given the small size of the project and its distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brundish Manor Solar Farm scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, as well as the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme means that significant effects on the setting of assets are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: No significant cumulative effects are predicted as there are no shared receptors or pathways.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brundish Manor Solar Farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|--|---|------------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | Progress to Stage 3/4? |
| | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brundish Manor Solar Farm is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | No | Yes | The development is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips in both the construction and operational phases. The development is also located a significant distance (15 km) away from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Given this, there is not expected be any potential for cumulative effects. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Given the scale, nature and location of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Brundish Manor Solar Farm development and no cumulative effects are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Brundish Manor Solar Farm development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, and noise and vibration, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.23 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID 287)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | Stage 2 | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | Similar scale and type of onshore development with shared visual receptors and LCAs and therefore there is the potential for significant cumulative effects during construction associated with the converter station construction and Friston connection. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Similar scale and type of development to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, in a similar location. Cumulative impact pathways that may arise include disturbance of birds associated with Sandlings SPA, loss of functionally linked habitat for white-fronted goose associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and so cumulative effects are possible, | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | Yes | Yes | Similar scale and type of development and also shared visual receptors, therefore the potential for significant cumulative effects. Also, the potential for cumulative physical impacts on receptors. | Yes |
| Water Environment | Yes | Yes | Similar scale and type of development and shared water environment receptors and shared pathways within the ZOI, with the potential for significant cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | Yes | Yes | The nature of the development is such that significant effects on geology and hydrogeology are not anticipated. In addition, significant contamination sources have not been identified within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and legislation and planning requires that for new development, risks to human health and controlled waters from | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | potential contamination are appropriately mitigated and therefore cumulative adverse effects in relation to geology and hydrogeology are unlikely. Furthermore, each development will be bound by its own CoCP, and in turn a CEMP where applicable, and it is assumed each development will apply best practice construction methods so as to minimise impacts from contamination on ground conditions and groundwater. | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The LionLink Offshore Interconnector scheme is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | The LionLink Offshore Interconnector scheme is of a similar scale and type of development to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. There is potential for cumulative traffic and transport effects across several shared road link and road junction receptors during the construction phase of the Proposed Project as a result of construction traffic associated with the LionLink Offshore Interconnector. Further to the above, there is potential for cumulative effects on several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) as a result of the Proposed Project and LionLink Offshore Interconnector which have therefore been considered. | Yes |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Project. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Noise and Vibration | Yes | Yes | There is potential for significant cumulative effects from operational noise from the LionLink Offshore Interconnector development. There is also the potential for significant cumulative effects from construction noise and construction vibration, depending on the temporal overlap. | Yes |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | Given the proximity and potential temporal overlaps of construction phases, there is potential for cumulative socio-economic, recreation and tourism effects from construction and operational workforce availability and accommodation capacity. | Yes |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Given the proximity and potential temporal overlaps of construction phases, there is potential for cumulative impacts on health and wellbeing linked to landscape and visual amenity, noise and vibration, traffic and transport and socio-economics. These cumulative effects may have impact on mental health due to reduced visual amenity, noise disturbance, and community severance, as well as physical health such as physical activity. | Yes |

Table 13.24 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Norwich to Tilbury (ID 288)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Not likely to have a significant cumulative effect due to lack of shared receptors, the lack of combined theoretical visibility and distance.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: No potential for cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to distance.]</i> | N/A |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The Norwich to Tilbury scheme will not result in any physical impacts on assets that fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Likewise, the nature of the scheme, as well as the distance from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, means no significant effects on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project are predicted.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Similar scale and nature of development however, significant cumulative effects are unlikely as there are no shared receptors or pathways.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Norwich to Tilbury is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Norwich to Tilbury is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Traffic and Transport | No | Yes | The Norwich to Tilbury scheme is located a significant distance (30km) away from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. It is not expected that many (if any) construction vehicle trips associated with the development would use the road junction and road link receptors associated with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and no cumulative effects are expected. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Given the scale, nature and location of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Norwich to Tilbury development and no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | There is potential for cumulative socio-economic, recreation and tourism effects from construction and operational workforce availability, accommodation capacity, GVA and social infrastructure. | Yes |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, noise and vibration, and air quality effects, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.25 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood (ID 291)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | Yes | Yes | The South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood is in the same LCA as the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and there is combined theoretical visibility, such that there is the potential for significant cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Effects that may arise cumulatively with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme are disturbance of birds associated with Sandlings SPA and loss of functionally linked habitat for species associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | Yes | Yes | Although the full extent of archaeological remains south of Saxmundham are not fully understood, it is assumed that the Saxmundham South Garden scheme has the potential to impact heritage assets that also fall within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, or remains of a similar date and form. There is also the possibility that the scheme could result in impacts on the setting of assets assessed as part of the Proposed Project are predicated. There is therefore the potential for cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Water Environment | Yes | Yes | The South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood development is in the catchment of the River Fromus and within the water environment ZOI, with a common receptor and potential common pathways and so cumulative effects are possible. | Yes |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | Yes | Yes | The nature of the South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood is such that significant effects on geology and hydrogeology are not anticipated. | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| | | | In addition, significant contamination sources have not been identified within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and legislation and planning requires that for new development, risks to human health and controlled waters from potential contamination are appropriately mitigated and therefore cumulative adverse effects in relation to geology and hydrogeology are unlikely. Furthermore, each development will be bound by its own CEMP, where applicable, and it is assumed each development will apply best practice construction methods so as to minimise impacts from contamination on ground conditions and groundwater. | |
| Agriculture and Soils | Yes | Yes | The development has the potential for the removal of land from agricultural use and the disturbance of soil resources, and therefore has the potential for a cumulative effect. | Yes |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | Whilst land has been allocated within the Local Plan for this development (SCLP 12.29), no planning applications have been submitted. Given this, there is currently insufficient information available to incorporate this site as part of the cumulative assessment, as the timescales for any potential development are unknown and details relating to potential construction/ operational trips are not available. | No |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Details relating to potential construction/operational trips are not available as such there is currently insufficient information available to incorporate this site as part of the cumulative assessment. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood development and so no cumulative effects are likely. | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | Yes | Yes | There is currently insufficient information available regarding the construction and operational phases, but as a worst-case scenario, it is assumed that there is potential for cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | The combined theoretical visibility of the development with the Suffolk onshore scheme could impact on visual amenity. However, considering details relating to potential construction/operational trips are not available, there is currently insufficient information available to conclude whether there would be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects, based on potential traffic and transport, or noise impacts. | No |

Table 13.26 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Sizewell A Power Station (ID 305)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: No combined theoretical visibility and no potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | | | The demolition of Sizewell A may affect Minsmere-Walberswick SPA including through disturbance of SPA birds. Mitigation has been built into the project. However, it is possible that white-fronted geese associated with the SPA could be using functionally-linked habitat (e.g. farmland or wetlands) within the Suffolk Onshore Scheme leading to the potential for cumulative effects. | Yes |
| Cultural Heritage | No | Yes | There are no predicted physical or setting impacts on the same receptors. | No |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Sizewell A Power Station is located outside of the water environment ZOI therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Sizewell A Power Station is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative impacts.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Sizewell A Power Station is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative impacts.]</i> | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | Construction vehicles associated with the demolition phase of this development would potentially share road junction and road link receptors with the Proposed Project. Whilst the demolition phase of the development is expected to be complete prior to the Proposed Project, the development has been included in any case to provide a worst-case assessment. | Yes |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes as vehicles associated with the construction of the Proposed Project.. However, as the Proposed Project only has negligible effects, cumulative effects are not likely to occur. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | Yes | Yes | There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Sizewell A main development site with regards to operational noise and construction noise. There are however, shared construction traffic routes. | Yes |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | Yes | Sizewell A Power Station is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects. | No |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | As a worst-case assessment, there is potential for cumulative impacts on health and wellbeing linked to traffic and transport and air quality impacts. Vehicles associated with the development may share the same routes, which may impact on respiratory health particularly for vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions. | Yes |

Table 13.25 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Cockfield Hall Estate (ID 307)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There is no combined theoretical visibility and so no potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | No | The creation of a waterbody is likely to be neutral or positive for ecological receptors and is therefore unlikely to lead to significant adverse cumulative effects with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | Yes | No predicted physical or setting impacts on the same receptors. | No |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Cockfield Hall Estate is located outside of the water environment ZOI therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Cockfield Hall Estate is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Cockfield Hall Estate is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative impacts.]</i> | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | Construction vehicles associated with the construction phase of this development may share road junction and road link receptors with the Proposed Project. However, vehicle trips are expected to be minimal given the nature/ scale of the development (Noting that the planning application was <u>not</u> informed by a Transport Assessment or Construction Traffic Management Plan). In addition, the planning application is currently awaiting decision and it is unclear whether this development is expected to come forward. The potential for cumulative effects is judged to be unlikely. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Cumulative effects are considered unlikely given the nature and location of the development.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Cockfield Hall Estate development and so no cumulative effects are expected.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Cockfield Hall Estate is located outside the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, and noise and vibration, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.28 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - Marsh View Farm (ID 321)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There is no combined theoretical visibility and so no potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | Yes | Yes | Non-breeding waterfowl and waders associated with SPAs will travel up to 2km from the SPAs to forage or roost on functionally-linked land. Some species will travel further, in some cases up to 15-20 km. However, no relevant functionally-linked land distances associated with SPAs encompass both the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and this project and so no cumulative effects are expected. | No |
| Cultural Heritage | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: No predicted physical or setting impacts on the same receptors.]</i> | N/A |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Marsh View Farm is located outside of the water environment ZOI for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Marsh View Farm is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Marsh View Farm is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative impacts.]</i> | No |
| Traffic and Transport | Yes | Yes | Given the limited scale and nature of the development, significant cumulative effects are unlikely. The development comprises five rows of solar panels within a small field and no transport impacts are expected. | No |
| Air Quality | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Cumulative effects considered unlikely given the nature and location of the development.]</i> | N/A |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the Marsh View Farm development and so no cumulative effects are likely.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: Marsh View Farm development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development, and the low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, and noise and vibration, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Table 13.29 Matrix Summarising Stage 1 and 2 of the Inter -Project CEA - A12 Major Road Network Improvement Scheme, Seven Hills to Woods Lane (ID 520)

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Landscape and Visual | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There is no combined theoretical visibility and so no potential for cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Ecology and Biodiversity | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion. Due to the nature and distance of this scheme from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme there is no potential for cumulative effects]</i> | N/A |
| Cultural Heritage | No | Yes | No predicted physical or setting impacts on the same receptors. | No |
| Water Environment | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Major Road Network Improvement Scheme, Seven Hills and Woods Lane is outside of the ZOI for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and there would be no significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Geology and Hydrogeology | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Major Road Network Improvement Scheme is located outside of the ZOI for geology and hydrogeology for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects]</i> | N/A |
| Agriculture and Soils | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Major Road Network Improvement Scheme is located outside of the ZOI for agriculture and soils therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative impacts.]</i> | No |

| Technical Discipline | Stage 1 | | Stage 2 | |
|---|---|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Within Technical Discipline Specific ZOI? | Progress in Stage 2 | Scale and nature of development likely to have a significant cumulative effect? | Progress to Stage 3/4 |
| | | | Relevant Shared receptors and/or pathways? | |
| | | | Assumed overlap in temporal scope? Yes | |
| Traffic and Transport | No | Yes | Whilst the construction of the A12 highway improvements may increase construction traffic flows along the A12 within the study area, the potential for cumulative effects is expected to be limited given that the scheme is a substantial distance away from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (16 km away). Furthermore, there is no information currently available to inform an assessment, given that scheme is only at Scoping stage. | No |
| Air Quality | Yes | Yes | Whilst the construction of the A12 highway improvements may increase construction traffic flows along the A12 within the study area, the potential for cumulative effects is expected to be limited given that the scheme is a substantial distance away from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (16 km away). Furthermore, there is no information currently available to inform an assessment, given that scheme is only at Scoping stage. | No |
| Noise and Vibration | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: There are no shared noise sensitive receptors with the A12 development and so no cumulative effects are likely.]</i> | N/A |
| Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism | No | No | <i>[Stage 1 conclusion: The A12 Major Road Network Improvement Scheme, Seven Hills and Woods Lane development is located outside of the ZOI for socio-economics, recreation and tourism for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and therefore there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects.]</i> | N/A |
| Health and Wellbeing | Yes | Yes | Due to the scale and nature of the development being only at Scoping stage and outside of the ZOI for multiple relevant attributes to health and wellbeing. The low likelihood of significant cumulative landscape and visual, traffic and transport, and noise and vibration, means there are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects. | No |

Stage 3

- 13.2.10 Further information on the short list of other developments is provided in **Application Document 6.3.2.13.A Appendix 2.13.A Descriptions of Other Developments** in order to support Stage 3. This appendix provides further information on the design, construction and programme for the other developments and has been used as a basis for the Stage 4 assessment.

Stage 4

- 13.2.11 Stage 4 has entailed undertaking a CEA for the 'short list' of developments where that development has been taken through to Stage 4 for a particular topic as defined in the Stage 2 tables above. The results of this assessment are again reported in matrix format for each topic and for each relevant development in the tables below. Where topics have not carried through for any developments to Stage 3 and Stage 4 (i.e. geology and hydrogeology), no table is provided.
- 13.2.12 In the Stage 4 assessment, it is assumed that the impacts of each development, including the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, has been mitigated to the extent that would normally be expected for developments of this scale. The determination as to whether cumulative effects are likely is therefore based on consideration of residual effects and their significance.
- 13.2.13 Professional judgement has been applied in determining whether the combination of residual effects from two developments could result in a new significant cumulative effect overall. As a guide and to aid consistency and transparency of how professional judgement has been applied, a 'significance matrix' has been developed, as presented in **Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodologies**. As noted above, in all cases professional judgement has also been applied to each assessment.
- 13.2.14 Specifically, in relation to traffic and transport in the Stage 4 assessment, where a scheme is expected to be approximately 50% built out, 50% operational trip generation has been adopted, and where the development is expected to be 75% built out, 75% operational trip generation has been assumed, and so on. This is based on the anticipated construction programme for each development and the likely completion against that program when the Suffolk Onshore Scheme comes forward. A worst-case approach is taken, by combining both construction and operational trips for these schemes (rather than just one or the other). This is a worst-case approach, as for many types of development operational traffic will not be generated until construction is complete. Further details of the approach to each development is set out in Section 9 of **Application Document 6.3.2.7.A Appendix 2.7.A Transport Assessment Note** which forms an appendix to **Application Document 6.2.2.7 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 7 Traffic & Transport**.

Landscape and Visual CEA

Table 13.26 Landscape and Visual CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| The Sizewell C - main development site (ID 1) | <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on Nearshore Waters and LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands.</p> <p>Minor adverse (Not Significant) effects on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Suffolk Heritage Coast.</p> <p>Significant effect on LCA K3: Aldringham and Freston Sandlands.</p> <p>Major adverse (Significant) effect on representative viewpoint 1 and minor adverse</p> | <p>Direct effect on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands and LCA K3: Aldringham and Freston Sandlands however noting that there is no permanent infrastructure proposed in this LCA thereby limiting the likelihood for significant cumulative effects.</p> <p>Minimal Adverse (not significant) effect on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB or Suffolk Heritage Coast. Views likely to be</p> | <p>The cumulative effect on SCT 03: Nearshore Waters, LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands, LCA K3: Aldringham and Freston Sandlands, the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, the Suffolk Heritage Coast and representative viewpoints 1 and 13 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme at all project stages (not significant). Whilst the Sizewell C - main development site would be visible in views from some of the representative viewpoints, it is unlikely that these would represent a significant cumulative effect due to the geographic separation and distance.</p> | No further cumulative mitigation required. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | (not significant) effect on representative viewpoint 13. | experienced by viewpoints 1 and 13. | | | |
| A12 Bypass (ID 292) | No significant effect on LCA 01: Benhall Estate Sandlands. No specific viewpoints but potential for pockets of combined theoretical visibility between the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and A12 Bypass development. | Direct effect on LCA 01: Benhall Estate Sandlands within the context of the A12 road corridor. Views likely to be experienced from those along A12 and in nearby landscape. | The cumulative effect on LCA 01: Benhall Estate Sandlands is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme at all project stages due to intervening built form and vegetation, and the context of the A12 road corridor. Whilst there are likely to be some places within the local landscape that experience views towards both the A12 Bypass development and Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is sufficient existing layering of vegetation in the local landscape, existing built form and the context of the existing A12, such that the cumulative effect on visual receptors is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme at all project stages. | No further cumulative mitigation required. | No |
| Sizewell Link Road- Bridge across rail tracks (ID 295) | Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects on LCA L1: Heveningham | Direct effect on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands. | The cumulative effect on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore | No further cumulative mitigation required. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | and Knodishall Estate Claylands. | | Scheme at all project stages due to no combined theoretical visibility, geographic separation, different type of development and the context of the road networks (A12, B1119 and B1121) near to the respective developments which has existing influence on the rural character of the LCA. No significant cumulative effects on visual amenity. | | |
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms (ID 5 and ID 6) | <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands.</p> <p>Minor Adverse (Not significant) effect on LCA K3: Aldringham and Friston Sandlands, and LCA D4: Thorpeness to Aldeburgh.</p> <p>Minor Adverse (Not significant) effects on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast.</p> <p>Moderate to Major Adverse (Significant)</p> | <p>Direct effects on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands, K3: Aldringham and Friston Sandlands, and D4: Thorpeness to Aldeburgh.</p> <p>Directly effects the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast. Views likely to be experienced from representative viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16,</p> | <p>Similar type and scale of development, therefore the combination of both developments at construction (including decommissioning) has the potential for significant cumulative effects by extending and intensifying the original effects on both landscape character (LCA L1, LCA K3, SCT 03), Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and the Suffolk Heritage Coast and visual amenity (viewpoints 6,7,8,22). At operation and maintenance, the potential for cumulative effects on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and the Suffolk Heritage Coast is unlikely due to the reinstatement of cable</p> | No further cumulative mitigation available. | <p>Potential significant – Construction and decommissioning</p> <p>Cumulative effects on landscape character and visual amenity at construction (including decommissioning). Cumulative effects for landscape character or visual amenity are likely to be 'Not significant' at the operation and</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|---|---|---|
| | <p>effects for representative viewpoints 1, 2, 3, 19, 20 and 21.</p> <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on representative viewpoint 15 until mitigation planting established at year 15 of operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect on representative viewpoint 16 at construction (including decommissioning) and not significant effect at operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Not significant effects for representative viewpoints 6, 7, 8, 11, 22 and 23.</p> | 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23. | <p>corridors and distance between the onshore permanent elements of the developments (not significant).</p> <p>The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would remove a small part of the landscape mitigation proposed as part of the East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms development to facilitate the HVDC and HVAC cable routes. At operation and maintenance, there is sufficient geographic separation, intervening vegetation and distance between the onshore permanent elements of the developments that there is unlikely for significant cumulative effects on landscape character (not significant). It is noted that the permanent elements of both developments would largely be located in the same LCA (LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands) and would both be similar in the nature of the development. However, the developments are both located in a similar part on the edge of the wider LCA within areas which are influenced by road networks and the existing OHL and towers. On</p> | | <p>maintenance phase for all receptors except for viewpoint 6 where potential significant cumulative effects could result.</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | balance it is not considered that these developments would become character defining features across the LCA such that significant cumulative effects would result. At operation and maintenance, there is the potential that significant cumulative effects could remain at viewpoint 6 where views in succession of both developments would be experienced although intervening vegetation towards the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would limit the potential cumulative effect. | | |
| Town Farm Solar Farm (ID 277 and ID 278) | <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands.</p> <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on LCA B4: Fromus Valley until mitigation planting has established at year 15 of operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on representative viewpoint</p> | <p>Direct effects on LCA B4: Fromus Valley and LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands.</p> <p>Likely to be views from viewpoint 15 at construction and unlikely at operation.</p> | Due to the difference in scale and type of development, geographic separation intervening landform, vegetation and built form which would result in minimal visual intervisibility, it is unlikely that for landscape character the cumulative effect would be greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme at all project stages. Furthermore, both developments largely retain the landscape pattern and existing vegetation, including field boundaries present within the LCA | No further cumulative mitigation required. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| | 15 until mitigation planting established at year 15 of operation and maintenance. | | further limiting potential cumulative effects. There would be minimal intervisibility at construction (including decommissioning) and operation and maintenance, due to the screening effects created by the layered vegetation network in the local landscape and intervening built form, and any views towards the Town Farm Solar Farm would be within the context of the A12 road corridor, thereby limiting the potential for significant cumulative effects on visual amenity to result at all project stages. | | |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID 287) | <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands.</p> <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on LCA B4: Fromus Valley until mitigation planting has established at year 15 of operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Minor Adverse (Not significant) effect on</p> | The LionLink Offshore Interconnector development not progressed as far as the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, but is considered likely to have direct effects on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands, LCA B4: Fromus Valley, LCA | Similar type and scale of development, therefore the combination of both converter station developments and the connection at Friston Substation at construction (including decommissioning) has the potential to extend and intensify the original effects on both landscape character and visual amenity in this part of the landscape, resulting in the potential for significant cumulative effects on landscape character (likely limited to LCA L1: Heveningham and | No further cumulative mitigation available. | <p>Potentially significant – All Stages.</p> <p>Cumulative effects – landscape character and visual amenity at all project stages.</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>LCA K3: Aldringham and Friston Sandlands, and LCA D4: Thorpeness to Aldeburgh.</p> <p>No significant effect on Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast.</p> <p>Shared visual receptors including significantly affected receptors.</p> | <p>K3: Aldringham and Friston Sandlands, and shared visual receptors are likely, including those with direct effects.</p> <p>Direct effect on Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast.</p> | <p>Knodishall Estate Claylands) and visual amenity (1 – 7, 15-17, 19 – 21). The construction of cable routes for both the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink Offshore Interconnector within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast, SCT 03: Nearshore Waters, LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands would extend the influence of construction activity across a wider part of the landscape which increases the likelihood of a significant cumulative effect on landscape character and visual amenity (significant).</p> <p>Cumulative construction effects on LCA B4 Fromus Valley and LCA K3: Aldringham Friston Sandlands, are not considered to be significant. At operation and maintenance, despite the siting to concentrate the energy development in one location, the LionLink Offshore Interconnector is likely to appear as an extension at the Saxmundham Converter Station site and Friston Substation, which has the potential to intensify the landscape and</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | visual effects of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and Friston Substation development. This is due to the scale of development likely to further heighten impacts on key characteristics of LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands, including the deeply rural nature and limited intrusion from modern development, and the change in the scale and extent of views from visual receptors including viewpoints 1 – 7, 15-17, 19 – 21 (significant). At operation and maintenance, cumulative effects on LCA B4 Fromus Valley, LCA K3: Aldringham Friston Sandlands, SCT 03: Nearshore Waters, Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme as potential to extend and intensify the original effects on both landscape character and visual amenity would be limited due to the parts of the developments located within such landscapes and the reinstatement | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| | | | of the cable corridors (not significant). | | |
| South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood (ID 291) | <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effects on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands.</p> <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on LCA B4: Fromus Valley until mitigation planting has established at year 15 of operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Not significant effect on LCA 01: Benhall Estate Sandlands.</p> <p>Moderate Adverse (Significant) effect on representative viewpoint 2 and Major Adverse (Significant) effect on representative viewpoint 20.</p> | Direct effects on LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands, LCA B4: Fromus Valley and LCA 01: Benhall Estate Sandlands. Likely to be views from representative viewpoints 2 and 20. | Different type and scale of development, however due to proximity of similarities in construction activity there is the potential for significant cumulative effects at construction (including decommissioning) on landscape character and visual amenity. At operation and maintenance, the South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood development would be similar in the local landscape to the context of residential development and different to the scale and type of development of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. The South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood development would have some separation across the B1121 to the operational elements of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and both developments aim to enhance the green infrastructure network where possible, such that it is unlikely that there would be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | No further cumulative mitigation available. | <p>Potentially significant – Construction and decommissioning</p> <p>Cumulative effects - landscape character and visual amenity at construction (including decommissioning). Not significant at operation and maintenance.</p> |

Ecology and Biodiversity CEA

Table 13.27 Ecology and Biodiversity CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| The Sizewell C main development site | There are no adverse residual effects above negligible (Not Significant) associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | Sizewell C will affect Minsmere-Walberswick SPA including through disturbance and loss of habitat for SPA birds. Mitigation and compensation for this has been built into the DCO for Sizewell C. | No significant cumulative effect | No further cumulative mitigation required. | No |
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | There is a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect associated with the temporary loss of functionally-linked land for Sandlings SPA through removal of a field of acid grassland close to Sandlings SPA to enable the HDD to be undertaken. This field would be occupied by surface construction infrastructure for approximately 6 months which | East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO already have requirements in their DCOs ensuring they will not have adverse effects on the site integrity of Sandlings SPA, including measures recommended by Natural England (specifically, all cable line construction works in the boundary, or within 200 m, of the Sandlings SPA and Leiston– | Potentially significant disturbance or habitat loss impacts for notable species, but with the mitigation committed to for the Proposed Project, such effects are considered unlikely to occur. | No further cumulative mitigation required. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>would include the nightjar and woodlark nesting season.</p> <p>There is a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect associated with the disruption of bat commuting and other wildlife connectivity through breaks in hedgerows.</p> | <p>Aldeburgh SSSI is to be undertaken outside of the breeding bird season (1 February to 31 August for woodlark and 1 of April to 31 August for nightjar).</p> <p>The DCOs for the schemes also require them to deliver mitigation for the habitat losses due to the projects.</p> | | | |
| Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | <p>There is a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect associated with the disruption of bat commuting and other wildlife connectivity through breaks in hedgerows.</p> <p>A Minor Adverse (Not Significant) short to medium-term habitat loss through removal of grassland, woodland and hedgerow habitat for temporary construction and permanent gaps in hedgerows for permanent access.</p> | <p>The project will potentially involve disturbance of nesting nightjar associated with Sandlings SPA, or non-breeding birds associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. It will also involve impacts on other notable species. However it is considered not likely to have significant effects as EIA was not required.</p> | <p>Disturbance of Sandlings SPA would only arise if multiple projects were to cause noise levels exceeding the 60 dB threshold agreed with Natural England and were to do so during the nightjar and woodlark nesting season. In combination effects would not arise due to works being undertaken for multiple projects in the same location at the same time, as space constraints would not allow for works close to the SPA to be undertaken for multiple projects simultaneously,</p> | No further cumulative mitigation required. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p>even if the programme for the other schemes were to accelerate.</p> <p>Potential for combined losses of habitat for other notable species.</p> <p>However, it has been established for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme that disturbance of the SPA can be avoided by maintaining noise levels in the SPA below 60 dB and/or avoiding the most potentially disturbing works near to the SPA (i.e. compound set up for Sea Link) during the nesting season. This is secured through Application Document 7.5.3.2 CEMP Appendix B Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments.</p> <p>For the temporary duration of works this will be offset by leaving an area of</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p>arable land on sandy soils fallow and/or seeding it as acid grassland to be maintained for 10 years, which will have a medium-term benefit.</p> <p>Temporary gaps in hedgerows will be closed to a maximum of 10 m at night through use of hurdles, while in the long-term habitat creation around the Saxmundham Converter Station and Friston Substation mean that there will be a net increase in woodland, wetland, grassland and hedgerow due to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. This is set out in Application Document 7.5.7.1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan – Suffolk.</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities | There are no adverse residual effects above negligible (Not Significant) associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | Relocation of Sizewell B will affect Minsmere-Walberswick SPA including through disturbance and loss of habitat for SPA birds. Mitigation and compensation for this has been built into the consent. | The Sizewell B relocated facilities are being constructed on an area of former woodland (Coronation Wood) that does not constitute functionally-linked habitat for SPA birds and has already been cleared. | No additional cumulative mitigation required. | No |
| Town Farm Solar Farm | There are no adverse residual effects above negligible (Not Significant) associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | This development also lies within 10km of Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and thus within the zone that white-fronted goose could be travelling to roost or forage away from the SPA. | No significant cumulative effect | No additional cumulative mitigation required. | No |
| UKZ139 BC Wissett Solar Farm | There are no adverse residual effects negligible (Not Significant) associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | This development also lies within 10km of Minsmere-Walberswick SPA and thus within the zone that white-fronted goose could be travelling to roost or forage away from the SPA. | No significant cumulative effect | No additional cumulative mitigation required. | No |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector | There is a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect associated with the temporary loss of functionally-linked land for Sandlings SPA through removal of a field of acid | There is little information publicly available about this project. However, given its location, in the opinion of the authors of this cumulative assesment there could | Potentially significant disturbance or habitat loss effects for notable species. While in the long-term habitat creation around the Saxmundham Converter | No additional cumulative mitigation required. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>grassland close to Sandlings SPA to enable the HDD to be undertaken. This field would be occupied by surface construction infrastructure for approximately 6 months which would include the nightjar and woodlark nesting season.</p> <p>There is a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect associated with the disruption of bat commuting and other wildlife connectivity through breaks in hedgerows.</p> <p>A Minor Adverse (Not Significant) short to medium-term habitat loss through removal of grassland, woodland and hedgerow habitat for temporary construction and permanent gaps in hedgerows for permanent access.</p> | <p>potentially be disturbance of Sandlings SPA or loss of functionally linked land for Sandlings SPA. There is no space for works to occur simultaneously in the same location but they could occur sequentially.</p> <p>There could also be disruption of bat commuting and other wildlife connectivity through breaks in hedgerows.</p> <p>Lastly there could be short to medium-term habitat loss through removal of grassland, woodland and hedgerow habitat for temporary construction and permanent gaps in hedgerows for permanent access.</p> | <p>Station and Friston Substation mean that there will be a net increase in woodland, wetland, grassland and hedgerow due to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. This is set out in Application Document 7.5.7.1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan – Suffolk.</p> | | |
| South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | <p>There is a Minor Adverse (Not Significant) effect associated with the disruption of bat commuting and other wildlife connectivity through breaks in hedgerows.</p> | <p>There is no information publicly available about this scheme. However, given its location, in the opinion of the authors of this cumulative assessment the project will potentially involve</p> | <p>Disturbance of Sandlings SPA would only arise if multiple projects were to cause noise levels exceeding the 60 dB threshold agreed with Natural England and were</p> | <p>No additional cumulative mitigation required.</p> | <p>No</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | A Minor Adverse (Not Significant) short to medium-term habitat loss through removal of grassland, woodland and hedgerow habitat for temporary construction and permanent gaps in hedgerows for permanent access. | disturbance of nesting nightjar associated with Sandlings SPA, or non-breeding birds associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or Alde-Ore Estuary SPA. It will also involve impacts on other notable species. | to do so during the nightjar and woodlark nesting season. In combination effects would not arise due to works being undertaken for multiple projects in the same location at the same time, as space constraints would not allow for works close to the SPA to be undertaken for multiple projects simultaneously, even if the programme for the other schemes were to accelerate. Potential for combined losses of habitat for other notable species. | | |
| Sizewell A | There are no adverse residual effects above negligible (Not Significant) associated with Minsmere-Walberswick SPA as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | Demolition of Sizewell A may affect Minsmere-Walberswick SPA including through disturbance, however, mitigation as necessary has been built into the consent. | No significant cumulative effects are considered likely. | No additional cumulative mitigation required. | No |

Cultural Heritage CEA

Table 13.28 Cultural Heritage CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | <p>Potential for direct physical impacts on buried archaeological remains located in the Suffolk Onshore Boundary, as well as possible impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets.</p> <p>During construction, there is potential for residual effects (above negligible) on the following receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible Enclosure Northeast of Hill Farm (SNF038) (Minor); • Saxmundham Converter Station (SXM085; SNF033; SNF039) (Minor); • Saxmundham Converter Station | <p>Potential for direct physical impacts on buried archaeological remains located in the Suffolk Onshore Boundary that extend into the EA1 and 2 site, as well as possible impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets, although it should be noted that mitigation for impacts on the majority of assets where physical impacts are predicted commenced in Autumn 2024.</p> | <p>There is the potential for buried archaeological remains to extended across both schemes, and as such the construction phase has the potential to result in direct physical impacts on a larger area of such features. There is also the potential for both schemes to impact on the same asset where the Order Limits for the two schemes overlap, although impacts on these assets are currently being mitigated as part of the SPR scheme with archaeological mitigation commencing in Autumn 2024.</p> | <p>Mitigation of cumulative physical impacts to include, but not be limited to, archaeological excavation, recording, and dissemination.</p> <p>Potential mitigation of setting impacts through screening (associated with 'Landscape mitigation').</p> | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>South, Ring Ditch (SNF034) (Minor);</p> <p>During operation and maintenance, there is potential for residual effects (above negligible) on the following receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wood Farm Grade II Listed Building (NHLE1231179) (Minor); • The approach from the south to Saxmundham Conservation Area (Minor); • Views of Hurts Hall Grade II Listed Building and Associated Parkland (NHLE1268178; SXM017; SXM077) from the B1121 (Minor); Hill Farmhouse (NHLE 1231296); | | <p>Permanent impacts on the setting of designated assets for both schemes should be limited to the above ground infrastructure (i.e. Saxmundham Converter Station and Friston Substation) and the operational phase. Cumulative setting impacts should be limited due to existing screening/vegetation cover, as well as the distance between designated assets and the proposed above ground infrastructure associated with the two projects – not significant.</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector | Potential for direct physical impacts on buried archaeological remains located in the Suffolk Onshore Boundary, as well as possible impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets. | Potential for direct physical impacts on buried archaeological remains located in the Suffolk Onshore Boundary that extend into the LionLink boundary, as well as possible impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets. | There is the potential for buried archaeological remains to extended across both schemes, and as such the construction phase has the potential to result in direct physical impacts on a larger area of such features. Cumulative impacts on the setting of assets has been taken into account as part of the co-location assessment – not significant . | Mitigation of cumulative physical impacts to include, but not be limited to, archaeological excavation, recording, and dissemination. Potential mitigation of setting impacts through screening (associated with 'Landscape mitigation'). | No |
| South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | Potential for direct physical impacts on buried archaeological remains located in the Suffolk Onshore Boundary, as well as possible impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets (in particular, Hurts Hall). | Potential for direct physical impacts on buried archaeological remains located in the Suffolk Onshore Boundary that also extend into the South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood area, as well as possible impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets (in particular, Hurts Hall). | There is the potential for buried archaeological remains to extended across both schemes, and as such the construction phase has the potential to result in direct physical impacts on a larger area of such features. Permanent impacts on the setting of designated | Mitigation of cumulative physical impacts to include, but not be limited to, archaeological excavation, recording, and dissemination. Potential mitigation of setting impacts | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | assets for both schemes should be limited to the above ground infrastructure (i.e. Saxmundham Converter Station and Friston Substation) in the operational phase. Setting impacts should be limited due to existing screening/vegetation cover, as well as the distance between designated assets and the proposed above ground infrastructure – not significant. | through screening (associated with 'Landscape mitigation'). | |

Water Environment CEA

Table 13.29 Water Environment CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on water quality of watercourses; • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on flow regime/hydromorphology of watercourses; • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on land drainage regime. | Effects of a similar nature to those described for the Proposed Project. | No significant cumulative effects expected following implementation of embedded, control and management measures for each separate development – not significant . | No bespoke mitigation measures relevant to water environment receptors are considered necessary to avoid cumulative effects. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on water quality of the River Fromus; • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on flow regime/hydromorphology of the River Fromus; • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on land drainage regime. | Effects of a similar nature to those described for the Proposed Project. However, the development is not considered likely to have any potential for likely significant effects as it was screened out for EIA. | No significant cumulative effects expected following implementation of embedded, control and management measures for each separate development – not significant . | No bespoke mitigation measures relevant to water environment receptors are considered necessary to avoid significant effects. | No |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on water | Effects of a similar nature to those described for the Proposed Project. | No significant cumulative effects expected following implementation of embedded, control and management measures for each separate development – not significant . | No bespoke mitigation measures relevant to water environment receptors are considered necessary to avoid significant effects. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| | <p>quality of watercourses;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on flow regime/hydromorphology of watercourses; • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on land drainage regime. | | | | |
| South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on water quality of the River Fromus; • Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on flow regime/hydromorphology of the River Fromus; | <p>Effects of a similar nature to those described for the Proposed Project. However, as no planning application has been submitted there is little information available about the development.</p> | <p>No significant cumulative effects expected following implementation of embedded, control and management measures for each separate development – not significant.</p> | <p>No bespoke mitigation measures relevant to water environment receptors are considered necessary to avoid significant effects.</p> | <p>No</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor Adverse (not significant) effect on land drainage regime | | | | |

Agriculture and Soils CEA

Table 13.30 Agriculture and Soils CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Sizewell C related rail improvements and rail extension route (ID 298) | <p>Moderate to Minor adverse (Significant) effects in relation to temporary disturbance to soils during construction, and decommissioning.</p> <p>Major to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects</p> | Potential for Minor (not significant) effect on soils and BMV land. | The Sizewell C related rail improvements and rail extension route will result in additional temporary soil disturbance and temporary (though long term) loss of BMV land resulting in the potential for a minor cumulative effects on these receptors at construction and decommissioning. This could result in a significant | No additional mitigation is available in relation to temporary disturbance to soils and temporary and permanent loss of BMV land. | Yes |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | <p>in relation to permanent loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during construction.</p> <p>Minor adverse (Not Significant) effects in relation to temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during construction.</p> <p>Minor to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects in relation to temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during decommissioning.</p> | | cumulative effect when considered in combination with the Proposed Project . | | |
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms (ID 5 & 6) | Moderate to Minor adverse (Significant) effects in relation to temporary disturbance to soils during construction, | Potential for Minor (Not significant) effect on soils and BMV land. | The onshore elements of the East Anglia ONE and TWO windfarms are likely to result in additional temporary soil disturbance and temporary and permanent loss of BMV land which alone result in a | No additional mitigation available in relation to temporary disturbance to soils and temporary and | Yes |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>and decommissioning.</p> <p>Major to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects in relation to permanent loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during construction.</p> <p>Minor adverse (Not Significant) effects in relation to temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during construction.</p> <p>Minor to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects in relation to temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land during decommissioning.</p> | | <p>minor effect potential for significant cumulative effects on these receptors at construction and decommissioning. This could result in a significant cumulative effect when considered in combination with the Proposed Project.</p> | <p>permanent loss of BMV land.</p> | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Croft Farm land and buildings (ID 228) | <p>Moderate to Minor adverse (Significant) effects in relation to temporary disturbance to soils during construction, and decommissioning.</p> <p>Major to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects in relation to permanent loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during construction.</p> <p>Minor adverse (Not Significant) effects in relation to temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during construction.</p> <p>Minor to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects in relation to</p> | Potential for significant effect on soils and BMV land, though insufficient information is available to confirm. | The Croft Farm land and buildings development could result in additional temporary soil disturbance and temporary and permanent loss of BMV land resulting in the potential for significant cumulative effects on these receptors at construction and decommissioning. At operation and maintenance, the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would not have a significant effect, based on the works required likely being small-scale and of limited duration and the Croft Farm development would be similar. | No additional mitigation available in relation to temporary disturbance to soils and temporary and permanent loss of BMV land. | Yes |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during decommissioning. | | | | |
| South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood (ID 291) | <p>Moderate to Minor adverse (Significant) effects in relation to temporary disturbance to soils during construction, and decommissioning.</p> <p>Major to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects in relation to permanent loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during construction.</p> <p>Minor adverse (Not Significant) effects in relation to temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV)</p> | As no planning application has been submitted for the development there is little information available. | The South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood development could result in additional temporary soil disturbance and temporary and permanent loss of BMV land resulting in the potential for significant cumulative effects on these receptors at construction and decommissioning. At operation and maintenance, the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would not have a significant effect, based on the works required likely being small-scale and of limited duration and the Saxmundham development would be similar. | No additional mitigation available in relation to temporary disturbance to soils and temporary and permanent loss of BMV land. | Yes |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | Land during construction. Minor to Moderate adverse (Significant) effects in relation to temporary loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land during decommissioning. | | | | |

Traffic and Transport CEA

Table 13.31 Traffic and Transport CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1) [noting that this also includes traffic movements | The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project: | The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of The Sizewell C - main | The following cumulative effects are expected based on the inter-project cumulative effects indicative screening matrix contained within Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative | No mitigation necessary as all cumulative effects have been identified as unlikely to be significant . | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| associated with all Sizewell C 'offsite' infrastructure including ID296 and ID297]. | <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL10, S-RJ6) <p>Fear and Intimidation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1) | <p>development site (ID1):</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL10, S-RJ6) <p>Fear and Intimidation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1) | <p>Effects Assessment Methodologies:</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate (for receptors : S-RL10 and S-RJ6. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on receptors S-RL10 and S-RJ6 would be not significant. <p>Fear and Intimidation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptor S-RL1. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction traffic phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL1 would be not significant. | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project (which includes construction traffic associated with Friston substation on the basis that this is constructed as part of the Proposed Project):</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL10 and S-RL12) <p>Driver Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL12) <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1 and S-RJ1) <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-P9 and S-P10) | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) (which includes construction traffic associated with Friston substation on the basis that this is constructed as part of East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm, but see comment to right):</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL10 and S-RL12) <p>Driver Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL12) <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1 and S-RJ1) <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> | <p>The following cumulative effects are expected based on the inter-project cumulative effects indicative screening matrix contained within Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodologies (note, these are expected to be lower as the assessment includes the double-counting of trips associated with the construction of Friston substation):</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptors S-RL10 and S-RL12. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction traffic phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL10 and S-RL12 would be not significant <p>Driver Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be | <p>No mitigation necessary as all cumulative effects have been identified as unlikely to be significant. These are also expected to be lower than the levels identified, as Friston substation will only be built once i.e. as part of EA1N/EA2 or the Proposed Project (not both).</p> <p>In terms of PRoW, to reduce the potential for significant overall cumulative effects, PRoW closures/diversions will be co-ordinated with East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6).</p> | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate (S-P9) • Minor (S-P10) | <p>Minor / Moderate for receptor S-RL12. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction traffic phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL12 would be not significant.</p> <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptors S-RL1 and S-RJ1. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction traffic phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL1 and S-RJ1 would be not significant. <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Moderate/ Major for receptor S-P9, however, significant cumulative effects on S-P9 are considered to be unlikely to arise given the | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p>Proposed Project will be Minor adverse (not significant) and the peak construction traffic phases are unlikely to overlap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptor S-P10. Given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction traffic phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-P10 would be not significant. | | |
| East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) | The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project (which includes construction traffic associated with Friston substation on the basis that this is constructed as part of the Proposed Project): | The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) (which includes construction traffic associated with Friston substation on the basis that this is constructed as part of East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm): | <p>The following cumulative effects are expected based on the inter-project cumulative effects indicative screening matrix contained within Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodologies (note, these are expected to be lower as the assessment includes the double-counting of trips associated with the construction of Friston substation):</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> | No additional mitigation necessary as all cumulative effects have been identified as unlikely to be significant . These are also expected to be lower than the levels identified, as Friston substation will only be built once i.e. as part of EA1N/EA2 or the Proposed Project (not both). | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| | <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL10 and S-RL12) <p>Driver Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL12) <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1 and S-RJ1) <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-P9 and S-P10) | <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL10 and S-RL12) <p>Driver Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL12) <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1 and S-RJ1) <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate (S-P9) • Minor (S-P10) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptors S-RL10 and S-RL12. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL10 and S-RL12 would be not significant. <p>Driver Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptor S-RL12. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL12 would be not significant. <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptors S-RL1 and S-RJ1. | <p>In terms of PRoW, to reduce the potential for significant overall cumulative effects, PRoW closures/diversions will be co-ordinated with East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6).</p> | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p>However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL1 and S-RJ1 would be not significant.</p> <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Moderate/ Major for on receptor S-P9, however, this is considered to be unlikely to arise given the effects of the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse (not significant) and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap – not significant.• The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptor S-P10. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | receptor S-P10 would be not significant . | | |
| High Lodge Leisure (ID221) | There are no shared receptors that could be subject to cumulative effects, as no effects have been identified for High Lodge Leisure (ID221). | No effects are expected as a result of High Lodge Leisure (ID221) | No cumulative effects are expected – not significant | No mitigation necessary. | No |
| Residential Development, Brightwell Lakes (ID240) | There are no shared receptors that could be subject to cumulative effects, as no effects have been identified for Residential Development, Brightwell Lakes (ID240). | No effects are expected as a result of Residential Development, Brightwell Lakes (ID240) | No cumulative effects are expected – not significant | No additional mitigation necessary | No |
| Residential Development, Darsham Station (ID245) | There are no shared receptors that could be subject to cumulative effects, as no effects have been identified for Residential | No effects are expected as a result of Residential Development, Darsham Station (ID245) | No cumulative effects are expected – not significant | No additional mitigation necessary | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| | Development, Darsham Station (ID245). | | | | |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of the Proposed Project:</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL5 and S-RJ6) <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1 and S-RJ1) <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-P14, S-P15 and S-P17) | <p>The following temporary effects are expected during the construction phase of LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287):</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL5 and S-RJ6) <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-RL1 and S-RJ1) <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor (S-P14, S-P15 and S-P17) | <p>The following cumulative effects are expected based on the inter-project cumulative effects indicative screening matrix contained within Application Document 6.3.1.5.A Appendix 1.5.A Cumulative Effects Assessment Methodologies:</p> <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptors S-RL5 and S-RJ6. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL5 and S-RJ6 would be not significant. <p>Road Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate | <p>No additional mitigation necessary as all cumulative effects have been identified as unlikely to be significant</p> <p>Nonetheless to reduce the potential for significant overall cumulative effects, PRoW closures/diversions will be co-ordinated with LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287)</p> | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | <p>for receptors S-RL1 and S-RJ1. Given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on S-RL1 and S-RJ1 would be not significant.</p> <p>PRow Closures and Diversions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Minor / Moderate for receptors S-P14, S-P15 and S-P17. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect on receptors S-P14, S-P15 and S-P17 would be not significant. | | |
| Sizewell A Power Station (ID305) | There are no shared receptors that could be subject to cumulative effects, as no effects have | No effects are expected as a result of Sizewell A Power Station (ID305) | No cumulative effects are expected – not significant | No mitigation necessary | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | been identified for Sizewell A Power Station (ID305). | | | | |

Noise and Vibration CEA

Table 13.32 Noise and Vibration CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Sizewell C - main development site (Construction traffic noise) | Negligible effects on road traffic noise due to construction traffic. | Negligible to minor effects of road traffic noise due to construction traffic on shared routes. | The effects of construction traffic noise are negligible or minor on all shared construction traffic routes. The cumulative effect is therefore expected to be negligible to minor effects at all nearby NSR and significant cumulative effects are not expected – not significant . | No additional mitigation beyond measures already proposed by each respective project. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms (Construction noise and vibration) | Negligible to minor effects at all noise sensitive receptors (NSR) where best practicable means (BPM) are applied to reduce impacts. | Negligible to minor effects at all noise sensitive receptors (NSR) where best practicable means (BPM) are applied to reduce impacts. | The effects of construction noise and vibration are negligible or minor on for both projects. As the projects will impact different receptors to different extents, the cumulative effect is therefore expected to be negligible to minor effects at all nearby NSR and significant cumulative effects are not expected – not significant. | No additional mitigation beyond measures already proposed by each respective project. | No |
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms (Operational noise) | Negligible to minor effects at all NSR where appropriate noise mitigation measures are considered during detailed design. | Negligible to minor effects at all NSR where appropriate noise mitigation measures are considered during detailed design. (Impacts have been evaluated using the assessment methodology of the Proposed Project). | Negligible to minor effects are expected at all nearby NSR. Due to the relatively large distance between the worst-case affected NSR for each respective project, the projects are not expected to interact to produce significant cumulative effects – not significant. | No additional mitigation beyond measures already proposed by each respective project. | No |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector | Negligible to minor effects at all NSR where BPM | Based on being a similar project, negligible to minor effects | The effects of construction noise and vibration are negligible or minor on for both projects. As the projects will impact different receptors to different extents, | No additional mitigation beyond BPM that is already proposed by each respective project. | No |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| (Construction noise and vibration) | are applied to reduce impacts. | would be expected at all NSR where BPM are applied to reduce impacts | the cumulative effect is therefore expected to be negligible to minor effects at all nearby NSR and significant cumulative effects are not expected– not significant . | | |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector (Operational noise) | Negligible to minor effects at all NSR where suitable mitigation measures are incorporated in the design. | Negligible to minor effects at all NSR where suitable mitigation measures are incorporated in the design. | Potential for significant cumulative effect where noise from both projects is towards the higher end of a low magnitude impact. However, this is unlikely to be the case at any shared receptor the projects will affect different receptors to different extents due to their respective locations. Significant cumulative effects are therefore not considered likely– not significant . | No additional mitigation beyond noise mitigation measures proposed by each respective project. | No |
| Sizewell A – Power Station (Construction traffic noise) | Negligible effects on road traffic noise due to construction traffic. | Negligible or low magnitude effects on road traffic noise due to construction traffic shared routes. | As effects associated with the proposed project are negligible, significant effects are unlikely to occur– not significant . | No additional mitigation beyond design measures already proposed by each respective project. | No |

Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism CEA

Table 13.33 Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Sizewell C - main development site | <p>No significant effects expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction workforce generation – minor beneficial - local accommodation - negligible, - social infrastructure - negligible - construction workforce availability - negligible - GVA – minor beneficial <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area.</p> | <p>Likely to be moderate beneficial (significant) effects on employment generation during the construction phase on the local and regional economy.</p> <p>Likely to be moderate beneficial (significant) effects on the local and regional economy in terms of business and supply chain, and wages / spending and additionality.</p> <p>Likely to be minor adverse (not significant) effects on social infrastructure.</p> | <p>The construction employment generated by Sizewell C in combination with the Proposed Project is likely to provide an uplift in employment opportunities and will represent a beneficial effect. Additionally, the construction workforce is likely to generate local and regional spending in terms of business and supply chain. However, considering the limited amount staff required for the construction of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on construction employment and GVA – not significant.</p> <p>The construction workforce required for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and Sizewell C will place additional demand on the</p> | <p>No additional mitigation proposed.</p> | <p>Construction Employment Generation – Not Significant</p> <p>GVA – Not Significant</p> <p>Social Infrastructure – Not Significant</p> <p>Local Accommodation Capacity – Not Significant</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | Likely to be negligible to minor adverse (not significant) effects on local accommodation capacity. | <p>local health facilities. Taking a 'worst-case scenario' approach in which the total peak construction workforce of the Proposed Project and cumulative scheme register with local GP practices, the overall practice list size would increase however GP:Patient ratio will remain below the 1:1,800 target. As a result there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on social infrastructure – not significant.</p> <p>Considering a worst-case scenario, whereby the peak construction workforce of Sizewell C (7,900 FTEs) and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (327 FTEs) require construction workers from the local labour supply (a negligible effect), there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on construction workforce availability in the 60-minute Drive Time Catchment Area.</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | According to Sizewell C Project Accommodation Strategy, approximately 2,000 construction workers will require tourist accommodation and private rental accommodation. Considering a worst-case scenario, whereby the Suffolk Onshore Scheme peak construction workforce (327 FTEs) require local accommodation (a negligible effect), there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on local accommodation capacity in the 60 minute Drive Time Catchment Area. | | |
| East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarms | No significant effects expected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction workforce generation – minor beneficial - local accommodation - negligible, | Likely to be moderate beneficial (significant) effects on employment generation during the construction phase within the local and regional labour market. Likely to be negligible to minor adverse (not significant) effects on all PRow during the | The construction employment generated by East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm in combination with the Proposed Project is likely to provide an uplift in employment opportunities and will represent a beneficial effect. However, considering the limited amount of construction employment generated by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is | PRow closures/ diversions will be co-ordinated with East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects. | Construction employment - Not Significant Footpaths 260/016/0, 354/006/0, 354/007/A and 260/017/0 – Not Significant |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - social infrastructure - negligible - construction workforce availability - negligible - GVA – minor beneficial - Open Space – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible.</p> <p>No significant effects expected on PRow as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Footpath 354/006/0 – minor adverse - Footpath 354/007/A – minor adverse | <p>construction and operation phase of East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm.</p> | <p>unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on socio-economics, recreation and tourism based on the currently available information.</p> <p>Footpaths 354/006/0, 354/007/A, 260/017/0 and 260/016/0 will be impacted during the construction phase of the Proposed Project and East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarms. East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm proposes to temporarily divert Footpaths 354/007/A, 260/017/0 and 260/016/0, permanently divert Footpath 354/006/0, and provide safety management measures to mitigate impacts on PRow users. Overall, this will result in a negligible impact on Footpaths 354/007/A, 260/017/0 and 260/016/0 and as a result there are not anticipated to be any change to the effects on the shared receptors from those identified from the Proposed Project.</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Footpath 260/017/0 – minor adverse - Footpath 260/016/0 – minor adverse <p>Other PRoW receptors are outside of the cumulative study area.</p> | | <p>Considering a worst case scenario where East Anglia ONE Offshore Windfarm has a minor adverse impact on Footpath 354/006/0, Proposed Project in-combination with the scheme is unlikely to intensify the significance of effect. Therefore the significance of effect on the PRoW remains minor adverse (not significant).</p> | | |
| East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarms | <p>No significant effects expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction workforce generation – minor beneficial - local accommodation - negligible, - social infrastructure - negligible - construction workforce | <p>Likely to be moderate beneficial (significant) effects on employment generation during the construction phase within the local and regional labour market.</p> <p>Likely to be negligible to minor adverse (not significant) impacts on PRoW during the construction and operation phase.</p> | <p>The construction employment generated by East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm in combination with the Proposed Project is likely to provide an uplift in employment opportunities and will represent beneficial effect. However, considering the limited amount of construction employment generated by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on socio-economics, recreation and</p> | <p>PRoW closures/ diversions will be co-ordinated with East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects.</p> | <p>Construction employment -Not Significant</p> <p>Footpaths 260/016/0, 354/006/0, 354/007/A and 260/017/0 – Not Significant</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>availability - negligible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GVA – minor beneficial - Open Space – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible.</p> <p>No significant effects expected on PRoW as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Footpath 354/006/0 – minor adverse - Footpath 354/007/A – minor adverse - Footpath 260/017/0 – minor adverse | | <p>tourism based on the currently available information.</p> <p>Footpaths 354/006/0, 354/007/A, 260/017/0 and 260/016/0 will be impacted during the construction phase of the Proposed Project and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarms. East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm proposes to temporarily divert Footpaths 354/007/A, 260/017/0 and 260/016/0, permanently divert Footpath 354/006/0, and provide safety management measures to mitigate impacts on PRoW users. Overall this will result in a negligible impact on Footpaths 354/007/A, 260/017/0 and 260/016/0 and as a result there are not anticipated to be any change to the effects on the shared receptors from those identified from the Proposed Project.</p> <p>Considering a worst case scenario where East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm has a minor adverse impact on Footpath 354/006/0, the</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--------------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Footpath 260/016/0 – minor adverse <p>Other PRow receptors are outside of the cumulative study area.</p> | | Proposed Project in-combination with the scheme is unlikely to intensify the significance of effect. Therefore, the significance of effect on the PRow remains minor adverse (not significant) . | | |
| Norwich to Tilbury | <p>No significant effects expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction workforce generation – minor beneficial - local accommodation - negligible, - social infrastructure - negligible - construction workforce availability - negligible - GVA – minor beneficial <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no</p> | Potential effects as a result of the development but there is currently insufficient information available to understand their significance. | Insufficient information is available to determine any cumulative effects at this stage. | No mitigation necessary. | Not Significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | residual effect above negligible. | | | | |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector | <p>No significant effects expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction workforce generation – minor beneficial - local accommodation - negligible, - social infrastructure - negligible - construction workforce availability - negligible - GVA – minor beneficial - Open Space – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible.</p> | Potential effects on PRow and recreational routes during the construction phase similar to the Proposed Project. However, there is currently insufficient information available to understand their significance. | Footpaths 491/006/0, 491/005/0 and 460/023/0 will likely be impacted during the construction phase of the Proposed Project and Lion Link Offshore Interconnector. There is insufficient information to determine cumulative effects currently as LionLink is at Scoping Report stage, however the PRow diversions required as part of the Proposed Project have been designed and co-ordinated with Lion Link Offshore Interconnector to minimise additional journey distances, re-join existing routes and improve route connectivity. Therefore, there are not anticipated to be any change to the effects on the shared receptors from those identified from the Proposed Project – not significant . | PRow closures and diversions will be co-ordinated with LionLink Offshore Interconnector to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects. | Footpath 460/023/0, 491/006/0 and 491/005/0 – Not Significant . |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>No significant effects expected on PRow as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Footpath 491/005/0 – minor adverse <p>Other PRow receptors are outside of the cumulative study area or have no residual effect above negligible.</p> | | | | |
| South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | <p>No significant effects expected on residential properties, business premises, visitor attractions, community facilities, open space, development land receptors as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme.</p> <p>No significant effects expected on local</p> | There is currently no information available about the effects of this development. | There is insufficient information available to determine any cumulative effects at this stage. | No cumulative mitigation identified. | Not Significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| | communities impacted by severance. Negligible (not significant) to Moderate (significant) impacts on PRow and recreational routes. | | | | |

Health and Wellbeing CEA

Table 13.34 Health and Wellbeing CEA

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| The Sizewell C - main development site | No significant effects during construction expected on: - Access to open space, leisure and play– minor adverse | One significant effect identified on shared human health receptors in Sizewell C Environmental Statement: - Health effects from changes in | There is a moderate beneficial (significant) effect identified by the Sizewell C main development of relevance to health and wellbeing arising from changes in employment and income generation. However, considering the | No mitigation necessary. | Not significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality – negligible - Noise and vibration – minor adverse - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Employment and income – minor beneficial - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>No significant effects during operation expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to open space, leisure and play – minor adverse - Air quality – negligible | <p>employment and income generation during construction – moderate beneficial</p> <p>No further significant effects, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health effects from changes in noise exposure during construction and operation – minor adverse - Health effects from changes in transport nature and flow rate during operation – minor beneficial | <p>limited amount staff required for the construction of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is unlikely to be a significant beneficial cumulative effect on construction employment and GVA.</p> <p>Sizewell C main development assessed a minor adverse (not significant) effect on noise exposure during both operation and construction. However, as no shared noise sensitive receptors between the Sizewell C main development site and the Proposed Project relevant to construction and operational noise, there are no anticipated cumulative effects – not significant.</p> <p>Sizewell C and the Proposed Project are unlikely to lead to significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects from changes in transport nature and flow rate. This is because</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible.</p> | | <p>Sizewell C main development has been assessed to have negligible residual effects (not significant) from changes in traffic and transport during construction. Once operational the Proposed Project will have a minor adverse effect whilst Sizewell C will have minor beneficial impacts on health from changes in transport. Together, these effects are unlikely to lead to a significant adverse cumulative effect – not significant.</p> <p>In addition, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects on health and wellbeing, given that there are no significant cumulative effects identified for other environmental aspects of relevance to health and wellbeing, including, landscape and visual, traffic and transport, air quality, noise and vibration. Specifically, this includes no anticipated significant adverse effects in</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | relation to mental health due to community severance, reduced visual amenity, disturbance from noise impacts, nor to physical health outcomes such as levels of physical activity or respiratory health – not significant . | | |
| East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | <p>No significant effects during construction expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to open space, leisure and play– minor adverse - Air quality – negligible - Noise and vibration – minor adverse - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Employment and income – minor beneficial | <p>No significant effects identified for human health within East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarm Environmental Statements.</p> <p>There is also potential for health and wellbeing effects in regard to the determinant of social cohesion and community identity, based on the landscape and visual assessment.</p> | <p>Cumulative construction vehicle traffic could occur due to shared construction routes such as the A12, which could impact air quality and impact on noise and vibration, both determinants of health and wellbeing. However, as indicated in Table 13.36, cumulative traffic and transport effects are not anticipated to be significant. As such cumulative health and wellbeing effects as a result of construction vehicle impact on noise and air quality are not anticipated to be significant.</p> <p>There is potential for there to be cumulative effects on health and wellbeing linked to landscape and visual amenity.</p> | No mitigation necessary. | Not significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>No significant effects during operation expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to open space, leisure and play– minor adverse - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible.</p> | | <p>These cumulative effects may have impact on mental health due to community severance and reduced visual amenity. However, there is sufficient geographic separation, intervening vegetation and distance between the onshore permanent elements of the developments that mean the reduction in visual amenity is unlikely to result in a significant cumulative effect on health and wellbeing – not significant.</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--------------------|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| High Lodge Leisure | <p>No significant effects during construction expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>No significant effects during operation expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Social cohesion and community | <p>There is potential for effects in regard to the determinant of social cohesion and community identity, due to severance outlined in the traffic and transport assessment.</p> | <p>Cumulative construction vehicle traffic could occur due to shared construction routes such as the A12, which could impact air quality and impact on noise and vibration, both determinants of health and wellbeing. However, as indicated in Table 13.36, cumulative traffic and transport effects are not anticipated to be significant. As such cumulative health and wellbeing effects as a result of construction vehicle impact on noise and air quality are not anticipated to be significant. There are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects in relation to mental health, social cohesion, and community identity, as there are no significant severance effects outlined in the traffic and transport assessment. – not significant</p> | No mitigation necessary. | Not significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | identity – minor adverse Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible . | | | | |
| Brightwell Lakes | <p>No significant effects during construction expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>No significant effects during operation expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, | There is also potential for effects in regard to the determinant of social cohesion and community identity, due to severance outlined in the traffic and transport assessment. | Cumulative construction vehicle traffic could occur due to shared construction routes such as the A12, which could impact air quality and impact on noise and vibration, both determinants of health and wellbeing. This is particularly relevant to the respiratory health of vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with pre-existing conditions. However, as indicated in Table 13.36, cumulative traffic and transport effects are not anticipated to be significant. As such cumulative health and wellbeing effects as a result of construction vehicle impact on noise and air quality are not anticipated to be significant. | No mitigation necessary. | Not significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|--|---|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| | <p>connections, and physical activity – minor adverse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible</p> | | <p>There are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects in relation to mental health, social cohesion, and community identity, as there are no significant severance effects outlined in the traffic and transport assessment – not significant.</p> | | |
| Residential Development, Darsham Station | <p>No significant effects during construction expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse | <p>There is also potential for effects in regard to the determinant of social cohesion and community identity, due to severance outlined in the traffic and transport assessment.</p> | <p>Cumulative construction vehicle traffic could occur due to shared construction routes such as the A12, which could impact air quality and noise and vibration, both determinants of health and wellbeing. However, as indicated in Table 13.36, cumulative traffic and transport effects are not anticipated to be significant. As such cumulative health and wellbeing effects as a result of construction vehicle impact on noise and air quality are not anticipated to be significant.</p> | <p>No mitigation necessary.</p> | <p>Not significant.</p> |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <p>No significant effects during operation expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible</p> | | <p>There are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects in relation to mental health, social cohesion, and community identity, as there are no significant severance effects outlined in the traffic and transport assessment – not significant.</p> | | |
| Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | It is not clear at this stage whether there could be any shared receptors. | Unlikely to be significant effects on health receptors. The development is not considered to have any potential for likely significant effects as it was screened out for EIA. | Due to the difference in scale and nature of development, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects on health and wellbeing, given that there are no significant effects identified for other environmental aspects of relevance to health and | No mitigation necessary. | Not significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | | | wellbeing, including, landscape and visual, traffic and transport, noise and vibration, socio-economics, and recreation and tourism. Specifically, this includes no anticipated significant adverse effects in relation to mental health due to community severance, reduced visual amenity, disturbance from noise impacts, nor to physical health outcomes such as levels of physical activity or respiratory health – not significant . | | |
| LionLink Offshore Interconnector | <p>No significant effects during construction expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to open space, leisure and play– minor adverse - Air quality – negligible - Noise and vibration – minor adverse | <p>There is potential for effects in regard to the determinant of social cohesion and community identity, due to severance outlined in the traffic and transport assessment.</p> <p>There is also potential for health and wellbeing effects in regard to the determinant of social cohesion and community</p> | <p>Cumulative construction vehicle traffic could occur due to shared construction routes such as the A12, which could impact noise and vibration, a determinant of health and wellbeing.</p> <p>However, as indicated in Table 13.36, cumulative traffic and transport effects are not anticipated to be significant. As such cumulative health and wellbeing effects as a result of construction vehicle impact on</p> | No mitigation necessary. | Not significant. |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse - Employment and income – minor beneficial - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>No significant effects during operation expected on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to open space, leisure and play– minor adverse - Air quality – negligible - Transport modes, access, connections, and physical activity – minor adverse | <p>identity, based on the landscape and visual assessment.</p> | <p>noise and air quality are not anticipated to be significant.</p> <p>There are unlikely to be significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects in relation to mental health, social cohesion, and community identity, as there are no significant severance effects outlined in the traffic and transport assessment.</p> <p>The combination of both converter station developments and the connection at Friston Substation at construction (including decommissioning) has the potential to extend and intensify the effects on both landscape character and visual amenity in this part of the landscape. However, this is unlikely to lead to significant cumulative health and wellbeing effects due to their being no identified significant health and wellbeing effects for the Suffolk Onshore</p> | | |

| Project | Effects on shared receptors from the Proposed Project | Effects on shared receptors from the 'other developments' | Assessment of Cumulative effects | Is mitigation needed to address any Cumulative Effect | Residual Cumulative Effect? |
|---------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Social cohesion and community identity – minor adverse <p>Other receptor types are outside of the cumulative study area, or have no residual effect above negligible.</p> | | Scheme in relation to visual amenity – not significant . | | |

13.3 Assessment of total cumulative effects

- 13.3.1 The Stage 4 assessment above provides a cumulative assessment for each topic with each of the other individual developments taken through to Stage 3 and 4 considered alongside the Suffolk Onshore Scheme as per Advice Note Seventeen (Planning Inspectorate, 2024). However, due to the large number of other developments assessed and particularly given the proximity of some of these to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, a further assessment has been undertaken which considers the overall cumulative effect of the Proposed Project with all other developments which may each impact any shared receptors. This overall assessment is provided in the tables below. Where topics have not carried through any developments to Stage 3 and Stage 4 (i.e. geology and hydrogeology), no table is provided.
- 13.3.2 In addition to the assessment of total cumulative effects, a sequential Landscape and Visual assessment is provided at Table 13.35. The sequential cumulative visual assessment has been undertaken on key routes and transport corridors within the landscape and visual study area which have been agreed through stakeholder consultation. The sequential cumulative visual assessment has been undertaken at operation and for the major projects considered within the cumulative assessment for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, namely Sizewell C, EA1 and 2 and LionLink, as these are considered to be the most likely projects to result in potentially significant sequential visual effects. The assessment considers the nature of the viewing experience along each route, which includes where the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and one or more of the cumulative developments are visible in combination for part of the route and also where developments can be repeatedly encountered through the landscape which does not depend on intervisibility. The types of visibility are split into the following criteria:
- Continuous – cumulative development would be visible for the entire route;
 - Frequent – where the cumulative development would appear regularly and with short time lapses between instances depending on speed of travel and distance between the viewpoint/viewing locations; and
 - Occasional – where the cumulative development would appear with longer time lapses between appearances because the observer is moving very slowly and/or there are larger distances between the viewpoint/viewing locations.
- 13.3.3 The sequential cumulative visual assessment is supported by Table 13.36 and associated figures can be found within **Application Document 6.4.3.1.9 Cumulative Schemes (Major Projects) Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility**.

Table 13.35 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Landscape and Visual

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|---|--|---|--|
| Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast | The Sizewell C - main development site | The cumulative effect on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to geographic separation and distance. | <p>When considered together there is likely to be an intensification of the cumulative effects that were reported separately for each of the other developments during the construction and decommissioning stages on the Suffolk Coasts and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast.</p> <p>There is no additional mitigation available to address this intensified cumulative effect, which remains significant during construction and decommissioning.</p> <p>No significant cumulative effects anticipated for operation and maintenance.</p> |
| | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms at construction (including decommissioning) due to the similar type and scale of development which has the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. At operation and maintenance, the potential for significant cumulative effects is unlikely due to sufficient geographic separation, intervening vegetation, reinstatement of cable corridors and distance between the onshore permanent elements of the developments. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and Lion Link Offshore Interconnector at construction (including decommissioning) due to the similar type and scale of development which has the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. At operation and maintenance, the potential for significant cumulative effects is unlikely due to the | |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | reinstatement of the landfalls and cable corridors and distance of the onshore permanent elements of the development being distant and geographically separate to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB and Suffolk Heritage Coast. | |
| LCA L1 Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands | The Sizewell C - main development site | The cumulative effect on LCA L1 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to geographic separation and distance. | When considered together there is likely to be an intensification of the cumulative effects that were reported separately for each of the other developments at all project stages. This is primarily as a result of the Suffolk Onshore scheme, East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink; however the remaining projects may also contribute in a minor way to the total effect. There is no additional mitigation available to address this intensified cumulative effect, which remains significant at all project stages. |
| | Sizewell Link Road-Bridge across rail tracks | The cumulative effect on LCA L1 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to no combined theoretical visibility, geographic separation, different type of development and the context of the road networks which has existing influence on the rural character of the LCA. | |
| | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on LCA L1 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms at construction (including decommissioning) due to the similar type and scale of development which has the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would remove a small part of the landscape mitigation proposed as part of the East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms development to facilitate the Suffolk Onshore Scheme cable route. At operation and maintenance, unlikely for significant cumulative effects due to sufficient geographic separation, intervening vegetation and distance between the onshore permanent elements of the developments. | |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Town Farm Solar Farm | The cumulative effect on LCA L1 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to the difference in scale and type of development, geographic separation, both developments largely retain the landscape pattern and existing vegetation, including field boundary vegetation, and intervening landform, vegetation and built form which would result in minimal visual intervisibility. | |
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on LCA L1 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood at construction (including decommissioning) due to proximity on construction activity. At operation and maintenance, unlikely for significant cumulative effects due to the different scale and type of development, separation and context of the edge of Saxmundham. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on LCA L1 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink Offshore Interconnector at all project stages due to the intensification and extension of effects on landscape character. This is due to the scale of development likely to further heighten impacts on key characteristics of LCA L1: Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands, including the deeply rural nature and limited intrusion from modern development. | |
| LCA B4 Fromus Valley | Town Farm Solar Farm | The cumulative effect on LCA B4 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to the difference in scale and | When considered together the total cumulative effects are unlikely to be any |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | type of development, geographic separation, both developments largely retain the landscape pattern and existing vegetation, including field boundary vegetation, and intervening landform, vegetation and built form which would result in minimal visual intervisibility. | greater than the cumulative effects in isolation that were reported separately for each of the other developments. Not significant at all project stages |
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on LCA B4 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood at construction (including decommissioning) due to proximity on construction activity. At operation and maintenance, unlikely for significant cumulative effects due to the different scale and type of development, separation and context of the edge of Saxmundham. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | The cumulative effect on LCA B4 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to the parts of the developments located within the LCA limiting the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. | |
| <u>LCA K3 Aldringham and Freston Sandlands</u> | The Sizewell C - main development site | The cumulative effect on LCA K3 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to geographic separation and distance. | When considered together there is likely to be an intensification of the cumulative effects that were reported separately for each of the other developments at construction and decommissioning stages. This is primarily as a result |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | The cumulative effect on LCA K3 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to the parts of the developments located within the LCA limiting the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. | |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | East Anglia ONE North & TWO Offshore Windfarms | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on LCA K3 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms at construction (including decommissioning) due to the similar type and scale of development which has the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. At operation and maintenance, unlikely for significant cumulative effects due to sufficient geographic separation, intervening vegetation and distance between the onshore permanent elements of the developments. | of the Suffolk Onshore scheme, East Anglia ONE North & TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink; however Sizewell C main development site may also contribute in a minor way to the total effect. There is no additional mitigation available to address his intensified cumulative effect, which remains significant during for construction (including decommissioning). At operation and maintenance the total cumulative effects are unlikely to be any greater than the cumulative effects in isolation that were reported separately for each of the other developments. Not significant for operation and maintenance. |
| LCA 01 Benhall Estate Sandlands | A12 Bypass | The cumulative effect on LCA O1 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to due to intervening built form and vegetation, and the context of the A12 road corridor. | When considered together the total cumulative effects are unlikely to be any greater than the cumulative effects in isolation that were |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on LCA 01 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood at construction (including decommissioning) due to proximity on construction activity. At operation and maintenance, unlikely for significant cumulative effects due to the different scale and type of development, separation and context of the edge of Saxmundham. | reported separately for each of the other developments. Not significant at all project stages |
| SCT 03 Nearshore Waters | The Sizewell C - main development site, East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink Offshore Interconnector | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on SCT 03 as a result of the construction activity associated with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, Sizewell C, East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink Offshore Interconnector which has the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. At operation and maintenance, the potential for significant cumulative effects is unlikely due to sufficient geographic separation, intervening vegetation and distance between the onshore permanent elements of the developments. | When considered together there is likely to be an intensification of the cumulative effects that were reported separately for each of the other developments during the construction and decommissioning stages on SCT 03 Nearshore Waters. There is no additional mitigation available to address this intensified cumulative effect, which remains significant during construction and decommissioning. No significant cumulative effects anticipated for operation and maintenance. |
| Representative Viewpoints | The Sizewell C - main development site | The cumulative effect on shared representative viewpoints 1 and 13 is unlikely to be any greater than | When considered together there is likely to be an |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to geographic separation and distance. | intensification of the cumulative effects from some viewpoints that were reported separately for each of the other developments. This is primarily as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and multiple other developments appearing together within a view. There is no additional mitigation available to address this intensified cumulative effect, which remains significant from some representative viewpoints at all project stages. |
| | A12 Bypass | The cumulative effect on shared visual receptors is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to sufficient existing layering of vegetation in the local landscape, existing built form and the context of the existing A12. | |
| | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects for representative viewpoints 6, 7, 8 and 22 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms at construction (including decommissioning) due to the similar type and scale of development which has the potential to extend and intensify the original effects. The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would remove a small part of the landscape mitigation proposed as part of the East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms development to facilitate the Suffolk Onshore Scheme cable route. At operation and maintenance, there is the potential that significant cumulative effects could remain at viewpoint 6 where views in succession of both developments would be experienced although intervening vegetation towards the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would limit the potential cumulative effects. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on shared visual receptors (viewpoints 1 – 7, 15-17, 19 – 21) as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink Offshore Interconnector at all project stages due to the intensification and extension of effects on visual amenity. This is due to the change in the scale and extent of views from visual receptors. | |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Town Farm Solar Farm | The cumulative effect on shared representative viewpoint 15 is unlikely to be any greater than the effects in isolation of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme due to minimal intervisibility at construction (including decommissioning) and operation and maintenance, due to the screening effects created by the layered vegetation network in the local landscape and intervening built form, and any views towards the Town Farm Solar Farm would be within the context of the A12 road corridor. | |
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | There is the potential for significant cumulative effects on representative viewpoints 2 and 20 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood at construction (including decommissioning) due to proximity on construction activity. At operation and maintenance, unlikely for significant cumulative effects due to the different scale and type of development, separation and context of the edge of Saxmundham. | |

Table 13.36 Sequential Cumulative Visual Assessment

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|--|---|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| B1119 | There would be almost continuous theoretical visibility of the LionLink and Sizewell C developments from the B1119. These would be mostly experienced in succession rather than in combination due to the developments occupying different parts of the view. There would be two very short sections of combined visibility with EA1 and 2 to the east and west of Saxmundham. | LionLink and Sizewell C | | EA1 and 2 | There would be almost continuous theoretical visibility of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme with LionLink and Sizewell C between Saxmundham and Leiston. Typically, the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink would be visible in combination and Sizewell C in succession. In addition to this for two very short sections of the route EA1 and 2 would also be visible. Overall, there would be an intensification and extension of effects on visual amenity of users of this section of the B1119. | Potential significant cumulative effects from the section of the B1119 between Saxmundham and Leiston. |
| B1121 | There would be almost continuous theoretical visibility of the LionLink and Sizewell C developments from the B1121 to the south of Saxmundham and frequent theoretical visibility of EA1 and 2. These would be | LionLink and Sizewell C | EA1 and 2 | | There would be frequent theoretical visibility of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme with LionLink, Sizewell C and EA1 and 2 from the B1121 to the south of Saxmundham. Typically, the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, LionLink and EA1 | Potential significant cumulative effects from the section of the B1121 to the south of Saxmundham. |

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------|------------|---|--|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| | mostly experienced in succession rather than in combination due to the developments occupying different parts of the view. There would be frequent theoretical visibility of the LionLink development to the north of Saxmundham. | | | | and 2 would be visible in combination and Sizewell C in succession. It should be noted that there would be certain angles where the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would screen views to LionLink, but this would be from a short section of the route. Theoretical views of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme do not introduce additional areas of visibility in between the continuous and frequent sequential visibility of the other developments. Overall, there would be an intensification and extension of effects on visual amenity of users of the section of the B1119 to the south of Saxmundham where there is combined theoretical visibility between the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and other cumulative developments both in combination and succession. | |

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------|------------|---|--|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| Sandlings Walk | There would be almost continuous theoretical visibility of Sizewell C and frequent theoretical visibility of the LionLink development between Snape and the B1122. There would be a short section of theoretical visibility of the EA1 and 2 development to the east of Friston. These would be mostly experienced in succession rather than in combination due to the developments occupying different parts of the view. | Sizewell C | LionLink | EA1 and 2 | There would be a small section of shared theoretical visibility along the Sandlings Walk to the west of Friston between the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and Sizewell C and LionLink. Typically, the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink would be visible in combination and Sizewell C in succession. Theoretical views of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme do not introduce additional areas of visibility in between the varied sequential visibility of the other developments. Overall, there would be an intensification and extension of effects on visual amenity of users of a section of the Sandlings Walk to the west of Friston, however this would be for a short part of the route, this would be within the context of the existing towers and overhead line which lessens the contrast in views and part of the route would be at an | No significant cumulative effects. |

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--------------------|---|--------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| | | | | | angle where the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would screen views to LionLink. | |
| Suffolk Coast Path | There would be occasional theoretical visibility of the Sizewell C development from the coastal hinterland and to the east of Snape. There would be a small section of combined visibility of the LionLink and EA1 and 2 developments to the east of Snape. These would be mostly experienced in succession rather than in combination due to the developments occupying different parts of the view. | | | EA1 and 2, LionLink and Sizewell C | There would be a very small section of shared visibility along the Suffolk Coast Path to the east of Snape between the Suffolk Onshore Scheme with LionLink and Sizewell C. The Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink would be visible in combination and Sizewell C in succession. Immediately to the west of this section of the route, there would be visibility of the EA1 and 2 development in a similar part of the view to LionLink and near to where the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would be visible for the section of the route to the immediate east. The remainder of views along the route would remain unaffected which limits the potential for significant cumulative sequential effects on this route. | No significant cumulative effects. |

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------|----------|------------|---|--|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| Suffolk Coastal Cycle Route | There would be almost continuous theoretical visibility of the Sizewell C and LionLink developments across the route. There would be a section of visibility of the EA1 and 2 development to the north of Friston. These would be mostly experienced in succession rather than in combination due to the developments occupying different parts of the view. | LionLink and Sizewell C | | EA1 and 2 | The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would appear in combination with the LionLink and Sizewell C developments frequently along the Suffolk Coastal Cycle Route, predominately to the north of Friston. The Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink would be visible in combination and Sizewell C in succession. For a section of the route to the north of Friston, there would also be combined visibility with the EA1 and 2 development, however in most views the EA1 and 2 development would largely screen views towards LionLink and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, which limits the cumulative effect. The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would not introduce additional areas of visibility but would slightly increase the proportion of the view affected. This would result in the slight intensification and extension of effects on visual | No significant cumulative effects. |

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|----------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|--|--|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| | | | | | amenity of users of the Suffolk Coastal Cycle Route to the north of Friston, however due to the distance this would be a small part of the overall panorama affected and for a limited section of the route. | |
| Wolf Way Cycle Route | There would be frequent theoretical visibility of the Sizewell C and LionLink developments across the route. There would be two sections of visibility of the EA1 and 2 development to the northwest and northeast of Friston. These would be mostly experienced in succession rather than in combination due to the developments occupying different parts of the view. | | LionLink and Sizewell C | EA1 and 2 | The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would appear in combination with the LionLink and Sizewell C developments for a short section of the Wolf Way Cycle Route to the west and northwest of Friston, which would also include the EA1 and 2 development for the section to the northwest of Friston. The Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink would be visible in combination, however due to the angle of the view, the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would largely screen views of LionLink, and Sizewell C and EA1 and 2 in succession. Overall, there would be an intensification and extension of effects on visual amenity of users of a | No significant cumulative effects. |

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|--|--|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| | | | | | section of the Wolf Way Cycle Route to the west and northwest of Friston. This would be limited to a short part of the route, and within the context of the existing towers and overhead line which would lessen the contrast in views. | |
| PRoW within the Study Area | There would be frequent theoretical visibility of the Sizewell C and LionLink developments from the PRoWs across the Study Area. There would be occasional theoretical visibility of the EA1 and 2 developments predominantly focused to the north and east of Friston. These would be mostly experienced in succession rather than in combination due to the developments occupying different parts of the view. | LionLink and Sizewell C | EA1 and 2 | | The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would appear in combination with the LionLink and Sizewell C developments for frequent sections of PRoW within the Study Area. Typically, the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and LionLink would be visible in combination and Sizewell C in succession. There would be short sections of PRoW around Friston where the EA1 and 2 development would also be visible typically in succession with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. The Suffolk Onshore Scheme would not introduce additional areas of visibility but would slightly increase the proportion of the | Potential significant cumulative effects from the PRoW network in closer proximity to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. |

| Sequential Route | Cumulative Baseline Description | Cumulative Baseline Visibility | | | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Suffolk Onshore Scheme with the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|------------|---|--|
| | | Continuous | Frequent | Occasional | | |
| | | | | | view affected. Overall, there would be an intensification and extension of effects on visual amenity of users on the PRow within the Study Area which is likely to be most notable in closer proximity to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme where the proportion of the view occupied by both LionLink and the Suffolk Onshore Scheme would be larger. | |

Table 13.37 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Ecology and Biodiversity

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Minsmere-Walberswick SPA | Sizewell C - main development site | All of these developments (including the Suffolk Onshore Scheme) lie within 10 km of the SPA. They could all therefore potentially | | No significant cumulative effects |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|----------------------|---|---|--|
| | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | affect functionally-linked habitats (wetlands, farmland) used by white-fronted goose for which the SPA is partly designated. | |
| | Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | However, surveys have confirmed that the only part of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme which supports a significant population of birds that may be associated with this SPA is the wetland part of RSPB North Warren which will be traversed by HDD. Moreover, noise modelling has confirmed that only a very small part of the wetland will be subject to noise levels above 60dB during construction, which will therefore not cause material disturbance. | |
| | Sizewell B Relocated Facilities | | |
| | Town Farm Solar Farm | | |
| | UKZ139 BC Wissett Solar Farm | | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | | |
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood Sizewell A | | |
| Alde-Ore Estuary SPA | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | All of these developments (including the Suffolk Onshore Scheme) lie within 2 km of the SPA. They could all therefore potentially affect functionally-linked habitat used by non-breeding birds for which the SPA is partly designated. However, surveys have shown the Suffolk Onshore Scheme does not support significant numbers of birds associated with this SPA except for the wetland part of RSPB North Warren which will be traversed by HDD. Moreover, noise modelling has confirmed that only a very small part of the wetland will be | No significant cumulative effects |
| | Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | | |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | subject to noise levels above 60 dB during construction, which will therefore not cause material disturbance. | |
| Sandlings SPA | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | All of these projects lie sufficiently close to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, and will occur over a sufficiently similar timetable, such that cumulative disturbance impacts could arise on nightjar and woodlark nesting within Sandlings SPA. | No significant cumulative effects |
| | Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | There is insufficient space for these to occur close to the Sandlings SPA simultaneously, but a potential cumulative effect could arise with LionLink, and Sea Link projects following each other temporally, extending the overall potential disturbance period. However, it has been established for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme that disturbance of the SPA can be avoided by maintaining noise levels in the SPA to below 60 dB and/or avoiding the most potentially disturbing works near to the SPA (i.e. compound set up for Sea Link) during the nesting season. Therefore, it is possible for the Proposed Project to be constructed without disturbance of nesting nightjar and woodlark in Sandlings SPA, meaning that irrespective of the effects of other developments, the Proposed Project is unlikely to contribute to them. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | | |
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | | |
| | | Temporary loss of functionally-linked land for Sandlings SPA would arise from Sea Link through removal of a field of acid grassland close to Sandlings SPA to enable the HDD to be undertaken. This field would be occupied by surface construction infrastructure for approximately six months which would include the nightjar and woodlark nesting season. For the temporary duration of works to construct the Proposed Project this will be offset by leaving an area of arable land on sandy soils fallow and/or seeding it as acid | |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | grassland to be maintained for 10 years, which will have a long-term benefit. Other schemes could implement similar measures. | |
| Other local wildlife | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms | All of these projects lie sufficiently close to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, and will occur over a sufficiently similar timetable, that cumulative disturbance or habitat loss impacts could arise on wildlife local to the Proposed Project, such as bats, breeding birds and dormice. | No significant cumulative effects |
| | Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | Disruption of bat commuting and other wildlife connectivity through breaks in hedgerows may arise. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | Short to medium-term habitat loss will arise through removal of grassland, woodland and hedgerow habitat for temporary construction and permanent gaps in hedgerows for permanent access. | |
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | However, for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme temporary gaps in hedgerows will be closed to a maximum of 10 m at night through use of hurdles, while in the long-term, habitat creation around the Saxmundham Converter Station and Friston Substation mean that there will be a net increase in woodland, wetland, grassland and hedgerow due to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. | |

Table 13.38 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Cultural Heritage

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects. |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | EA ONE North | Potential loss of non-designated heritage assets during construction due to Order Limits overlapping, and/or archaeological remains | Not significant |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects. |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Physical impacts on non-designated cultural heritage | | extending into the Order Limits of multiple developments. While physical impacts are predicted, mitigation is possible through standard measures (such as excavation, recording, and publication), with mitigation for EA One North commenced in Autumn 2024. | |
| | EA TWO | Potential loss of non-designated heritage assets during construction due to Order Limits overlapping, and/or archaeological remains extending into the Order Limits of multiple developments. While physical impacts are predicted, mitigation is possible through standard measures (such as excavation, recording, and publication), with mitigation for EA One North commenced in Autumn 2024. | |
| | LionLink | Potential loss of non-designated heritage assets during construction due to Order Limits overlapping, and/or archaeological remains extending into the Order Limits of multiple developments. While physical impacts are predicted, mitigation is possible through standard measures (such as excavation, recording, and publication). | |
| Impacts on the setting of designated assets | EA One North | Potential impacts on the setting of designated heritage assets resulting from the above ground infrastructure (i.e. Saxmundham Converter Station and Friston Substation). | Not significant |
| | EA Two | As above | |
| | LionLink | There is the potential for the LionLink Converter Station at Saxmundham to result in a cumulative impact on specific designated assets, including the Grade II listed Wood Farm (NHLE 1231179) which is located on the western edge of the landholding proposed for both the Sea Link and LionLink Converter Stations. This will result in a further loss of the agricultural land which forms a key component of the farm's setting, as well as well as introduce further modern infrastructure to views from the farm and farm buildings to the east, although it will not result in a complete loss of the asset's setting. Furthermore, the heritage value of Wood Farm has been impacted as a result of a fire which required the demolition of the historic core | |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects. |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--|---|
| | | of the structure, and an application has been made to have the listed status of the farm removed and the building fully demolished. As a result, while an impact on the setting of the asset is predicted, it is unlikely to be significant. | |

Table 13.39 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Water Environment

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--|---|---|---|
| River Fromus, Hundred River, and ordinary watercourses/ land drains. Coastal and fluvial floodplains, existing land uses and infrastructure | EA One North | No significant cumulative effects. | Potential for overall cumulative effects on flow regime/hydromorphology and water quality of watercourses and potential for changes to the land drainage regime during concurrent construction periods of the projects. Each project would reasonably be expected to adopt embedded and best practice control/management measures, which would be secured against the development consent, to reduce effects to acceptable levels and therefore significant overall cumulative effects are not considered likely. |
| | EA Two | No significant cumulative effects | |
| | LionLink | No significant cumulative effects | |
| | Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation | No significant cumulative effects | |
| | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | No significant cumulative effects | |

Table 13.40 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Agriculture and Soils

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land | <div>Sizewell C related rail improvements and rail extension route (ID 298)</div> <div>East Anglia One North Offshore Windfarm (ID 5)</div> <div>East Anglia Two Offshore Windfarm (ID 6)</div> <div>Croft Farm land and buildings</div> <div>South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood</div> | Combined loss of or temporary disturbance to soils and temporary and permanent loss of BMV land considered likely to result in a significant cumulative effect based on the information available to date. There is no further mitigation available to address this cumulative effect. | Significant |

Table 13.41 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Traffic and Transport

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|
| A12 (south of A1094) (S-RL1) | <div>The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1)</div> <div>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5)</div> <div>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6)</div> | <p>The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fear and Intimidation: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is | Severance and Pedestrian Delay: Given that the effect of each individual development is either negligible or minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant . |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | High Lodge Leisure (ID221) Residential Development, Brightwell Lakes (ID240) Residential Development, Darsham Station (ID245) LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) Sizewell A Power Station (ID305) | <p>minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Safety: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Safety: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287):</p> | <p>Fear and Intimidation: Given that the effect of each individual development is either negligible or minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <p>Road Safety: Given that the effect of each individual development is either negligible or minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <p>Note, cumulative effects as a result of the Proposed Project and both East Anglia One North (ID5) and East Anglia Two (ID6) are expected to be lower than the levels identified, as Friston substation will only be built once i.e. as part of EA1N/EA2 or the Proposed Project (not both).</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Safety: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | |
| B1121 Main Road (east of A12) (S-RL5) | The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1) East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) Sizewell A Power Station (ID305) | LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | Severance and Pedestrian Delay: Given that the effect of each individual development is either negligible or minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant . |
| A1094 (between A12 and B1069 Snape Road) (S-RL10) | The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1) East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) | The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction | Severance and Pedestrian Delay: Not significant given the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse (not significant) and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap. |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Sizewell A Power Station (ID305) | <p>phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | <p>Driver Delay: Given that the effect of each individual development is either negligible or minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <p>Note, cumulative effects as a result of the Proposed Project and both East Anglia One North (ID5) and East Anglia Two (ID6) are expected to be lower than the levels identified, as Friston substation will only be built once i.e. as part of EA1N/EA2 or the Proposed Project (not both).</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--|--|---|--|
| B1069 Snape Road (between A1094 Aldeburgh Road and Aldringham Lane) (S-RL12) | The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1) East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) Sizewell A Power Station (ID305) | <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. Driver Delay: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall | <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay: Given that the effect of each individual development is either negligible or minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <p>Driver Delay: Not significant given the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse (not significant) and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap.</p> <p>Note, cumulative effects as a result of the Proposed Project and both East Anglia One North (ID5) and East Anglia Two (ID6) are expected to be lower than the levels identified, as Friston substation will only be built once i.e. as part of EA1N/EA2 or the Proposed Project (not both).</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Driver Delay: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | |
| A12/A1094 Junction (S-RJ1) | <p>The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1)</p> <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5)</p> <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6)</p> <p>High Lodge Leisure (ID221)</p> <p>Residential Development, Brightwell Lakes (ID240)</p> <p>Residential Development, Darsham Station (ID245)</p> <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287)</p> <p>Sizewell A Power Station (ID305)</p> | <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Safety: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Safety: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and | <p>Road Safety: The potential cumulative impact of all schemes is assessed to be Moderate/ Major; however, this is considered to be unlikely to arise given the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap. No significant cumulative effects are anticipated – not significant</p> <p>Note, cumulative effects as a result of the Proposed Project and both East Anglia One North (ID5) and East Anglia Two (ID6) are expected to be lower than the levels identified, as Friston substation will only be built once i.e. as part of EA1N/EA2 or the Proposed Project (not both).</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant.</p> <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road Safety: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | |
| B1121 Main Road/B1121 Church Hill Junction (S-RJ6) | <p>The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1)</p> <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5)</p> <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6)</p> <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287)</p> <p>Sizewell A Power Station (ID305)</p> | <p>The Sizewell C - main development site (ID1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | <p>Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative impact of all schemes is assessed to be Moderate/Major; however, this is considered to be unlikely to arise given the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap. No significant cumulative effects are anticipated – not significant</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Severance and Pedestrian Delay: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | |
| PRoW E-354/006/0 (S-P9) | <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5)</p> <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6)</p> | <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRoW Closures and Diversions: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Moderate/Major, however, this is considered to be unlikely to arise given the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse (not significant) and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap. <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRoW Closures and Diversions: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Moderate/Major, however, this is considered to be unlikely to arise given | <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions: The potential cumulative impact of all schemes is assessed to be Moderate/Major; however, this is considered to be unlikely to arise given the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap. No significant cumulative effects are anticipated – not significant</p> <p>Note, cumulative effects as a result of the Proposed Project and both East Anglia One North (ID5) and East Anglia Two (ID6) are expected to be lower than the levels identified, as this PRoW will only need to be permanently diverted around Friston substation once. PRoW closures/ diversions will be co-ordinated with</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | the Proposed Project will be Minor adverse (not significant) and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap. | East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects. |
| PRoW E-260/017/0 (S-P10) | East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) | <p>East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRoW Closures and Diversions: The cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. <p>East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRoW Closures and Diversions: The cumulative effect of the two developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions: The cumulative effect of all developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would not be significant. No significant cumulative effects are anticipated – not significant</p> <p>PRoW closures/ diversions will also be co-ordinated with East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm (ID5) and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm (ID6) to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects.</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| PRoW E-491/006/0 (S-P14) | LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) | <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRoW Closures and Diversions: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions: The cumulative effect of all developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would not be significant. No significant cumulative effects are anticipated – not significant</p> <p>PRoW closures/ diversions will also be co-ordinated with LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects.</p> |
| PRoW E-491/005/0 (S-P15) | LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) | <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRoW Closures and Diversions: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions: The cumulative effect of all developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would not be significant. No significant cumulative effects are anticipated – not significant</p> <p>PRoW closures/ diversions will also be co-ordinated with LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects.</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| PRoW E-460/023/0 (S-P17) | LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) | <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PRoW Closures and Diversions: The potential cumulative impact of the two schemes is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and the peak construction phases are unlikely to overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would be not significant. | <p>PRoW Closures and Diversions: The cumulative effect of all developments is assessed to be Minor / Moderate. However, given that the effect of each individual development is minor, and that the peak construction traffic phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap, it is considered likely that the overall cumulative effect would not be significant. No significant cumulative effects are anticipated – not significant</p> <p>PRoW closures/ diversions will also be co-ordinated with LionLink Offshore Interconnector (ID287) to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects.</p> |

Table 13.42 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Noise and Vibration

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|---|---|---|--|
| NSR located within the study of both the Proposed Project and other developments. | Sizewell C - main development site (construction traffic noise) | The effects of construction traffic noise are negligible or minor on all shared construction traffic routes. The cumulative effect is expected to be minor at most at all nearby NSR and significant cumulative effects are not expected. | No significant cumulative effects. |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms (Construction noise and vibration) | The effects of construction noise and vibration are negligible or minor on for both projects. The cumulative effect is expected to be minor at most at all nearby NSR and significant cumulative effects are not expected. | |
| | East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms (Operational noise) | Negligible to minor effects are expected at all nearby NSR. Significant cumulative effects are not expected due to the relatively large distance between the worst-case affected NSR for each respective project. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector (Construction noise and vibration) | The effects of construction noise and vibration are negligible or minor on for both projects. The cumulative effect is expected to be minor at most at all nearby NSR and significant cumulative effects are not expected. | |
| | Sizewell A – Power Station (construction traffic noise) | The effects of construction noise and vibration are negligible or minor on for both projects. The cumulative effect is expected to be minor at all nearby NSR and significant cumulative effects are not expected. | |

Table 13.43 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Residential properties, business premises, visitor attractions, community | South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood | No significant cumulative effects are identified for any of the relevant developments in isolation with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme. Although the schemes listed share a number of receptors, due | No significant cumulative effects. |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|
| facilities, open space and development land. | East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore | to the size, nature and temporal scope of the relevant developments, there are unlikely to be any significant cumulative effects on local communities, residential properties, business premises, visitor attractions, community facilities, open space and development land. | |
| | LionLink Offshore Interconnector | | |
| | East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore | There is potential for a significant cumulative effect on Footpaths 260/016/0, 354/007/A and 260/017/0 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore Windfarms during construction (including decommissioning). However as East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore Windfarms are likely to have a negligible impact on this route, the cumulative schemes are unlikely to extend and intensify the original effects. At operation and maintenance, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects as PRow will be reinstated. | |
| Footpaths 260/016/0, 354/007/A, 260/017/0 and 354/006/0 | East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore | Simialrly, there is potential for a significant cumulative effect on Footpath 354/006/0 as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore Windfarms during construction (including decommissioning). East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore Windfarms are likely to have a negligible/minor adverse impact on this route and the Proposed Project is assessed to have a minor adverse impact. Considering a worst case scenario where East | No significant cumulative effects. PRow closures and diversions will be co-ordinated with East Anglia ONE North Offshore Windfarm and East Anglia TWO Offshore Windfarm to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects. |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore Windfarms both have a minor adverse impact on Footpath 354/006/0, the cumulative schemes are unlikely to extend and intensify the original effects on the PRoW to become significant. At operation and maintenance, there are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects as PRoW will be reinstated. | |
| Construction workforce generation | <div>The Sizewell C</div> <div>East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore</div> <div>Norwich to Tilbury</div> <div>LionLink Offshore Interconnector</div> | The construction employment generated by Sizewell C, East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink Offshore Interconnector in combination with the Proposed Project is likely to provide an uplift in employment opportunities and will represent a beneficial effect. However, considering the limited amount of construction employment generated by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect relating to construction workforce based on the currently available information. | No significant cumulative effects. |
| Construction workforce labour supply | <div>The Sizewell C</div> <div>East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore</div> <div>Norwich to Tilbury</div> <div>LionLink Offshore Interconnector</div> | Considering a worst case scenario, whereby the peak construction workforce for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and cumulative schemes coincide, the local construction labour supply will have capacity to accommodate the required worker demand for the duration of Sea Link's construction period. Therefore, it is unlikely that there will be significant adverse effects on construction workforce labour supply in the economic study area. | No significant cumulative effects. |
| Gross Value Added (GVA) | The Sizewell C | | No significant cumulative effects. |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | <div>East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore</div> <div>Norwich to Tilbury</div> <div>LionLink Offshore Interconnector</div> | <p>The construction employment generated by Sizewell C, East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink Offshore Interconnector in combination with the Proposed Project is likely to generate local and regional spending in terms of businesses, supply chain and wages. However, considering the limited amount of construction employment generated by the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on GVA based on the currently available information.</p> | |
| Social infrastructure | <div>The Sizewell C</div> <div>East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore</div> <div>Norwich to Tilbury</div> <div>LionLink Offshore Interconnector</div> | <p>Considering a worst case scenario, whereby the peak construction workforce for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and the construction of each of the other developments coincide, and each worker demands primary healthcare, there is likely to be additional demand on local facilities. The additional demand has the potential to increase the GP:Patient Ratio in the study area to exceed the recommended target of 1:1,800 to 1:1,808. However, even in the worst-case the ratio is predicted to remain broadly in line with the recommended provision.</p> | No significant cumulative effects |
| Local accommodation capacity | <div>The Sizewell C</div> <div>East Anglia ONE and TWO Offshore</div> <div>Norwich to Tilbury</div> <div>LionLink Offshore Interconnector</div> | <p>Considering a worst case scenario, whereby the peak construction workforce for the Suffolk Onshore Scheme and the construction of the other developments coincide, in the peak occupancy month of July there is anticipated to be 68% of total inventory stock (tourist accommodation and private rental) available in the 60 Minute Drive Time Area. Therefore, there</p> | No significant cumulative effect |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| | | is unlikely to be a significant cumulative effect on local accommodation capacity based on the currently available information. | |

Table 13.44 Assessment of total cumulative effects for Health and Wellbeing

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|--|--|---|---|
| Human health and wellbeing receptors within the study areas of both the Proposed Project and other developments. | The Sizewell C - main development site A12 Bypass Yoxford Roundabout | No significant cumulative effects have been identified for any of the topics that are considered | No significant cumulative effects. There are unlikely to be significant cumulative effects on health and wellbeing, given that there are no significant cumulative effects identified for other environmental aspects of relevance to health |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>Sizewell Link Road-Bridge across rail tracks</p> <p>Sizewell Link Road-Pretty Road Junction</p> <p>Sizewell Link Road-Moat Road Junction</p> <p>East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms</p> <p>High Lodge Leisure</p> <p>Croft Farm land and buildings</p> <p>Park Farm Solar Farm</p> <p>Brightwell Lakes</p> <p>Residential Development, Darsham Station</p> <p>Proposed Reservoir, Grange Farm</p> <p>Saxmundham to Peasenhall Water Mains Installation</p> <p>UKZ139 BC Wissett Solar Farm</p> | <p>within the health and wellbeing assessment.</p> | <p>and wellbeing, including, traffic and transport, air quality, noise and vibration, and socio-economics, recreation and tourism. Specifically, this includes no anticipated significant adverse cumulative effects in relation to mental health due to community severance, reduced visual amenity, disturbance from noise impacts, nor to physical health outcomes such as levels of physical activity or respiratory health. This assessment includes consideration of vulnerable groups, such as children, the elderly, and individuals with pre-existing health conditions</p> |

| Shared Receptor | Relevant other developments | Summary of the assessment of Cumulative effects of Proposed Project with each of the other developments | Overall assessment of cumulative effects with all projects |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| | <p>LionLink Offshore Interconnector</p> <p>The Sizewell B Relocated Facilities</p> <p>Town Farm Solar Farm</p> <p>South Saxmundham Garden Neighbourhood</p> | | |

13.4 Summary of total cumulative effects

Landscape and Visual

- 13.4.1 In summary, when considering the total potential cumulative effect of all the other developments combined with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, there is the potential for significant cumulative effects for a short term and temporary period on the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB as a result of the potential simultaneous or sequential construction of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, Sizewell C main development site, East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink Offshore Interconnector. The concentration of construction activity associated with the landfalls and HVDC cable corridors within part of the Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB has the potential to alter the perception of the AONB with construction of major energy projects becoming a temporary characteristic feature of the landscape. These total cumulative effects are unlikely to remain once all projects are operational, particularly once the cable corridors are reinstated and mitigation planting becomes established over time.
- 13.4.2 Total cumulative effects on LCAs at all project stages, only have the potential to be significant for LCA L1 (Heveningham and Knodishall Estate Claylands) primarily as a result of East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink Offshore Interconnector developments, although the remaining projects may also contribute in a minor way to the total effect. There would also be total cumulative effects for a temporary and limited duration for LCA K3 (Aldringham and Freston Sandlands) and SCT 03 Nearshore Waters during construction (and decommissioning).
- 13.4.3 Total cumulative effects on representative viewpoints have the potential to be significant as a result of the total combined effects primarily from the Suffolk Onshore Scheme with East Anglia ONE & TWO Offshore Windfarms and LionLink Offshore Interconnector developments for various viewpoints at all project stages.

Ecology and Biodiversity

- 13.4.4 The potential for cumulative effects exists where multiple large schemes lie within 10 km of Minsmere-Walberswick SPA or 2 km of Alde-Ore Estuary SPA, through the potential for cumulative loss of functionally linked habitat associated with one or other SPAs. For those other developments located close to the Suffolk Onshore Scheme there is also potential for cumulative disturbance of nesting nightjar and woodlark at Sandlings SPA and cumulative disturbance or habitat loss relating to other locally important receptors such as breeding birds, bats and dormice. However, due to the embedded measures incorporated into the Suffolk Onshore Scheme (set out in **Application Document 7.5.7.1 Landscape and Ecological Management Plan – Suffolk**, and **Application Document 7.5.3.2 CEMP Appendix B Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments**) no cumulative effects are predicted to arise.

Cultural Heritage

- 13.4.5 The assessment of total cumulative effects for cultural heritage has identified that there is the potential for four of the other projects to result in a cumulative impact on heritage receptors. These impacts include physical impacts on archaeological remains that potentially extend outside of the Order Limits of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme, as well as

impacts on the setting of heritage assets. However, the overall assessment of cumulative effects is currently assessed as 'not significant'.

Water Environment

- 13.4.6 Whilst each of the projects individually have the potential to have impacts on the watercourses and the land drainage regime within the study area, these impacts would expect to be reduced in magnitude by the adoption of embedded and control/management measures, secured against the individual consents, such that individually, and cumulatively, residual effects are not significant.

Agriculture and Soils

- 13.4.7 There is a likely to be a significant cumulative effect in relation to soils and best and most versatile (BMV) land in Suffolk as a result of the temporary disturbance and the temporary and permanent loss of BMV land associated the Suffolk Onshore Scheme combined with the other developments.
- 13.4.8 However, there is no additional mitigation available in relation to the permanent loss of BMV land other than that presented in **Application Document 7.5.10.1 Outline Soil Management Plan- Suffolk**, and **Application Document 7.5.3.1 CEMP Appendix A Outline Code of Construction Practice**.

Traffic and Transport

- 13.4.9 In summary no significant cumulative effects on traffic and transport receptors are expected as a result of construction traffic associated with the Suffolk Onshore Scheme when combined with construction/ operational traffic associated with each of the other developments in isolation. In addition, no significant cumulative effects are expected when considering construction/ operational traffic associated with all committed developments combined on the same basis, given that the peak construction phases for each scheme are unlikely to fully overlap. In terms of PRow closures/ diversions, these will be coordinated with other committed developments where possible (as identified above) to reduce the potential for significant cumulative effects. In view of the above, no additional mitigation is expected to be required to that already outlined within **Application Document 6.2.2.7 Part 2 Suffolk Chapter 7 Traffic and Transport**, **Application Document 7.5.1.1 Outline Construction Traffic Management and Travel Plan – Suffolk (Outline CTMTP – Suffolk)** and **Application Document 7.5.9.1 Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan – Suffolk (Outline PRowMP – Suffolk)**.

Noise and Vibration

- 13.4.10 There are a number of projects which overlap with the noise ZOI and therefore there is potential for cumulative effects from construction noise at shared receptors. However, with the committed mitigation implemented, as detailed in outlined in **Application Document 7.5.3.1 CEMP Appendix A Outline Code of Construction Practice** and **Application Document 7.5.8.1 Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan – Suffolk**, this is considered unlikely to be significant.
- 13.4.11 The preliminary assessment of total cumulative effects for noise and vibration has not identified any significant cumulative effects.

Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism

- 13.4.12 The assessment of total cumulative effects for socio-economics, recreation and tourism has identified that there are six other developments that have some potential to result in cumulative effects upon shared socio-economic, recreation and tourism receptors.
- 13.4.13 However, following further analysis, no significant cumulative effects on socio-economics, recreation and tourism are expected as a result of the Suffolk Onshore Scheme in combination with each of the other developments in isolation. In addition, no significant effects are expected when considering the impacts of the cumulative schemes in aggregation and in combination with the Proposed Project.

Health and Wellbeing

- 13.4.14 The health and wellbeing CEA draws upon the conclusions of other relevant environmental aspects, including traffic and transport, air quality, noise and vibration, socio-economics, recreation, and tourism. No significant effects were identified within the respective CEAs of these relevant environmental disciplines. Therefore, the health and wellbeing CEA anticipates no significant adverse effects on mental health due to community severance, reduced visual amenity, noise disturbance, or physical health outcomes such as levels of physical activity or respiratory health. This assessment also considers vulnerable groups, such as children, the elderly, and individuals with pre-existing health conditions. In conclusion, the overall inter-Project assessment of cumulative effects has been assessed as 'not significant'.

13.5 References

Planning Inspectorate. (2024, September). *Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment*. Retrieved from [www.gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-cumulative-effects-assessment): <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-cumulative-effects-assessment>

National Grid plc
National Grid House,
Warwick Technology Park,
Gallows Hill, Warwick.
CV34 6DA United Kingdom

Registered in England and Wales
No. 4031152
nationalgrid.com