



# The Sizewell C Project

## 5.1 Consultation Report Annex C Stage 2 Issues Table

---

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

---

May 2020

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



## Annex C – Stage 2 Issues

### Tables CONTENTS

<b>Table C.1: Summary of Section 42 Responses and Consideration by Topic .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>a. Overall Proposals.....</b>	<b>1</b>
• Theme: Need Case .....	1
• Theme: Safety .....	11
• Theme: Socio-Economics.....	18
• Theme: Accommodation Strategy .....	43
• Theme: Construction Materials.....	58
• Theme: Consultation Process .....	61
<b>b. Main Development Site .....</b>	<b>71</b>
• Theme: Need Case .....	71
• Theme: Alternative site assessment.....	81
• Theme: Site Suitability .....	97
• Theme: Environment - General .....	99
• Theme: Noise and Vibration .....	103
• Theme: Air Quality.....	104
• Theme: Landscape and Visual .....	105
• Theme: Ecology .....	106
• Theme: Amenity and Recreation .....	110
• Theme: Historic Environment .....	112
• Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water.....	113
• Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water.....	117
• Theme: Community Impact .....	122
<b>c. Rail Improvement Options.....</b>	<b>124</b>
• Theme: Need Case .....	124
• Theme: Alternative site assessment.....	126
• Theme: Environmental Impacts.....	150



• Theme: Community Impact .....	156
• Theme: Other comments and suggestions.....	161
<b>d. Sea Transport Options.....</b>	<b>163</b>
• Theme: Need case .....	163
• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	171
• Theme: Environmental Impacts.....	195
• Theme: Community Impact .....	197
<b>e. Park and Ride Options.....</b>	<b>201</b>
• Theme: Need Case .....	201
• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	205
• Theme: Site Suitability.....	206
• Theme: Environmental Impacts.....	214
• Theme: Community Impacts.....	223
• Theme: Other comments and suggestions.....	227
<b>f. Road Improvements – A12 .....</b>	<b>228</b>
• Theme: Need Case .....	228
• Theme: Alternative Site Assessment.....	231
• Theme: Environmental Impact.....	258
• Theme: Community Impact .....	262
<b>g. Transport: Road Improvements – Yoxford / B1122.....</b>	<b>266</b>
• Theme: Need Case .....	266
• Theme: Alternative site assessment.....	268
• Theme: Site Suitability.....	276
• Theme: Environmental Impacts.....	278
• Theme: Community Impacts.....	280
• Theme: Other Comments.....	285
<b>Table C.2: Summary of Section 47 Responses and Consideration by Topic .....</b>	<b>287</b>
<b>a. Overall Proposals.....</b>	<b>287</b>
• Theme: Socio-economics.....	287
• Theme: Consultation Process .....	294




---

- Theme: Accommodation Strategy ..... 296
- Theme: Transport..... 305
- b. Main development site..... 309**
  - Theme: Need Case ..... 309
- c. Rail Improvement Options..... 330**
  - Theme: Need Case ..... 330
  - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 331
- d. Sea Transport Options..... 343**
  - Theme: Need Case ..... 343
  - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 354
- e. Park & Ride Options..... 358**
  - Theme: Need Case ..... 358
- f. Transport: Road Improvements – A12 ..... 365**
  - Theme: Need Case ..... 365
  - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 367
- g. Transport: Road Improvements Yoxford / B1122..... 375**
  - Theme: Need Case ..... 375
  - Theme: Alternative Site Assessment..... 378

Table C.1: Summary of Section 42 Responses and Consideration by Topic<sup>1</sup>

a. Overall Proposals

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Unrealistic Timetable	<b>Concern about the predicted timescale of construction and lifespan of the development, with comments about the increasing estimated timescale and lack of EPR operating experience. Suggestions that a specific timetable should be made available.</b>	<p>SZC Co. anticipates that the construction stage would take 9-12 years for Sizewell C. This is based on learning from the planning for and construction of other European Pressurised (Water) Reactor (UK EPR™) projects.</p> <p>Since Stage 2 both EPR reactors at Taishan in China are now operational, which has provided additional assurance that the construction programme is robust and realistic.</p> <p>An indicative phasing schedule for the Sizewell C Project as a whole is provided in the <b>Implementation Plan</b>, in <b>Appendix I</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Technology	<b>Suggestions for the use of an alternative reactor, such as</b>	The design of the United Kingdom European Pressurised (Water) Reactor (UK EPR™) units is based on technology used successfully and safely around the world	N

<sup>1</sup> Note: Comments in bold and shaded grey were also raised by Section 47 consultees.

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>smaller footprint reactor technology or other facility designs.</b>	for many years, including innovations to enhance performance and safety. The UK EPR™ design has passed the Generic Design Assessment (GDA) process undertaken by United Kingdom (UK) regulators, and has been licensed and permitted at Hinkley Point C. Further information can be found in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4)	
Economic Viability	<b>Challenges to the value for money and business case of the proposed development, criticising it for being high cost and potentially over-budget.</b>	Nuclear power is the most affordable large-scale, low-carbon energy source currently available to the UK. Following the Stage 2 consultation in January 2019, the Managing Director of Nuclear Development published an article on the Sizewell C Project website noting that nuclear is needed but not at any cost [ <a href="https://www.edfenergy.com/energy/nuclear-new-build-projects/sizewell-c/news-views/needed-but-not-at-any-price-how-to-lower-the-cost-of-nuclear">https://www.edfenergy.com/energy/nuclear-new-build-projects/sizewell-c/news-views/needed-but-not-at-any-price-how-to-lower-the-cost-of-nuclear</a> ]. It must be competitive with renewables and this can be achieved through the series effect of replicating the design of Hinkley Point C Power Station, learning the lessons and identifying the right financing model.  The funding of new nuclear power stations is the subject of a consultation being conducted by the Department for	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the <b>Funding Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 4.2).</p>	
Planning Process	<p><b>Challenges to the selection process for the Sizewell C site and for a new nuclear power station as part of energy policy, ahead of other potential sites identified as suitable for a nuclear power station.</b></p>	<p>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 is clear that that nuclear power generation is <i>“anticipated to play an increasingly important role as we move to diversify and decarbonise our sources of electricity”</i>. This is further supported by the Statement on Energy Infrastructure on 7 December 2017 (the ‘ministerial statement’) which states that <i>“with a number of the existing coal and nuclear fleet due to close by 2030, new nuclear power generation remains key to meeting our 2050 obligations”</i> and that the Government <i>“believes that it is important that there is a strong pipeline of new nuclear power to contribute to the UK’s future energy system”</i></p> <p>The Government’s National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6) is clear that any new nuclear power stations consented under the Planning Act 2008 will play a vitally important role in providing reliable electricity supplies and a secure and diverse energy mix as the UK makes the transition to a low carbon economy.</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The Government’s policy on the siting of new nuclear power stations is set out in NPS EN-6. This followed a Strategic Siting Assessment to identify sites potentially suitable for deployment of new nuclear power stations by 2025. Sizewell C was identified as a site considered to be suitable and was included in the NPS.</p> <p>The ministerial statement states that whilst NPS EN-6 only has effect for projects which are able to demonstrate expected deployment by the end of 2025, the Government continues to give its strong in principle support to project proposals at those sites listed in EN-6, i.e. including Sizewell C.</p> <p>A full justification for the proposals in the context of planning policy is set out within the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Associated developments	<b>Concern about the impact of associated developments as part of the development proposals e.g.</b>	Section 115 of the Planning Act (2008) provides that, in addition to the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) itself, consent may also be granted for associated development.	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>infrastructure developments, accommodation and visitor centre and resulting impacts.</b>	The associated development is proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposed power station and its effects have been fully assessed in this application, as explained further in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Principle of Nuclear Energy	<b>Concerns about the implications of locating a large amount of power generation in one small area.</b>	The Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) regulates the nuclear industry on behalf of the public. Nuclear site licenses are granted by the ONR to the relevant operator for individual power stations, which include standard conditions covering design, construction, operation and decommissioning. There will therefore be nuclear site licenses for each of Sizewell A, B and C.  SZC Co. is an experienced nuclear operator and would work within the requirements of its Sizewell licenses.	N
Mitigation	<b>Concern about the inadequacy of the proposed mitigation measures and failure to reduce impacts on people and the environment.</b>	SZC Co.’s vision is to ensure that any significant adverse impacts of the construction, operation or decommissioning of the power station shall be mitigated where practical and appropriate. This shall be in a way which is environmentally responsible and sensitive both to the needs of the communities and to the strategies of the relevant authorities.	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The details of these mitigation measures has been subject to detailed dialogue with the authorities and relevant stakeholders and fully assessed within the <b>Environmental Statement (Book 6)</b> .	
Main development site	<b>Concern about the method used to transmit power from the power station, including the lack of information and potential interaction with the existing 400kv line.</b>	<p>In the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. said that electrical connections from Sizewell C would be made via underground cables to a new National Grid 400 kilovolts (kV) substation, which would be located adjacent to the existing Sizewell B substation.</p> <p>However, design work carried out since Stage 2, and further development of plans for the construction of the main platform has highlighted that there are <b>significant</b> safety and programme risks with constructing and operating an underground cable option.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore explained at Stage 3 that the connection would need to be made via overhead power lines. Further details on assessment undertaken is set out in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.3)</b>.</p>	Y
Principle of	<b>Positive comments</b>	New nuclear power stations will make an important	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Nuclear Energy	<b>about the proposed development being a source of clean and sustainable energy, and being needed to continue meeting the UKs energy demands, thus being worth any other impacts.</b>	<p>contribution to the electricity generating mix in the UK, as they reliably generate low-carbon electricity. Nuclear power is the most affordable large-scale, low-carbon energy source currently available to the UK.</p> <p>The purpose of the consultation and resulting Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is to assess and mitigate the impacts of the construction and operation of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Planning Process	<b>Suggestion that locals' quality of life should be considered and their opinion taken into account as a guide for key decisions about the development.</b>	<p>SZC Co. are grateful for the extensive feedback that has been received from the local community through consultation.</p> <p>This has been taken into consideration in refining and revising our proposals and strategies for the development of Sizewell C, as set out in the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) and Site Selection Report (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>Activities with the potential to impact upon the quality of life of local communities have been investigated and assessed</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>through the individual technical disciplines of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (e.g. air quality, noise, transport), and these have informed the quality of life and wellbeing assessment in <b>Chapter 28</b> (Health and Wellbeing) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>In addition, a Community Fund is proposed to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life. Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b>, Socio-Economics, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Planning Process	<b>Suggestion that the long-term legacy of the Sizewell C Project should be provided as part of the development.</b>	<p>The significant contribution that the Sizewell C Project will deliver in providing safe and secure low carbon electricity, as well as job creation, skills development and investment in the local economy will deliver substantial and long lasting legacy benefits.</p> <p>In addition, some of the associated development proposed to mitigate the effects of the construction period would remain as a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project,</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>including the Sizewell link road, two-village bypass and the sports facilities in Leiston.</p> <p>Further information regarding legacy benefits is contained within the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4)</p>	
Planning Process	<b>Suggestion that the area should be restored to its original state after the development.</b>	<p>The main development site construction is expected to take between 9 and 12 years. Following construction, the temporary construction areas will be restored in accordance with the landscape restoration scheme. The details of this scheme will be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. Further details of the expected landscape restoration scheme for the main development site can be found in the <b>Main Site Design and Access Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p> <p>The temporary associated development sites will be removed, and the land reinstated to agricultural land once the need for that facility ceases at the end of the construction phase. This includes the northern and southern park and rides, the rail extension and the freight management facility. Other elements of associated development will be permanent development providing a</p>	Y



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>legacy benefit to the area. These include the Sizewell link road, two village bypass and other rail and highway improvements.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Planning Process	<p><b>Suggestions for the overall development, such as removal of the buildings after operation and to assess the Sizewell C Project impacts as a whole, rather than each individual element separately.</b></p>	<p>An extensive and detailed assessment of the environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project has been undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (EIA Regulations 2009) (at Stage 1 and 2) and the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA Regulations 2017) (at Stage 3 and 4).</p> <p>The <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) that accompanies the application for development consent fully assesses all aspects of the Sizewell C Project proposals, including any cumulative impacts and ensures appropriate mitigation is identified.</p> <p>The Development Consent Order and associated legal agreement secures all necessary controls and mitigation.</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		This includes requirements that relate to the works necessary to restore the site following construction of Sizewell C. Decommissioning will require a further EIA and consent in the future.	

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Waste management	<b>Concern about the dangers of radioactive waste being kept on-site, and questions about how it will be safely stored and disposed of.</b>	<p>The treatment, storage and disposal of radioactive waste is strictly regulated to ensure that it is safely managed in ways that pose no risk to human health and to the environment.</p> <p>Strategic planning of waste management is a regulatory requirement and will be implemented during the Sizewell C Project through the development and production of an Integrated Waste Strategy. This will ensure that no radioactive waste is produced for which there is not an envisaged disposal route.</p> <p>The Integrated Waste Strategy will support the SZC Radioactive Substances Regulation (RSR) Environmental Permit application to the Environment Agency. This will be</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>submitted at the same time as the SZC Development Consent Order Application.</p> <p>As part of the RSR Environmental Permit application, SZC will also demonstrate through the use of Best Available Techniques (BAT) how it minimises the volumes of radioactive wastes which are created.</p> <p>The strategy for solid radioactive waste at SZC is to dispose of the waste as soon as reasonably practicable where a viable disposal route is available.</p> <p>The radioactive wastes for which there are as yet no available disposal routes would be accumulated and safely shielded, contained and stored on-site in compliance with the requirements of the Nuclear Site License and RSR Environmental Permit until the UK’s Geological Disposal Facility is available.</p> <p>Further details are provided in the <b>Chapter 7</b> (Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Safety	<b>Concern about the potential for a major</b>	Generic design assessment (GDA) is the process being used by nuclear regulators (Office for Nuclear Regulation	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>nuclear disaster resulting from the proposed development and impact of radiation or radioactive accidents on the local community.</b>	<p>(ONR) and the Environment Agency) to assess the new nuclear power station design.</p> <p>GDA allows the regulators to assess the safety, security and environmental implications of new reactor designs, separately from applications to build them at specific sites. The design of the proposed United Kingdom European Pressurised Reactor (UK EPR™) exceeds the requirements of the Safety Assessment Principles and legal requirements set by government, in terms of accidents that could lead to harm.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 27</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Safety	<b>Concern about the lack of emergency planning and evacuation routes as part of the overall transport strategy.</b>	<p>SZC Co. are committed to ensuring that the Sizewell C Project is as safe as possible. This is also strictly regulated.</p> <p>The Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations (REPPiR 2019) require provision to be made for emergency plans and preparedness with the local authority, which may include provision for evacuation, depending on scenarios. The Nuclear Site License (Condition 11) also requires the power plant to have</p>	Y

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>emergency arrangements.</p> <p>SZC Co. are therefore required to satisfy the above. Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 27</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Decommissioning	<p><b>Concern about the impacts of decommissioning and the lack of information for example about the types of works and the disposal of remaining waste.</b></p>	<p>As part of the development of any new build nuclear power plant it is necessary to develop plans to demonstrate that the facility can be decommissioned in a safe and environmentally acceptable way.</p> <p>Under the Energy Act 2008 the costs of decommissioning, waste and spent fuel management and disposal of all higher activity waste would be funded through a Funded Decommissioning Programme (FDP), approved by the Secretary of State. This is required to have been approved before ‘construction work on buildings with nuclear safety significance’ commences.</p> <p>Under these arrangements, SZC Co. will ensure that it sets aside funds over the operating life of the power station to cover these costs in full.</p> <p>Further details are provided in the <b>Chapter 5</b> (Description of</p>	Y





SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Decommissioning of Sizewell C) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Foreign Ownership	<b>Concern about the foreign ownership of Sizewell C by the French and Chinese investors, and potential problems with international relations.</b>	<p>SZC. Co has more than 30 years’ experience working with China General Nuclear. China General Nuclear has a 20% stake in the Sizewell C Project through the planning and development stage i.e. up to the point where a decision is announced by the Secretary of State on the Development Consent Order (DCO).</p> <p>China General Nuclear also has a 33% stake in Hinkley Point C Power Station and this took the form of a signed contract between all three governments, SZC Co. and China General Nuclear.</p> <p>China General Nuclear have ambitions to be long-term investors in the UK and wish to gain experience in order to become nuclear developers here – in full compliance with UK regulatory requirements.</p>	N
Terrorism	<b>Concerns about safety issues associated with the proposed development such as potential target the</b>	<p>SZC Co. are committed to optimising the safety and security of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The design of Sizewell C (the UK EPR) has undergone Generic design assessment (GDA) which is the process used by the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) and the</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>site may be for potential security and terrorism threats.</p>	<p>Environment Agency to assess new nuclear station design.</p> <p>Security forms a major part of the GDA considerations, which requires the power station design company to submit Conceptual Security Arrangements, providing sufficient information to enable ONR to make an informed judgement of the adequacy of the security aspects of the generic design.</p> <p>ONR Security Inspectors work as part of the wider ONR regulatory team to ensure the design company incorporates security by design across the full spectrum of protective security measures, including physical protection, cyber and information and personnel security. The Conceptual Security Arrangements will ultimately form the basis of a Nuclear Site Security Plan for any licensed site using the design. The Office for Nuclear Regulation (Civil Nuclear Security) have requirements defined in their Security Assessment Principles that the operator of the power plant must achieve in their security plan. These arrangements are routinely audited, assessed and exercised.</p> <p>Further information on the proposed safety and security arrangements is provided within <b>Chapter 27</b> (Major</p>	

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Accidents and Disasters) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Health concerns	<b>Concern about worker welfare and health and safety during construction.</b>	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has sought to ensure that worker welfare and safety is a priority.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project is committed to zero harm and this will be reflected in the approach to health and safety and worker wellbeing.</p> <p>All contractors will be required to comply with health and safety plans and ensure project risk registers and task risk assessments and matrices are complete before work is undertaken.</p> <p>An on-site occupational health service will be available for workers covering a wider range of services including assessment of fitness to work, ongoing health surveillance, GP, pharmacy, 24-hour nurse cover and treatment services. Mental and sexual health services will be included, including a chaplain/counselling service and mental health first aiders.</p> <p>Full details can be found in <b>Chapter 28</b> (Health and</p>	Y

Theme: Safety			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Wellbeing) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Crime	<b>Concern about the increase in crime and antisocial behaviour from the workers in the area, such as drunken behaviour, drug use and prostitution, as experienced during Sizewell A and B construction, as well as suggestions that any code of conduct must be monitored for compliance.</b>	<p>Further to the Stage 1 consultation, and throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has sought to ensure that worker behaviour is effectively managed.</p> <p>As part of the DCO application, a number of measures are proposed to be implemented to encourage good worker behaviour. All workers will be security vetted and drug and alcohol tested ahead of commencing work on the Sizewell C Project and will be required to sign a Worker Code of Conduct. If breached, this may result in dismissal from the Sizewell C Project. The Code of Conduct will be reinforced through ongoing training and workers will be subject to ongoing random and for cause drug and alcohol testing throughout their time on the Sizewell C Project. On-site security will be also be provided, and it is anticipated that there will be Suffolk Constabulary support (funded via the s106).</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Full details can be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Community Safety Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.16).	
People and Economy	<b>Concern about the disruption caused to local communities in general as a result of the proposals as well as specific concerns about elderly residents who may be more disturbed.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognises that in places close to the Sizewell C Project, residents may experience a combination of effects such as changes to the environment, transport network and perceptions of community life.</p> <p>SZC Co. has assessed the impacts of the Sizewell C Project and the results of this assessment are presented in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6). A separate <b>Community Impact Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.13) has been prepared that sets out and summarises the significant residual environmental effects that may be experienced by geographic area.</p> <p>A Community Fund will be provided via a Section 106 agreement and will help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p>	Y
Health and Wellbeing	<b>Concern that the health, wellbeing and quality of life of the community will be</b>	The Health and Wellbeing assessment scope and focus was initially defined with statutory consultees from the outset of the Sizewell C Project, was further informed and refined through community consultation, and has been iteratively informed by the	Y



Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>affected as part of the proposals, and that not enough has been proposed to mitigate this.</b></p>	<p>Health Forum, comprising Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council and key health stakeholders (including Public Health Suffolk, Suffolk Clinical Commissioning Groups and Suffolk NHS).</p> <p>Activities with the potential to impact upon local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (e.g. air quality, noise, transport), and these have further informed the scope and focus of the health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the Sizewell C Project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation will comprise an on-site occupational health service along with a Section 106 residual health care contribution.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in <b>Chapter 28</b> (Health and Wellbeing) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Local Villages	<p><b>Concern about the impact on local services and amenities, such as health services, social care, schools,</b></p>	<p>In response to these comments, SZC Co. provided a socio-economic assessment in <b>Chapter 4</b> of the Stage 3 Consultation Document provided in <b>Appendix E1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>This included an initial assessment of the impacts on these types</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>emergency services and policing as a result of the influx of workers.</b>	<p>of services (pages 60 to 65). SZC Co. has been in continued engagement with service providers since the consultation to further assess these impacts and identify, where necessary, mitigation measures including financial contributions to ensure that where there is evidence of potential effects they will be addressed.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-economics) and <b>Chapter 28</b> (Health and Wellbeing) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Local Villages	<b>Concern about the impact on infrastructure as part of the proposals such as damage to local road networks because of increased traffic including heavy goods vehicles (HGVs).</b>	<p>EDF recognizes that there are concerns regarding the impact of the construction traffic on existing local road networks.</p> <p>The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the transport impacts from the scheme. Mitigation has been proposed where necessary and the scheme designs have retained access to residential properties. For example, at the A12/A144 junction proposals, access to Stone Cottage was modified to suit the new junction layout. This and all other highway scheme designs have been subject to a Stage 1 safety audit that has been submitted to Suffolk County Council and forms part of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	Y
Local Economy	<b>Concern about the cost of the Sizewell C</b>	Nuclear power is the most affordable large-scale, low-carbon energy source currently available to the UK.	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	development to the consumer and criticisms of the price of energy generated.	<p>Following the Stage 2 consultation in January 2019, the Managing Director of Nuclear Development published an article on the Sizewell C Project website noting that nuclear is needed but not at any cost [<a href="https://www.edfenergy.com/energy/nuclear-new-build-projects/sizewell-c/news-views/needed-but-not-at-any-price-how-to-lower-the-cost-of-nuclear">https://www.edfenergy.com/energy/nuclear-new-build-projects/sizewell-c/news-views/needed-but-not-at-any-price-how-to-lower-the-cost-of-nuclear</a>]. It must be competitive with renewables and this can be achieved through the series effect of replicating the design of Hinkley Point C Power Station, learning the lessons and identifying the right financing model.</p> <p>The funding of new nuclear power stations is the subject of a consultation being conducted by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the <b>Funding Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 4.2).</p>	
Local Economy	Concern about the impact on property values and distortion to the property market, blight on property and demolition as a result	<p>SZC Co. does not anticipate that the Sizewell C Project would have a significant effect on property or rental prices, but aims to mitigate where practicable using the Housing Fund to help provide more capacity and better use of existing capacity.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	of the proposed development.	<p><b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p> <p>In addition, SZC Co. has developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination.</p>	
Tourism	Concerns about impact of the proposed development will have on the tourism industry, due to increases in traffic and damage to the AONB, with concerns that tourists will avoid the area in the future as a result.	<p>SZC Co. recognises that tourism is a key strength within Suffolk’s economy, and in particular within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which stretches north and south of Sizewell C.</p> <p>Following Stage 2, SZC Co. continued working with partners including local authorities, Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation, Visit Suffolk, Visit East Anglia (now Visit East of England), and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to understand and define the tourist sector and to define the key reasons tourists come to the area, the extent to which Sizewell C could have an impact on the attractiveness of the area for tourists, and the opportunities the Sizewell C Project could bring.</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information – including an assessment of potential significant effects on tourism based on a Tourism Survey undertaken by Ipsos MORI and informed by stakeholders – is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9).	
Local Economy	<b>Concerns about impact of the proposed development on the local economy and businesses such as distortions to the labour market and trade supply due to the employment of tradespeople at Sizewell C instead.</b>	<p>The Sizewell C Project’s effects on the local economy will be overwhelmingly positive – supporting long-term, sustainable careers through employment, skills and training initiatives which tie in with Suffolk County Council and New Anglia LEP’s strategic plans for the regional economy.</p> <p>Jobs will be created in construction, non-construction, management, support and operational positions across a range of skill levels – enhanced by the measures set out in the <b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b> in <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>In response to these comments, the Stage 3 consultation material set out that by understanding the local employment sector and the education and skills base that supports it, it is possible to explore both potential capacity and availability, as well as barriers limiting the potential uptake of employment opportunities. It is then</p>	Y



Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>possible to work with Suffolk County Council and other stakeholders including New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (NALEP) and educational institutions to improve access to a range of employment and career opportunities through targeted initiatives and support.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that while the macro-level effects of the Sizewell C Project are beneficial – creating more jobs, higher skilled jobs and promoting competency in the supply chain – as set out in the <b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b> provided in <b>Appendix A</b> to the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) – there may be some effects on local businesses such as some vacancies being harder to fill. As a result of this feedback, SZC Co. have committed to using the Sizewell Jobs Service to support backfilling hard to fill vacancies in local businesses.</p>	
Economic Benefits	<b>Positive comments about the economic and community benefits of the proposed development, such as employment opportunities and benefits to local</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the recognition that there will be national and local economic benefits related to employment opportunities supported by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project will result in positive economic effects in terms of employment, but also supply chain, spending, and sustainable investment in skills and training pathways from education to in-work upskilling.</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	businesses.	<p>The Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term mitigation and support in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A Community Fund to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</li> <li>b) A Housing Fund that will enable empty properties to return to the market, and provide recyclable grants and loans for renovation of homes;</li> <li>c) An Employment, Skills and Education Strategy to support New Anglia LEP and Suffolk County Councils long-term plans for key growth sectors in the region; and</li> <li>d) A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</li> </ul> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9)</p>	
Compensation	<b>Suggestions for compensation, such as financial reimbursement, to</b>	Following Stage 2, SZC Co. continued to consider appropriate mitigation measures where they are necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the development. For further	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	residents, communities and businesses affected by the development proposals.	<p>details please refer to the <b>Mitigation Route Map</b> (Doc Ref. 8.12).</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term interventions including a Community Fund to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Visitor Centre	Comments about the proposed visitor centre as part of the development proposals such as design suggestions, that it is a benefit and long-term resource, or that even though it is welcome as a new attraction, it is not enough to mitigate the negative impacts	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the proposed visitor centre.</p> <p>The visitor centre would be accessible by the general public with exhibition space and modern educational elements providing capacity for school groups. Its role would be to provide information to the general public and school groups about aspects including: the process for generating electricity, the benefits of low-carbon energy and sustainability more generally, and the new technology's role in the future of nuclear power in the UK. It would also illustrate the contribution of Sizewell C to carbon reduction and its role as part of the Suffolk Energy Coast, and demonstrate the importance of the surrounding AONB.</p> <p>However, the visitor centre's role is not to mitigate the effects of the</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>of the development on local people.</b>	<p>development on people. This is addressed through individual environmental impact assessment chapters and their proposed mitigation which are summarised in the <b>Community Impact Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.13).</p> <p><b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-economics) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) also sets out how SZC Co. has sought to maximise the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	
Employment and Education	<b>Challenges to the assumptions and estimations made about the benefits and impacts to people and the economy, such as how much education benefits there will be and if employment opportunities will be as high as predicted.</b>	<p>The Sizewell C Project will result in positive economic effects in terms of employment, but also supply chain, spending, and sustainable investment in skills and training pathways from education to in-work upskilling.</p> <p>SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Training Plan that sets out measures to support local people into work, into higher skilled work, and to develop sustainable careers in construction, energy and other sectors that support the Sizewell C Project and the wider ambitions for growth in the region.</p> <p>Stage 3 set out a plan for education including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working collaboratively within existing structures of support for education in the region that builds a strong network of</li> </ul>	Y



Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>schools and colleges with which SZC Co. can work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Education interventions will be developed in collaboration with Suffolk County Council (SCC) and the NALEP Skills Board, with input from schools.</li> <li>- Where Sizewell B is already engaged with specific schools, such as with Alde Valley in Leiston, we will support and enhance this activity to create a 'joined up' approach to improving the life chances and wellbeing of local young people. Longer-term, we intend to create an environment into which the Sizewell C supply chain, once in place, will be able to deliver their own education interventions.</li> </ul> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in <b>Annex A</b> of the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) (<b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b>).</p>	
Employment	<b>Challenges to the people and economy proposals, commenting that local opportunities for employment, training and education are</b>	<p>SZC Co. are committed to supporting and enhancing existing skills, training, education and employment strategies for the region that would benefit the Sizewell C Project itself and the long-term future of the region's key growth sectors.</p> <p>SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and education, training and skills providers to develop an <b>Employment,</b></p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	unclear or inadequate, such as the lack of ambition for home-based workers and enough time to upskill the workforce.	<p><b>Skills and Education Strategy</b> that sets out measures to support local people into work, into higher skilled work, and to develop sustainable careers in construction, energy and other sectors that support the Sizewell C Project and the wider ambitions for growth in the region.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in <b>Annex A</b> of the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) (<b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b>).</p>	
Employment	Concern that the assumed benefits to people and the economy will only be short-term, and end after the construction phase, or that the jobs that are generated will be of a low grade.	<p>SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and education, training and skills providers to develop an Employment, Skills and Training Plan that sets out measures to support local people into work, into higher skilled work, and to develop sustainable careers in construction, energy and other sectors that support the Sizewell C Project and the wider ambitions for growth in the region.</p> <p>At the end of the construction phase, the Sizewell C Project will have created 900 long-term, high skilled job opportunities, and regular opportunities for outage employment for the lifetime of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	N



Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Furthermore, the Sizewell C Project includes a number of long-term, physical improvements such as new roads, highway improvements, and the new 3G sports pitch and multi-use games areas (MUGAs) proposed in Leiston which will be for shared use between the school, workers and the community during construction and left as a legacy thereafter.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term mitigation and support in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A Community Fund to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</li> <li>b) A Housing Fund that will enable empty properties to return to the market, and provide recyclable grants and loans for renovation of homes.</li> <li>c) An <b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b> to support New Anglia LEP and Suffolk County Councils long-term plans for key growth sectors in the region.</li> <li>d) A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</li> </ul>	

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
People and Economy	<b>Concern that the assumed benefits to people and the economy will not be equally distributed with employment opportunities going to younger people and a lack of benefits for the older generation.</b>	<p>SZC Co. will continue to work collaboratively with other service providers (including health, social services, and children’s services) to determine the likely impact of the Sizewell C Project and develop ways of both mitigating any effects on the existing capacity and maximizing benefits where possible.</p> <p>SZC Co.’s employment, skills, training, supply chain and other implementation strategies will not discriminate against any protected characteristic, including age. SZC Co. recognises that there may be a differential experience of the Sizewell C Project by younger and older people. SZC Co.’s intention is to ensure that wherever practicable the effects of the Sizewell C Project on different groups are considered and mitigation and engagement designed to promote equality.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in the <b>Equality Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 5.14).</p>	N
Health and Wellbeing	<b>Concern about the impact on wildlife and the environment from the proposed</b>	<p><b>Chapter 14</b> (Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> defines measures which will help mitigate the impacts of the development. Measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 67ha habitat creation area at Aldhurst Farm, just west of</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>development in terms of the importance to people and the economy.</b></p>	<p>Lovers Lane, which provides reed-bed and ditch habitats to compensate for loses of these habitats associated with the new power station platform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creating off-site habitat compensation areas to create fen meadow habitats and to provide additional habitat for marsh harriers, which might be dissuaded from hunting across the EDF Estate during construction.</li> <li>• Implementing mitigation strategies for protected species, such as reptiles, water voles and badgers to ensure that individuals are not killed during construction and populations are sustained across the EDF Energy Estate over the long-term.</li> <li>• Carefully screening the boundaries of the site, with bunds and hoarding and also making use of natural topography and vegetation including woodland blocks and mature hedgerows to contain the construction site and screen it as much as possible from external views.</li> <li>• In the longer-term the operational masterplan will establish extensive areas of acid grassland, characteristic of the Suffolk Sandlings, using the approaches summarised in the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP)</b> across the EDF Energy Estate.</li> </ul> <p>These measures are expected to reduce potential impacts on recreational users of the area and any associated risk to the local</p>	

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		economy.	
People and Economy	<b>Concern that the local community will receive no benefit from the proposed development and that the negatives of the development outweigh any potential positives for people and the economy.</b>	<p>Since Stage 2, SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an <b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b> and <b>Supply Chain Strategy</b> that set out measures to support local people and businesses into work on the Sizewell C Project. These are appended to the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p> <p>At the end of the construction phase, the Sizewell C Project will have created 900 long-term, high skilled job opportunities, and regular opportunities for outage employment for the lifetime of the Sizewell C Project</p> <p>Furthermore, the Sizewell C Project includes a number of long-term, physical improvements such as new roads, highway improvements, and the new 3G sports pitch and MUGAs proposed in Leiston which will be for shared use between the school, workers and the community during construction and left as a legacy thereafter.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term mitigation and support in the form of:</p> <p>a) A Community Fund to help compensate for intangible,</p>	Y

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>b) A Housing Fund that will enable empty properties to return to the market, and provide recyclable grants and loans for renovation of homes.</p> <p>c) A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</p> <p>Details of all of these measures are included throughout the EIA, and in particular in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Employment	<b>Concern that workers hired for the proposed development will not be hired from the local area, and skilled workers will be brought in from other areas/nuclear projects.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concerns held regarding the employment of local workers.</p> <p>Since Stage 2, SZC Co. has worked with partners including Suffolk County Council, the Suffolk Chamber of Commerce, New Anglia LEP and education, training and skills providers to develop an <b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b> and <b>Supply Chain Strategy</b> that set out measures to support local people and businesses into work on the Sizewell C Project. These are appended to the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
People and Economy	<p><b>Comments that further assessment is needed about the impact of the proposed development on people and the economy, such as the potential impacts of Brexit, more robust modelling on the impact of skills displacement and for an independent assessment of impacts to provide quantifiable statistics.</b></p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project assumptions are used alongside baseline information (collected both from statistical sources, such as the Census, and consultation with local stakeholders to understand particular local sensitivities and vulnerabilities), to identify potential impacts and define strategies for enhancing the benefits of Sizewell C and addressing any significant adverse effects.</p> <p>With regards to impacts of skills displacement, we do not consider there is likely to be a shortage of workers due to the dynamic labour market being both flexible and responsive and are primarily concerned with effects on other sectors which may experience displacement effects such as public (e.g. social care) and emergency services. SZC Co. are working with these service providers to identify the potential for these issues based on experience at Hinkley Point C, training and recruitment needs of these sectors, and potential changes in national and local funding. Where significant effects are predicted, SZC Co. would work with these services to provide resilience to avoid the effects e.g. through funding of training or recruitment.</p> <p>With regards to provision of quantifiable statistics, our approach uses public datasets and desk-based research which will allow us to predict the potential effects of Sizewell C, as a result of its construction workforce and supply chain, on people and the</p>	N



Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>economy.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	
Mitigation	<p><b>Comments stating that people and economy mitigation should minimise impact on the local community, such as bus services for local people.</b></p>	<p>In response to these comments, <b>Chapter 4</b> of the Stage 3 Consultation Document provided in <b>Appendix E.1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) included a socio-economic assessment. This included an initial assessment of the impacts on these types of services (pages 60 to 65).</p> <p>EDF has been in continued engagement with these service providers since the consultation to further assess these impacts and have identified, where necessary, mitigation measures including financial contributions to ensure that where there is evidence of potential effects they are addressed.</p> <p>These will ultimately be secured through the Section 106 agreement as part of the development consent.</p>	Y
Mitigation	<p><b>Impact on the local economy should be minimised e.g. by establishing parking restrictions on</b></p>	<p>The Sizewell C Project’s effects on the local economy will be overwhelmingly positive – supporting long-term, sustainable careers through employment, skills and training initiatives secured in partnership with Suffolk County Council and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership’s (LEP) strategic plans for the regional</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>village roads to maintain access; or presenting opportunities such as apprenticeships, or the chance for property owners to let holiday lets at market rates for use as accommodation by Sizewell C employees.</p>	<p>economy.</p> <p>Jobs will be created in construction, non-construction, management, support and operational positions across a range of skill levels – enhanced by the measures set out in the <b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b>.</p> <p>With input from local stakeholders including Local Authorities and the Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation, SZC Co. commissioned Ipsos MORI to undertake a Tourism Survey to understand the potential sensitivities of new and returning tourists to the Suffolk Coast.</p> <p>Using feedback from the Tourism Survey, SZC Co. has developed proposals for a Tourism Fund, details of which are set out in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). This includes funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p> <p>SZC Co. anticipates that some workers will seek to use local tourist sector accommodation for short-term roles on the Sizewell C Project during the construction phase. During the peak of construction, where this coincides with peak tourist seasons, there</p>	

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>is potential for this to limit the availability of accommodation in the tourist sector.</p> <p>However, as set out in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3), this effect is likely to be short-term, temporary and would not be significant. Where these effects occur outside of peak times, they would contribute positively towards spending in the local area.</p> <p>SZC Co. are committed to supporting and enhancing existing skills, training, education and employment strategies for the region that would benefit the Sizewell C Project itself and the long-term future of the region’s key growth sectors.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9)</p>	
Mitigation	<b>Comments that SZC Co. should use local supply chains and staff wherever possible to ensure the local area benefits as much as</b>	<p>SZC Co. support the suggestion that wherever possible and practicable the Sizewell C Project should draw on local labour and supply chains, and has developed measures to inform, enable and sustain local benefits such as contracting and upskilling.</p> <p>These measures will be set out in <b>Annex A</b> of the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) (<b>Employment, Skills and Education</b></p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	possible.	Strategy).	
Economic benefits	<b>Comments about the benefits of the proposed development to the local economy, and businesses and local community through the creation of infrastructure, amenities and local jobs and diversifying the community from the addition of people to the area, as well as the wider UK economy.</b>	<p>SZC Co. are committed to supporting and enhancing existing skills, training, education and employment strategies for the region that would benefit the Sizewell C Project itself and the long-term future of the region’s key growth sectors</p> <p>SZC Co. welcomes the recognition that there will be national and local economic benefits related to employment opportunities supported by the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project will result in positive economic effects in terms of employment, but also supply chain, spending, and sustainable investment in skills and training pathways from education to in-work upskilling.</p> <p>Full details of the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project are assessed in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9)</p>	N
Economic benefits	<b>Suggestions for the people and economy proposals, that they should ensure long-term benefits to the</b>	SZC Co. welcomes the support for the Sizewell C Project, and recognises the importance of the Sizewell C Project’s legacy in the area. The Sizewell C Project includes a number of long-term, physical improvements such as new roads, highway improvements, and the new 3G sports pitch and MUGAs proposed	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>local area, such as long-term employment.</b></p>	<p>in Leiston which will be for shared use between the school, workers and the community during construction and left as a legacy thereafter.</p> <p>Stage 3 sets out that the Sizewell C Project also provides less tangible, long-term mitigation and support in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A Community Fund to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</li> <li>b) A Housing Fund that will enable empty properties to return to the market, and provide recyclable grants and loans for renovation of homes.</li> <li>c) An Employment, Skills and Education Strategy to support New Anglia LEP and Suffolk County Councils long-term plans for key growth sectors in the region.</li> <li>d) A Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</li> </ul> <p>Details of all of these measures are included throughout the EIA, and in particular in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
People and Economy	<b>Suggestions that the development proposals should improve local infrastructure and services, such as broadband and mobile phone signals, transport services and a new school and leisure centre.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the Sizewell C Project, and recognises the importance of the Sizewell C Project’s legacy in the area.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project includes a number of long-term, physical improvements such as new roads, highway improvements, and the new 3G sports pitch and MUGAs proposed in Leiston which will be for shared use between the school, workers and the community during construction and left as a legacy thereafter.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Education	<b>Suggestions about skills and training and school education as part of the people and economy proposals, particularly for local people and youth.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the support for the Sizewell C Project’s proposals for people and the economy, and specifically the recognition of SZC Co.’s commitment to education, skills and employment.</p> <p>SZC Co. have developed an Employment, Skills and Education Statement, provided in <b>Annex A</b> to the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) that will enhance the positive economic effects of the Sizewell C Project identified in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Socio-Economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The Strategy has been developed through engagement with Local Authorities, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and skills, education and training providers in the local area in order to support and catalyse existing plans and growth sectors.	

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Accommodation Strategy	<b>Comments acknowledging that an accommodation campus will be required for Sizewell C Project workers.</b>	<p>SZC Co. note and welcome the support for locating project accommodation (campus and caravan site) close to the main development site. This is part of a balanced accommodation strategy developed through consultation to help deliver Sizewell C Project efficiencies and attract a high quality workforce, while reducing effects on local housing markets and transport networks.</p> <p>The <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10) and <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) document how site selection has been undertaken to justify the balanced approach to project accommodation – promoting the efficient delivery of the NSIP while limiting environmental effects and community effects.</p> <p>The proposed location of the campus has been developed to allow</p>	N



Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		direct access to the site, while maintaining safe distance from the main operations of the site, and has been designed to limit disruption to local residents and workers living there temporarily.	
Accommodation Strategy	<b>Challenges to the estimates and assumptions given for accommodation strategy, including the 90-minute distance and underestimation of the impacts.</b>	<p>Data from the 2011 Census and Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) research into labour mobility both suggest that construction workers travel further to work than other sectors, and some are willing to travel for up to 50 miles (or 90 minutes). The assessment recognises the deterrence effect of distance, however – that workers are more likely to choose to live closer to the site to minimize their travel to work time. So, while around 90 minutes is considered the furthest extent of home-based worker travel time, the number of workers travelling this far is likely to be very low.</p> <p>The potential accommodation effects are modelled using this approach to workforce distribution, with more workers likely to seek accommodation closer to the main development site, and where there is more accommodation.</p> <p>Estimates of existing capacity are taken from 2011 Census data, information provided by Visit East Anglia, and Local Authority published research (where available). The approach to estimating the effect on accommodation capacity is considered to be conservative / precautionary for a number of reasons:</p> <p>A) The supply of accommodation is likely to have increased –</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>particularly in the rented sector and tourist sector – since the data used at a local scale for the baseline was collected.</p> <p>B) A number of workers may use latent accommodation (including spare rooms, conversions and non-rated tourist accommodation) – current assumptions exclude this, thereby overestimating effects.</p> <p>C) The assessment excludes some tourist sectors (such as holiday parks and a portion of caravan sites) from the supply based on feedback from the council, therefore potentially over-estimating the effects.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed Housing Fund would increase and make better use of the supply across all accommodation sectors, particularly the rented and tourist sectors.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Further Information	<b>Suggestions for further assessment/studies/modelling to be carried out into the</b>	SZC Co. have undertaken a detailed study of the Sizewell C Project’s construction workforce and the characteristics of local accommodation – appended to <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) – in order to determine the potential significant effects on housing	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>impacts of the accommodation strategy and for more information about points that have not been discussed in the documentation, such as the impacts on Leiston and on the AONB and the business case for the proposed campus locations.</b></p>	<p>availability, particularly for households who may be considered more vulnerable or at risk of homelessness .</p> <p>SZC Co. have consulted on and developed elements of an accommodation management system and Housing Fund, working with East Suffolk Council to understand the key issues and vulnerabilities of the sector, and set out the best ways to mitigate any effects of the Sizewell C Project via a Housing Fund that can be used to employ measures already forming part of the council’s Housing Strategies.</p> <p>The accommodation management system sets out measures that SZC Co. and contractors will use to monitor effects and manage the distribution of workers, where practicable, in response to sensitivities of the local housing market.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10)</p>	
Mitigation	<p><b>Comments and suggestions about mitigation measures for the accommodation</b></p>	<p>The design of the accommodation campus is set out and explained in <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Sizewell C Main Development Site Design and Access Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.1). This sets out a series of design principles that set out how the principles of good design have been incorporated into the scheme, including measures that</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>strategy in general, for example the design of the campus, screening and measures to mitigate impact on the wider housing market.</p>	<p>seek to minimise</p> <p>Impacts on the housing market have also been carefully considered and a detailed assessment of the effects on the housing market has been undertaken as part of <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and has formed the basis for a balanced <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10), which aims to limit effects through the provision of worker accommodation and an accommodation management system.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project has also developed proposals for a Housing Fund, which will align with initiatives set out in East Suffolk Council’s Housing Strategies to avoid and reduce significant effects where they may arise on most vulnerable households, particularly in the private rented sector.</p> <p>This fund – along with the Community Fund – are designed to be flexible and responsive as well as to provide resilience early in the Sizewell C Project to mitigate or compensate for the potential for effects to arise at peak construction activity. They are designed to be proportionate to the potential scale of effects, which are set out in detail in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Accommodation Strategy	<b>Suggestions about upgrading existing facilities, such as the sports facility in Red House Lane or Ministry of Defence facilities at Woodbridge, and upgrading existing properties, instead of building new ones.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has worked with service providers including East Suffolk Council (housing) and health stakeholders to develop ways of both mitigating any effects on the existing capacity and maximising benefits where possible. It is recognised that local service providers are the experts and have well-thought out strategies in place already that SZC Co. could support.</p> <p>Measures are likely to include direct investment in physical infrastructure to attract a high-quality workforce while simultaneously reducing the potential for undue pressure on services and facilities. For example through the provision of an on-site occupational health service and provision of recreation and sports facilities for workers.</p> <p>Based on East Suffolk Council’s methodology, and given the weighting in terms of demographics and market segmentation, the workforce is expected to require the sports facilities below. These would also fill existing gaps in provision and be of benefit to the community through shared access during the construction phase and being left as a legacy thereafter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A full-sized synthetic turf 3G football pitch (currently closest</li> </ul>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>facilities in Framlingham and Woodbridge currently).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 2 multi-use games areas (MUGAs) (closest facility in Yoxford currently).</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. has worked with East Suffolk Council to identify the potential for these new sports facilities to be provided on land at Alde Valley School, adjacent to Leiston Leisure Centre School with shared access between the school, construction workers and the community. This was in response to support from respondents at Stage 2 for campus sports facilities to be located off-site and in Leiston.</p> <p>An on-site gym and informal exercise route around the perimeter of the campus as well as a bar and restaurant will be provided on-site at the campus.</p> <p>Providing a range of on- and off-site facilities would ensure workers have a range or leisure options which in turn should limit pressure on community facilities. Some workers may prefer to join existing sports clubs and use existing facilities, which will have the positive effect of boosting gym memberships or increasing participation in local sports clubs. There may be some existing facilities within communities that could be used by workers, but these are not expected to be significant changes.</p>	

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Accommodation Strategy	<b>Support for the overall accommodation strategy as long as, for example it is managed to limit pressure on rental accommodation and minimise impacts on the community.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognise the potential for the Sizewell C Project to result in adverse effects on accommodation availability in the local area – particularly in Leiston, Saxmundham and Aldeburgh.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the effects on the housing market has been undertaken as part of <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and has formed the basis for the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10), which aims to limit effects through the provision of worker accommodation and an accommodation management system.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project has also developed a Housing Fund, which will align with initiatives set out in East Suffolk Council’s Housing Strategies to avoid and reduce significant effects where they may arise on most vulnerable households, particularly in the private rented sector.</p> <p>SZC Co. do not anticipate that the Sizewell C Project would have a significant effect on property or rental prices, but aims to mitigate where practicable through monitoring homeless presentations and their reasons, and matching the Housing Fund to initiatives</p>	N



Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		accordingly.	
Local Community	<b>Criticism of the accommodation campus as not being suitable for the village and surrounding rural community, particularly Eastbridge being a ‘small hamlet’ and Leiston a small town, unable to support the predicted number of workers.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation and the final proposals comprise a single, on-site accommodation campus, along with a caravan site on Land East of Eastlands Industrial Estate (LEEIE). This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of workers using existing local accommodation with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. has considered the alternatives to a single, on-site accommodation campus. It has concluded that an off-site campus (either as an alternative, or an addition to a smaller, on-site accommodation campus i.e. a split campus model) would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys on local roads, and wider worker management.</p> <p>Providing a single, on-site accommodation campus would also help mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Further details on the approach to accommodation is contained in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10). <b>Volume 1, Chapter 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.2) sets out the evolution of the Sizewell C Project through consultation and engagement, including consideration of alternative strategies and locations for workforce accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has also specified how it would deal with community issues in the context of the wider socio-economic strategy provided in <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Following Stage 2, detailed measures have been proposed and consulted upon including a Worker Code of Conduct to set expectations and provide a means of addressing poor behaviour. These standards would apply to all workers across the Sizewell C Project, within the site and accommodation campus, and in the community. The Code of Conduct has been developed in partnership with contractors and would be imposed through all main contracts, to ensure that prompt and effective action is taken to address any cases of unacceptable behaviour.</p> <p>A similar Code of Conduct has been developed and implemented</p>	

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		at Hinkley Point C and West Burton B (EDF Energy’s combined cycle gas turbine power station) and these have proved to be highly effective.	
Campus Accommodation	<b>Suggestions for an alternative approach to the campus accommodation strategy for example dispersing the campus around larger villages.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation, and settled on a strategy for a single, on-site accommodation campus. This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>While a campus in e.g. Lowestoft or Ipswich may be perceived to disperse the effects on the housing market, a split campus approach in this instance would likely increase the number of road trips, and would not be attractive to workers such that it would fail to mitigate potential effects on the local accommodation market and affect the efficient delivery of the Sizewell C Project – workers moving to an area temporarily would seek to live as close to the site as possible and may simply not use a campus at this distance from the main development site.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-Economics) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10).	
Campus Accommodation	<b>Comments stating that the proposed campus is not an appropriate, acceptable or viable option and highlighting the level of opposition amongst local residents and stakeholders.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has consulted on different strategies for construction worker accommodation and the final proposals comprise a single, on-site accommodation campus, along with a caravan site on LEEIE. This strategy is intended to balance the economic benefits of workers using existing local accommodation with the need to reduce transport effects and effects on the housing market, while attracting a workforce to efficiently, safely and securely deliver the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. has considered the alternatives to a single, on-site accommodation campus. It has concluded that an off-site campus (either as an alternative, or an addition to a smaller, on-site accommodation campus i.e. a split campus model) would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys, and wider worker management.</p> <p>Providing a single, on-site accommodation campus would also help mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Further details on the approach to accommodation is contained in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10). <b>Volume 1, Chapter 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.2) sets out the evolution of the Sizewell C Project through consultation and engagement, including consideration of alternative strategies and locations for workforce accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. has also specified how it would deal with community issues in the context of the wider socio-economic strategy, as discussed in <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Caravan Accommodation	<b>Concerns about the strategy for the caravan site, such as the inadequacy of the proposed site and infrastructure, traffic impacts and the large amount of people predicted to live in the caravan site.</b>	<p>The caravan site of 400 serviced pitches (estimated occupancy of 1.5 per pitch), for construction workers on the LEEIE in Leiston would be made available in the early years of construction, before the campus is established, as well as helping to provide resilience for the workforce at the peak of construction and reducing effects on other accommodation sectors.</p> <p>Following Stage 2, a site layout was developed and shared with ESC, and refined in response to comments on the capacity, layout and facilities at the site. More information on the caravan site including number of caravans, estimated occupancy and an</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>indicative site layout was provided in Stage 3 consultation. The layout was further refined following consultation and final proposals are set out in descriptions of development in <b>Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>SZC Co. has been working with East Suffolk Council (ESC) to examine the issues around the delivery, operation and management of the site. Discussions have also been held with Leiston Town Council, in response to a number of issues raised during consultation in terms of the movement of workers between the caravan site and facilities in Leiston.</p> <p>Further information on how community and transport impacts will be managed may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> (Socio-economics) and <b>Chapter 10</b> (Transport) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). Further detail on the role of the caravan site may be found in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Further Information	<b>Requests for more information about the proposed worker caravan site, such as the on-site facilities,</b>	Further work on the caravan site was undertaken following Stage 2 and more information on the caravan site including number of caravans, estimated occupancy and an indicative site layout were provided in Stage 3 consultation. The layout was further refined following consultation and final proposals are set out in descriptions	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>numbers of people expected to reside there, the design and assessment of alternative sites</b>	<p>of development in <b>Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>In summary, the proposals comprise serviced pitches for up to 400 caravans. An average of 1.5 workers per caravan is assumed, therefore creating a total of 600 construction workers staying at this facility.</p> <p>Further detail on the role of the caravan site may be found in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Caravan Accommodation	<b>Suggestions about the worker caravan site, including alternative locations, mitigation measures such as pedestrianising roads and encouraging walking and cycling to the main development site.</b>	<p>Further work on the caravan site was undertaken following Stage 2 and more information on the caravan site including number of caravans, estimated occupancy and an indicative site layout were provided in Stage 3 consultation. The layout was further refined following consultation and final proposals are set out in descriptions of development in <b>Volume 2, Chapters 2 and 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>A temporary footpath for construction workers would be provided from the caravan park through LEEIE, joining Valley Road opposite the existing footpath. This would allow construction workers from within the caravan part to walk to Leiston town centre safely.</p>	Y



Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Machinery / Programme	<b>General/other concerns about construction materials, including concerns about the size of construction machinery and the length of time of construction.</b>	<p>The scale of the development requires a <b>significant</b> construction period along with large construction machinery for the build. The impacts of construction are fully considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) requires compliance with certain measures including maximum speed limits, avoidance of stationary generators and mobile power plant where practicable, and compliance with particular vehicle emissions standards.</p> <p><b>Volume 2, Chapter 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes parameter zones, which limit the heights of construction activity, including (but not limited to) the size of stockpiles and the height of cranes.</p>	Y
Sourcing of Materials	<b>Alternative suggestions to the proposals for construction materials, such as sourcing of materials from</b>	The detailed procurement strategy for the materials required for the construction of the Sizewell C Project is unknown at this stage. Assessments have assumed within this application that, apart from bulk earthworks fill, not all materials would be available to be sourced regionally (within Suffolk), and that the majority would be sourced nationally (within the UK).	N

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	aggregates in the sea.	<p>In order to source more material by sea, a jetty (rather than a beach landing facility) would be required, which would result in several <b>significant</b> environmental impacts including: severe underwater noise during construction and a greater habitat loss associated with its footprint.</p> <p>Further details are set out in <b>Volume 1, Chapter 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the environmental impact of construction materials including carbon emissions, air quality impacts, and the use of concrete.</b>	<p>Both concrete production and steel manufacture make up the vast majority of carbon emissions as a result of the high amount of energy required for their production.</p> <p>These areas, together with fuel fabrication, are the highest throughout the life-cycle of the power station, which includes operation and decommissioning. This was the subject of a study which was part of the Hinkley Point C DCO submission.</p> <p>From a full lifecycle perspective, the greenhouse gas emissions associated with 1 kWh of electricity generated from Hinkley Point C were calculated to be 4.75 g CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh. This is comparable to offshore wind and less</p>	Y

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>than 10% of the limit advised by the Committee on Climate Change (50g CO<sub>2</sub>e/kWh).</p> <p>The carbon dioxide emissions are small when compared with the emissions from a typical UK coal plant of around 900 g/kWh, based upon the operational stage alone. Typical emissions from a gas-fired combined cycle power plant are around 490 g/kWh.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6).</p>	
Further information	<b>Requests for further information about the construction material proposals including assessment of impacts, and the types and sourcing of materials.</b>	<p>The detailed procurement strategy for the materials required for the construction of the Sizewell C Project is unknown at this stage. Assessments have assumed within this application that, apart from bulk earthworks fill, not all materials would be available to be sourced regionally (within Suffolk), and that the majority would be sourced nationally (within the UK).</p> <p>Further details are set out in <b>Chapter 8 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Borrow Pits	<b>General/other concerns about spoil</b>	Construction of Sizewell C requires large quantities of both primary raw materials and manufactured construction	Y

Theme: Construction Materials			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>heaps and borrow pits, including the severe overall impact on the community, height and visual impact and resultant water and air pollution.</b></p>	<p>products. Use of borrow pits allows substantial volumes of material to originate from within the site, thereby substantially reducing impacts on wider movement networks.</p> <p>In response to feedback received, in the Stage 3 proposals SZC Co. excluded land east of Eastbridge Road as it was the most visually exposed of the identified borrow pit sites and would have required interaction with the public highway at Eastbridge Road.</p> <p>The natural topography of the site, as well as existing and planned screening means that the proposed spoil management area will be relatively well screened from most public rights of way.</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) specifies measures to mitigate impacts during the construction and restoration phases. <b>Chapter 3 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3), includes parameter zones which limit the height of construction activities, including stockpiles.</p>	

Theme: Consultation Process

Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Decision Making	<p><b>Criteria for the development of the Sizewell C project, that local residents should be consulted and their opinions considered and valued in decision making to help inform the proposals.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. continued to consult local communities informally following Stage 2 and there were further formal stages of consultation which informed the proposals.</p> <p>Changes informed by the feedback from each stage of consultation (along with the results from technical assessments and compliance with planning policy), included the discounting of site options, several changes to the land take and access arrangements for associated development sites and <b>significant</b> alterations to transport strategy options.</p> <p>The <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides full details of the process followed. The Issues Tables at <b>Annexes A, D, G and J</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) explain how the issues raised through consultation have been responded to.</p>	N
Decision Making	<p><b>Concern that local people have not been adequately consulted or their opinions listened to about the proposed park and ride locations.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. values the feedback from local communities and residents.</p> <p>The consultation is a qualitative exercise and the outcome of Stage 1 indicated that the sites selected from the options presented were the most appropriate on the basis of feedback received from the public and statutory stakeholders, and further technical assessment work.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Consultation Events	<b>Negative comments and criticisms about the consultation events and staff, that comments made were contradictory, staff were condescending and had a lack of interest.</b>	<p>Where issues were raised in relation to exhibition staff, these were addressed in pre-briefings ahead of subsequent exhibitions and events.</p> <p>To ensure optimum performance from exhibition staff, at every formal stage of consultation SZC Co. also commissioned independent market research, which involved surveying the attendees as they exited the exhibitions.</p> <p>At Stage 1, 416 visitors to the exhibitions were interviewed. 88% viewed the staff as extremely helpful, 11% as quite helpful. At stage 2, 383 visitors to exhibitions were interviewed. 69% viewed the staff as very helpful and a further 20% as quite helpful.</p>	N
Consultation Events	<b>Positive comments about the consultation process, including the events, staff knowledge from the</b>	Positive comments welcomed. SZC Co. aimed to deliver an accessible and informative Stage 2 public consultation to ensure as many local residents as possible had the opportunity to feedback.	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>events, and the timescale respondents had to complete their responses, as well as the consultation document itself.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes the responses received which help to inform the proposals we will submit for the DCO.</p> <p>The <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides full details of the process followed. The Issues Tables at <b>Annexes A, D, G and J</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) explain how the issues raised through consultation have been responded to.</p>	
<p>Consultation Documents</p>	<p><b>Challenging the content within the consultation documentation as being inaccurate, such as estimations and assumptions derived from traffic modelling, or that the document has been put together to encourage support for a particular option.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. have made every effort to ensure that the information presented in the consultation material is accurate, and is not misleading or drafted to encourage support for particular options.</p> <p>All of the information in the documentation reflected the outcomes of technical assessments, delivered against approved methodology.</p>	N
<p>Consultation Documents</p>	<p><b>Commenting on the difficulty in understanding the</b></p>	<p>In response, SZC Co. commissioned and produced easy-read documents for the Stage 3 and Stage 4 consultation.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>information presented in the consultation documents and that the document was difficult to follow and navigate.</b>	<p>In addition to the exhibitions, consultees were encouraged to use the Freephone line and contact the Sizewell C Information Office if they experienced any difficulties with the consultation materials or had any questions.</p> <p>Further details are contained within the Stage 3 Pre-Application Consultation Document: Volume 1 – Development Proposals (January 2019), the Stage 4 Consultation Summary Document and Stage 4 Consultation Document at <b>Appendices E.1, F.1 and F.2</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	
Consultation process	<b>Comments and criticisms about the distribution and availability of the consultation documentation.</b>	<p>The Stage 2 newsletter, which presented an outline of the proposals, was distributed to 27,879 homes and businesses within the consultation area identified within the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (November 2016) provided in <b>Appendices D.12 and D.6</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The newsletter informed recipients about where they could find more information and where exhibitions would take place. All documents were available on request and available to download from the website.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Documents	<b>Comments about lack of an Environmental Impact Assessment as part of the documentation.</b>	<p>The Stage 2 consultation document provided in <b>Appendix D.7</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) included Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) which was appropriate to the stage of project development.</p> <p>It was always the intention to provide more extensive PEI at a later stage on consultation and this was subsequently provided in the Stage 3 Consultation Document provided in <b>Appendices E.2, E.3</b> and <b>E.4</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1), in full accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The DCO application is supported by a full Environmental Impact Assessment.</p>	N
Consultation Questionnaire	<b>Comments about criticisms about the feedback form/questionnaire including structure, wording and its limited scope, etc.</b>	<p>SZC Co. was open to receiving feedback in several ways. In addition to the online and paper questionnaire responses, hundreds of responses were received by e-mail and letter.</p> <p>SZC Co. endeavoured to make the questionnaire form as a clear as possible to allow respondents to give their views.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		A copy of the Stage 2 Questionnaire is provided at <b>Appendix D.12</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Consultation Documents	<b>Criticisms of the consultation documentation as being too vague and missing important information and lacking in detail, and requests for more information about the overall development.</b>	<p>This was the second of a multi-stage consultation process. More information and details followed in the Stage 3 and 4 consultations as a result of the feedback received.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that it needed to be clearer in explaining that the full Environmental Impact Assessment is subject to public and technical scrutiny once it is submitted as part of the DCO.</p> <p>This was clarified in the Stage 3 Pre-Application Consultation Document: <b>Volumes 2A, 2B and 3</b> (Preliminary Environmental Information) (January 2019) at <b>Appendices E.2, E.3 and E.4</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N
Consultation Process	<b>Challenging the consultation for being poorly publicised and communication to the public being poor in general.</b>	<p>SZC Co. publicised the Stage 2 consultation in all of the ways identified in the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (November 2016) provided at <b>Appendix D.6</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project Team recognised that some time had passed since the end of Stage 1, so more exhibitions</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		were organised and the newsletter distribution area was extended to 27,879.	
Decision Making	<b>Challenging the influence of SZC Co. (or other organisations) over the consultation process and outcome, and saying that the public has a lack of influence in the decision making.</b>	<p>As the developer, SZC Co. has the responsibility to consult on its proposals.</p> <p>Adequacy of consultation is a key test in the DCO process which SZC Co. has to demonstrate – showing how it responded to the feedback raised by the public.</p> <p><b>Volume 1</b> (Main Report) of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides full details of the consultation process followed. The Issues Tables at <b>Annexes A, D, G and J</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) explain how the issues raised through consultation have been responded to.</p>	N
Decision Making	<b>Specific requests for more information about certain parts of the proposals/consultation, for example, the principle of development and inter-relationship with Essex and Bradwell B and potential impacts on</b>	<p>A number of respondents raised the issue of other developments, particularly ScottishPower Renewables' Galloper project.</p> <p>Despite the Sizewell C Project not yet being permitted, SZC Co. included the traffic forecasts published by ScottishPower Renewables in the Stage 4 consultation on the Sizewell C Project as a response to local communities requesting more information on the combined impacts of these projects.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>Galloper Wind Farm onshore transmission cables.</b>	<p>SZC Co. also regularly meets with ScottishPower Renewables through the Suffolk Energy Coast Delivery Board. This is chaired by the local MP and brings together government departments and local authorities to consider the impacts and opportunities arising from the development of the energy coast.</p> <p>Further information is contained within <b>Volume 10</b> (Cumulative and Transboundary Effects) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.11).</p>	
Decision Making	<b>Requests for continued engagement with the respondent or other suggested groups in the future stakeholders or other suggested groups in the future, such as Network Rail or the AONB Partnership.</b>	<p>SZC Co. continued to engage with community groups, local representatives and interested parties at the Stage 3 and 4 consultations, and between these formal stages.</p> <p>SZC Co.'s Transport Planners regularly met with Network Rail on the proposals, and we met with the AONB Partnership at their invitation or through events such as the Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation's annual conference in 2016.</p> <p>The <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides full details of the consultation process followed.</p>	N
Consultation Period	<b>Suggestion that the timescale of the</b>	The Updated Statement of Community Consultation (November 2016) stated that consultation should "run for	N

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>consultation was inconvenient and should be made longer, and not held over Christmas.</b></p>	<p><i>at least 8 weeks but could be extended should the consultation run over a major public holiday”, as provided in <b>Appendix D.6</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</i></p> <p>The Stage 2 consultation ran for 10 weeks (23 November 2016 to 3 February 2017). This is two weeks beyond the target timeframe, as it ran over the Christmas public holidays.</p> <p>The Stage 3 consultation took place after Christmas. It ran for 12 weeks from 4 January 2019 to 29 March 2019.</p>	
<p>Consultation Period</p>	<p><b>Suggestion that the timescale of the consultation should be made shorter/less time consuming/quicker to start developing sooner.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. is required to undertake adequate pre-application consultation. This is in order to ensure that feedback from the community and stakeholders is suitably taken into account. This was necessary to ensure that SZC Co. arrive at proposals which will help to mitigate the impact of construction and operation, and maximise the opportunities arising from the development of Sizewell C.</p> <p>The consultation must therefore provide adequate time for local communities and residents to respond, and SZC Co. must abide by the commitments made in the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (November 2016)</p>	<p>N</p>

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>as provided in <b>Appendix D.6</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>In total, SZC Co. has conducted 44.5 weeks of formal consultation on the Sizewell C Project – which is necessary for a project of this scale.</p>	

b. Main Development Site

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Access Road	<p><b>Challenge to the need and basis for the proposals for the access route on the basis that the B1122 should not be used for construction traffic at all, so no access route should be built from the B1122.</b></p>	<p>In Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels.</p> <p>The new road providing access to Sizewell C site meets the B1122 at the main development site access roundabout as described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref.</p>	Y



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		6.3).	
Access Road	<b>Concern about the lack of legacy benefits and the potential life span of the proposed access road options.</b>	The new access road would be the main route to bring workers and materials onto the site during construction and the main access for the Sizewell C Project once the station is operational. It has no wider or legacy purpose. It would remain in place until the decommissioning of Sizewell is completed. It is described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N
Access Road	<b>Concern about safety for the proposed access road options, including the safety to other road users and wildlife crossing.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns held in regards to safety of the road options and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) has considered road safety for the main development site, associated development schemes, junctions and off-site highway improvements.</p> <p>The new access road would be the main route to bring workers and materials onto the site during construction and the main access for the Sizewell C Project once the station is operational. The needs and safety of all road users, i.e. cars, buses, light goods vehicles (LGV), HGV, cyclists and pedestrians have formed an important design consideration. Environmental issues, e.g. the needs of wildlife, have also been carefully considered in design.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		These are addressed in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Further Information	<b>Requests for more information about the proposed access road options and associated impacts, such as more tangible data to be able to evaluate the options.</b>	<p>Details of the new access road from the north-west, to function as the main operational access to the Sizewell C Project, were set out at Stage 3 consultation. This explained that a permanent two lane access road continued to be proposed, with a segregated route for cyclists and pedestrians, and that the road width would be reduced following construction and designed to establish a corridor similar in character to a country road, while maintaining safe access/ egress.</p> <p>The new access road would meet the B1122 at the main development site access roundabout as described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Further details were also provided at Stage 3 on the different options being considered for the necessary crossing of the Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) to access the main platform. More detail is provided in the DCO submission in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref.</p>	<b>N</b>

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		8.4).	
Access Road	<b>Comments about the need for an access road to connect to the main development site, but questioning the connection to the B1122.</b>	<p>In Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road is described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>. The new road providing access to the Sizewell C site meets the B1122 at the main development site access roundabout as described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Access Road	<b>Suggestions for the new access road, specifically suggestions for restricting vehicle access to the site.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcome the suggestions for the new access road.</p> <p>The confirmed new access road is described in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). It would be the main route to bring workers and materials onto the</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		site during construction and the main access to the Sizewell C Project for cars, buses, LGV, HGV, cyclists and pedestrians once the station is operational. Only those travelling to/from the Sizewell C Project would be permitted to use the new access road, which would not be a public highway.	
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about safety impacts from the construction materials proposals, including potential accidents involving the pits and excavated materials.</b>	<p>This <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) Part A</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) sets out the standards and procedures which SZC Co. would require its contractor(s) to adopt, and implement in the construction of Sizewell C, to maintain satisfactory levels of environmental protection, and limit disturbance from construction activities as far as reasonably practicable. This <b>CoCP</b> applies to the proposed construction works on the main development site, and the associated development sites.</p> <p>SZC Co. would require all contractors to comply with all relevant legislative controls, construction health, safety and environmental standards and other relevant best practice methodologies.</p>	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Suggestion that further assessment is needed to assess</b>	A programme of archaeological evaluation has been carried out across the main development site, including archaeological geophysical survey and trial trenching. The	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>the alternative construction materials options or if the areas have been screened for important archaeological finds.</b></p>	<p>scope of this was agreed with SCC Archaeological Service who also monitored the fieldwork.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with Suffolk County Council Archaeological Service (SCCAS) and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified to date on the site.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 16</b> (Terrestrial Historic Environment) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Construction Materials	<p><b>Challenging the process of the construction materials proposals as they were not mentioned in the previous stage of consultation.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. has carefully considered where aggregates for the construction of the Sizewell C Project are sourced from.</p> <p>Aggregates sourced either directly from the sea (dredged) or delivered by sea would require a jetty. The <b>significant</b> environmental impact of constructing a jetty resulted in this option being terminated following Stage 2.</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Materials will be sourced predominantly from the UK and be transported by rail and road. It may be possible to utilise local ports for some materials for onward movement by road or rail.	
Construction Materials	<b>Comments about how the creation of a new relief route would obviate the need for borrow pits.</b>	<p>The use of borrow pits reduces the volume of material required to be imported and exported to and from the construction site, but a relief road is still required in order to minimise impacts of the local community. The aim of the Sizewell C Project is to minimise as far as possible the volume of materials to be imported, and therefore the number of HGVs travelling to the construction site.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> (Transport) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Mitigation	<b>Comments about the importance and necessity of mitigation to reduce environmental impacts of the development and prevent long-term</b>	<p>The construction of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), such as the Sizewell C Project, requires an extensive programme of mitigation to ensure that significant effects are minimised so that the proposals are acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p>The DCO application is supported by a full Environmental Impact Assessment. The mitigation proposals for the</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>damage.</b>	Sizewell C Project include a wide range of measures which are 'embedded' within the Sizewell C Project design and a large number of controls of construction which are defined within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11).	
Mitigation	<b>Other suggestions for environmental mitigation measures, such as landscaping and screening, trenching and wetland creation.</b>	<p>A new area of wetland has already been created to compensate for the loss of approximately 3% of reedbed and ditches from the (Site of Special Scientific Interest) SSSI, associated with the SSSI crossing and the western edge of the Sizewell C Project platform. SZC Co. is continuing to identify other opportunities for further habitat creation measures both on the EDF Energy Estate and more widely.</p> <p>As the proposals have developed, considerable consideration has been given to screening, both at the main development site and the off-site associated developments. The approach to screening includes the use of existing natural landforms, the use of temporary bunds (e.g. top soil storage) and new areas of planted trees and shrubs to screen the developments from sensitive viewpoints. The vertical alignment of the road proposals, including the use of cuttings, combined with bunding and</p>	Y



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>others screening will help reduce the impacts to local residents.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 14</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Mitigation	<p><b>Suggestions that SZC Co. should work with experts or local groups and use their knowledge for environmental mitigation measures or that more information on what is proposed should be provided.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. has been working with non- statutory consultees including the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) to fully understand their concerns in relation to environmental impacts and seek their comments on the development of migration and compensation proposals.</p> <p>The habitat creation scheme at Aldhurst Farm, the development of off-site proposals such as the fen meadow strategy, as well as other habitat creation opportunities, including the habitats established under the operational masterplan have all benefited from the input from these groups.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 14</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Need Case	<b>Comments that the</b>	The National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (NPS EN-	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>impacts are necessary for the Sizewell C Project, because this is the best option for a nuclear station owing to Sizewell A and B.</b></p>	<p>1) (paras. 3.1.1 – 3.1.4) is clear that the decision maker should assess all applications for development consent for the types of infrastructure covered by the energy NPSs on the basis that the Government has demonstrated that there is a need for those types of infrastructure and that substantial weight should be given to the contribution which projects would make towards satisfying this need.</p> <p>The NPS states that given the level and urgency of the need for energy infrastructure the decision maker should start with a presumption in favour of granting consent to applications for energy NSIPs, unless any more specific and relevant policies set out in the relevant NPSs clearly indicate that consent should be refused.</p> <p>As set out at paragraph 4.1.3 the decision maker should take into account the positives and potential adverse impacts. The NPS recognises that it is not possible to develop the necessary amounts of energy infrastructure without some significant residual adverse impacts, and in this regard substantial weight should be given to considerations of need.</p> <p>However, the likely significant environmental effects</p>	



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		predicted to arise from the Sizewell C Project are identified in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6).	

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Access Road	<b>Suggestion that the criteria for the access road option decision should be based on the opinion of expert/local groups.</b>	<p>SZC Co. established at an early stage of consultation that the main development site would need to be accessed from the north, from a new access road linking the site to the B1122. This necessarily means going through the Sizewell Marshes SSSI to achieve access to the main power station platform, which would involve direct land take from the SSSI.</p> <p>The key environmental considerations for the SSSI crossing have been subject to consultation with stakeholders and the public. These were outlined in the Stage 2 consultation and more information provided at Stage 3 and within the DCO submission provided in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b>, to support the choice of a culverted causeway in preference to a bridge option.</p> <p>The decision to proceed with a causeway over a culvert has</p>	<b>N</b>

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		been based on appropriate and comprehensive criteria, including ecology (direct loss of habitat, fragmentation, incidental mortality, changes in hydrology / hydrogeology), groundwater, surface water, flood risk, landscaping and important construction considerations which influence the programme and delivery of the Sizewell C Project.	
Access Road	<b>Suggestions on how SZC Co. should choose which option to construct, including selecting the option which uses the least land overall, or causes the least environmental damage according to expert assessment.</b>	<p>The decision to progress with the option for crossing the Sizewell Marshes SSSI via a causeway over culvert, rather than a bridge, has been a balanced consideration of a wide range of environmental and construction related considerations. Whilst an important consideration, it does not necessarily follow that the option that would result in the greatest direct land take from the SSSI would cause the most environmental damage.</p> <p>The additional information provided at Stage 3 consultation and within the DCO submission provided in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref 8.4) and in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) to support the choice of a culverted causeway in preference to a bridge option.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Access Road	<b>Suggestion that the criteria for the access road option decision should be based on whichever is the most effective or economically sensible.</b>	<p>The decision to progress with the option for crossing the Sizewell Marshes SSSI via a causeway over culvert, rather than a bridge, has been a balanced consideration of a wide range of environmental and construction related considerations.</p> <p>The benefits of constructability, and the implications for the construction programme, are however very important considerations in favour of the causeway over culvert option. The Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) provide further details.</p>	Y
Access Road	<b>Opposition to Option 2 of the access road proposals because it required multiple phases, a larger footprint and will limit the flow of wildlife.</b>	<p>These comments are noted and supports our overall decision to progress a causeway over culvert. However, whilst SZC Co. are not progressing a bridge options – for reasons primarily related to construction and operational flexibility – it is not considered that the implications for the movement of wildlife would be materially different whichever option was progressed.</p>	N
Access Road	<b>Support for the use of bridges in Options 2 and 3 for the proposed</b>	<p>The decision to progress with the option for crossing the Sizewell Marshes SSSI via a causeway over culvert, rather than a bridge, has been a balanced consideration of a wide</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>access road, as they would be the least disruptive to wildlife and hydrology in the SSSI.</b>	<p>range of environmental and construction related considerations.</p> <p>Whilst the amount of direct land take required for the four options would be marginally different it is not considered that the effects on ecology and hydrology within the SSSI would be materially different with the proposed primary mitigation measures (to compensate for the loss of SSSI habitat as a whole) in place.</p>	
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about benefits to access long lifespan of the bridges from Options 2 and 3 of the access road proposals.</b>	Any of the options for the SSSI crossing would require short-term, temporary and permanent access solutions. The causeway over culvert option would be wide enough to accommodate both the temporary and permanent crossings, whereas the bridge Options (2 and 3) would require the removal of the temporary structure and separate construction of the permanent bridge. There are no additional benefits of the bridge options in terms of life-span of the permanent crossing compared to the causeway.	<b>N</b>
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the reduced disturbance of hydrology and flood</b>	The decision to progress with the option for crossing the Sizewell Marshes SSSI via a causeway over culvert, rather than a bridge, has been a balanced consideration of a wide range of environmental and construction related	<b>N</b>

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>risk and reduced amount of land take required for the bridge options of the access road proposals.</b>	<p>considerations.</p> <p>Whilst the amount of direct land take required for the four options would be marginally different it is not considered that the effects on hydrology and flood risk would be materially different. The causeway option does, however, have the beneficial potential to adapt during the operational phase to perform as a flood defence (which the bridge options would not).</p>	
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the reduced impact on the SSSI environment from the bridge options of the access road proposals, as they allow sediment to move more freely and will not physically separate the SSSI.</b>	Although culverts can impact on surface water flows and geomorphology, the direct loss of channel from Option 1 would be small and will not have the potential to affect the wider geomorphological functionality of the river.	N
Access Road	<b>Opposition and concerns about the use of causeways for</b>	The decision to progress with the option for crossing the Sizewell Marshes SSSI via a causeway over culvert, rather than a bridge, has been a balanced consideration of a wide	N



Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>Options 1 and 4 of the access road proposals due to land take and disturbance of the SSSI.</b>	<p>range of environmental and construction related considerations. Whilst an important consideration, it does not necessarily follow that the option that would result in the greatest direct land take from the SSSI would cause the most environmental damage.</p> <p>Whilst the amount of direct land take required for the four options would be marginally different it is not considered that the effects on the SSSI would be materially different with the proposed primary mitigation measures (to compensate for the loss of SSSI habitat as a whole) in place.</p> <p>The additional information provided at Stage 3 consultation and within the DCO submission provided in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3), supports the choice of a culverted causeway in preference to a bridge option.</p>	
Access Road	<b>Suggestions for the causeway options of the access road proposals, such as establishing trees to</b>	Comments noted and agreed that the causeway option for the SSSI crossing has the greatest potential to support mitigation planting – compared to the bridge options. This will help to soften the engineered appearance, whilst also providing some screening of close views, and allowing for	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	integrate it into the landscape.	the establishment of vegetation along its eastern edge that would be retained into the operational phase.	
Access Road	<b>Comments that the causeway options for the access road would be cheaper and a better flood defence, but more environmentally insensitive.</b>	<p>The decision to progress with the option for crossing the Sizewell Marshes SSSI via a causeway over culvert, rather than a bridge, has been a balanced consideration of a wide range of environmental and construction related considerations. This includes important implications with regard to construction timescales and the potential operational flexibility, but also consideration of ecology groundwater, surface water, flood risk and landscaping.</p> <p>The additional information provided at Stage 3 consultation and within the DCO submission, provided in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) supports the choice of a culverted causeway in preference to a bridge option.</p>	N
Access Road	<b>Concern about the closure of access due to the causeway proposals during construction.</b>	The SSSI crossing would be part of a private route and within a wider, secure construction area. It would not therefore specifically result in the closure of access to pedestrians, vehicles or equestrians.	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details of the SSSI crossing during construction are set out in <b>Chapters 3</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Access Road	<b>Concern that causeways would provide less flood risk capacity than bridges, and would slightly increase groundwater levels.</b>	It is predicted that changes to water levels and flows during construction would be similar for each of the options and the predicted changes would be well within the baseline ground water level variation.	N
Access Road	<b>Concern about the impact on the SSSI from the causeway options of the access road proposals, including impact on species such as the water vole and impediment to water flow.</b>	<p>The potential for a causeway option to effect connectivity for various species has been considered and it is considered that an embankment with a culvert would not represent a major barrier to the passage of otters, water voles or eels, with primary mitigation proposed to allow the passage of otter. <b>Volume 2, Chapter 14</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) concludes that habitat fragmentation as a result of the proposed SSSI crossing would not be significant.</p> <p>With regard to bats, a culvert option is likely to be more successful than a bridge in delivering a functional dark 'movement corridor', along the Leiston Drain for bats,</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>because it will be easier to avoid disturbance from light and noise.</p> <p>The changes to water levels as a result of any of the four options are not considered to be sufficient to result in geomorphological changes. Some increase in exchange between groundwater and surface water would be expected for any of the four options, though the effect for each option would be minor.</p>	
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the cost effectiveness, and the reduced flood risk and landscape and visual impacts of the use of causeways for of Options 1 and 4 of the access road proposals.</b>	Comments supporting the choice for the causeway option welcomed.	N
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the reduced environmental impacts</b>	Comments supporting the choice for the causeway option welcomed.	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	of Option 1 of the access road proposals, including reduced impact on landscape features and the SSSI.		
Access Road	<b>Suggestions for Option 3 of the access road proposals, for example to install a permissive path under the bridge, and to give it an attractive design.</b>	<p>Comment noted, though Option 3 is not being progressed as the preferred SSSI crossing – for the reasons set out in Stage 3 consultation and in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>The causeway option will provide pedestrian access.</p>	<b>N</b>
Access Road	<b>Support for Option 4 of the access road proposals as being the 'least worst' option.</b>	The decision to progress with a variation of Option 1 through Stage 3 consultation (and in the DCO submission) has been a balanced consideration of a wide range of environmental and construction related considerations. This is explained in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	<b>N</b>
Construction Materials	<b>Criteria for the construction materials option choice, that it</b>	SZC Co. notes the preference for whichever option has the least environmental impact, including least visual impact and least land take. Borrow Pit Option Field 1 was the most	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>should be based on whichever has the least environmental impact, including least visual impact and least land take.</b>	visually exposed field and no longer forms part of the proposals.  Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Construction Materials	<b>Criteria for the construction materials option choice, that it should be based on local and expert opinion.</b>	SZC Co. has consulted the public and stakeholders in relation to this option and excluded Borrow Pit Option Field 1 after Stage 2 and no longer forms part of the proposals.  Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Criteria for the construction materials option choice, that it should be based on whichever has the most direct access to the main development site.</b>	SZC Co. notes the preference for whichever option was the most direct accessible to the area of main construction activity. Borrow Pit Option Field 1 was the furthest distance from the main platform and it would have been necessary for construction machinery to have crossed Eastbridge Road. This field no longer forms part of the proposals accordingly.  Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Construction Materials	<b>Criteria for the construction materials option choice, that it should be based on whichever is the closest to the development site/stockpile area.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the preference for whichever option was the closest to the stockpile area and development site. Borrow Pit Option Field 1 was the furthest distance from these areas and it would have been necessary for construction machinery to have crossed Eastbridge Road. This field no longer forms part of the proposals accordingly.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Criteria for the construction materials option choice, that it should be based on the option where as little as possible materials leave the site.</b>	<p>SZC Co. aims to achieve a neutral cut and fill balance across the main development site and associated development sites. Measures to help achieve this aim include the treatment of excavated materials to enable reuse where practical.</p> <p>Options relating to the siting of borrow pits and stockpiles have minimal bearing in relation to the volume of material that may ultimately need to leave the site. Further details are set out in <b>Appendix 3B of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N



Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the community impact of Option 1 of the construction materials proposals being located too close to Eastbridge.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the concern in relation to Borrow Pit Option Field 1. This field was excluded after Stage 2 and no longer forms part of the proposals.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> (Alternatives and Design Evolution) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the environmental impact on the AONB, habitats and on old hedging and large oak trees of Option 1 of the construction materials proposals.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the concern in relation to Borrow Pit Option Field 1. This field was excluded after Stage 2 and no longer forms part of the proposals.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Support for Option 1 of the construction materials proposals because it has the least environmental impact, but needs greater screening and</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the support from some stakeholders in relation to Borrow Pit Option Field 1. However, as noted above, this field was excluded after Stage 2 and no longer forms part of the proposals.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	mitigation for protected species.	<b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the close proximity and resulting community impact on Eastbridge from Option 2 of the construction materials proposals.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the concern in relation to Borrow Pit Option Field 2, however this field option remains part of the proposals.</p> <p>With appropriate boundary treatments, including screening as well as the measures defined within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), including a <b>Dust Management Plan</b>, the impacts on Eastbridge would be minimised.</p>	N
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the environmental impact of Option 2 of the construction materials proposals, from the proximity to Minsmere Reserve and impact on marsh harrier habitats and the setting of the AONB.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the concern in relation to Borrow Pit Option Field 2, however this field option remains part of the proposals.</p> <p>With appropriate boundary treatments, including screening as well as the measures defined within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), the impacts on Minsmere Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) reserve, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the newly created Marsh Harrier habitats would be minimised.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in the <b>Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.10).	
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the environmental impact of Option 3 of the construction materials proposals on the setting of the AONB, Ash Wood and bats and marsh harriers.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the concern in relation to Borrow Pit Option Field 3, however this field option remains part of the proposals.</p> <p>With appropriate boundary treatments, including screening as well as the measures defined within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), the impacts on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Ash Wood, bats and the newly created Marsh Harrier habitats would be minimised.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.10).</p>	N
Construction Materials	<b>Positive comments about Option 3 of the construction materials proposals being the closest to the main</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes positive comments about use for Borrow Pit Option 3, which includes land east of Bridleway 19. Whilst Field 1 has been removed from the proposals in response to consultation feedback, Field 2 remains part of the proposals to help ensure an adequate supply of</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	development site and furthest away from residents and Eastbridge Road, therefore minimising the amount of road transport required and impact on people.	<p>materials is available.</p> <p>Further information is set out in <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Construction Materials	Comments about Option 3 being the 'least worst' of the available options, but still presenting significant impacts on wildlife.	<p>SZC Co. notes the concern in relation to Borrow Pit Option Field 3, however this field option remains part of the proposals.</p> <p>With appropriate boundary treatments, including screening as well as the measures defined within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), the impacts on wildlife would be minimised.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.10).</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site Location	<b>Comments stating that the proposed location for the Sizewell C Project is unsuitable, being in an area of high ecological and environmental value.</b>	<p>The Government concluded, in the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6), that the Sizewell C site was a potentially suitable location for new nuclear power. This took into consideration potential effects on biodiversity including the SSSI which is partially included within the site boundary, and the visual impact on the AONB, but concluded that none of these factors is sufficient to prevent the site from being considered as potentially suitable.</p> <p>The ministerial statement states that whilst NPS EN-6 only has effect for projects which are able to demonstrate expected deployment by the end of 2025, the Government continues to give its strong in principle support to project proposals at those sites listed in EN-6, i.e. including Sizewell C.</p> <p>The Statement on Energy Infrastructure on 7 December 2017 (the ‘ministerial statement’) confirmed that the Government continues to give its strong in principle support to project proposals at those sites listed in EN-6, i.e. including Sizewell C.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Size of Main Development Site	<b>Concern about the overall size of the proposed development and the scale of the Sizewell C Project, with large amounts of land take from the AONB and having to support two reactors.</b>	<p>The Government confirmed in the assessment of the site in including it in NPS EN-6 as a potentially suitable site for nuclear power, that it is reasonable to conclude that there is enough land within the nominated boundary to safely and securely operate at least on single unit nuclear power station.</p> <p>NPS EN-6 draws attention to the visual sensitivity of the location within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is recognised and the NPS EN-6 annex accepts that there are likely to be some long-lasting adverse direct and indirect effects on the landscape, but that these are not likely to be sufficient to rule out developing a new nuclear power station (paragraph C.8.83 Annex C); (paragraph 3.10.8);</p> <p>SZC Co. have taken steps to address the sensitivity of the AONB by the careful siting and design of the proposals.</p>	N
Site Location	<b>Positive comments about the proposed development being sited at a location previously used as a nuclear site.</b>	Positive comments welcomed. The Government concluded, in the National Policy Statement (NPS) for Nuclear Power Generation (NPS EN-6), that the Sizewell C site (to the north of Sizewell B) is a potentially suitable location for new nuclear power.	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the impact of the overall development proposals, including the access road, borrow pits and associated infrastructure on the environment in general and on designated areas such as Suffolk Coast and Heath AONB, Sizewell Marshes SSSI and RSPB Minsmere Reserve.</b>	<p>The environmental impacts of the proposals have been assessed by the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which has helped inform design choices as well as enabled SZC Co. to define appropriate mitigation measures and compensatory measures where necessary.</p> <p>The impact of the proposals on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) have been considered as part of <b>Chapter 13</b> (Landscape and Visual Impact) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impacts on both the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB) Minsmere reserve have been considered within the Ecological Assessment (EcIA) as well as where relevant within other workstreams such as the Hydrology workstream. The assessment work demonstrates that with the implementation of suitable mitigation measures, these impacts can be appropriately managed.</p> <p>All of the relevant assessments are included within the <b>Environmental Statement</b> which accompanies the application.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.10).</p>	N



Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern the amount of land take required for the proposed development site including the main development site and associated developments such as the access road</b>	<p>SZC Co. has continually refined its proposals and the proposed amount of land is required to develop the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposals comprise the most sustainable balance between being appropriately located, comprising an acceptable level of land take, and minimising impacts upon the environment and communities as far as possible.</p> <p>Further information is set out in the <b>Main Development Site Design and Access Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 8.1).</p>	N
Environmental Mitigation	<b>Suggestions for mitigation of the new access road, such as a path from Kenton Hills to the beach and traffic calming measures near the access road.</b>	<p>The establishment of the temporary construction area means that it is not possible during construction to maintain the permissive paths which link Kenton Hills with the beach.</p> <p>However, improvements to the Kenton Hills car park are proposed to encourage greater use of the Kenton Hills area for dog-walking in particular.</p> <p>Once the temporary construction area has been removed a permissive path between Kenton Hills and the beach will be</p>	N

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>reinstated and this may need to include traffic calming on what will be the operational access road through the Goose Hill area.</p> <p>Further details on impacts to users of the access road can be found in <b>Chapter 8 of Volume 9</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the impact of dust and consequential air and water pollution, health and property impacts from stock piles and borrow pits and potential to be blown to designated areas.</b>	<p>Control measures to mitigate air quality impacts including dust are set out in the <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), which will be further developed in a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) prepared by the contractor.</p> <p>These measures have been informed by an <b>Outline Dust Management Plan</b>, provided in <b>Appendix 12A, Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the environmental impact of non-radioactive waste management and</b>	<p>SZC Co. have also taken steps to avoid negative effects from waste generated by the development. In this regard: excavated materials will be used on-site; waste movements will be consolidated and taken to local facilities where possible; waste movements are included within transport numbers; and SZC Co.</p>	Y

Theme: Environment - General			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	request for identification and categorisation of the storage and disposal of materials.	<p>will have a dedicated sewage treatment plant early in the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained within the <b>Chapter 8</b> of the <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> and the <b>Waste Management Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Environmental Mitigation	Concerns that proposed environmental mitigation measures are insufficient, including noise and light pollution and impact on designated areas and greenfield land.	<p>The proposed mitigation measures have been defined through the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, including an extensive noise assessment, a landscape and visual assessment and the development of a lighting management plan.</p> <p>Impacts to designated areas and greenfield land would be minimised by boundary treatments, which include a 5m hoarding along the northern boundary of the temporary construction area to limit noise impacts to Minmere to the north and the use of lighting which minimises lateral light spill.</p> <p>Further information is contained within <b>Chapter 11</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> and <b>Chapter 13</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Noise and Vibration	<b>Concern about the impact of noise and vibration on people and wildlife from construction sites as well as transportation of materials to the main development site.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact of noise from the Sizewell C Project. <b>Chapter 11</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes an assessment of noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main development site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment for the main development site considers the impact on ecological receptors, including bats and birds, as well as residential and other sensitive receptors such as users of public rights of way, or Leiston Abbey.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6), and includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Boundary treatments, including acoustic fences and landscape bunds to screen impacts.</li> <li>- Construction noise management and monitoring measures to control impacts arising from construction activities.</li> <li>- Provision of new foraging land for marsh harriers that may be affected by noise generated from the main development site construction.</li> </ul> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 11</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Air Quality			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Air Quality	<b>Concern about the impact on air quality and pollution as a result of the overall development proposals and effect on people and wildlife.</b>	<p>The impacts of the development will be mitigated by the measures outlined in the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), which includes dust management measures to minimise the spread of dust as well as a range of measures which would be implemented to minimise the potential impacts to both surface and ground waters.</p> <p>Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 12 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Air Quality	<b>Concern about the pollution and contamination resulting from the construction materials, especially borrow pits, and resulting impact on people and wildlife.</b>	<p>The impacts of the development will be mitigated by the measures outlined in the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), which includes dust management measures to minimise the spread of dust as well as a range of measures which would be implemented to minimise the potential impacts to both surface and ground waters.</p> <p>Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 12 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	Y

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Visual Impact	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impact of the overall development proposals, including associated infrastructure and developments, access road and construction materials (not specific to AONB).</b>	<p>The landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment within <b>Chapter 13</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process has helped inform decisions on proposed landforms (such as vertical and horizontal road alignments, cutting and embankment slopes), boundary treatments, landscape planting for main development site as well as for the off-site associated developments.</p>	N
Visual Impact	<b>Concern about the impact of the overall development proposals on light pollution in the surrounding area including the type of lighting used for construction and impact on the ‘dark skies’ status.</b>	<p>The landscape and visual impacts of the proposals have been considered as part of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment within <b>Chapter 13</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment process for the main development site has considered the night-time views in the context of the ‘dark skies status’. The <b>Lighting Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3B) has identified approaches, including lighting types, which will help minimise light spill from the development during both construction and operation and this is considered in undertaking the night-time</p>	N

Theme: Landscape and Visual			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		appraisal.	

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Ecology	<b>Concern about the impact of construction on the breeding bird species and species invading sensitive habitats.</b>	<p>The impacts to breeding birds in retained areas adjacent to the development have been assessed in the ecological assessment and in the <b>Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b> (Doc Ref. 5.10).</p> <p>A range of measures are included in the development proposals to minimise the effects on birds including the use of boundary treatments, such as a 5m hoarding along the northern boundary of the temporary construction area to limit noise impacts to Minsmere to the north and the use of lighting which minimises lateral light spill.</p> <p>The impacts of the development will be further mitigated by the measures outlined in the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>Although relatively few invasive species are present within the</p>	Y



Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>proposed construction areas, the <b>CoCP</b> will include measures to prevent the spread of invasive species.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the <b>Chapter 14</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Ecology - Mitigation	<p><b>Comments and suggestions about proposed mitigation measures, including the inadequacy of the proposed Aldhurst Site habitat creation in mitigating the loss of 6 hectares of SSSI.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. is confident that the Aldhurst Farm habitat creation area provides acceptable compensation for the loss of reedbed and ditch habitats which will be lost from the Sizewell Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>Aldhurst Farm does not however provide compensation for the permanent loss of about 0.5 ha fen meadow habitats from the SSSI and for this reason an off-site compensation strategy has been developed.</p> <p>Two sites have now been identified where new fen meadow habitats could be created and these will be subject to further detailed investigation during 2020 to determine whether one or both are progressed to deliver compensatory habitat.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the <b>Chapter 14</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	N
Ecology	<p><b>Concern about the impact of the overall</b></p>	<p><b>Chapter 14</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3) has identified a large number of mitigation</p>	N



Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>development proposals on wildlife and ecology habitats including rare species, dune grassland, bird species, woodland and hedgerows, bat species and County Wildlife Sites.</b></p>	<p>measures which have been included within the design proposals for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>These are included within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) or form part of the mitigation strategies for individual protected species or species groups. Mitigation strategies have been developed for water voles, reptiles, bats and badgers and these strategies would be implemented under protected species licenses where these are necessary.</p> <p>In respect of the dune grassland, whilst there would be a loss of an area of this habitat during construction, once the coastal defences have been constructed at an early stage of construction, dune grassland habitats would be re-established across the new defences, using surface substrates from the existing dune systems and also aided by rapid natural recolonisation of both plants and invertebrates from the retained areas of habitat east of Sizewell A and B.</p> <p>A range of measures are included in the development proposals to minimise the effects on birds including the use of boundary treatments, such as a 5m hoarding along the northern boundary of the temporary construction area to limit</p>	

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>noise impacts to Minsmere to the north and the use of lighting which minimises lateral light spill which will also benefit bat species.</p> <p>The layout of the temporary construction area retains as many existing treelines and hedgerows as possible including the mature trees along bridleway 19, east of the proposed accommodation campus and the line of mature oaks along the northern edge of Kenton Hills. These areas as well as other retained woodland areas such as Kenton Hills and Ash Wood are valuable for bats There would be some loss of trees in the Goose Hill area but the great majority of these trees would be plantation conifers.</p>	
Ecology	<p><b>Comments and suggestions about mitigation measures for wildlife and ecology, including the lack of mitigation or compensation for Ash Wood and the loss of wet woodland and fen meadow as well as species rich</b></p>	<p><b>Chapter 14 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3) has identified a large number of mitigation measures which have been included within the design proposals for the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>These are included within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) or form part of the mitigation strategies for individual protected species or species groups.</p> <p>Ash Wood is acknowledged as being important for bats and will be retained in its entirety. Measures to mitigate the</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Ecology			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	grassland next to the Sizewell C Project.	disturbance to Ash Wood include noise screening and the use of lighting which minimises lateral light spill, provided in the <b>Lighting Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3B).	

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Infrastructure	<b>Concern about the impact on amenity and recreation of the overall development proposals including coastal walks and enjoyment of the beach, due to closures of footpaths and bridleways, the coastal path, and landscape impacts.</b>	<p>SZC Co. have sought to minimize the impacts of the Sizewell C Project on amenity and recreation, including footpaths. The impacts in this regard are assessed in detail in <b>Chapter 15</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3) and within the <b>Recreational Strategy</b> appended to the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>More specifically, a diversion route will be in place during times when the coast path will be closed during construction. The route will use existing and new diversion routes to enable PRow users to come inland at Minsmere sluice and following a series of paths to re-join the coast path south of the Sizewell A.</p> <p>A new off-road Bridleway will be created as a diversion route when Bridleway 19 is closed. This route will maintain and improve north to south connectivity from Eastbridge to Leiston.</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The route will cross a number of roads and have suitable crossing points to enable a safe off-road diversion route.</p> <p>The Sandlings walk will be closed during construction of the Sizewell C Project, removing access from the Kenton Hills to the beach directly north of SZB due to safety concerns. The access to the Beach will now run along Sandy lane and along Sizewell Gap.</p>	
Access Road	<b>Concern about the impact of the proposed access road options on amenity and recreation assets, such as Kenton Hills.</b>	<p>SZC Co. have sought to minimize the impacts of the Sizewell C Project on amenity and recreation, including footpaths. The impacts in this regard are assessed in detail in <b>Chapter 15</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3) and within the <b>Recreational Strategy</b> appended to the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>A range of mitigation proposals are set out in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) to minimise the effects on Public Rights of Way (PRoW) users including diversion proposals and enhancements in the local area, such as within the Kenton Hills car park.</p>	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the impact of construction</b>	<p>SZC Co. have sought to minimize the impacts of the Sizewell C Project on amenity and recreation, including footpaths. The impacts in this regard are assessed in detail in <b>Chapter 15</b> of</p>	Y

Theme: Amenity and Recreation			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	materials on amenity and recreation assets such as the pollution of spoil heaps near footpaths.	<b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3) and within the <b>Recreational Strategy</b> appended to the <b>Environmental Statement</b> . Further mitigation measures can be found within the <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11).	

Theme: Historic Environment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Heritage Assets	<b>Concern about the impact of the overall development proposals on heritage assets and their setting, such as listed buildings including Leiston Abbey.</b>	SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the Sizewell C Project, including on designated heritage assets such as Leiston Abbey.  Where possible, impacts are proposed to be avoided or reduced by design or by embedded mitigation measures such as screening.  Where required, additional mitigation will take the form of agreed schemes of archaeological investigation or s106 commitments.  Please see <b>Chapters 16</b> and <b>23</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> and <b>Chapter 4</b> of <b>Volumes 3-9</b> , the historic environment chapters, of the	Y

Theme: Historic Environment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3 to 6.10) for full details.	

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Hydrological Processes	<b>Concern about the impact on hydrology and waterbodies and the increase in flood risk from construction materials due to water discharge and run-off from the site.</b>	<p><b>Chapter 19 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3) includes a thorough assessment of the water environment, considering the existing and predicted conditions in relation to groundwater, surface water and drainage. The flood risk associated with the development has been addressed in the <b>Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p> <p>The <b>Flood Risk Assessment</b> (a requirement of the planning process) addresses all sources of flooding. This includes the fluvial flooding on the River Minsmere and Leiston Drain.</p> <p>Construction in the floodplain will change the hydrology and the assessment has been designed to understand the impacts and risk (to receptors including people, property and habitats). The assessment considers risk in relation to depth, flow velocity and hazard. Overall the increase in flood risk is not considered to be</p>	Y

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>significant.</p> <p>The management of stormwater, both in volumetric and quality terms, is proposed through the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b> at <b>Volume 2, Appendix 2A</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> and assessed in <b>Chapter 19</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement (ES)</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Water Supply	<b>Concern about the impact of an increase in people to the area on water supply and the availability of water for local people, whilst it is being used for construction and worker residences.</b>	<p>SZC Co. is in dialogue with both the Environment Agency and Essex and Suffolk Water to establish a supply of potable water during construction and in the long-term.</p> <p>Essex and Suffolk Water is carrying out technical work to understand the available potable water in the system and options that can be developed to meet the construction timescale. At the same time SZC Co. is looking at the opportunities for minimising water use and taking learning from Hinkley C to maximise opportunities and embed these into working practices and design at the earliest stage.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the <b>Water Supply Strategy</b> in <b>Appendix K</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Hydrological Processes	<b>Concern about the impact of construction and</b>	The impacts in this regard are assessed in detail in <b>Chapter 19</b> Groundwater and Surface Water of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). Mitigation measures	Y

Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>infrastructure (e.g. the access road) on hydrological processes, drainage and waterbodies including lakes and rivers, such as the blockage of the Sizewell Marshes drainage corridor and Minsmere Levels.</p>	<p>are set out in this chapter and within the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>The development has the potential to impact on the local hydrology and movement of groundwater.</p> <p>The groundwater dewatering operation during early construction at the main development site will take place within a subsurface low permeability cut-off wall. Further information is provided within the <b>Monitoring and Response Strategy</b> provided in <b>Volume 2, Appendix 19A</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> <p>The proposal to realign the Sizewell Drain is assessed in this chapter and further described in <b>Volume 2, Appendix 19C</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b></p> <p>Modelling indicates that impacts on groundwater levels are <b>not significant</b>. Mitigation is described in this chapter and the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11). The residual risk is not considered to be significant.</p>	
Hydrological Processes	<p><b>Concern about the increased flood risk and impact of</b></p>	<p>The flood risk associated with the development has been addressed in the <b>Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> (Doc Ref. 5.2) and summarised in <b>Chapter 19</b></p>	Y



Theme: Groundwater and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>flooding inland and on hydrology e.g. <b>Minsmere Sluice and the River Leiston flooding.</b></p>	<p>of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The development of the approach to these assessments and the supporting modelling has been discussed in detail with key stakeholders including the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The flood risk to the development has been assessed in relation to all forms of flooding and designed to be safe and operable under foreseeable conditions, also taking account of Climate Change and rising sea levels.</p> <p>The impacts on flood risk from the development have been lessened through design development where avoidance has not been possible. Designs have been developed to minimise impacts to receptors including properties and habitats.</p> <p>A number of mitigation measures have been included within the design proposals and are set out in the <b>Sizewell C Main Development Site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> (Doc Ref. 5.2), <b>Chapter 19</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p>	

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Marine Ecology	<b>Concern about impact of the proposed development on coastal ecology and habitats, such as Suffolk Shingle Beaches County Wildlife Site, and damage to marine life.</b>	<p>Sizewell C will be ‘direct-cooled’ which means that it will abstract sea water from Sizewell Bay before returning it back to the same location at a warmer temperature (+11°C) having been used to cool the power station steam condensers.</p> <p>Our assessments have been made in-line with best practice issued by the Environment Agency and show that the ‘thermal plume’ will not adversely affect the marine ecology. To abstract and return the cooling water, 4 large intake head structures and 2 large outfall head structures need to be placed on the seabed.</p> <p>Construction would require the area of each head to be dredged prior to placement of the heads themselves and connection to the tunnels that run back to shore 10s of metres below the seabed. Our assessments have shown that the dredging and installation of the heads will create some minor suspension of sediment (from dredging), loss of an insignificant amount of seabed where the heads are placed and some short-term, insignificant increases in underwater noise from piling.</p> <p>When operating, the cooling water infrastructure will draw in fish and other marine organisms as there is no available means to prevent this. However, mitigation in the form of a special intake head design and a fish recovery and return (FRR) system will</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>significantly reduce the number of fish captured and return to sea alive (respectively).</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapters 21</b> and <b>22</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	
Coastal Processes	<p><b>Concern that the proposed development may increase coastal erosion on a coastline that is already susceptible and vulnerable to erosion.</b></p>	<p>We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is part of a changing coastline and our assessments have investigated the potential impact of the proposed power station. We have also had to assess the impacts of a potentially changing shoreline on the safety of the power station. We have a long history of coastal studies in this area as part of the ongoing shoreline management group of the adjacent power station (Sizewell B) and have a good understanding of the local system.</p> <p>Using our own studies and the opinions of independent experts our assessments show that the construction and operation of the proposed power station will not have a significant impact on coastal process to the north or south of the site. The coastal defences have been designed to allow for erosion, with sediment lost from the soft coastal defence being replaced. The presence of the hard (rock armour) sea defence will serve to restrict erosion at the north of the site some way towards Minsmere.</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> .	
Coastal Processes	<b>Concern about the dangers of building a power station on an eroding coastline, as evidenced by a collapse at Thorpeness and erosion at Dunwich and storm surges.</b>	<p>We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is part of a changing coastline and our assessments have investigated the potential impact of the proposed power station. We have also had to assess the impacts of a potentially changing shoreline on the safety of the power station. We have a long history of coastal studies in this area as part of the ongoing shoreline management group of the adjacent power station (Sizewell B) and have a good understanding of the local system.</p> <p>Using our own studies and the opinions of independent experts our assessments show that the construction and operation of the proposed power station will not have a significant impact on coastal process to the north or south of the site. The coastal defences have been designed to allow for erosion, with sediment lost from the soft coastal defence being replaced. The presence of the hard (rock armour) sea defence will serve to restrict erosion at the north of the site some way towards Minsmere.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		the <b>Environmental Statement</b> .	
Costal Processes Assessment	<b>Comments about the lack of assessment of coastal process impacts, for example, no evidence to be able to assess the magnitude, geographical and timescale extent of impacts.</b>	<p>We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is part of a changing coastline and our assessments have investigated the potential impact of the proposed power station. We have also had to assess the impacts of a potentially changing shoreline on the safety of the power station. We have a long history of coastal studies in this area as part of the ongoing shoreline management group of the adjacent power station (Sizewell B) and have a good understanding of the local system.</p> <p>We have used Expert Geomorphological Assessment, with independent specialists, to make the very best, robust assessment of (a) how the local coast might evolve without the proposed development and (b) how it might evolve with the proposed development. Our assessments have investigated the potential impacts of, and coastal reaction to, both natural process and those exerted by the presence of the station over the lifetime of the development. We will need to monitor coastal processes and potential impacts (and mitigate if necessary) through the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20 of Volume 2</b> of</p>	Y

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).	
Coastal Processes Mitigation	<b>Concerns that the impacts of the development on coastal processes have not been adequately mitigated against, and suggestions for robust ongoing monitoring of coastal change and adequate safety margins for proposed defences.</b>	<p>We recognise that the coastline adjacent to the proposed development is part of a changing coastline and our assessments have investigated the potential impact of the proposed power station. We have also had to assess the impacts of a potentially changing shoreline on the safety of the power station. We have a long history of coastal studies in this area as part of the ongoing shoreline management group of the adjacent power station (Sizewell B) and have a good understanding of the local system.</p> <p>We have used Expert Geomorphological Assessment, with independent specialists, to make the very best, robust assessment of (a) how the local coast might evolve without the proposed development and (b) how it might evolve with the proposed development. Our assessments have investigated the potential impacts of, and coastal reaction to, both natural process and those exerted by the presence of the station over the lifetime of the development. We will need to monitor coastal processes and potential impacts (and mitigate if necessary) through the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20 of Volume 2</b> of</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Coastal Geomorphology and Surface Water			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	<b>Concern about the impact on Eastbridge residents from the construction materials proposals, especially if storage straddles Eastbridge Road.</b>	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has been committed to minimising construction impacts on the local community.</p> <p>SZC Co. notes the concern in relation to construction materials west of Eastbridge Road. This field was excluded after Stage 2 and no longer forms part of the proposals.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>The DCO application is supported by a <b>Community Impact Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.13). This summarises potential impacts on the local community and proposed mitigation measures which seek to address these, as assessed fully elsewhere in the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Tourism	<b>Concern about the construction materials' impact on tourism, as the visual and pollution impact is likely to dissuade tourists from visiting the area.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognises that tourism is a key strength within Suffolk's economy, and in particular within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which stretches north and south of Sizewell C.</p> <p>Following Stage 2, SZC Co. continued working with partners including local authorities, Suffolk Coast Destination Management Organisation, Visit Suffolk, Visit East Anglia (now Visit East of England), and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to understand and define the tourist sector and to define the key reasons tourists come to the area, the extent to which the Sizewell C Project could have an impact on the attractiveness of the area for tourists, and the opportunities the Sizewell C Project could bring.</p> <p>Further information – including an assessment of potential significant effects on tourism based on a Tourism Survey undertaken by Ipsos MORI and informed by stakeholders – is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3) and the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	Y



c. Rail Improvement Options

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Rail Strategy	<b>Challenges to the assumptions and estimations made in the rail transport proposals, for example whether the East Suffolk line can accommodate the proposed amount of freight and taking into account loading restrictions, line speeds and passenger services.</b>	<p>Network Rail have undertaken detailed feasibility studies to confirm the interventions required to deliver additional capacity to operate freight trains on the East Suffolk line. This work has fed in to the proposals presented at consultation. Freight trains will operate around the passenger service and not require any timetable changes as a result.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.2), the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Further Information	<b>Requests for more information about the rail transport proposals, such as greater detail of potential impacts on the rail line and evidence to show</b>	Any work proposed on the rail network is managed through the Network Rail ‘Governance for Railway Investment Projects’ (GRIP) process. The different stages run through feasibility, option selection, detailed design and construction. All proposals presented for the Sizewell C Project have been through the feasibility stage of this process. This takes into account the existing passenger service, the operational restrictions on the rail line, available rail capacity with regard to	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	that the rail proposals are achievable.	the feasibility of moving materials on the rail network and the necessary interventions required to facilitate this. Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3), the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Rail Strategy	<b>Comments saying that rail transport is needed to reduce the amount of construction traffic using the local roads.</b>	<p>The use of rail to transport materials to the construction site is a key element of the proposals and SZC Co. therefore support the recognition of the need for this.</p> <p>Following Stage 2 consultation, Stage 3 set out two freight delivery options for the Sizewell C Project; a rail-led and road-led option. Both options included the movement of freight by both road and rail, with the road-led option allowing for up to 30% of materials to be moved by rail, and the remaining 70% by road (construction materials by weight). The rail-led then allowed for 45% by rail and 55% by road. These two options were consulted on at Stage 3 consultation.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3), the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Rail Strategy	<b>Suggestions for the previously proposed 'red rail' route instead of the proposed route, to reduce the harm to Leiston Abbey.</b>	<p>A wide range of views were expressed in relation to the three rail extension route options, with no clear preference emerging. Those favouring the red rail route tended to consider that because it was the shortest of the routes, it would have the least effect on surrounding countryside. However, some raised concerns over the potential for noise and vibration impacts arising from freight trains passing through Leiston.</p> <p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>SZC Co. reached a view that the blue and red rail route</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>options should not be considered further and the green rail route option and rail terminal were retained for further consultation.</p> <p>The green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Rail Strategy	<b>Criteria for the rail transport proposals, that the maximum of materials should be delivered by rail, with only a minimal amount on the roads, for</b>	SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>example by extending the rail line into the main development site.</p>	<p>attach to each issue.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>As part of the <b>Integrated Transport Strategy</b>, rail transport would be used to move construction material to build the Sizewell C Project. The <b>Integrated Strategy</b>, including the green rail route, allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The key benefits of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b></li> </ul>	

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Once the construction of Sizewell C is complete, the green rail route would be removed and the land restored. Please refer to <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10) for further details.</p>	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the rail transport proposals, that land required should be recovered after use as much as possible.</b>	A DCO requirement is proposed to require all temporary buildings and structures to be removed from the main development site and for the land to be restored. The design details of the landscape restoration would then be secured by a separate DCO requirement.	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the rail transport proposals, that local and expert opinion should be taken into consideration.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>Since Stages 3 and 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>• Reduction in HGV movements: the Integrated Strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the transport impacts from the scheme. Mitigation has been proposed where necessary and the scheme designs have retained access to residential properties. For example, at the A12/A144 junction proposals, access to Stone Cottage was modified to suit the new junction layout. This and all other highway scheme designs have been subject to a Stage 1 safety audit that has been submitted to Suffolk County Council and forms part of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	
Buckleswood Road	<b>Concern about access issues for the temporary rail extension option, primarily the closure of</b>	As set out in the Site Selection Report, provided in <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), further to the consultation responses, SZC Co. concluded that the disruption and inconvenience to the public through the closure of Buckleswood Road to motor vehicles	Y



Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>Buckleswood Road and associated traffic impacts.</b>	<p>(including for delivery and emergency access) made the footbridge option less suitable than Option 2 (a level crossing).</p> <p>Whilst the level crossing would cause some short delays during periods when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements are likely to be spread throughout the day. SZC Co. held initial discussions with representatives of the Office of Rail Regulation (now the Office of Rail and Road) on this issue, who confirmed the potential acceptability of a new temporary level crossing.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 2 of Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about air quality, dust, light pollution and noise and vibration impacts from the temporary rail extension option, as the route would run close to properties.</b>	<p>The impacts of the development will be mitigated by the measures outlined in the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), which includes dust management measures to minimise the spread of dust as well as a range of measures which would be implemented to minimise the potential impacts to both surface and ground waters.</p> <p>Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 12 of Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the environmental and ecology impacts of the temporary rail extension, from disturbance to wildlife habitats due to pollution and construction, including rare bat roosts.</b>	<p>The green rail route would cross improved pasture and arable areas of relatively low value to wildlife, avoiding areas of woodland and almost all mature trees.</p> <p>There would be some loss and severance of hedgerows but there would be no significant effects on wildlife and no roosts of rare bat species would be impacted. The green rail route, unlike the previous Red Rail Route, avoids the habitat creation at Aldhurst Farm and minimises the environmental impacts of construction and operation of the temporary rail extension compared to the alternative longer Blue Rail Route.</p> <p>The ecological effects of the green rail route are assessed in <b>Chapter 7 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10) and mitigation measures are embedded within the proposals to ensure that impacts on protected species are minimised.</p>	Y
Heritage Impact	<b>Concern about the heritage asset impacts on the setting of Leiston Abbey from the temporary rail extension option.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the Sizewell C Project, including on the setting of Leiston Abbey.</p> <p>Impacts are proposed to be reduced through retention of established vegetation and appropriate landscape proposals, as well as best practice noise mitigation</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>measures. Additional mitigation would also be provided in the form of a Section 106 agreement to provide for enhancements to the visitor experience to allow perceptual aspects on the asset to be better appreciated.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Tourism Impact	<p><b>Concern about the impacts on local businesses, tourism and the local economy from the temporary rail extension option due to damage to farmland, the Leiston Abbey Site and the closure of Buckleswood road preventing access to businesses.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. recognises that tourism is a key strength within Suffolk’s economy, and in particular within the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which stretches north and south of Sizewell C. A Tourism Fund would be provided to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast. Further information on potential significant effects on tourism based on a Tourism Survey undertaken by Ipsos MORI and informed by stakeholders is contained in <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Impacts on Leiston Abbey are proposed to be reduced through retention of established vegetation and appropriate landscape proposals, as well as best practice noise mitigation measures. Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Subsequent to Stage 2, SZC Co. further investigated options at Buckleswood Road, which confirmed that a level crossing at the green rail route was feasible. The closure of the road was therefore not in the Stage 3 proposals, which included a level crossing that would retain access for local businesses.</p> <p>EDF and their agents continue to engage with landowners concerning accommodation works in order to minimise impact on holdings as far as possible.</p> <p>SZC Co. is committed to negotiating voluntary agreements with landowners for the relevant interests in land and is continuing to pursue this objective. However, SZC Co. requires the power to compulsorily acquire interests.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and pest practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.	
Safety	<b>Concern about the safety impacts from the temporary rail extension option, from additional rail crossings for new rail lines impacting emergency services.</b>	<p>SZC Co. worked closely with Network Rail to identify a safe and deliverable solution to maximise the amount of freight transported by rail.</p> <p>The options provided at Stage 3 presented the most feasible solutions to mitigate impacts from the construction and operation of the temporary green rail route in association with the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Both the B1122 (Abbey Road) and Buckleswood Road would remain available for access. Whilst the level crossings would cause some short delays during periods when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements would predominantly be at night.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 2 of Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The options presented at both Stages 3 and 4 for Buckleswood Road were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that part of Buckleswood Road to be stopped up to vehicular traffic with the construction of a new footbridge connecting the intersected parts of Buckleswood Road (Option 1); or</li> <li>• no stopping up of the road but with a new level crossing on Buckleswood Road (Option 2).</li> </ul> <p>The consultation feedback raised concerns over the visual impact of the proposed footbridge connecting the two parts of Buckleswood Road, but feedback from Summerhill School in particular raised safety concerns regarding the closure of Buckleswood Road. The school stated that Buckleswood Road was a vital route for the emergency services when travelling between the school and Ipswich Hospital.</p> <p>There were also concerns raised regarding the disruption that short-term closures of the level crossing option would entail. Whilst the level crossing would cause some short delays during periods when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train</p>	

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as the majority of train movements are likely to be at night.</p> <p>The choice of options for Buckleswood Road was based on the views of local residents as well as advice from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) team.</p> <p>As Buckleswood Road is not a heavily trafficked road (both by car and non-motorised users), the need for a significant structure like the proposed footpath was considered to be unnecessary, having a greater visual impact on the area.</p> <p>It was therefore considered that the level crossing option was more appropriate in the circumstances and would have less disruption for users of Buckleswood Road.</p> <p>The <b>Integrated Transport Strategy</b> introduced at Stage 4, and being carried forward as part of the Sizewell C DCO submission, would not require the large number of level crossing interventions necessary for the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b>, and closures and upgrades on the East Suffolk line are no longer proposed, informed by risk assessment work undertaken by Network Rail.</p>	

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Rail Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the temporary rail extension, that it would benefit the development by being closer to the main development site, so that materials can be taken as close as possible to the site.</b>	<p>The use of rail to transport materials to the construction site is a key element of our proposals.</p> <p>Following Stage 2 consultation, Stage 3 set out two freight delivery options for the Sizewell C Project; a rail-led and road-led option. Both options included the movement of freight by both road and rail, with the road-led option allowing for up to 30% of materials to be moved by rail, and the remaining 70% by road (construction materials by weight). The rail-led then allowed for 45% by rail and 55% by road. These two options were consulted on at Stage 3 consultation.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 4</b> of <b>Volume 1</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.2), the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Rail Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the lack of land take and use of the east of Eastlands</b>	SZC Co. welcome the positive comments which recognise the lack of land take associated with the temporary rail extension.	N



Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>Industrial Estate for the temporary rail extension proposal.</b>	<p>SZC Co. have worked closely with Network Rail throughout the Sizewell C Project, including on timetable studies and infrastructure design, and as described in Network Rail’s stage 3 and 4 consultation responses, will continue to work closely to deliver the changes required to deliver the integrated transport strategy.</p> <p>The rail spur consulted upon at Stage 4 consultation was chosen as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. Longer trains are able to remove more freight from roads. Further details are set out in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 6</b> and <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Rail Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the long-term legacy benefits of the temporary rail extension option to serve the local community, as well as new level crossings.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcome the positive comments associated with the temporary rail extension.</p> <p>The green rail route would be removed and land reinstated when it is no longer required. However, there would still be junction improvements where the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line meets the East Suffolk line, to allow for a faster, quieter and more reliable transfer of trains between the lines.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The eight level crossing upgrades on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch, and a replacement of the branch line track, would be permanent improvements to the line. Therefore, the line would be left in an improved state as a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapters 2 and 3 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Rail Strategy	<p><b>Suggestions for the temporary rail extension proposals, for example that it should avoid closing roads and that Option 2 should be used in addition to Option 1.</b></p>	<p>The choice of options for Buckleswood Road was based on the views of local residents as well as advice from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) team.</p> <p>As Buckleswood Road is not a heavily trafficked road (both by car and non-motorised users), the need for a significant structure like the proposed footpath was considered to be unnecessary, having a greater visual impact on the area.</p> <p>It was therefore considered that the level crossing option was more appropriate in the circumstances and would have less disruption for users of Buckleswood Road.</p> <p>Both the B1122 (Abbey Road) and Buckleswood Road would remain available for access. Whilst the level crossings would cause some short delays during periods</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements would predominantly be at night.</p> <p>Further details are contained in <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impacts	<b>Concern about air quality and dust resulting from the new, temporary rail terminal option, from gantry crane use and unloading bulk materials.</b>	<p>The impacts of the development will be mitigated by the measures outlined in the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), including dust management measures to minimise the spread of dust which would be important in any areas where bulk materials are unloaded from trains, particularly at the temporary rail terminal option at the LEIEE.</p> <p>Under the <b>Integrated Transport Strategy</b>, the temporary rail terminal option would be replaced later by a rail terminal within the temporary construction area on Goose Hill which is relatively remote from housing.</p>	N
Ecology Impacts	<b>Concern about the wildlife and ecology impacts on sensitive habitats from pollution, vibration and general</b>	<p><b>Chapter 14</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) has identified a number of mitigation measures.</p> <p>These have been included within the design proposals and</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>disturbance of the new, temporary rail terminal option.</b>	the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11), a number of the mitigation measures relate to the green rail route and the temporary rail terminal. These include the use of top spoil bunds along the route alignment to minimise noise spill and a range of measures in the <b>CoCP</b> to minimise the risks to surface and groundwaters.	
Community Impact	<b>Concern about the impacts on local residents, including traffic and disturbance to Leiston, from the new, temporary rail terminal option.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact of noise from the Sizewell C Project. <b>Chapter 4 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes an assessment of noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment for the main development site considers the impact on ecological receptors, including bats and birds, as well as residential and other sensitive receptors such as users of public rights of way, or Leiston Abbey.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6), and includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Boundary treatments, including acoustic fences and landscape bunds to screen impacts.</li> <li>- Construction noise management and monitoring</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>measures to control impacts arising from construction activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of new foraging land for marsh harriers that may be affected by noise generated from the main development site construction.</li> </ul> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 11 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Environmental Impact	<p><b>Concern about land take required for the new, temporary rail terminal option, for example by using land which could be used alternative for the caravan accommodation.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. is progressing with the rail spur option consulted</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>upon at Stage 4 as this provides equal ability to mitigate potential adverse effects, whilst allowing longer trains to be delivered into LEEIE. This option does involve a larger land take but would not follow the existing rail alignment adjacent to Eastlands Industrial Estate and instead involves a spur, which is further from many of the existing properties.</p> <p>Project accommodation (including a caravan site) would be located close to the main development site. This is part of a considered, balanced strategy developed through consultation to deliver Sizewell C Project efficiencies and attract a high quality workforce, while reducing effects on local housing markets and transport networks.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Landscape and Visual Impact	<b>Concern about the light pollution and noise and vibration impacts resulting from the new, temporary rail terminal option and the disturbance to people, including those living</b>	<p>A number of mitigation measures have been included within the design proposals and the <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11).</p> <p>A number of these relate to the green rail route and the temporary rail terminal. These include the use of top spoil bunds along the route alignment to minimise both noise spill and visual impacts.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	in the caravan accommodation.	<p>There is also a range of measures in the <b>CoCP</b> to minimise the noise impacts to residents in Leiston in other nearby properties. These include boundary treatments such as screening and earth bunds to minimise noise spill, a <b>Lighting Management Plan</b> which defines measures to minimise light spill. These measures will also benefit construction workers in the caravan park accommodation.</p> <p>Further details are contained in <b>Chapter 4</b> of <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref.10).</p>	
Rail Strategy	Concern that the new, temporary rail terminal option would not avoid 'double handling', and the depositing of materials into a terminal would not reduce traffic.	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	
Rail Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the new, temporary rail terminal,</b>	SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.	Y



Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>in that reduces impact on the village, including the amount of traffic on Lover’s Lane and the use of two level crossings in Leiston.</p>	<p>SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>• Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b></p>	

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.	
Rail Strategy	<b>Positive comments about reduced environmental and landscape impact and use of agricultural land for the new, temporary rail terminal option, as the proposed land for this option would be used anyway whereas Option 1 would run through unused agricultural land.</b>	<p>In response to these comments, the green rail route was taken forward to Stage 3 consultation because it has less overall effect on agricultural land than either the blue or red route options. The blue route is significantly longer than the green and would therefore impact a greater amount of agricultural land. Whilst the red route is shorter than the green route, it would require significant earthworks and would have a greater effect on the surrounding landscape. The green rail route is proposed as part of the integrated strategy under the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Air Quality	<b>Concern about air quality impacts of the rail transport proposals, for example that diesel and coal-fired locomotives can cause high levels of sulphur dioxide.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact on air quality from the Sizewell C Project, including from pollution, and dust and emissions impacts during the construction phase.</p> <p><b>Chapter 5, Air Quality, of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes the assessment of air quality impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network. The air quality, and associated impact assessments considers the impact on residential receptors as well as ecological receptors.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified and are detailed in the <b>Environmental Statement</b>. No significant effects are predicted to arise from vehicle emissions.</p>	Y
Amenity and Recreation	<b>Concern about impacts on amenity and recreation from the rail transport proposals, such as the diversion of Leiston footpaths 6 and 10.</b>	<p>The green rail route would require a number of footpaths to be closed and diverted during the construction and operation of the green rail route.</p> <p>Footpath E-363/006/0, E-363/010/0 and E-363/003/0 would be diverted to a suitable route aimed to minimise the disruption caused by closures. The footpaths would be reopened on the original alignment, unless agreed otherwise</p>	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>with the relevant planning authority, following construction of SZC.</p> <p>Further are contained in <b>Chapter 8</b> Amenity and Recreation, of <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Environmental Impact	<p><b>Concern about the environmental impact resulting from the rail transport proposals, for example on the Outer Thames Estuary Special Protection Area and the heritage coast.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. noted that the different rail options give rise to different efficiencies in the construction of the Sizewell C Project as well as different environmental effects. No option would meet all project requirements whilst avoiding giving rise to any significant environmental impacts. In this context, SZC Co. formed an overall judgement on the respective merits of each option and the relative weight to attach to each issue.</p> <p>SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	
Heritage Impact	<b>Concern about the potential impact on</b>	The proposed location of the passing loop was based on modelling by, and advice from, Network Rail who considered	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>heritage and the historic environment from the location of the passing loop.</b></p>	<p>this to be the optimum location to allow for increased freight capacity on the East Suffolk Line.</p> <p>However, as set out in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), SZC Co. have concluded that the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> would not be deliverable as Network Rail may not be able to deliver the extent of improvement works necessary to the East Suffolk line to a timescale that would fit in with SZC Co.’s programme for the Sizewell C Project. The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> proposed at Stage 4 sought to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application. The upgrades on the East Suffolk line, including the passing loop, are therefore not part of the proposed development set out within the DCO application.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	
Noise and Vibration	<p><b>Concern about the noise and vibration impacts from the rail</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact of noise from the Sizewell C Project. <b>Chapter 4</b> of <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10) includes an</p>	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>transport proposals, from the trains engine, movement, unloading and impacts on people and wildlife.</b></p>	<p>assessment of noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main developments site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network.</p> <p>The noise impact assessment for the main development site considers the impact on ecological receptors, including bats and birds, as well as residential and other sensitive receptors such as users of public rights of way, or Leiston Abbey.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been identified in the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6), and includes, but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Boundary treatments, including acoustic fences and landscape bunds to screen impacts.</li> <li>- Construction noise management and monitoring measures to control impacts arising from construction activities.</li> <li>- Provision of new foraging land for marsh harriers that may be affected by noise generated from the main development site construction.</li> </ul> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 11 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Environmental Impact	<p><b>Positive comments about the reduction</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated</b></p>	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>in environmental impact from rail transport compared to the use of road transport.</p>	<p><b>Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3)</p>	



Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Local Community Impact	<b>Concern about the disturbance to the local community resulting from the rail transport proposals, especially those living in close proximity to the proposed line.</b>	<p>SZC Co.'s core objective is to ensure that the Sizewell C Project limits any significant adverse local economic or social impacts, whilst optimising local benefits that directly arise from the construction and operation of the power station.</p> <p>Stage 2 set out the work that would be undertaken to assess these effects, including: assessing the impacts on key public services such as school places, local healthcare services, police and other emergency services; undertaking a health impact assessment; assessing potential negative and positive impacts on tourism; and assessing the impacts on individual communities, including but not limited to Leiston, Theberton and Eastbridge.</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> Socio-economics and <b>Chapter 28</b> Health and Wellbeing of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). A summary of the local environmental effects of the Sizewell C Project on people and communities is contained in the <b>Community Impact Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.13).	
Existing Services	<b>Concern about the impact on existing train services, including the East Coast line from Ipswich to Lowestoft, the Felixstowe to Ipswich line and the East Suffolk line from the rail transport proposals.</b>	<p>The Integrated Strategy seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Safety	<b>Concern about the safety impacts from the rail transport proposals, such as from level crossings and speed of trains and the ability of the</b>	<p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	track to withstand heavy freight trains.	the Sizewell C Project.  Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about the amount of traffic and congestion resulting from the rail transport proposals, due to the closure of level crossings and resultant tailbacks, disruption from longer trains and the creation of rat runs.</b>	The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.  SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.  Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	Y
Community Impact	<b>Positive comments about the reduction in community impact from rail transport and comments that it may benefit the area through long-term legacy benefits and aiding development</b>	Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b> , in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	in the area and improve travel for job opportunities for young people.	<p>is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</li> </ul> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Traffic Flow	Positive comments about the use of rail transport removing traffic and HGVs from local roads.	<p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves. SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</li> </ul> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Local Community Impact	<b>Concern about the disturbance to the local community resulting from the rail transport proposals, especially those living in close proximity to the proposed line.</b>	SZC Co. recognises the concern about the impact of noise from the Sizewell C Project. <b>Chapter 4</b> Noise and vibration, of <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10) includes an assessment of noise impacts arising from the construction and operation of the main development site, including the associated traffic movements on the wider traffic network.	Y

Theme: Other comments and suggestions			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Rail Strategy	<p><b>Other suggestions for rail transport proposals, that night-time use should be minimised and the use of a ‘rolling highway’ system, and that there should be greater use of rail for the transport proposals to be acceptable.</b></p>	<p>Since Stage 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>• Reduction in HGV movements: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	Y

Theme: Other comments and suggestions			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Rail Infrastructure	<b>Suggestions for infrastructure upgrades as part of the rail transport proposals, such as double tracking on the East Suffolk line between Woodbridge and Saxmundham and a passing loop at Wickham Market.</b>	<p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Rail Strategy	<b>Suggestions for improving passenger rail service as part of the rail transport proposals which could then also be used for commuting workers.</b>	<p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report,</p>	Y

Theme: Other comments and suggestions			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Appendix A of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).	

d. Sea Transport Options

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Marine Strategy	<b>Challenges to the assumptions and estimations made in the proposals for sea transport, for example that they may not be practical in handling the bulk of material and may be unreliable due to changing sandbars and weather conditions.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has evaluated the possibility of moving bulk materials and containerised goods by sea or by rail. This has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluating the capability of the options for sea and rail deliveries, including assessment of potential constraints on delivery (e.g. weather and navigational constraints in respect of sea delivery and rail pathing/infrastructure constraints in respect of rail deliveries);</li> <li>assessing the key material requirements that would arise over time during the construction phase, for each key area of the Sizewell C Project build, and from this identifying the periods during which demand for materials is greatest;</li> <li>considering the scope to move each major category of materials by sea and rail, taking account of the nature of the materials and possible supply sources; and</li> <li>consideration of the environmental impact of each of the</li> </ul>	Y



Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>main strategies.</p> <p>Based on the above principles, the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• beach landing facility;</li> <li>• green rail route;</li> <li>• two village bypass; and</li> <li>• Sizewell link road.</li> </ul> <p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Further Information	<b>Suggestions that further studies and assessments are required into the impacts of the sea transport proposals, such as in relation to existing wind farm usage of land and historic seascape assessment.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the Marine Strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment. However, although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal, indivisible loads (AILs). In addition, SZC Co. propose to bring rock armour and containerised equipment and material to site by sea.</p> <p>Our marine navigation assessments fully assess the potential impacts of deliveries by sea to the proposed development on other sea-users. Our assessments, together with the application for a temporary harbour authority during the construction (and, therefore, busiest time for ship movements) show no significant impacts from the proposed development.</p> <p>Although the BLF will be retained throughout the operational phase of the proposed development for delivery of occasionally AILs, it would have removable bridge sections such that normally only the piles would be visible. Existing wind farms</p>	N

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>are geographically distant from the proposed development and no significant impacts are predicted.</p> <p>Further assessment on the marine historic environment was undertaken following Stage 2 but due to the reduction in marine infrastructure following Stage 2, no significant impacts on historic seascape have been identified. Further detail may be found in <b>Chapter 16</b> and <b>Chapter 23</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 24</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Further Information	<p><b>Requests for more information about the sea transport proposals, such as about what material will be seaborne, how it will be policed and more information about access issues.</b></p>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the Marine Strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment. However, although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). In addition, SZC Co. propose to bring rock armour and containerised equipment and material to site by sea.</p> <p>SZC Co. is applying for a temporary harbour empowerment during the construction element when deliveries are being</p>	N

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>made by sea. The temporary Harbour Authority would mean the offshore area immediately in front of the proposed development would legally operate as a harbour area and have a Harbour Master appointed with powers to direct vessels etc. The Harbour Master will manage all deliveries to the construction site.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 24</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and <b>Section 7.2</b> Additional information relating to harbour facilities, of (Book 7).</p> <p>All vessels arriving at the beach landing facility will be thoroughly checked by security and only licensed and reputable contractors will be utilised.</p> <p>In addition, a <b>Community Safety Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.16) has been developed to accompany the application for development consent in consultation with local authorities, emergency services and public services, among other stakeholder groups, to outline the approach to community safety in the area.</p>	
Marine Strategy	<b>Positive comments about sea transport</b>	SZC Co. has evaluated the possibility of moving bulk materials and containerised goods by sea or by rail. This has included:	Y

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>being the least disruptive method of transport and the most efficient at transporting bulk materials, and needs to be used to a maximum extent to reduce the impacts of road and rail transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluating the capability of the options for sea and rail deliveries, including assessment of potential constraints on delivery (e.g. weather and navigational constraints in respect of sea delivery and rail pathing/infrastructure constraints in respect of rail deliveries);</li> <li>assessing the key material requirements that would arise over time during the construction phase, for each key area of the Sizewell C Project build, and from this identifying the periods during which demand for materials is greatest;</li> <li>considering the scope to move each major category of materials by sea and rail, taking account of the nature of the materials and possible supply sources; and</li> <li>consideration of the environmental impact of each of the main strategies.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above principles, the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>beach landing facility;</li> <li>green rail route;</li> <li>two village bypass; and</li> <li>Sizewell link road.</li> </ul>	

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p> <p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Marine Strategy	<b>Suggestions that a further interim consultation is needed when marine structure designs are known, and that the marine option should</b>	<p>Design of offshore infrastructure has evolved since Stage 2 and is reported in the application material.</p> <p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the <b>Marine Strategy</b> was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p>	N

Theme: Need case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>aim to avoid ecology impacts and coastal erosion.</p>	<p>This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site. The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology.</p> <p>Whilst the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). In addition we propose to bring rock armour and containerised equipment and material to site by sea.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Assessment demonstrates that suitable measures will be put in place to ensure that impacts upon ecology and coastal erosion are suitably mitigated.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (Doc Ref. 8.4) appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), <b>Chapter 2</b> Description of the Sizewell C Main Development Site, and <b>Chapter 6</b> Alternatives and Design Evolution of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Site	<b>Alternative suggestions for sea transport, such as using Lowestoft Port or including a ‘coastal’ facility for workers.</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “<i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Sizewell C Project, where cost-effective</i>”. The feasibility of a marine led strategy was therefore considered, but these options were not considered practical or feasible.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (A), appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the sea transport options, that the proposal should be that with the least environmental opinion.</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “<i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Sizewell C Project, where cost-effective</i>”. The feasibility of a marine led strategy was therefore considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a</p>	Y



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>wide jetty. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both jetty options would result in severe underwater noise during construction as a result of the nature of the construction works, and the significant amount of time required to construct the jetty. This noise would likely extend to a radius of several kilometres (km). This would cause significant adverse effects on marine ecology and fisheries, which could only be limited, but not removed by extensive seasonal controls on construction activity, which would greatly extend the construction programme and the commencement of operation of the power station.</li> <li>• The jetty options would result in greater habitat loss associated with the footprint of the piles.</li> </ul> <p>The beach landing facility (BLF) also requires piling, but to a greatly reduced extent, and only in shallow waters which greatly attenuates the radius of underwater noise. The BLF is therefore predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment, shipping and navigation activities compared with either of the jetty options, and would not require removal as it would be retained for use during the operation of the power station.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Whilst the wide jetty option would not have caused permanent change to the shoreline alignment, it would likely have caused greater temporary effects, such as a reduced wave height at the shore, and associated short-term changes to the alignment of the shoreline. Measures to reduce these impacts would significantly increase the overall time taken to construct the power station, would not fully address those impacts, and it could delay the overall construction programme.</p> <p>The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase. SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail. The decision was informed by design development and environmental work, and SZC Co.'s experiences from the construction of Hinkley Point C in relation to the type of material and deliveries needed during construction.</p> <p>A BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted. It will allow for the delivery of AILs throughout the construction phase and during the operational phase, to remove heavy and</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		oversized loads from the road network.  Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (A), appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the sea transport proposals, that the option should maximise the amount of sea deliveries and minimise the amount of road deliveries.</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “<i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Sizewell C Project, where cost-effective</i>”. The feasibility of a marine led strategy was therefore considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both jetty options would result in severe underwater noise during construction as a result of the nature of the construction works, and the significant amount of time required to construct the jetty. This noise would likely</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>extend to a radius of several kilometres (km). This would cause significant adverse effects on marine ecology and fisheries, which could only be limited, but not removed by extensive seasonal controls on construction activity, which would greatly extend the construction programme and the commencement of operation of the power station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The jetty options would result in greater habitat loss associated with the footprint of the piles.</li> </ul> <p>The beach landing facility (BLF) also requires piling, but to a greatly reduced extent, and only in shallow waters which greatly attenuates the radius of underwater noise. The BLF is therefore predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment, shipping and navigation activities compared with either of the jetty options, and would not require removal as it would be retained for use during the operation of the power station.</p> <p>Whilst the wide jetty option would not have caused permanent change to the shoreline alignment, it would likely have caused greater temporary effects, such as a reduced wave height at the shore, and associated short-term changes to the alignment of the shoreline. Measures to reduce these impacts would</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>significantly increase the overall time taken to construct the power station, would not fully address those impacts, and it could delay the overall construction programme.</p> <p>The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase. SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail. The decision was informed by design development and environmental work, and SZC Co.'s experiences from the construction of Hinkley Point C in relation to the type of material and deliveries needed during construction.</p> <p>A BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted. It will allow for the delivery of AILs throughout the construction phase and during the operational phase, to remove heavy and oversized loads from the road network.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Site Selection Report</b> (8.4a), appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the sea transport options, that the proposed infrastructure should be able to handle bulk materials.</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “<i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Sizewell C Project, where cost-effective</i>”. The feasibility of a marine led strategy has therefore been considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the BLF is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the <b>Site Selection Report, Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the sea transport proposals, that whichever option chosen should be temporary only, and be removed to avoid negative legacy issues.</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “<i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Sizewell C Project, where cost-effective</i>”. The feasibility of a marine led strategy was therefore considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both jetty options would result in severe underwater noise during construction as a result of the nature of the construction works, and the significant amount of time required to construct the jetty. This noise would likely extend to a radius of several kilometres (km). This would cause significant adverse effects on marine ecology and</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>fisheries, which could only be limited, but not removed by extensive seasonal controls on construction activity, which would greatly extend the construction programme and the commencement of operation of the power station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The jetty options would result in greater habitat loss associated with the footprint of the piles.</li> </ul> <p>The beach landing facility (BLF) also requires piling, but to a greatly reduced extent, and only in shallow waters which greatly attenuates the radius of underwater noise. The BLF is therefore predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment, shipping and navigation activities compared with either of the jetty options, and would not require removal as it would be retained for use during the operation of the power station.</p> <p>Whilst the wide jetty option would not have caused permanent change to the shoreline alignment, it would likely have caused greater temporary effects, such as a reduced wave height at the shore, and associated short-term changes to the alignment of the shoreline. Measures to reduce these impacts would significantly increase the overall time taken to construct the power station, would not fully address those impacts, and it</p>	



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>could delay the overall construction programme.</p> <p>The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase. SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail. The decision was informed by design development and environmental work, and SZC Co.'s experiences from the construction of Hinkley Point C in relation to the type of material and deliveries needed during construction.</p> <p>A BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted. It will allow for the delivery of AILs throughout the construction phase and during the operational phase, to remove heavy and oversized loads from the road network.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (A), appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Coastal Processes	<b>Concern about the impact on coastal</b>	Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that " <i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the</i>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>processes from the wide jetty option, such as erosion from the slowing of sediment movement, the impacts of dredging and changes to currents and flows.</b></p>	<p><i>Sizewell C Project, where cost-effective</i>". The feasibility of a marine led strategy was therefore considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both jetty options would result in severe underwater noise during construction as a result of the nature of the construction works, and the significant amount of time required to construct the jetty. This noise would likely extend to a radius of several kilometres (km). This would cause significant adverse effects on marine ecology and fisheries, which could only be limited, but not removed by extensive seasonal controls on construction activity, which would greatly extend the construction programme and the commencement of operation of the power station.</li> </ul>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The jetty options would result in greater habitat loss associated with the footprint of the piles.</li> </ul> <p>The beach landing facility (BLF) also requires piling, but to a greatly reduced extent, and only in shallow waters which greatly attenuates the radius of underwater noise. The BLF is therefore predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment, shipping and navigation activities compared with either of the jetty options, and would not require removal as it would be retained for use during the operation of the power station.</p> <p>Whilst the wide jetty option would not have caused permanent change to the shoreline alignment, it would likely have caused greater temporary effects, such as a reduced wave height at the shore, and associated short-term changes to the alignment of the shoreline. Measures to reduce these impacts would significantly increase the overall time taken to construct the power station, would not fully address those impacts, and it could delay the overall construction programme.</p> <p>The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>phase. SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail. The decision was informed by design development and environmental work, and SZC Co.'s experiences from the construction of Hinkley Point C in relation to the type of material and deliveries needed during construction.</p> <p>A BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted. It will allow for the delivery of AILs throughout the construction phase and during the operational phase, to remove heavy and oversized loads from the road network.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (A), appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Marine Ecology	<b>Concern about the impact on the environment, particularly marine ecology, from both jetty options.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the Marine Strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report Document A, appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), and <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
	<p><b>Concern about the landscape and visual impacts of both jetty options, including substantial impact on the AONB.</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “<i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Project, where cost-effective</i>”. The feasibility of a marine led strategy was therefore considered.</p> <p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty.</p> <p>The beach landing facility (BLF) also requires piling, but to a greatly reduced extent, and only in shallow waters which</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>greatly attenuates the radius of underwater noise. The BLF is therefore predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment, shipping and navigation activities compared with either of the jetty options, and would not require removal as it would be retained for use during the operation of the power station.</p> <p>A BLF is now to be the only marine based capacity promoted. It will allow for the delivery of AILs throughout the construction phase and during the operational phase, to remove heavy and oversized loads from the road network.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (A), appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Safety	<b>Concern about the potential safety impacts of the wide and narrow jetty options, such as shipping, hazardous cargo and dockyard risks.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the Marine Strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (Document A) appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Marine Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the bigger size and greater efficiency and ability of the wide jetty option to handle greater loads.</b>	<p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several <b>significant</b> environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the BLF is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Marine Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the reduced environmental impact from the wide jetty option as it would reduce the need for borrow pits and spoil heaps by bringing in material by sea.</b>	<p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the BLF is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Marine Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the reduced impact on local residents from the wide jetty option, due to the reduction in rail and road traffic and because it will be removed after construction.</b>	<p>As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the BLF is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Coastal	<b>Comments</b>	The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Processes	<b>suggesting that the longer and more useful the jetty becomes, the greater its effect on currents and flows.</b>	<p>the proposals when the <b>Marine Strategy</b> was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the Site Selection Report (Document A) appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Beach Landing Facility	<b>Concern about impacts of the beach landing facility option, on the enjoyment of the beach due to visual impact and disruption of access to the beach, harming its use as a recreational space.</b>	<p>PRoW E-363/021/0 on the coast within the main development site would be temporarily closed, and the Suffolk Coast Path and Sandlings Walk would be temporarily diverted inland from Sizewell hamlet to Minsmere Sluice, via Sizewell Gap, Sandy Lane, the new off road bridleway, Eastbridge Road and PRoW E-363/020/0, for periods while the BLF is being constructed. This would also occur during the operation of the BLF for the remainder of the construction phase, although occurrences would be minimised by utilisation of a banksman to allow safe passage of people past the BLF when it is in use, see <b>Figures 15I:4 and 15I:5 in Appendix 15I of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) for further</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		information.	
Beach Landing Facility	<b>Concern about the impact of the beach landing facility on coastal processes by trapping sediment, by forming a hard point and by exposing the coastline to erosion, with consequences to Dunwich, Minsmere Sluice, Thorpeness and Aldeburgh.</b>	<p>The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised scour will occur at the piles but this is not significant. Apart from this, our assessments predict no impact from the beach landing facility on coastal processes; no accretion or erosion and therefore no consequences to Dunwich, Minsmere Sluice, Thorpeness and Aldeburgh.</p> <p>Regardless, SZC Co. will be required to monitor local coastal processes and mitigate any impacts; the monitoring plan and mitigation would include any potential impacts from the beach landing facility.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Beach Landing Facility	<b>Concern about the impact of the beach landing facility on the marine environment, especially as it will</b>	<p>The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised scour will occur at the piles but this is not significant. Our assessments predict no impact from the beach landing facility on marine ecology.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	be permanent.	Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 22</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Beach Landing Facility	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impacts of the beach landing facility on the AONB.</b>	<p>Once constructed, the beach landing facility (BLF) would have relatively limited visual impacts, compared to other marine structures which had previously been considered, including the jetty previously proposed under the marine-led <b>Transport Strategy</b>.</p> <p>The BLF would include a temporary deck structure that can be removed when not in use, leaving minimum visible elements. Fender piles with cross beams and piled mooring dolphins would be located immediately adjacent to the BLF to aid safe berthing. A ramp, which would comprise a short steel constructed bridge (up to 6m in length) would provide a connection to the cross beams. A 5m taper section would then provide a ramp onto the barge. If required, fixed structures in the water (e.g. dolphins or lateral pillars) would be lit. When not in use for extended periods of time, the modular sections of the BLF including the ramp and the taper would be removed. When the BLF deck is removed for storage, several elements would remain and be maintained for the operational life of Sizewell C. These would consist of piling structures and a ground beam connection from the BLF to the access road.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The height of pile projections, including fender piles and mooring dolphins would be up to approximately 1 metre above mean high water tide.</p> <p>The pile and ground beam furthest into the beach would be within the existing dunes and so would typically not be visible.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 13</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Beach Landing Facility	<p><b>Concern about the long-term lifespan of the beach landing facility, that it may become a permanent groyne.</b></p>	<p>The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised (non-significant) scour will occur at the piles and no accretion by acting as a groyne is expected.</p> <p>Regardless, SZC Co. will be required to monitor local coastal processes and mitigate any impacts; the monitoring plan and mitigation would include any potential impacts from the beach landing facility.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Beach Landing Facility	<b>Positive comments about the bigger size and ability of the beach landing facility to handle greater loads, reducing the amount of materials being transported on the roads and resultant traffic impacts.</b>	SZC Co. welcome the positive comments regarding the functionality of the BLF.	Y
Beach Landing Facility	<b>Comments stating that the beach landing facility will be needed as part of the operational phase anyway and will need to be built.</b>	Noted. The BLF is retained for the operation stage of the Sizewell C Project.	Y
Beach Landing Facility	<b>Comments suggesting that the beach landing facility can be used to maximise the potential for sea</b>	SZC Co. has evaluated the possibility of moving bulk materials and containerised goods by sea or by rail. This has included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluating the capability of the options for sea and rail deliveries, including assessment of potential constraints on delivery (e.g. weather and navigational constraints in respect of sea delivery and rail pathing/infrastructure</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>delivery to reduce road transport during construction and operation.</b></p>	<p>constraints in respect of rail deliveries);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• assessing the key material requirements that would arise over time during the construction phase, for each key area of the Sizewell C Project build, and from this identifying the periods during which demand for materials is greatest;</li> <li>• considering the scope to move each major category of materials by sea and rail, taking account of the nature of the materials and possible supply sources; and</li> <li>• consideration of the environmental impact of each of the main strategies.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above principles, the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• beach landing facility;</li> <li>• green rail route;</li> <li>• two village bypass; and</li> <li>• Sizewell link road.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Coastal Processes	<b>Concern about the impact on coastal processes from the sea transport options and potential flood risk to the fragile coastline.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the <b>Marine Strategy</b> was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised (non-significant) scour will occur at the piles and no accretion by acting as a groyne is expected.</p> <p>Regardless, SZC Co. will be required to monitor local coastal processes and mitigate any impacts; the monitoring plan and</p>	N



Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>mitigation would include any potential impacts from the beach landing facility.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Marine Ecology	<b>Concern about the impact on the environment and marine ecology from the sea transport options.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the Marine Strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment, particularly potential impacts on the harbour porpoise population within the Southern North Sea Special Area of Conservation (SAC).</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). The BLF is much less intrusive than a jetty and no significant impacts on marine ecology are predicted from its construction and operation.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 22</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Visual Impact	<b>Concern about the intrusive, disruptive nature and resultant landscape and visual</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the <b>Marine Strategy</b> was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>impact of the sea transport options.</b></p>	<p>As part of this strategy, the jetty option was not taken forward, predominantly due to the potential for significant adverse effects on coastal processes (sediment transport) and on the harbour porpoise population within the Southern North Sea SAC.</p> <p>The jetty would have been a large industrial structure in Sizewell Bay and would have been prominent in a number of sensitive views. A marine-led strategy would have led to a large number of barge movements and unloading operations associated with the jetty.</p> <p>Further details are contained within the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 22 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	<p><b>Concern about the access to the beach</b></p>	<p>A beach landing facility (BLF) crossing the beach is proposed to enable boats to dock and deliver large items during</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>because of sea transport infrastructure and impact on the visual amenity of the beach and its enjoyment as a recreational space.</b></p>	<p>construction and very infrequently during operation. It would be accessed on the landward side via an access road from the main development site. The phasing and programme for the construction of the new sea defences and BLF has been carefully explored to minimise periods of closure and disruption to public access along the coastline. A banksman would be present when construction works and BLF use have potential to disrupt public access, to enable access along the coast for the maximum time possible.</p> <p>During operation of the power station, it is likely that the Coast Path will be temporarily closed for short periods while the BLF is in use. However, a banksman would be present when BLF use has potential to disrupt public access, to minimise temporary closure of the Coast Path. It is envisaged that during operation the BLF would be used very infrequently, every 5 to 10 years. Should the Coast Path need to be closed temporary inland diversions for pedestrians would be provided for the Suffolk Coast Path and the future England Coast Path.</p> <p>Once constructed, the beach landing facility (BLF) would have relatively limited visual impacts, compared to other marine structures which had previously been considered, including the jetty previously proposed under the marine-led <b>Transport</b></p>	

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<b>Strategy.</b>	
Crime	<b>Concern about the potential risk of the sea transport infrastructure being used for smuggling, human-trafficking and other illegal activities.</b>	<p>All vessels arriving at the beach landing facility will be thoroughly checked by security and only licensed and reputable contractors will be utilised.</p> <p>In addition, a <b>Community Safety Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.1) has been developed to accompany the application for development consent in consultation with local authorities, emergency services and public services, among other stakeholder groups, to outline the approach to community safety in the area.</p>	Y
Economic Impact	<b>Concern about the socioeconomic effects of the sea transport infrastructure options due to the loss of tourism from impact to the landscape, beach, recreational sailing and fishing boats.</b>	<p>Following Stage 2, the jetty option was not taken forward, predominantly due to the potential for significant adverse effects on coastal processes (sediment transport) and on the harbour porpoise population within the Southern North Sea SAC.</p> <p><b>Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> sets out potential tourism impacts and measures proposed to avoid, manage and mitigate these. This will include a Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	<p><b>Positive comments about the reduced community, tourism and economy impacts from sea transport, e.g. that the coastal path will be kept open and fewer tourists will be kept away by road traffic.</b></p>	<p>Following Stage 2, the jetty option was not taken forward, predominantly due to the potential for significant adverse effects on coastal processes (sediment transport) and on the harbour porpoise population within the Southern North Sea SAC.</p> <p>However, a beach landing facility remains part of the proposals and a number of other measures are proposed to reduce traffic including using rail and an on-site accommodation campus for 2,400 workers to avoid daily commuting on local roads. For workers living outside the campus, park and rides or direct bussing will be utilised to reduce the number of car movements.</p> <p><b>Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) sets out potential tourism impacts and measures proposed to avoid, manage and mitigate these. This will include a Tourism Fund to promote the area and support the longevity of the very important and diverse tourist economy of the Suffolk Coast.</p>	Y

e. Park and Ride Options

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Comments stating that park and ride schemes are essential to transport workers to the main development site and reduce the number of road journeys overall.</b>	<p>These comments are welcomed. SZC Co. agree that the park and ride schemes are an important part of the overall transport strategy and play a significant role in reducing transport impacts on local communities.</p> <p>Further details of the proposals are contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Concern about the use of the park and ride schemes by workers e.g. how they will be enforced, or that not enough workers will use them.</b>	<p>The geographic distribution of the workforce estimated by the gravity modelling work supports two park and ride developments to help reduce traffic from construction workforce movements. One would intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the south, and one would intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the north. Both park and ride developments would intercept traffic movements from locations west of the A12.</p> <p>The park and ride strategy includes an actively managed parking permit system for the construction workforce. This would limit and control the allocation of permits for the car park</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>on the main development site during construction. Only workers living inside the area bounded by the A12, River Blyth and River Deben (except those living in the Leiston area) would be issued a parking permit. Each worker arriving at the site by car would need a valid parking permit to enter the site, i.e. workers, not vehicles, would be allocated permits. In this way, SZC Co. seeks to eliminate the possibility of workers from outside the area bounded by A12 and the rivers Blyth and Deben driving into the zone, parking at another worker’s house or elsewhere and getting a lift to the site car park. Workers without a parking permit (including those living in the Leiston area) would need to use one of the park and ride sites. Compliance with the <b>Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.8) and its parking strategy would be a requirement of all construction employees and contractors working at the construction site. It would be reinforced through a consenting and management process which would be produced in discussion with the local authorities.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Further Information	<b>Suggestions that further assessment should be taken into</b>	Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. have undertaken a significant amount of further technical assessment work in connection with the Park and Ride proposals. This was to	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the impacts of the park and ride proposals in general.	ensure that the most appropriate and suitably mitigated proposals are delivered.  Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> .	
Further Information	<b>Requests for more information about the park and ride proposals, and comments that the plans are not yet sufficiently detailed, and rules (on who uses the parking sites, for example, local residents who want to use Darsham station, or workers using them rather than travelling on other local roads) do not appear to be 'clear and binding'.</b>	Following the Stage 2 consultation, further design and technical assessment work was undertaken. The park and ride at Darsham will be used by Sizewell C construction workers (and not by local residents wishing to use the Darsham railway station). The park and ride strategy includes an actively managed parking permit system for the construction workforce. This would limit and control the allocation of permits for the car park on the main development site during construction. Only workers living inside the area bounded by the A12, River Blyth and River Deben (except those living in the Leiston area) would be issued a parking permit. Each worker arriving at the site by car would need a valid parking permit to enter the site, i.e. workers, not vehicles, would be allocated permits. In this way, SZC Co. seeks to eliminate the possibility of workers from outside the area bounded by A12 and the rivers Blyth and Deben driving into the zone, parking at another worker's house or elsewhere and getting a lift to the site car park. This will therefore mean that workers will be required to use the park	N



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>and ride facilities.</p> <p>The park and rides will maximise transportation of the construction workforce by bus to the Sizewell C main development site, reducing car trips on the local highway network.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>CWTP</b> (Doc Ref. 8.8), the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the proposed postal consolidation facility as part of the southern park and ride, as it would reduce the number of vehicles driving to the site.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes these comments. The postal consolidation facility would help to reduce traffic by eliminating many Light Goods Vehicle (LGV) movements.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	N
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Challenges to the estimates and assumptions made about the proposed</b>	SZC Co.'s Gravity Model, which estimates the residential location of the peak construction workforce, has informed the required number of car parking spaces at each of the park and ride facilities. Following the Stage 2 consultation, further	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>park and ride locations, including how they will be used, operational capacity assumptions and predicted impacts.</b>	<p>technical assessments were undertaken to determine the most appropriate locations for the park and ride sites.</p> <p>Further information is contained within the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 3</b> Alternatives and Design Evolution, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Challenging the need for the proposed park and rides if the accommodation proposals were improved.</b>	<p>SZC Co.’s Gravity Model, which estimates the residential location of the peak construction workforce, has informed the required number of car parking spaces at each of the park and ride facilities.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Suggestions for alternative locations to the two-proposed</b>	The rationale for the site selection, including justification of why other sites were not progressed, can be found in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>park and ride locations, including the reserve locations, on brownfield sites or one mid-way location.</b>	Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 3 of Volumes 3 and 4 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).	
Southern Park and Ride Suggestion	<b>Suggestions for alternative locations for the southern park and ride site, such as at Martlesham or closer to Campsea Ashe railway station.</b>	The rationale for the site selection, including justification of why other sites were not progressed, can be found in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 3 of Volumes 3 and 4 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Concern about the unsuitability of the local infrastructure to handle the proposed park and ride schemes, and that</b>	Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling to inform the development options to be taken forwards. This has included identifying whether further improvements need to be made to the existing transport network.	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>infrastructure would need upgrading.</b>	<p>Together with the proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that local infrastructure can suitably accommodate the traffic in connection with the park and ride schemes.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Park & Ride Criteria	<b>Criteria for the proposed park and rides, that they should leave legacy benefits for the local community and be able to be used by local people.</b>	<p>Once the need for the park and ride facilities has ceased, the buildings and associated infrastructure, would be removed in accordance with a demolition and restoration plan. This would maximise the potential for re-use of building modules and materials. When the site has been cleared, the area would be returned to agricultural use. This would however not prevent others from applying for planning permission to use the site for alternative uses once the site is no longer needed for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Park & Ride Criteria	<b>Criteria for the proposed park and rides, that the countryside environment should</b>	<p>The proposals have been designed to be sensitive to the setting of the sites, as far as possible.</p> <p>The <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref.</p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>be protected in their development.</b>	6.4 – 6.5) explain the design and mitigation measures which will be put in place to ensure that the park and ride sites are appropriate in landscape and visual impact terms.	
Park & Ride Criteria	<b>Criteria for the proposed park and rides, that the screening and bunding mitigation should be adequate to minimise visual impact.</b>	<p>The proposals will be designed to be sensitive to the setting of the sites, as far as possible.</p> <p>The <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.2) and <b>Chapter 6 of Volumes 3 and 4 of the Environmental Statement</b> explain the design and mitigation measures which will be put in place to ensure that the park and ride sites are appropriate in landscape and visual impact terms.</p>	N
Northern Park & Ride Traffic flow	<b>Concern about access issues for the northern park and ride scheme, particularly the use of the B1122 and impact on local access to local amenities, and that it will add to congestion at Yoxford.</b>	<p>During the Stage 2 consultation two options were proposed to alleviate disruption in Yoxford: a new roundabout or a signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction. There was over three times more support for the roundabout at Stage 2, and this option was carried forward to Stage 3.</p> <p>Whilst both options increased capacity at the junction, micro-simulation (VISUM) modelling showed that the roundabout would result in shorter queues (and less delay) on the A12 and B1122.</p> <p>Stage 3 also included proposals for the Sizewell link road, linking the A12 with the main development site. Vehicles</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>associated with the Sizewell C Project, travelling south on the A12 from the northern park and ride, would bypass Yoxford by taking the B1122 from the proposed Yoxford Roundabout and then access the link road via a new roundabout and branch road, west of Middleton Moor. This would further reduce the impact of the northern park and ride on Yoxford (both the A12 and A1120) and also Middleton Moor and Theberton on the B1122.</p> <p>Vehicles travelling north on the A12 would also bypass Yoxford by joining the link road via a proposed roundabout to the south of Yoxford.</p> <p>The link road was only proposed under the <b>Road-Led Strategy</b> at Stage 3. However, under the ‘integrated’ <b>Transport Strategy</b>, initially proposed at Stage 4 and now proposed under the DCO application, the Sizewell link road forms part of the proposed associated development sites and will mitigate against construction vehicles and worker traffic having to travel through Yoxford from the south.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Northern Park & Ride Infrastructure Impact	<b>Concern about the unsuitability of the local infrastructure to handle the northern park and ride, with the design of the new access route to aim to minimise any delay along the route.</b>	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling to inform the development options to be taken forwards. This has included identifying whether further improvements need to be made to the existing transport network.</p> <p>The DCO application proposes a new roundabout on the A12 situated to the north of the existing Willow Marsh Lane junction. The proposed access road would be the western arm of the proposed roundabout, which would cross the existing Willow Marsh Lane to enter the northern end of the site. A new T-junction would connect the existing Willow Marsh Lane alignment to the access road.</p> <p>There would be a pedestrian route from Darsham railway station along the footway on the A12 to the south-east of the site.</p> <p>Together with the proposed mitigation measures, it is considered that local infrastructure can suitably accommodate the traffic in connection with the park and ride schemes.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental</b></p>	N

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<b>Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).	
Northern Park & Ride	<b>Positive comments about the northern park and ride site being closely connected to the railway line and close to the main development site.</b>	The proposed site at Darsham lies to the west of the A12, to east of the East Suffolk line and to the north of Darsham railway station. This would encourage interchange with rail and potentially reduce traffic on the roads overall.  Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).	N
Southern Park & Ride Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about access issues for the southern park and ride scheme, for example the impact on access for Marlesford traffic onto the A12.</b>	The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) that is part of the DCO submission considers the impact of all elements of the Sizewell C Project proposals on the local road network. The analysis shows no significant impact in accessing the Wickham Market site. Both the site access itself and the nearby B1116/B1078 roundabout would operate well within capacity. Analysis of the junctions immediately north of the site, i.e. A12/Marlesford Road and A12/Bell Lane shows that both continue to operate well within capacity. There would be some increased delay for the right turn out of Bell Lane during the Sizewell C Project construction but the low demand would not necessitate mitigation.	N
Southern Park & Ride	<b>Concern about the proposed southern</b>	The Wickham Market site is described in <b>Environmental Statement Volume 4</b> (Doc Ref. 6.5). The site located so as to	N



Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Location	<b>park and ride site being too far away from the main development site.</b>	reduce traffic impacts on a significant part of the local road network, particularly through Marlesford, Little Glemham, Stratford St Andrew and Farnham as the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) indicates. Sites closer to the main construction site would not relieve the local road network to the same extent.	
Southern Park & Ride	<b>Concern about the unsuitability of the local infrastructure to handle the southern park and ride, and comments that infrastructure would need upgrading, such as making additional sections of the A12 dual carriageway.</b>	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling to inform the development options to be taken forwards. This has included identifying whether further improvements need to be made to the existing transport network.</p> <p>On the A12 northeast of Wickham Market it is proposed to reduce two lanes to one before the northbound slip road joins the A12 (to avoid the A12 reducing from three lanes of traffic to one). It is proposed to request that Suffolk County Council (SCC) reduce the speed limit from 60 miles per hour (mph) to 30mph on the B1078 that crosses the A12 northeast of Wickham Market.</p> <p>Regarding Wickham Market itself, at Stage 2, some respondents expressed concern about the potential for additional delays and queuing at some times of the day on the westbound B1078 approach to Wickham Market where it</p>	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>crosses the River Deben, unless mitigation is provided. As such, a diversion route north of the village was proposed at Stage 3. Vehicles would be diverted via Valley Road and Easton Road, and over Glevering Bridge.</p> <p>Under this option, presented at Stage 3, SZC Co. would encourage those travelling along the B1078 from locations west of Wickham Market to and from the southern park and ride to use the diversion route instead of the B1078 through the east side of Wickham Market. The Sizewell C Project traffic volumes would be less than 100 vehicles per hour and would not include any buses or HGVs. They would be predominately eastbound in the morning and westbound in the afternoon/evening.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Visual Impact	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impacts from the park and ride infrastructure, such as the position of mounding and the design of the components.</b>	<p>For both park and ride locations, further development of the proposals and detailed landscape and visual assessment has enabled the boundary treatments to be optimised including the extent of planting and the location of any bunds.</p> <p>Further information is contained within <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	Y
Park & Ride Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the park and ride schemes' impact on the rural feel and character of the local area.</b>	<p>For both park and ride locations, further development of the proposals and detailed landscape and visual assessment has enabled the designs to be refined and landscape planting to be used to help screen the development from the most sensitive views.</p> <p>Once the construction of Sizewell C is complete, the park and ride facilities would be removed and the land restored to agricultural use, using top soil stored whilst the park and rides are in operation.</p> <p>Further information is contained within <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Noise and Vibration Impact	<b>Concern about impacts on air quality and noise from the park and rides, including dust, light pollution, noise and vibration from buses and associated infrastructure.</b>	<p>For both park and ride locations, the use of bunds and other boundary treatments, as well as the use of lighting which minimises lateral light spill will minimise the noise and light pollution during the operational phase.</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) includes measures to be implemented during construction of the park and rides, including a <b>Dust Management Plan</b> which defines measures to ensure dust is minimised during construction as well as measures to control noise.</p> <p>Further information is contained within <b>Chapters 4</b> Noise and Vibration, and <b>5</b> Air Quality, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Positive comments that the park and rides will lower the overall levels of pollution from the development.</b>	<p>SZC Co. agrees that the provision of the park and rides will lower overall levels of pollution by preventing workers travelling by car directly to the main development site and consolidating these journeys using buses from the park and ride sites.</p> <p>The park and ride strategy will greatly reduce the number of worker vehicles on local roads with a consequential benefit in reduced vehicle emissions.</p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 5</b> Air Quality, of <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).	
Park & Ride Mitigation	<b>Concern about the lack of mitigation measures proposed for both park and rides, such as the lack of landscape and noise mitigation and lack of protection for bats.</b>	<p>The use of bunds and other boundary treatments (including landscaping and lighting which minimises lateral light spill) will minimise the noise and light pollution during the operational phase.</p> <p>Minimising the noise and light spill will help mitigate the impacts on bats, populations of which are found in the vicinity of both park and ride sites.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 4</b> Noise and Vibration, <b>5</b> Air Quality, <b>6</b> Landscape and Visual, and <b>7</b> Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology, of <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N
Southern Park & Ride Suggestion	<b>Suggestions for all park and ride buildings to be single storey to minimise visual impact.</b>	<p>The park and ride buildings are limited to a single storey and this will help minimise the visibility of structures in their predominantly rural locations.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref.</p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		6.4 – 6.5).	
Northern Park & Ride Heritage Impact	<b>Concern about impact on heritage assets and their setting from the northern park and ride proposals, including the potential for medieval settlement fronting the A12, which should be assessed.</b>	<p>Following Stage 2, a programme of archaeological evaluation was carried out on the northern park and ride site including archaeological geophysical survey and trial trenching. This scope of this was agreed with SCC Archaeological Service who also monitored the fieldwork. This identified remains associated both with Romano-British activity and medieval activity.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified on the site.</p> <p>Potential settings impacts have also been assessed but no significant effects have been identified following implementation of landscape design measures, including retention of established vegetation, where possible.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> Historic Environment, of <b>Volume 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b></p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		(Doc Ref. 6.4).	
Southern Park & Ride Amenity and Recreation	<b>Concern about impacts on local amenities and recreation, such as footpaths, from the southern park and ride proposals.</b>	<p>The preliminary assessment of effects identified potential significant effects on amenity and recreation, including on the Public Right of Ways (PRoWs) in close proximity to the site. This has identified the need to mitigate potential impacts on the nearby uses.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 8</b> Amenity and Recreation, of <b>Volume 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.5).</p>	N
Southern Park & Ride Ecology Impact	<b>Concern about impacts on wildlife and ecology from the southern park and ride proposals, as the area contains rich habitat which has not been adequately mitigated against for example by the continued use of hard road surfaces.</b>	<p>The park and ride proposals have been fully informed by the SZC Co.'s ecological assessment work. This has identified the need to mitigate the potential impacts on bats and great crested newts, which are present in adjacent habitats and which will be retained. The footprint of the development is almost entirely arable land which is relatively poor for these species.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Chapter 7</b> Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Southern Park & Ride Hydrology Impact	<b>Concern about the increase in flood risk from the southern park and ride proposals, from the hard surfaces used and existing flood risk to a section of Marlesford Road.</b>	<p>The park and ride sites are subject to Flood Risk Assessment. Although not susceptible to significant flood risk at these locations, it is recognised that hardstanding could increase flows of surface water off-site.</p> <p>Our approach is also combined with a strategic approach to drainage, which seeks to attenuate locally using infiltration as the preferred option whenever possible and to control flows off-site to greenfield run-off rates.</p> <p>For the park and ride sites it is proposed to use swales to manage both the quantities and quality of surface water and to mimic natural infiltration processes.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 12</b> Groundwater and Surface Water, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N
Southern Park & Ride Heritage Impact	<b>Concern about impact on heritage assets and their setting from the southern park and ride proposals, particularly</b>	A programme of archaeological evaluation has been carried out on the southern park and ride site including archaeological geophysical survey and trial trenching. This scope of this was agreed with SCC Archaeological Service who also monitored the fieldwork. This identified remains associated both with the known Romano-British settlement of Hacheston and its Late	N



Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	underground archaeology.	<p>Iron Age precursor.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified on the site.</p> <p>Potential settings impacts have also been assessed but no significant effects have been identified following implementation of landscape design measures.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> Terrestrial Historic Environment, of <b>Volume 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.5).</p>	
Southern Park & Ride Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the impact on the nearby conservation areas from the southern park and ride proposals, including the Special Landscape Area.</b>	Following the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. further developed the park and ride proposals and undertook detailed landscape and visual assessment work. This considered the special landscape area context and the presence of nearby conservation areas. It has enabled the designs to be refined and landscape planting to be used to help screen the development from the most sensitive views.	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).	
Southern Park & Ride Landscape and Visual Impact	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impacts and damage to the ‘rural feel’ of the area from the southern park and ride infrastructure, and suggestions that more landscaping should be provided along the sensitive boundary.</b>	<p>Further development of the proposals and detailed landscape and visual assessment has enabled the design of the southern park and ride to be refined and landscape planting to be used to help screen the development from the most sensitive views.</p> <p>Once the construction of the Sizewell C Project is complete, the park and ride facilities will be removed and the land restored to agricultural use, using topsoil stored whilst the park and ride is in operation.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N
Southern Park & Ride Landscape and Visual Impact	<b>Concern about the type of lighting that will be used and resultant light pollution impacts from the southern park and ride proposals, especially</b>	<p>The use of bunds and other boundary treatments, including landscape boundary treatments, and the use of lighting which minimises lateral light spill will minimise light pollution during the operational phase. Minimising light spill will help mitigate the impacts on night time views and the impacts on local bat populations.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volume 4</b> of the</p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	given the proximity of bats.	<b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.5).	
Southern Park & Ride	<b>Positive comments that the southern park and ride will reduce impact of the development on local heritage assets.</b>	<p>This comment is welcomed. Evaluation trenching has identified some remains associated both with the known Romano-British settlement of Hacheston and its Late Iron Age precursor on the proposed site. However, these are far less concentrated than the extensive archaeological remains suggested by geophysical survey on the Stage 1 site.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified on the site.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> Terrestrial Historic Environment, of <b>Volume 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.5).</p>	N

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Concern about the legacy benefits and future use of the park and ride schemes.</b>	Once the need for the park and ride facilities has ceased, the buildings and associated infrastructure, would be removed in accordance with a demolition and restoration plan. This would maximise the potential for reuse of building modules and materials. When the site has been cleared, the areas would be returned to agricultural use.  Further details can be found in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	N
Impact on Local Community	<b>Concern about the impact on the local economy from the park and ride proposals, from congestion and disruption of the A12 as a main tourist route from London to Lowestoft.</b>	The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 2, Chapter 10</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Transport) (Doc Ref. 6.3) set out the expected A12 traffic increases in the early years and at peak construction. This has highlighted the need for mitigation at Farnham (the two village bypass) and on the junctions with the A1094 and A144. The <b>Transport Assessment</b> describes the impact of the whole Sizewell C project (not just the park and ride sites) around Woodbridge and on A12 journey times in the References Cases, early years and peak construction scenarios for comparison.	Y
Crime	<b>Concern about security issues for the proposed park and ride sites,</b>	SZC Co. is committed to optimizing the safety and security of the Sizewell C Project and SZC Co. anticipate that registration numbers of vehicles entering the park and ride sites would be recorded, primarily for security purposes.	N

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	particularly for residents living nearby.	The Sizewell C Project will also implement measures to encourage good worker behaviour including mandatory drug and alcohol testing and a worker code of conduct. Further details are set out in <b>Chapter 9</b> Socio-economics, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> . In addition, a <b>Community Safety Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.16) has been developed with partners including the local councils and emergency services.	
Park & Ride Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the park and ride schemes in reducing the amount of traffic caused by the development and subsequent speeding, accidents and impacts on local communities. Also, positive economic opportunities such as job creation, infrastructure</b>	<p>These comments are welcomed. The two park and ride sites proposed would intercept construction workers and transport them to site by bus which will help to manage the impact of construction on local communities by reducing traffic movements.</p> <p>Overall, the associated development sites are expected to provide 500 jobs at the peak of construction.</p> <p>Further details can be found in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), <b>Volumes 3</b> and <b>4</b> Northern and Southern Park &amp; Ride, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5), and <b>Chapter 9</b> Socio-Economics, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	improvements and long-term legacy benefits.		
Northern Park & Ride Community Impacts	<b>Concern about community impacts from the northern park and ride proposals, such as residential amenity.</b>	<p>These comments are noted. EDF have sought to develop measures to mitigate against amenity impacts on nearby residents and the local community.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 8</b> Amenity and Recreation, of <b>Volume 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	N
Northern Park & Ride Safety	<b>Concern about the safety impacts resulting from the northern park and ride scheme, such danger from speeding traffic for pedestrians trying to cross the roads.</b>	<p>Pedestrians would most likely seek to cross the A12 to use Darsham station since other sites, such as the garden centre, have their own parking and would most likely be accessed by car. The Sizewell C Project traffic increase would be lowest on the A12 at the level crossing where pedestrians would seek to cross the A12, since most traffic using the Darsham park and ride is to/from the A12 north of the site. This issue is addressed in <b>Chapter 10</b> in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Northern Park & Ride Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about increases in traffic and congestion on the roads to/around the northern park and ride site</b>	<p>The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) set out the expected traffic increases on these roads in the early years and at peak construction. The northern park and ride accessed was changed to a new roundabout north of Willow Marsh Lane at Stage 3 consultation. The forecast</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	including on the A12, B1122, B1125 and A1120, impacting residents' lives and businesses.	traffic increases are not expected to result in congestion or affect access to local amenities.	
Northern Park & Ride Suggestions	<b>Suggestions for upgrades to Darsham Station as part of the northern park and ride proposals, for legacy benefits.</b>	SZC Co. are required to mitigate the impact of their workers using the station, but this is expected to be a low proportion of the overall construction workforce. SZC Co. will upgrade the pedestrian route from the station to the park and ride site so that workers are provided with appropriate access. Wider improvements, e.g. to station parking, are not related to the Sizewell C Project so could not form part of the DCO proposals.	N
Southern Park & Ride Community Impacts	<b>Concern about community impacts from the southern park and ride proposals including bridleways and access to amenities on the B1116.</b>	The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> (Transport) in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) set out the expected traffic increases on the B1116 in the early years and at peak construction. The forecast increases are small and not expected to affect bridleways or access to local amenities.	N
Southern Park & Ride Safety	<b>Concern about the safety impacts</b>	The access to the southern park and ride site has been subject of a Stage 1 road safety audit, as reported in the	Y

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>resulting from the southern park and ride scheme, such as visibility issues on the B1078.</b></p>	<p><b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). This did not highlight any safety concerns at the access, which has been designed to Suffolk County Council standards. There is no other road safety concern in this area. SZC Co. have identified poor visibility to the right where the A12 southbound exit slip road meets the B1078 south west of the park and ride site. This is caused by the overbridge parapet and could not easily be rectified. At Stage 3, SZC Co. therefore proposed that Suffolk County Council extend the 30mph speed limit across the overbridge to the B1116/B1078 roundabout and will continue to encourage them to do so.</p>	

Theme: Other comments and suggestions			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Park & Ride Suggestions	<p><b>Suggestions for the park and ride proposals, such as the use of automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) technology, route guidance and</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. anticipate that registration numbers of vehicles entering the park and ride sites would be recorded, primarily for security purposes. Construction workers would not be constrained to particular routes given the dispersed nature of their home locations but would need to access the park and ride sites from the A12 since those are the only points of access. Both park and ride sites would be removed when no longer required for the Sizewell C Project construction, as the</p>	N



Theme: Other comments and suggestions			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	consideration of permanent facilities.	DCO requires, so there would not be any permanent facilities at these sites.	

f. Road Improvements – A12

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Road Strategy	<b>Alternative suggestions to the A12 road improvement options, by using greater rail and sea transport to negate the need for road improvements.</b>	The temporary jetty proposed at Stage 2 consultation was ruled out due to environmental impacts. The DCO does include a beach landing facility (BLF) to enable AILs (large loads) to be brought to site by sea. The environmental impacts of the BLF are set out in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). The optimum solution for moving freight by rail is described in <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10). Two trains per day will be taken into the Land to the East of Eastlands Industrial Estate during the early years phase of construction and up to three trains per day taken into the main construction site via the green rail route at peak construction. Additional train movements as presented at Stage 3 consultation did not prove feasible.	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The transport proposals use rail for freight and sea where possible and the impacts are assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Road Strategy	<b>Challenges to the estimates and assumptions made about the A12, and the inadequacy of assessment about impacts on the A12.</b>	<p>The traffic modelling work, including any assumptions made, was set out in <b>Chapter 6</b> of the Stage 2 consultation documents. It reflects engagement with Suffolk County Council, with whom SZC Co. worked to develop the modelling work. The chapter tabulates the Sizewell C Project impacts on daily flows, peak hour flows and changes in HGV and bus volumes at peak construction across a wide study area. This work was developed further and reported at Stage 3 and Stage 4 consultation. Preliminary Environmental Information was also provided at these stages.</p> <p>Further information on how the impacts to local roads were assessed, and what mitigation measures are proposed, can be found in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> Transport of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Mitigation	<b>Comments and concerns about the proposed mitigation (and lack of</b>	The two village bypass (Option 4 at the Stage 2 consultation) was confirmed as the proposed solution at Stage 3, based on several factors including public consultation responses. Further design development was presented at Stage 4 and	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	mitigation) to cope with the A12 traffic impacts and that congestion will just be moved further up the A12.	the scheme forms part of the DCO submission. It is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). The traffic modelling work reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) indicates that this scheme will mitigate the impact of the Sizewell C Project construction traffic. There is no traffic modelling evidence to suggest that it causes congestion further north on the A12.	
Further Information	<b>Requests for more information about impacts and proposals involving the A12, including traffic data and modelling and impacts on ecology.</b>	The traffic modelling work, including any assumptions made, was set out in <b>Chapter 6</b> of the Stage 2 documents. It reflects liaison with Suffolk County Council who SZC Co. worked with to develop the modelling work. The chapter tabulates the Sizewell C Project impacts on daily flows, peak hour flows and changes in HGV and bus volumes at peak construction across a wide study area. This work was developed further and reported at Stage 3 and Stage 4 consultation. Preliminary Environmental Information, including on ecology, was also provided at these stages. The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) provide full information as to the traffic data that is supporting the DCO application and the impacts on ecology.	N
Road Strategy	<b>Comments about the need case for the A12 transport</b>	The need for A12 improvements at Farnham and the proposed options were fully set out at Stage 2. Stage 3 confirmed that the two village bypass was the proposed	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>proposals, including the need for road improvements, even without the impact of the Sizewell C development.</b>	solution and set out that proposal in more detail, including providing Preliminary Environmental Information. Some additional information was provided at Stage 4. The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6) fully document the DCO proposals. Any road improvements needed without the impact of the Sizewell C Project would be the responsibility of Suffolk County Council as local highway authority.	
Road Strategy	<b>Support for the A12 road improvement proposals as long as traffic follows the B1122 route and not the A1094.</b>	Sizewell C buses and HGV would be required to use the A12 and Sizewell link road to travel to and from the main construction site. They would not be permitted to use the A1094 and B1069 to reach the construction site. These proposals form part of the DCO submission and are described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Options	<b>Other suggestions for the A12 road improvements such as building a dual</b>	SZC Co. is required to mitigate the impact of the Sizewell C Project construction and operational traffic on the local road network. The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>carriageway from Wickham Market to Lowestoft.</b>	(Doc Ref. 6.3) considers these impacts and sets out mitigation measures, including the Sizewell link road, two village bypass and numerous junction improvements. The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) demonstrates that the impacts do not justify a dual carriageway from Wickham Market to Lowestoft.	
Alternative Options	<b>Suggestions for an alternative bypass as opposed to the proposed A12 road improvement options, such as a three or four-village bypass.</b>	<p>SZC Co.'s traffic modelling and analysis at Stage 2 indicated that the impact of the Sizewell C Project traffic at Farnham alone requires mitigation. The two village bypass (Option 4 at Stage 2) taken forward into Stage 3, Stage 4 and to the DCO submission also bypasses Stratford St Andrew. This was because it was not possible to re-join the A12 satisfactorily between the two villages as they are contiguous and a one village bypass of Farnham (Option 3 at Stage 2) was not favoured.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is described in <b>Chapter 2</b> Description of the Two Village Bypass, of <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). The Sizewell C impact at Little Glemham and Marlesford does not necessitate mitigation by building a bypass, as indicated in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for proposals involving the A12,</b>	The two village bypass (Option 4 at Stage 2) was confirmed as the proposed solution at Stage 3, based on several factors	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	that the route with the least amount of disruption should be chosen for the development.	including public consultation responses. Further design development was presented at Stage 4 and the scheme forms part of the DCO submission. The proposed scheme is described in <b>Chapter 2</b> Description of the Two Village Bypass, of <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for proposals involving the A12, that local opinion should be taken into account for road improvements.</b>	<p>The A12 options presented at Stage 2 were assessed across a range of factors including evidence of utilities, land ownership, flooding and drainage, topography. These were supplemented with site observations and professional experience. This was complemented by local knowledge from any relevant Stage 1 public consultation responses.</p> <p>In Stage 3, the preferred solution of a two village bypass was presented, together with Preliminary Environmental Information. Public consultation responses to Stage 3 further informed the design developed and presented at Stage 4 and in the DCO submission. The proposals are described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	Y
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for proposals involving the A12, that long-term legacy should be taken into account in the</b>	SZC Co. are required to mitigate the impacts of the Sizewell C Project during construction and operation, as described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). Further development of SZC Co.'s highway proposals to create a long-term A12 legacy would be a matter for Suffolk County	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	development proposals.	Council and Local Highway Authority to address.	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for proposals involving the A12, that traffic flows should be considered in the development proposals.</b>	SZC Co.'s proposals for the A12 have been informed by the traffic modelling work for the early years, peak construction and operational phases of Sizewell C. The traffic forecasts were explained and tabulated at Stage 3 and Stage 4. They are fully reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> (Transport) of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	<b>Comments about the benefit of ‘no change’ or ‘Farnham bend road widening’ option for the A12 road improvements as having the least amount of environmental impact.</b>	The need for A12 improvements at Farnham and the proposed options were explained at Stage 2. The two village bypass (Option 4 at the Stage 2 consultation) was confirmed as the proposed solution at Stage 3, based on several factors including public consultation responses. Further design development was presented at Stage 4 and the scheme forms part of the DCO submission. It is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). The traffic modelling work reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) indicates that this scheme will mitigate the impact of Sizewell C Project construction traffic. Preliminary Environmental Information, was provided at stages 2, 3 and 4. The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) provide full information as to the traffic data that is supporting the DCO application and the impacts on the environment.	N
Air Quality	<b>Concern about the impact on air quality of the ‘no change’ option for the A12 road improvements,</b>	The two village bypass (Option 4 at the Stage 2 consultation) was confirmed as the proposed solution at Stage 3, based on several factors including public consultation responses. Further design development was presented at Stage 4 and the scheme forms part of the DCO submission. It is	N



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	as it would not mitigate against air pollution from vehicles through the villages.	described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). The traffic modelling work reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) indicates that this scheme will mitigate the impact of Sizewell C Project construction traffic. Preliminary Environmental Information, including air quality, was provided at stages 2, 3 and 4. The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) provide full information as to the traffic data that is supporting the DCO application and the impacts on the environment.	
Noise and Vibration	<b>Concern about the noise impact of ‘no change’ or ‘Farnham bend road widening’ option for the A12 road improvements, as they will not adequately mitigate noise impact of traffic through the villages.</b>	Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew. Once operational, the bypass will provide significant benefits to these two villages by removing both the Sizewell C construction traffic and the great majority of the existing A12 traffic from the two villages, with major benefits in noise reductions in the villages. By contrast the ‘no change’ approach or the ‘Farnham bend road widening’ would have led to worse noise impacts.  Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 4</b> Noise and Vibration, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass, of the	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about the unsuitability of the ‘no change’ or ‘Farnham bend road widening’ option for the A12 road improvements in being unable to handle the amount of traffic predicted to use the road.</b>	Both the no change (Option 1) and the Farnham bend road widening (Option 2) were discounted after Stage 2 consultation and neither forms part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme (Option 4 at Stage 2) forms part of the DCO application and is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). Further transport information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Safety	<b>Concern about the impact of the ‘no change’ and ‘Farnham bend road widening’ options on the safety of non-motorised road users and pedestrians, especially due to the number of HGVs passing through, leading to village</b>	Both the no change (Option 1) and the Farnham bend road widening (Option 2) were discounted after Stage 2 consultation and neither forms part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme (Option 4 at Stage 2) forms part of the DCO application and is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). Further transport information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>segregation.</b>		
Environmental Impact	<b>Positive comments about the lack impact of the Farnham bend road widening option on the environment as it is unlikely to have a significant effect on landscape or designated areas.</b>	<p>Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.</p> <p>This decision was based primarily on the need to remove construction traffic and related impacts from the two villages. The design of the bypass has focussed on minimising the impacts on the landscape, by careful choice of the alignment and by providing appropriate landscaping.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	N
Heritage Impact	<b>Concern about the demolition of Grade II listed buildings, especially the Old Post Office in Farnham, for the Farnham bend road widening option.</b>	<p>This concern was noted and reflected comments from statutory stakeholders including East Suffolk Council and Historic England. The Farnham Bend proposals were subsequently removed from the scheme following Stage 2 for amongst other things, its unacceptable impact upon the Grade II Listed building.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	<b>Comments on the environmental benefits of both one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements including air quality, land take and noise.</b>	<p>Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.</p> <p>This decision was based primarily on the need to remove construction traffic and related impacts, including both noise and air quality impacts, from both villages. The design of the bypass has focussed on minimising the impacts on the landscape, by careful choice of the alignment and by providing appropriate landscaping.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapters 4</b> Noise and Vibration, and <b>5</b> Air Quality, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	N
Community and Economic Impacts	<b>Comments on the community, traffic, legacy and economic benefits, or that there are less impacts on residents from the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements.</b>	<p>During the consultation, the councils noted that whilst there may be some ecological impacts, the Two village bypass would pass through less ecologically sensitive land compared to the one village bypass. The majority of respondents, including the councils, considered the Two village bypass to be the most effective in overcoming the narrow bend at Farnham.</p> <p>The Two village bypass as proposed complies with relevant policies of NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6, and represents the best form of associated development to support the construction of</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the Sizewell C Project, whilst also providing a legacy benefit to the area.</p> <p>There would be adverse impacts as a result of the Two village bypass, but these would be minimised through mitigation measures, and outweighed by the benefits of the bypass, and the benefits of meeting the need for energy infrastructure and job creation. It would also provide long-term benefits to the existing road network in and around Farnham, and therefore complies with the general principles of the NPS.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Road Strategy	<b>Comments that the benefits outweigh the costs for the one-village bypass options of the A12 road improvements.</b>	<p>Initial assessments identified that there would be a large beneficial noise effect for properties in the village of Farnham, and an improvement in air quality within the village itself. However, it was acknowledged that existing views, and the landscape character would be altered by the bypass.</p> <p>During the consultation many respondents expressed concerns regarding the community impacts of the single village bypass in that it would cause severance and division between the villages of Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew, which are currently very closely linked.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The councils also noted that flood mitigation required for this route, given it lies within a flood plain, could create significant impacts on ecology, archaeology, and on the landscape.</p> <p>During the consultation, the councils noted that whilst there may be some ecological impacts, the Two village bypass would pass through less ecologically sensitive land compared to the one village bypass. The majority of respondents, including the councils, considered the Two village bypass to be the most effective in overcoming the narrow bend at Farnham.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Community Impact	<b>Concern about the community impacts from the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, as it will divide the communities of Farnham and</b>	<p>Initial assessments identified that there would be a large beneficial noise effect for properties in the village of Farnham, and an improvement in air quality within the village itself. However, it was acknowledged that existing views, and the landscape character would be altered by the bypass.</p> <p>During the consultation many respondents expressed concerns regarding the community impacts of the single village bypass in that it would cause severance and division between the villages of Farnham and Stratford St. Andrew,</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>Stratford St. Andrew.</b>	<p>which are currently very closely linked.</p> <p>The councils also noted that flood mitigation required for this route, given it lies within a flood plain, could create significant impacts on ecology, archaeology, and on the landscape.</p> <p>During the consultation, the councils noted that whilst there may be some ecological impacts, the Two village bypass would pass through less ecologically sensitive land compared to the one village bypass. The majority of respondents, including the councils, considered the Two village bypass to be the most effective in overcoming the narrow bend at Farnham.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the environmental impacts of the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, such as loss of wetland habitat, local</b>	<p>Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.</p> <p>This decision was based primarily on the need to remove construction traffic and related impacts, including both noise and air quality impacts, from both villages. The design of the bypass has focussed on minimising the impacts on the</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>landscape character and impact on European Eel and other protected species.</b></p>	<p>landscape, by careful choice of the alignment and by providing appropriate landscaping.</p> <p>The two village bypass alignment traverses the River Alde flood plain but arguably in a less constrained location than would have been the case for the one-village bypass option to the north of Farnham. The less constrained location enables greater opportunity for flood mitigation solutions as well as minimising fragmentation impacts on European Eel and other protected species.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapters 6</b> Landscape and Visual, and <b>7</b> Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	
Heritage Impact	<p><b>Concern about the heritage impacts of the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements in harming designated heritage assets and archaeological</b></p>	<p>Following Stage 2 consultation, the one-village bypass was discounted, as was the Farnham Bend option which would have resulted in the demolition of a Grade II listed building.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	potential near the A12.		
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the amount of land take required for the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, for example from marshland west of the bypass and loss of amenity land.</b>	<p>Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two-village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.</p> <p>The two village bypass alignment traverses the River Alde flood plain but arguably in a less constrained location than would have been the case for the one-village bypass option to the north of Farnham. The less constrained location enables greater opportunity for flood mitigation solutions as well as minimising fragmentation impacts on European Eel and other protected species. It also removes impacts on marshlands north of Farnham and the loss of amenity land that would have arisen with the one village solution.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Volume 5 Two Village Bypass</b>, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	N
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about the long-term landscape and visual impacts for the one-village bypass options for the A12 road</b>	<p>Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two-village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.</p> <p>This decision was based primarily on the need to remove construction traffic and related impacts, including both noise</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>improvements.</b>	<p>and air quality impacts, from both villages. The design of the two village bypass has focussed on minimising the impacts on the landscape, by careful choice of the alignment and by providing appropriate landscaping.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	
Noise and Vibration	<b>Concern about the noise impacts of the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, particularly the provision of a raised section of road and noise impacts on Farnham properties.</b>	<p>Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two-village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.</p> <p>This decision was based primarily on the need to remove construction traffic and related impacts, including both noise and air quality impacts, from both villages. The two village bypass does introduce new noise impacts at some properties, east of Farnham, but these have been minimised as far as possible.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 4</b> Noise and Vibration, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	N
Safety	<b>Concern about safety issues from the one-</b>	The Farnham bypass (Option 1) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application.	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, including safety with regards to access to Mollett’s Farm.</b>	The two village bypass scheme (Option 4 at Stage 2) forms part of the DCO application and is described in <b>Chapter 2</b> Description of the Two Village Bypass, of <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). Further information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about traffic issues for the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, that congestion through the A12 villages will not be adequately reduced.</b>	The Farnham bypass (Option 1) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme (Option 4 at Stage 2) forms part of the DCO application and is described in <b>Chapter 2</b> Description of the Two Village Bypass, of <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). Further information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Environmental Impact	<b>Comments on the environmental benefits including air quality, heritage, landscape and visual and noise benefits of the two-village bypass option for the</b>	Further to the Stage 2 consultation, SZC Co. decided to progress with a two-village bypass around both Farnham and Stratford St Andrew.  We agree that this solution provides environmental benefits, particularly to the residents of these two villages. There are other impacts which arise with the two-village bypass and these have been assessed within the Environmental Impact	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>A12 road improvements.</b>	Assessment (EIA).  Further information is contained in <b>Volume 5</b> , the Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Community and Economic Impact	<b>Comments on the social and economic benefits of the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements for residents, including long-term legacy benefits and safety benefits.</b>	<p>During Stage 2 consultation, the councils noted that whilst there may be some ecological impacts, the Two village bypass would pass through less ecologically sensitive land compared to the one village bypass. The majority of respondents, including the councils, considered the Two village bypass to be the most effective in overcoming the narrow bend at Farnham.</p> <p>The feedback from the Stage 3 consultation was largely positive, with the majority of respondents supporting the Two village bypass of Stratford St Andrew and Farnham, describing the bypass as long overdue. Many respondents stated that Stratford St Andrew and Farnham are already struggling with increased traffic levels.</p> <p>In environmental terms, the proposed route would avoid the Foxburrow Wood ancient woodland and Stratford Plantation, which is part of Glemham Hall Registered Park and Garden. It has also been routed as far away from residential properties as possible, whilst avoiding the environmentally important woodland and gardens.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Traffic Flow	<b>Comments about the improved traffic flow if the two-village bypass option is chosen for the A12 road improvements.</b>	The two village bypass (Option 4) was taken forward after Stage 2 into Stage 3 and Stage 4 consultation and now forms part of the DCO application, as described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). Further information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Air Quality	<b>Concern about the impacts on air quality due to increased traffic from the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements.</b>	The initial assessments considered the Two village bypass to improve air quality overall, and would likely result in improvements in both Nitrogen Dioxide, and particulate matter concentrations. It was noted that this option would have some negative effects on biodiversity, including the loss of habitat, but these effects could be reduced through mitigation measures. This option would have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape, but sufficient landscaping would lessen the impact.  Whilst it was considered that this option would result in the part or complete loss of some other heritage assets, including an old field system, two flint scatters and a lithic scatter, these are considered to be of low archaeological value. It was	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>noted that this option would improve the setting of historic assets within the village of Farnham.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Economic Impact	<p><b>Concern about the economic impacts from the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements, including loss of trade for the petrol station and other passing trade for businesses.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. notes that in some instances, due to changes to the road network associated with the scheme, businesses may perceive a loss of passing trade, or severance which they may consider affects their business models. SZC Co. has carefully considered each of the elements of physical mitigation associated with changes to the transport network to create an overall network that limits significant effects on travel as a result of the Sizewell C Project. Businesses have the right to make a claim for statutory compensation should they perceive that they are significantly affected.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and pest practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose business will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> Socio-economics, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Environmental Impact	<p><b>Comments about the lack of environmental impact from the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements, from the crossing of the River Alde and the presence of protected species.</b></p>	<p>The ecological and hydrological impacts of the two village bypass are fully assessed within the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), including the impacts on the River Alde which include possible changes to flood risk and impacts on protected species including water voles and otters.</p> <p>Other protected species including bats, great crested newts and badgers are present along the wider road corridor and have been considered in the assessment and mitigation proposals developed.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 7</b> Terrestrial</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Ecology and Ornithology, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Heritage Impact	<b>Concern about the heritage impacts from the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements, such as on a historic field system and undesignated archaeological assets.</b>	<p>Following Stage 2, SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the two village bypass, including on the historic landscape and potential buried archaeology.</p> <p>Potential archaeological impacts will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation comprising evaluation, geoarchaeological assessment, excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified to date on the site.</p> <p>Potential loss of heritage significance through change to use of site and loss of hedgerows would be mitigation by retention of existing vegetation where possible and hedgerow planting along the route of the proposed development.</p> <p><b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 5</b> Historic Environment, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6) provides further detail.</p>	Y



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the amount of land take required from the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements.</b>	The two village bypass (Stage 2 Option 4) was taken forward after Stage 2 into Stage 3 consultation. SZC Co. aimed in the Stage 3 proposals to minimise land take where possible, commensurate with the need to provide some design flexibility through the limits of deviation, sufficient working space to enable the contractor to build the scheme quickly and efficiently and incorporate essential design features including space for drainage, accommodation works for affected landowners and contractor compounds. The scheme now forms part of the DCO application and more information can be found in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	Y
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impacts from the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements, as it has the largest footprint of all the options, using agricultural land.</b>	The landscape impacts of the two-village bypass are fully assessed within the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the landscape proposals for the bypass have been fully informed by that assessment. The proposals include setting the road in cutting to the east of Farnham Hall and the use of bunds and landscape planting to further screen the road alignment.  Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> Landscape and Visual, of <b>Volume 5</b> Two Village Bypass of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	N
Noise and	<b>Concern about the</b>	The initial assessments considered the Two village bypass to	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Vibration	<b>noise and vibration impacts from increased traffic for the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements.</b>	<p>improve air quality overall, and would likely result in improvements in both Nitrogen Dioxide, and particulate matter concentrations. It was noted that this option would have some negative effects on biodiversity, including the loss of habitat, but these effects could be reduced through mitigation measures. This option would have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape, but sufficient landscaping would lessen the impact.</p> <p>Whilst it was considered that this option would result in the part or complete loss of some other heritage assets, including an old field system, two flint scatters and a lithic scatter, these are considered to be of low archaeological value. It was noted that this option would improve the setting of historic assets within the village of Farnham.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Property Impact	<b>Concern about the blight and reduction in property values along the A12 from the two-village</b>	In developing our transport strategy, SZC Co. has sought to take account of the nature of the local highway network in the development and design of our proposals. Opportunities have been sought to limit and mitigate the traffic and traffic-related effects of moving goods through the use of non-road based	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>bypass option for the A12 road improvements.</b></p>	<p>transport where feasible.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and pest practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Order has been accepted for examination. SZC Co. have committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>The two-village bypass mitigates the impacts of the increased traffic on the A12 at Farnham and Stratford St Andrew. Mitigation measures have been built into the design of the two village bypass. Further information is contained in <b>Volume 5 Two Village Bypass</b>, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	
Traffic Flow	<p><b>Concern about traffic issues from the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements, as it would not completely prevent traffic issues and still cause minor roads to be used as rat-runs to avoid the A12 during construction, as well as concerns that the</b></p>	<p>The two village bypass (Option 4 at Stage 2) was taken forward into Stage 3 consultation, and now forms part of the DCO submission, as the most appropriate option to mitigate the impacts at Farnham. It is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p> <p>The scheme has greater capacity than the existing A12 so would be more attractive than the existing road to drivers, encouraging them to use the A12 rather than other roads. The new road would be designed to current design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and have a lower accident rate than the existing road. Further safety information is in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5)</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	increased traffic would pose a safety risk to other road-users.	and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Traffic Flow	<b>Comments about the overdue need for the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements.</b>	<p>The two village bypass (Option 4 at Stage 2) was taken forward into Stage 3 consultation, and now forms part of the DCO submission, as the most appropriate option to mitigate the impacts at Farnham. It is described in <b>Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p> <p>The scheme has greater capacity than the existing A12 so would be more attractive than the existing road to drivers, encouraging them to use the A12 rather than other roads. The new road would be designed to current design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and have a lower accident rate than the existing road. Further safety information is in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Road Strategy	<b>Suggestions for the two-village bypass option for the A12 road improvements, such as traffic lights</b>	On a rural, single carriageway scheme such as the two village bypass, roundabouts are the appropriate solution at the Tinker Brook and A1094 Friday Street junctions at each end of the scheme. They can accommodate the predicted traffic flows and roundabouts have the lowest accident rate of at	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	instead of roundabouts, small slip roads, signage and mitigation suggestions.	grade junctions. Slip roads are not permitted by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges on an at grade single carriageway scheme. There will be additional signage and mitigation measures as part of the scheme, as described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Road Strategy	<b>Concern about the unsuitability of the A12 in handling construction traffic given the size of the roads, narrow bends, visibility etc. and comments that the proposed improvements will not prevent these issues. Also that the inadequacy of the</b>	The two village bypass (Option 4 at Stage 2) was taken forward into Stage 3 consultation, and now forms part of the DCO submission, as the most appropriate option to mitigate the impacts at Farnham. It is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). The scheme has greater capacity than the existing A12 so would be more attractive than the existing road to drivers, encouraging them to use the A12 rather than other roads. The new road has been designed to current design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and would have a lower accident rate than the existing road. Further transport information is in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N

	road will lead the many using surrounding minor roads instead, which are also unsuitable.		
--	---	--	--

Theme: Environmental Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Air Quality	Concern about potential increase in pollution and impact on air quality due to the increase in traffic on the A12 and rat-running through villages.	<p><b>Chapter 12 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of potential air quality effects on human health arising from the construction and operation of the main development site. Air quality effects on ecology are considered in section 5.8g.</p> <p>To inform the assessment, a desk study of available air quality monitoring data and baseline dust and nitrogen dioxide surveys were undertaken. The baseline assessment established that the existing concentrations of air pollutants across the study area are generally well below air quality objective standards set out in legislation for the protection of human health. However, in Stratford St Andrew and Woodbridge there are two Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) due to elevated monitored concentrations of ambient nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>).</p> <p>The scope of the assessment considers emissions arising from</p>	Y

Theme: Environmental Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the construction works, construction road and rail traffic, and the combined heat and power plant associated with the accommodation campus. During operation, key emission sources include the back-up diesel generators on the main platform, which would be regularly tested for maintenance, as well as road traffic, the combined heat and power plant which would be retained to provide back-up power for the emergency equipment store.</p> <p>Measures to minimise and manage the effects of construction traffic such as the <b>Construction Workforce Travel Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.8) and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7), as discussed in <b>section 5.8d)ii</b>), also help to reduce traffic emissions to air. Construction road and rail traffic modelling of key pollutants (nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>)) indicates that traffic in all modelled scenarios during construction (2023 and 2028) would have a negligible effect at most receptor locations, with only a limited number of receptors experiencing a ‘minor’ or ‘moderate’ beneficial effect as a result of the proposed new road schemes. The air quality effects for the study area as a whole resulting from traffic associated with the construction of the proposed development are predicted to be not significant for all sensitive receptors within the study area</p>	



Theme: Environmental Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Heritage Impact	<b>Concern about the heritage impact surrounding the A12 due to transport proposals, especially the impact on listed buildings on high streets.</b>	<p>Following Stage 2, SZC Co. has undertaken an assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the proposed development, including on listed buildings.</p> <p>Potential loss of heritage significance through change to setting would be addressed through mitigation measures including standard code of construction practice measures to minimise noise and air quality effects, retention of existing vegetation where possible, design and screening.</p> <p>Further details may be found in <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	N
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about increased light pollution on the A12 as a result of increased traffic and transport infrastructure.</b>	<p>Light pollution from road traffic is not considered to be an issue that is likely to lead to significant environmental effects. Construction vehicle routing will be focused onto the main trunk roads to ensure that impacts arising from traffic are minimised. The Sizewell link road and two village bypass are proposed to further mitigated traffic impacts. Measures to minimise and manage the effects of construction traffic such as the <b>Construction Workforce Travel Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.8) and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7) also help to reduce traffic impacts.</p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Noise and Vibration	<b>Concern about increased noise pollution on the A12 as a result of increased traffic and transport infrastructure.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns related to increase noise pollution as a result of an increase in traffic and transport.</p> <p>The road traffic noise assessment provided in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 11</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) includes road links where there is a potential for a significant adverse effect to occur. The study area extends to Lowestoft to the north, Ipswich to the south and the A140 to the west, including the A12, A14 and key routes envisaged to be used by the Sizewell C Project traffic.</p> <p>Please refer to <b>Volume 2, Chapter 11</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) for further information.</p>	Y
Mitigation	<b>Suggestions for mitigation for the A12 transport proposals, for light pollution, signage, screening, noise reducing materials and planting.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes suggestion for mitigation. The necessary highway works for the Sizewell C Project have been designed to current design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and would have a lower accident rate than the existing road. Further transport information is in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Quality of life	<b>Concern about impact on residents living near and using the A12, especially due to the increase in HGV traffic, resulting environmental impacts and reduction in quality of life.</b>	<p>Activities with the potential to impact upon local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (e.g. air quality, noise, transport), and these have informed the scope and focus of a health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the Sizewell C Project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in <b>Chapter 28</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Safety	<b>Concern about safety on the A12 as a result of increased traffic and transport proposals, especially about the rise in traffic collisions and accidents.</b>	<p>Concerns over safety of the proposed A12 options have been considered throughout the optioneering process. The impact of Sizewell C Project construction traffic on safety of the local road network, including the A12, is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about the exacerbation of</b>	The two village bypass (Option 4 at Stage 2) was taken forward into Stage 3 consultation, and now forms part of the DCO	N

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>current traffic and congestion problems on the A12 due to the Sizewell C transport proposals.</b>	submission, as the most appropriate option to mitigate the impacts at Farnham. It is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). The scheme has greater capacity than the existing A12 so would be more attractive than the existing road to drivers, encouraging them to use the A12 rather than other roads. The new road has been designed to current design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and would have a lower accident rate than the existing road. Further transport information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Compensation	<b>Suggestions and comments about compensation as mitigation for those affected by the impacts on the A12.</b>	<p>In developing our transport strategy, SZC Co. has sought to take account of the nature of the local highway network in the development and design of our proposals. Opportunities have been sought to limit and mitigate the traffic and traffic-related effects of moving goods through the use of non-road based transport where feasible.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and best practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination. SZC Co. have committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p> <p>The two-village bypass mitigates the impacts of the increased traffic on the A12 at Farnham and Stratford St Andrew. Mitigation measures have been built into the design of the two-village bypass. Further information is contained in <b>Volume 5</b></p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Community Impact			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Two Village Bypass, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	
Mitigation	<b>Suggestions for mitigation for the A12 transport proposals, for crossing provisions and instalment of roundabouts.</b>	On the two village bypass, roundabouts are the appropriate solution at the Tinker Brook and A1094 Friday Street junctions at each end of the scheme. They can accommodate the predicted traffic flows and roundabouts have the lowest accident rate of at grade junctions. The scheme is described in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6). The Darsham park and ride access was upgraded, at Stage 3, to a roundabout north of Willow Marsh Lane. That scheme is described in <b>Volume 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4). The A12/A144 junction improvement described in <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8) is a single lane dualling upgrade, which increases capacity to accommodate the Sizewell C construction traffic as the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) demonstrates. Formal crossings would be inappropriate on a strategic rural road like the A12 and so have not been incorporated into the roadwork designs.	N

g. Transport: Road Improvements – Yoxford / B1122

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Road Strategy	<b>Challenges to the estimates and assumptions from assessments made for the Yoxford/B1122 road improvements and the use of the B1122, for example that the A12/A1120 junction has not also been taken into consideration.</b>	<p>The A12/B1122 and A12/A1120 junctions are included in a VISSIM microsimulation model used to test the impact of Sizewell C Project traffic and the operation of the junctions.</p> <p>The results of the modelling are reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>The A12/B1122 roundabout mitigation proposed as a result of this work and the proximity of the A1120 junction has been an important element of the analysis.</p>	N
HGV Traffic	<b>Concern that the predicted impacts on the B1122 and surrounding areas have been under-assessed and that the road has not been surveyed for its capability to carry</b>	<p>In the Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C Project construction traffic.</p> <p>This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows, reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	the proposed level of HGVs.	<p>Project construction than current levels.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p>	
Site Suitability	<b>Strong opposition against the use of the B1122 as part of the construction route at all, with comments that it is ‘appalling’ idea and will not be viable even with improvements.</b>	<p>The Sizewell link road would relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal forms part of the DCO submission.</p> <p>It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows, reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C Project construction than current levels.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p>	Y



Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Options	<b>Suggestions for an alternative 'D2' relief road, or a relief road in general to go from the A12 to the main development site instead of the proposed improvement options.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcome suggestions for the relief road.</p> <p>The DCO submission includes the Sizewell link road, which runs from the A12 north of Saxmundham to the B1122 east of Theberton. It is described in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7). It provides traffic relief to the B1122, Middleton Moor and Theberton as set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	Y
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the improvements, that environmental and expert assessment and local opinion should be considered.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has, and will continue, to take account of responses provided during consultation in developing the proposals.</p> <p>As detailed in the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1), SZC Co. has undertaken a thorough and robust approach to consultation, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The issues tables appended to the <b>Consultation Report</b> at <b>Annexes A, D, G</b> and <b>J</b> explain how local opinion has been taken into account and informed the evolution of the Sizewell C Project. The <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) demonstrates that the scheme has also been informed by robust technical environmental assessment to ensure that</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		impacts of the proposals are suitably addressed.	
Traffic Flow	<b>Comments about the benefit of reduced impacts on residents, including safety improvements and better traffic flow, resulting from both B1122 option proposals.</b>	The signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction was dropped after Stage 2. At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The scheme forms part of the DCO submission and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and in <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	N
Environmental Impacts	<b>Comments about the benefit of reduced air quality and noise impacts from the Yoxford roundabout option.</b>	<p>NPS EN-1 sets out that infrastructure developments can have a negative impact on air quality and emissions and on noise and vibration. NPS EN-6 states that there may be associated local impacts from nuclear development in terms of significant noise, vibration or air quality, but that there may be local impacts of this nature from transport. With appropriate mitigation, the subsequent effect of these is unlikely to be significant.</p> <p>These highway works provide the necessary improvements needed for the construction and operational traffic for the Sizewell C Project in the short and medium term, the proposed highway improvement works also offer permanent improvements of highway conditions for the local community. In the case of the Yoxford roundabout, the capacity improvements</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		met an identified need that would otherwise not be in operation as early without the construction of the Sizewell C Project.	
Air Quality	<b>Concerns about the impact on air quality from the increased amount of traffic especially around Yoxford and Theberton for the Yoxford roundabout option.</b>	<p>NPS EN-1 sets out that infrastructure developments can have a negative impact on air quality and emissions and on noise and vibration. NPS EN-6 states that there may be associated local impacts from nuclear development in terms of significant noise, vibration or air quality, but that there may be local impacts of this nature from transport. With appropriate mitigation, the subsequent effect of these is unlikely to be significant.</p> <p>These highway works provide the necessary improvements needed for the construction and operational traffic for the Sizewell C Project in the short and medium term, the proposed highway improvement works also offer permanent improvements of highway conditions for the local community. In the case of the Yoxford roundabout, the capacity improvements met an identified need that would otherwise not be in operation as early without the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	N
Community Impact	<b>Concerns about the impact on local villages from the Yoxford roundabout</b>	Following Stage 2 the options for the movement of freight and workers to the Sizewell C main development site has evolved, with the introduction of the Sizewell link road at Stage 3 and the integrated (rail and road) transport strategy at Stage 4.	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p>option, mainly because it would still require the use of the B1122 for construction traffic which would be disruptive to residents.</p>	<p>SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. The Sizewell link road forms part of the Stage 4 proposals for the integrated strategy, which is the chosen strategy submitted as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Vehicles will join the Sizewell link road via the Yoxford roundabout to the north, whilst traffic from the south will travel to the main development site via the two village bypass. Therefore, construction and worker traffic would not need to pass through the village of Yoxford.</p> <p>The wider construction transport strategy is provided in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Environmental Impact	<b>Concerns about the impact of land take for the Yoxford roundabout option, with requests for land to not be compulsorily purchased from property owners, for meadows to not be used as parking.</b>	<p>SZC Co. and their agents continue to engage with landowners concerning accommodation works in order to minimise impact on holdings as far as possible. SZC Co. is committed to negotiating voluntary agreements with landowners for the relevant interests in land and is continuing to pursue this objective. However, in the event that negotiations with particular landowners or statutory undertakers are unsuccessful, SZC Co. requires the power to compulsorily purchase remaining interests.</p> <p>Further information can be found in the <b>Community Impact Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.13).</p>	N
Traffic Flow	<b>Concerns about the amount of traffic from the Yoxford roundabout option with increased traffic on the A12, A1120 and B1122.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns about increased traffic levels.</p> <p>The A12/B1122 and A12/A1120 junctions are included in a VISSIM microsimulation model used to test the impact of Sizewell C traffic and the operation of the junctions. The results of the modelling are reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The A12/B1122 roundabout proposal is mitigation proposed as a result of this work and the proximity of the A1120 junction has been an important element of the analysis.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information can be found in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Alternative Options	<b>Comments suggesting that the Yoxford roundabout Option would only be a partial solution and that slip roads, or intermittent traffic light control should be incorporated as well.</b>	SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The scheme forms part of the DCO and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and in <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8). Slip roads are not permitted by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges as part of an at grade roundabout. Traffic modelling reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> indicates that the roundabout has sufficient capacity to accommodate the predicted traffic flows and that part-time traffic signals at the roundabout would not be required.	N
Traffic Flow	<b>Comments about the benefit of reduced community impact from the signalised junction option, such as safety benefits and improved traffic flow.</b>	The signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction was dropped after Stage 2 after the roundabout (Option A) received a significantly greater amount of support from consultees than the signalised junction option. At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. This scheme forms part of the DCO submission and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	Y
Environmental Impact	<b>Comments about the benefit of reduced</b>	The roundabout option was taken forward given that existing levels of traffic growth on the A12 were likely to bring forward a	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>amount of land take and reduced landscape and visual impacts from the signalised junction option.</b>	<p>need for a solution at this junction, irrespective of the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The roundabout option was better supported at Stage 2 by stakeholders than the signalised junction option, despite the reduced land take of the signalised option.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 7</b> Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p>	
Air Quality	<b>Concerns about impact on air quality from the signalised junction option, due to the backing up of traffic.</b>	<p>The roundabout option was taken forward given that existing levels of traffic growth on the A12 were likely to bring forward a need for a solution at this junction, irrespective of the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The roundabout option was better supported at Stage 2 by stakeholders than the signalised junction option, despite the reduced land take of the signalised option. SZC Co. have sought to ensure that air quality impacts are mitigated as far as possible.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 5 of Volume 7</b> Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Heritage Impact	<b>Concerns about the impact on heritage assets and their setting from the signalised junction option, near the boundary of the Yoxford conservation area.</b>	<p>The concern from some respondents about the potential “urbanising” effect of a signalised junction at Yoxford and how this might impact upon the setting of designated heritage assets was noted.</p> <p>Following Stage 2, the signalised junction option was discounted and only the roundabout proposal was taken forward at Stage 3 and into the DCO proposals.</p> <p>The heritage impacts of the roundabout proposal have been considered and are assessed in <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p>	Y
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concerns about the landscape and visual impact for both options of the B1122 road improvement options.</b>	<p>The roundabout option was taken forward given that existing levels of traffic growth on the A12 were likely to bring forward a need for a solution at this junction, irrespective of the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The roundabout option was better supported at Stage 2 by stakeholders than the signalised junction option, despite the reduced land take of the signalised option. SZC Co. have sought to ensure that air quality impacts are mitigated as far as possible.</p>	N



Theme: Alternative site assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The proposals for the roundabout include landscape planting, tying into the existing hedgerows, to help integrate the roundabout into the local landscape. Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volume 7</b> Yoxford Roundabout and Other Highway Improvements, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	
Traffic Flow	<b>Concerns about the amount of traffic from the signalised junction option, as it will interrupt traffic and slow the traffic flow.</b>	The signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction was dropped after Stage 2 following concerns such as these expressed here. At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The scheme forms part of the DCO and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Safety	<b>Concern that the B1122 would be unsuitable to be used as an evacuation</b>	SZC Co. propose the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C Project construction traffic. It would be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms	Y

Theme: Site Suitability			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	route in case of an emergency at Sizewell C.	part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows provided in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).	
Site Suitability	<b>Concern that the B1122 would be unsuitable for its proposed use due to the amount of traffic already using it, and be inadequate for the estimated amount of construction traffic, particularly large vehicles at it is a narrow, winding country lane.</b>	SZC Co. propose the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows, reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).	Y

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Air Quality	<b>Concern about the air quality impacts from the use of the B1122 for construction traffic.</b>	<p>Following Stage 2 the options for the movement of freight and workers to the Sizewell C main development site has evolved, with the introduction of the Sizewell link road at Stage 3 and the integrated (rail and road) <b>Transport Strategy</b> at Stage 4.</p> <p>SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. This would avoid air quality impacts on the B1122.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road forms part of the Stage 4 proposals for the <b>Integrated Strategy</b>, which is the chosen strategy submitted as part of the DCO. The wider construction <b>Transport Strategy</b> is provided in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	Y
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the environmental impacts from the use of the B1122 for construction traffic.</b>	<p>SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. This would avoid air quality impacts on the B1122.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road forms part of the Stage 4 proposals for the <b>Integrated Strategy</b>, which is the chosen strategy</p>	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		submitted as part of the DCO. The wider construction transport strategy is provided in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the amount of land take required for the B1122 road improvements, from surrounding agricultural land.</b>	The land take from road improvements along the B1122 will be minor and will not be significant.  Full details are contained within <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	N
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impacts from the B1122 road improvements from the proposed infrastructure and construction works.</b>	The road improvements on the B1122 will be minor, relatively short-term in duration and will not result in significant effects in a landscape and visual impact context.  Full details are contained within <b>Chapter 6</b> of <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	N
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about light pollution from infrastructure for the B1122 road improvements and the use of the road for construction traffic.</b>	The road improvements on the B1122 will be minor, relatively short-term in duration and will not result in significant effects from lighting, either from a visual impact or an ecological perspective. The works would be undertaken primarily in day light hours although some task lighting might be required in the winter months.	N

Theme: Environmental Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Further information specific to the B1122 road improvements can be found in <b>Chapter 6</b> and <b>Chapter 7</b> of <b>Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p> <p>Information relating to construction traffic is contained in the <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7).</p>	

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Traffic Flow	<p><b>Concern about access issues resulting/remaining from the B1122 road improvement options and the use of the B1122 for construction traffic. For example, tailbacks through Yoxford will cause difficulty in accessing the A12 from the A1120.</b></p>	<p>The A12/B1122 and A12/A1120 junctions are included in a VISSIM microsimulation model used to test the impact of Sizewell C Project traffic and the operation of the junctions. The results of the modelling are reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p> <p>The A12/B1122 roundabout proposal is mitigation proposed as a result of this work and the proximity of the A1120 junction has been an important element of the analysis. The Sizewell link road also forms part of the of the DCO submission and relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic flow. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton bypassing both settlements.</p>	N

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Further information on the impacts of traffic associated with the Sizewell C Project can be found in <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Details are also included in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7).</p>	
Community Impact	<b>Concern about the impacts on local villages and residents from the B1122 road improvements and use of the B1122 for construction traffic.</b>	SZC Co. propose the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C Project construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C Project construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).	Y
Property Damage	<b>Concern about property damage to houses close to the road resulting from construction and traffic on the B1122/Yoxford.</b>	In developing our <b>Transport Strategy</b> , SZC Co. has sought to take account of the nature of the local highway network in the development and design of our proposals. Opportunities have been sought to limit and mitigate the traffic and traffic-related effects of moving goods through the use of non-road based transport where feasible.	N

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Opposition to the use of the B1122 as the main route for construction traffic has led to the Sizewell link road being progressed, this new road would go from the A12 to site therefore reducing traffic volumes and property impacts through Yoxford, Middleton Moor and Theberton.</p> <p>Further information is contained within <b>Volume 6</b> Sizewell Link Road, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p>	
Safety	<b>Concern about safety impacts from construction and traffic on the B1122, especially the impact of dangerous traffic on pedestrians.</b>	<p>SZC Co. propose the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C Project construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7). The safety and environmental impacts on pedestrians are set out in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Tourism and Economic	<b>Concern about the impact on tourism and</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognises that tourism is a key strength within Suffolk's economy, and in particular within the Suffolk Coast</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Impact	<b>the local economy from construction and traffic on the B1122/Yoxford, especially farms, a car body repair business and the tourist industry.</b>	<p>and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which stretches north and south of Sizewell C. SZC Co. have committed to a Tourism Fund. This will include funding for measures deemed appropriate to avoid or reduce effects such as marketing, promotion, research and supporting local projects.</p> <p>SZC Co. notes that in some instances, due to changes to the road network associated with the scheme, businesses may perceive a loss of passing trade, or severance that they may consider affects their business models. SZC Co. has carefully considered each of the elements of physical mitigation associated with changes to the transport network to create an overall network that limits significant effects on travel as a result of the Sizewell C Project. Businesses have the right to make a claim for statutory compensation should they perceive that they are significantly affected.</p> <p>Further details may be found in <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about the increased amount of traffic from the use of the B1122 for</b>	SZC Co. propose the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction	Y



Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>construction vehicles.</b>	traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C Project construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7). The safety and environmental impacts on pedestrians are set out in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Pedestrian Access	<b>Comments about the pedestrian enhancement proposals for Theberton and suggestions for further crossing/path mitigation for the B1122 for residents' safety.</b>	<p>The mitigation proposals for B1122 were superseded at Stage 3 by the Sizewell link road, which now forms part of the DCO proposals.</p> <p>It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p> <p>Further information on why the Sizewell link road was chosen as the preferred option can be found in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Mitigation	<b>Comments that proposed mitigation measures for the B1122 are insufficient in reducing the impact</b>	<p>The mitigation proposals for B1122 were superseded at Stage 3 by the Sizewell link road, which now forms part of the DCO proposals.</p> <p>It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the</p>	Y

Theme: Community Impacts			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	that the use of this road will have on surrounding communities, including noise and pollution impacts.	<p><b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p> <p>SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road at Stage 3 (and also Stage 4) to help to reduce the amount of traffic on the B1122 through Middleton Moor and Theberton during the peak construction phase of the Sizewell C Project. This would avoid environmental impacts, including noise and pollution on the B1122.</p> <p>The Sizewell link road forms part of the Stage 4 proposals for the integrated strategy, which is the chosen strategy submitted as part of the DCO. The wider construction transport strategy is provided in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	

Theme: Other Comments			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Comments and suggestions about road realignment mitigation measures for the B1122.	SZC Co. propose the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C Project construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will	Y

Theme: Other Comments			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		be lower during Sizewell C Project construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7). The safety and environmental impacts on pedestrians are set out in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Mitigation	<b>Comments about proposed speed limit and traffic calming measures and suggestions for further mitigation for the B1122, including visibility improvements.</b>	<p>The mitigation proposals for B1122 were superseded at Stage 3 by the Sizewell link road, which now forms part of the DCO proposals.</p> <p>It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).</p> <p>Further information on why the Sizewell link road was chosen as the preferred option can be found in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	Y
Safety	<b>Other suggestions for the B1122 and Yoxford/B1122 road improvement proposals, including</b>	SZC Co. propose the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).	Y

Theme: Other Comments			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>incorporating slip roads and plans for emergency routes.</b>	It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels as the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) indicates. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It would be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency. Slip roads are not permitted by the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges for single carriageway highway schemes like Sizewell link road or for at grade junctions like the A12/B1122 roundabout at Yoxford.	

Table C.2: Summary of Section 47 Responses and Consideration by Topic<sup>2</sup>

a. Overall Proposals

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
People and Economy	<b>Challenges to the people and economy</b>	SZC Co. have worked to develop our understanding of the existing labour market in Suffolk and the East of England,	N

<sup>2</sup> Note: Comments in bold and shaded grey within Table D.1 were also raised by Section 47 consultees. They have not been repeated in Table D.2 to avoid unnecessary repetition.

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>proposals as requiring further evidence of assumed benefits, such as evidence of job opportunities, training and apprenticeships.</b></p>	<p>as well as the UK construction sector as a whole. This approach uses public datasets and desk-based research which will allow us to predict the potential effects of the Sizewell C Project, as a result of its construction workforce and supply chain, on people and the economy.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project would create up to 7,900 job roles at the peak of construction, followed by a permanent workforce of 900 people to operate the power station, and a regular short-term workforce in the region of 1,000 people associated with planned outages (for two months every 18 months per unit).</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project would also require a significant workforce in non-construction roles, both directly and in the supply chain. These jobs would be split across a number of sectors, including tourism and hospitality, food production and business support and administration. Many of these sectors are already strong in Suffolk. Therefore, improvements to the skills base as a result of new as a result of the Sizewell C Project would offer a tangible long-term legacy. This is certainly the case for the tourism sector, which has been identified as lacking higher skilled roles and experiencing a high level of seasonality.</p>	



Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Additionally, relatively mature strategies and plans are in place for the strategic economic development of the region, and SCC and NALEP are setting themselves ambitious targets to deliver inclusive growth for local residents and businesses into which SZC can make a positive contribution.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and in <b>Annex A</b> of the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) (<b>Employment, Skills and Education Strategy</b>).</p>	
Local Employment	<p><b>Concern about the feasibility of the assumed people and economy benefits, particularly that it is too late for education and training to lead to employment opportunities.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. is aligned with and in a position to help meet the challenges and opportunities for construction and energy sectors set out through national and regional plans and strategies. This includes to retrain, mobilise and up-skill the existing workforce to deliver improved productivity and performance demanded by the changing profile of investment and modern methods of construction.</p> <p>The Sizewell C Project would also require a significant workforce in non-construction roles, both directly and in the supply chain. These jobs would be split across a number of sectors, including tourism and hospitality, food production and business support and administration. Many of these sectors are already strong in Suffolk. Therefore,</p>	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>improvements to the skills base as a result of new jobs due to the Sizewell C Project would offer a tangible long-term legacy. This is certainly the case for the tourism sector, which has been identified as lacking higher skilled roles and experiencing a high level of seasonality.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Skills, Employment and Education Strategy</b> provided in <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9).</p>	
Landowner Impact	<p><b>Concern about the impact of the proposed development on landowners, including reduction in property values, impact farmland and compulsory land purchase.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. will minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls.</p> <p>EDF and their agents continue to engage with landowners concerning accommodation works in order to minimise impact on holdings as far as possible.</p> <p>SZC Co. is committed to negotiating voluntary agreements with landowners for the relevant interests in land and is continuing to pursue this objective. However, SZC Co. requires the power to compulsorily acquire interests.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the 'Compensation Code' based on legislation, case law and</p>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>pest practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned 'Compensation Code'. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination.</p> <p>SZC Co. have committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Community Impact	<b>Concern that the proposed development will leave the community open to future development projects.</b>	<p>This DCO relates to the construction of Sizewell C and associated developments, including mitigation measures embedded into the Sizewell C Project to limit effects.</p> <p>The DCO does not consider the potential for the Sizewell C Project to lead to more development projects.</p> <p>Any such projects would need to come forward separately as either a planning application or DCO application. Should these come forward, they would need to be appropriately assessed on their own merits by the relevant decision making body.</p>	N
Community Impact	<b>Comments that any benefits to people and the economy as a result of the development are not needed, as the job opportunities are not worth the environmental damage, to the community.</b>	<p>SZC Co. have set out the employment opportunities available for local people in the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) and within <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>This includes measures to ensure that the substantial economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project are focused on local communities – including existing businesses, residents and children who may have the opportunity to work in the energy sector in the future.</p> <p>SZC Co. does not seek to offset environmental effects with economic benefits – this is not a conceivable planning test.</p>	N

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		EDF has set out throughout the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) how environmental effects have been identified and will be mitigated where appropriate.	
Local Employment	<b>Suggestions that the people and economy benefits, such as local job opportunities, should be fully promoted and advertised amongst local people.</b>	<p>SZC Co. have set out the employment opportunities available for local people in the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) and within <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b>, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>This includes measures to ensure that the substantial economic benefits of the Sizewell C Project are focused on local communities – including existing businesses, residents and children who may have the opportunity to work in the energy sector in the future.</p>	N
Stakeholder Involvement	<b>Comments stating that the people and economy proposals look promising but must be demonstrated, and must be approved by local services such as the NHS.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcome the support for proposals for people and the economy related to the Sizewell C Project. These benefits will be demonstrated through regular monitoring of effectiveness as set out through the <b>Economic Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.9) and the Employment, Skills and Education Strategy provided in <b>Appendix A</b> to the <b>Economic Statement</b>, and <b>Chapter 9</b> of <b>Volume 2</b>, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>SZC Co. has engaged Local Authorities and other public service providers throughout the development of the</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		assessment of effects on public services and their mitigation, including NHS Clinical Commissioning Groups, District and County Council services and Emergency Services.	

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Consultation Process	<b>Positive comments about the planning and development process of Sizewell C, for example by the stage 2 consultation having taken community concerns on board.</b>	<p>Positive comments welcomed. SZC Co. is required to undertake adequate pre-application consultation. This is in order to ensure that feedback from the community and stakeholders is adequately taken into account. This was necessary to ensure that SZC Co. arrive at proposals which will help to mitigate the impact of construction and operation, and maximise the opportunities arising from the development of Sizewell C.</p> <p>The consultation must therefore provide adequate time for local communities and residents to respond, and SZC Co. must abide by the commitments made in the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (November 2016) provided in <b>Appendix D.6</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Consultation Process			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		In total, SZC Co. has conducted 44.5 weeks of formal consultation on the Sizewell C Project– which is necessary for a project of this scale.	
Consultation Events	<b>Suggestions for consultation events, such as a greater number of events and longer events.</b>	<p>SZC Co. undertook more public exhibitions at Stage 2 in recognition of the time that had passed since Stage 1.</p> <p>The team were also available to any group or individual who sought meetings or for a project presentation and discussion.</p> <p>SZC Co. abided by the commitments made in the Updated Statement of Community Consultation (November 2016) provided in <b>Appendix D.6</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1). <b>Volume 1</b> of the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides full details of the process followed.</p>	N
Consultation Documents	<b>Challenging information within the consultation documentation as being incorrect, such as the computer-generated image (CGI) presentation and incorrect page numbering in the documentation.</b>	<p>The CGI was labelled as providing a general representation of the local area, which might not be wholly accurate. There were also functions within the technology that can help to avoid misrepresentation, such as removing trees or switching to different seasonal characteristics.</p> <p>SZC Co. was grateful for feedback on inaccurate page numbers in the documentation. This was immediately fed back to the team so they were aware should the issue be raised at exhibitions and events.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Suggestion	<b>Suggestion that the accommodation strategy should include a relief road for workers to travel to the main development site.</b>	Each of the accommodation campus Stage 2 options were in the temporary construction area, which is part of the main development site. Workers would use the road network within the temporary construction area to access their place of work, as described in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). These roads are for construction use only and would have no public access. Further information can be found in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10) and in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	N
Site Restoration	<b>Suggestion that the areas used for worker accommodation should be restored to their original state after construction.</b>	The accommodation campus would be temporary and removed during the commissioning and land restoration phase of the main development site construction phasing.  The majority of hedgerows and trees around the perimeter of the site would be retained along with two central category B trees. The hedgerows adjacent to the existing bridleway, access road to Upper Abbey Farm and Eastbridge Road would all be retained.  Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	N
Accommodati	<b>Challenges to the</b>	The accommodation campus would be temporary and	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
on strategy	<b>accommodation campus being referred to as 'temporary'.</b>	<p>removed during the commissioning and land restoration phase of the main development site construction phasing.</p> <p>The majority of hedgerows and trees around the perimeter of the site would be retained along with two central category B trees. The hedgerows adjacent to the existing bridleway, access road to Upper Abbey Farm and Eastbridge Road would all be retained.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Environmental Impacts	<b>Concern about whether the benefits of the accommodation campus are worth the cost of impacts on people and the environment.</b>	<p>In response to the requirement for a large non-home-based workforce, SZC Co. has developed a balanced <b>Accommodation Strategy</b>. This strategy makes use of existing local accommodation where possible, in order to deliver local economic benefits, but also seeks to avoid impacts on the local accommodation market, by providing temporary project accommodation.</p> <p>SZC Co. recognises that it needs to try to avoid using existing accommodation sources beyond their capacity, or in ways which would have detrimental impacts on the local tourism sector or local communities. The temporary campus and caravan accommodation would help to take the pressure off existing accommodation supply, as well as</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>providing significant operational benefits for SZC Co. and its contractors.</p> <p>Further details may be found within the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10).</p>	
Alternative Options	<p><b>Alternative suggestion to the entire accommodation strategy, such as several smaller campus buildings in different locations, to allow the workforce to better integrate with the community.</b></p>	<p>Based on evidence from contractors at Hinkley Point C, along with experience on Hinkley Point C and Sizewell B, SZC Co. has identified that from a Sizewell C Project delivery perspective, it is preferable to have as many workers accommodated on-site as possible.</p> <p>SZC Co. has concluded that one or several off-site campuses would be unlikely to make a significant difference in terms of any localised community impacts around the main development site, but would lead to the reduction or loss of the many benefits of an on-site accommodation campus in terms of reduced journeys and wider worker management. Providing an on-site accommodation campus approach would also help to mitigate the impacts of large groups of construction workers in a number of otherwise small rural communities.</p> <p>Experience from other projects indicates that locations that are too far from the site are unlikely to be attractive to non-</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>home-based-workers. As SZC Co. cannot enforce workers accommodation choice, it is likely that a campus in say Ipswich or Lowestoft would be under-utilised. In turn, this could lead to increased pressure on tourist and private-rented sector accommodation close to site.</p> <p>Further details can be found within the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10) and in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the accommodation site option choice, that it should be whichever is closest to transport links.</b>	The DCO includes an accommodation campus adjacent to the site entrance to maximise the number of workers who do not need to use local roads. The impacts of the campus, as part of the whole Sizewell C project, are set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10, Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the accommodation site option choice, that it should be based on local opinion and preference.</b>	<p>A number of factors determine site selection, including responses to consultation, the need to minimise community and environmental impacts and project efficiency imperatives. The campus option presented at Stage 2 was identified as the preferred option by respondents at Stage 1.</p> <p>Following Stage 2, sports facilities were moved off-site to Leiston to facilitate shared community use and enable</p>	Y



Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>them to be left as a legacy following construction. This too was in response to public feedback.</p> <p>Further details on-site selection and alternatives may be found in <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Decision Making	<p><b>Criteria given for the accommodation strategy, that it should be based on local preference, expert opinion or on the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment.</b></p>	<p>The purpose of the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> is to represent a balanced solution for meeting the temporary increase in local accommodation demand which the Sizewell C Project would generate – offering construction efficiencies, and supporting the Sizewell C Project's aspirations for zero harm; delivering economic benefits for the local area and mitigating impacts during the construction phase.</p> <p>The <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> seeks to ensure that workers are accommodated in a way which maximises benefits, and ensures that impacts are minimised and, where appropriate, mitigated and managed.</p> <p>In formulating the strategy, SZC Co. has engaged regularly with Housing Officers at ESC on issues regarding housing need and vulnerability, capacity, and churn/change in the stock, the role of the Private Rented Sector, SZC Co.'s proposals for project accommodation, and the scope of</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>impact assessments, and development of mitigation. In addition to detailed information on local housing gained through engagement, SZC Co. has had regard also to information, policies, strategies, and business plans that have been published by local authorities and public bodies.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10) and in <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria given for the accommodation strategy, that it should be based on whatever will minimise the amount of travel required for workers.</b>	The DCO includes an accommodation campus adjacent to the site entrance to maximise the number of workers who do not need to use local roads. The impacts of the campus, as part of the whole Sizewell C project, are set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10, Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N
Sports Facilities	<b>Positive comments about campus Option 1 and 2(i) for having sports facilities close together, and close to the accommodation.</b>	<p>Comments noted and the campus will contain an on-site gym as well as other recreational facilities including a range of high quality food options, opportunities to mix in the evenings through the on-site bar, and a range of organised events such as quiz nights.</p> <p>However, in order to facilitate shared community use and leave a legacy post-construction, at Stage 3 the Sizewell C</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Project set out that the campus sports pitches would be located off-site in Leiston. These will comprise a 3G pitch and two MUGAs. There was widespread support for this option from respondents to Stage 2.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10) and in <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Visual and Landscape	<b>Positive comments about the lower landscape and visual impact of campus Option 1 due to the lower height of the building.</b>	Option 1 was not taken forward following Stage 2. The option 2ii site which was taken forward following Stage 2 has a smaller footprint so a lesser impact on archaeology.	N
Heritage Impact	<b>Support for campus Option 1 as long as account is taken of any potential archaeology.</b>	<p>Option 1 was not taken forward following Stage 2. The option 2ii site which was taken forward following Stage 2 has a smaller footprint so a lesser impact on archaeology.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified to date on the site.</p> <p>Full details are contained within <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.5).</p>	
Worker Welfare	<p><b>Concern that campus Option 2(ii) would be inconvenient for workers and cause unnecessary travel to sports facilities.</b></p>	<p>The campus will contain an on-site gym as well as other recreational facilities including a range of high-quality food options, opportunities to mix in the evenings through the on-site bar, and a range of organised events such as quiz nights.</p> <p>However, in order to facilitate shared community use and leave a legacy post-construction, at Stage 3 the Sizewell C Project set out that the campus sports pitches would be located off-site in Leiston. These will comprise a 3G pitch and two MUGAs and workers will be transported between the campus and sports pitches by bus. There was widespread support for this option from respondents to Stage 2.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Accommodation Strategy</b> (Doc Ref. 8.10) and in <b>Chapter 3 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Landscape and Visual	<b>Suggestions about the lighting to be used for the worker accommodation to reduce light pollution.</b>	The lighting of the campus would be in accordance with the <b>Lighting Management Plan</b> for the main development site (Doc Ref. 6.3B), which defines the measures to be used to minimise light spill.	N
Sports Facilities	<b>Comments about suggestions about the type of campus sports facilities and what should be included for example the inclusion of a swimming pool.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has identified the type of sports and leisure facilities the temporary Sizewell C construction workers would require, the extent to which these are already provided in areas where workers are expected to live, and estimated net demand (quantum).</p> <p>In order to mitigate potential localised demand from construction workers for specific facilities, in the context of overall sufficiency, but localised deficiency in Leiston, and in terms of certain facilities which the construction workforce demographic is more likely to seek, SZC Co. has developed a collaborative plan with ESC to deliver new sports facilities in Leiston. These facilities would mitigate the potential additional demand highlighted, and also enable the Sizewell C Project to attract a high-quality workforce.</p> <p>On this basis, the need for a swimming pool has not been identified. Instead the facilities will comprise a full-size 3G football pitch, and two MUGAs, on Alde Valley School's</p>	N

Theme: Accommodation Strategy			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>playing fields in Leiston, adjacent to Leiston Leisure Centre. These facilities would serve both the construction workforce, the school and the local community, subject to agreement of management protocols and safeguarding via physical and temporal management.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in <b>Appendix 9E</b> – Technical Note 5 – Sport and Leisure Audit and Estimated Demand – of <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Transport Strategy	<b>Comments stating that rail should be the main method of transport, and not enough use of rail has been proposed.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has evaluated the possibility of moving bulk materials and containerised goods by rail. This has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>evaluating the capability of the options for sea and rail deliveries, including assessment of potential constraints on delivery (e.g. weather and navigational constraints in respect of sea delivery and rail pathing/infrastructure constraints in respect of rail deliveries);</li> <li>assessing the key material requirements that would arise over time during the construction phase, for</li> </ul>	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>each key area of the Sizewell C Project build, and from this identifying the periods during which demand for materials is greatest;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• considering the scope to move each major category of materials by sea and rail, taking account of the nature of the materials and possible supply sources; and</li> <li>• consideration of the environmental impact of each of the main strategies.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above principles, the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the Sizewell C Project as far as reasonably practical, through the delivery of the following infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• beach landing facility;</li> <li>• green rail route;</li> <li>• two village bypass; and</li> <li>• Sizewell link road.</li> </ul> <p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> seeks to overcome the deliverability issues associated with the <b>Rail-Led Strategy</b> by including only those rail improvements that do not require works to the main East Suffolk line within the DCO application.</p>	

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for up to three trains per day, meaning that the delivery of construction materials by rail would play an important, and meaningful role in the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the <b>Site Selection Report, Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Transport Strategy	<b>Suggestions that rail should be used to transport workers to the main development site or to their accommodation.</b>	<p>The use of rail to transport workers was considered prior to Stage 2 consultation. However, SZC Co. considered that a rail-based solution would not offer the same flexibility as a bus-based system. It would also use scarce train paths that were better used for freight to remove HGV movements from the local road network. Rail transport for workers was thus discounted from further consideration at Stage 2 and does not form part of the DCO proposals.</p> <p>The rail proposals are described and assessed in <b>Environmental Statement Volume 9</b> (Doc Ref. 6.9) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).</p>	N
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the Transport Strategy, in</b>	SZC Co. has taken account of responses provided during consultation in developing the proposals.	N



Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	that local opinion should be taken account of in the proposals.	<p>As detailed in the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1), SZC Co. has undertaken a thorough and robust approach to consultation, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>The issues tables appended to the <b>Consultation Report</b> at <b>Annexes A, D, G and J</b> explain how local opinion has been taken into account in relation to the <b>Transport Strategy</b> and informed the evolution of the Sizewell C Project. The <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6) demonstrates that the scheme has also been informed by robust technical environmental assessment to ensure that impacts of the proposals are suitably addressed.</p>	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the amount of land take required for the overall Transport Strategy.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has considered and assessed a number of different social, economic and environmental factors in determining our <b>Transport Strategy</b>, including the level of land take.</p> <p>Full details are provided throughout the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Book 6).</p>	N
Landscape and Visual	<b>Comments and suggestions about light pollution mitigation as part of the transport</b>	The lighting requirements of new roads and junction improvements follow the requirements of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and are agreed with the relevant highway authorities. Lighting is minimised	N

Theme: Transport			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>strategy, for example that Campaign to Protect Rural England lighting guidelines should be followed.</b>	wherever possible to reduce the impacts on local residents and in accordance with the ‘dark skies’ policy.	
Transport Strategy	<b>Concern about the lack of planning for where trains will be loaded, the number of trains/carriages required and timetables.</b>	Once construction of the green rail route into the temporary construction area is complete, this would provide capacity for three return freight trains to operate in each direction. These trains would predominantly operate overnight to make use of available rail capacity at these times. An illustrative layout of the construction site is then shown on <b>Figure 3.8</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y

b. Main development site

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Size of main development site	<b>Challenges to the estimates and assumptions given about the construction materials, for example</b>	Use of borrow pits within the main development site provide a sustainable, efficient and cost-effective means of sourcing and disposing of material.  Material sourced from the borrow pits would be for uses	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	that 15 hectares will be too small to accommodate the construction.	<p>including backfill of land underlying the main power station structures. Peat and ‘peaty clay’ excavated from land within the main platform would be placed within the borrow pits, with appropriate treatment.</p> <p>The amount of land required for the borrow pits was increased at Stage 3 to allow more material to be sourced on-site and thereby reduce environmental impacts and programme risks associated with the import and export of that material.</p> <p>Further details on the borrow pits are set out in <b>Chapter 3 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.).</p>	
Alternative options	<b>Suggestions for the construction materials proposals, such as a conveyer belt system, recycling and reusing output, reducing the height and flattening spoil heaps.</b>	<p>The volume of materials that require management is very <b>significant</b> as provided in <b>Appendix 3B of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) for further details. It would not therefore be practicable to use a conveyor belt system to move material around the site and articulated dump trucks or similar will be required.</p> <p>With the exception of arisings from tunnel boring, all suitable earthworks material is assumed to be reused</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>on-site.</p> <p>Stockpile heights are restricted by parameters, as set out in <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). This chapter also contains further details of construction activity and stockpiles at the main development site, which development will need to be in general accordance with.</p>	
Alternative options	<b>Support for the construction materials proposals as necessary, but comments that more information and mitigation is needed.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcomes support for the construction materials proposals and further information is contained within <b>Chapter 3</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Stockpile heights are restricted by parameters, as set out in the above chapter. This chapter also contains further details of construction activity and stockpiles at the main development site, which development will need to be in general accordance with.</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) requires compliance with certain measures relating to construction activity.</p>	N
Access Road	<b>Opposition and</b>	Based on preliminary environmental information (PEI) on	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>concerns about both access road options that include bridges (Options 2 and 3), because they would interfere with water courses.</b>	<p>the four options presented, SZC Co.’s preferred option is for a causeway over a culvert (Option 1). In response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated PEI.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Access Road	<b>Concern about the cost and maintenance required for the upkeep of bridges for Options 2 and 3 of the proposed access road.</b>	<p>Based on preliminary environmental information (PEI) on the four options presented, SZC Co.’s preferred option is for a causeway over a culvert (Option 1). In response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated PEI.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Access Road	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impact of bridges for Options 2 and 3 of the proposed access road.</b>	<p>SZC Co. recognise the concerns regarding landscape and visual impact of bridges. Alternative options for the SSSI crossing have been considered throughout the consultation stages, leading to the final design, which comprises a vehicular and pedestrian crossing in the form of a culverted embankment.</p> <p>At Stage 2 SZC Co. introduced a proposed short-term park and ride area at the LEEIE, to allow workers to be shuttled by minibus to the power station platform, until a SSSI crossing has been established and the workforce can use the main construction car park.</p> <p>The environmental considerations relevant to the choice of SSSI crossing are set out in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>, and summarised below, along with other factors in relation to construction and operational flexibility. This analysis presents a comparative analysis of the proposed SSSI crossing design (Option 1) with Options 2, 3 and 4 presented during consultation.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Ref. 8.4).	
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the reduction in landscape and visual impacts from proposed bridges for Options 2 and 3 of the access road proposals.</b>	SZC Co. consider that the causeway options provide greater potential for integrating the crossing with the surrounding landscape than a bridge option.  Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	N
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the reduced cost and maintenance of bridges for Options 2 and 3 of the access road proposals.</b>	Based on preliminary environmental information (PEI) on the four options presented, SZC Co.'s preferred option is for a causeway over a culvert (Option 1). In response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated PEI.  Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	N
Access Road	<b>Concern about the amount of land take</b>	Although the bridge options required less direct land take from the SSSI, the difference would be relatively	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>required for the causeway over culvert option for the access road proposals.</b>	<p>small (resulting in the loss of around 0.25ha more of the SSSI than the causeway option), and the bridge options would not deliver comparable benefits of construction.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Access Road	<b>Concern about the landscape and visual impact from the causeway over culvert option of the access road proposals.</b>	<p>SZC Co. consider that the causeway options provide greater potential for integrating the crossing with the surrounding landscape than a bridge option.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the reduced amount of construction required, less disruption and potential legacy benefits with the causeway over culvert access road option.</b>	<p>SZC Co. welcome the support for the causeway option and the recognition that it would result in less disruption during construction than one of the bridge options. However, response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated</p>	N



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>PEI.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Access Road	<p><b>Concern about the impact of construction from the single span bridge access road option, as it would be more complex to build, and a waste of resources when only one bridge is required long-term.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. welcome the support for the causeway option and the recognition that it would involve a more straightforward single time limited procedure, compared to one of the bridge options. However, response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated PEI.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Access Road	<p><b>Concern about the impact on the SSSI/environment from</b></p>	<p>Based on preliminary environmental information (PEI) on the four options presented, SZC Co.’s preferred option is for a causeway over a culvert (Option 1). However, in</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>the bridge options of the access road proposals.</b>	<p>response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated PEI.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the legacy benefits of the causeway options of the access road proposals.</b>	<p>EDF welcomes the comments in relation to the causeway option, which represents the preferred approach based on preliminary environmental information (PEI) on the four options presented. However, in response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated PEI.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Access Road	<b>Positive comments about the amount of construction required/less disruption involved with Option 3 of the access road proposals.</b>	<p>SZC Co. consider that the causeway option would involve a more straightforward single time limited procedure, compared to one of the bridge options, resulting in less disruption to the during construction. However, response to varied feedback from respondents to the Stage 2 consultation with regard to the preferred SSSI crossing approach (in relation to loss of habitat, restriction of movement of wildlife and increased flood risk) the four options were presented again at Stage 3 with further detail of the proposed design, and updated PEI.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Construction Materials	<b>Criteria for the construction materials option choice, that it should be based on whichever has the least impact on residents.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the preference for whichever option has the least impact on residents. Borrow Pit Option Field 1 was the most visually exposed field to residents and no longer forms part of the proposals.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b>,</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Alternatives and Design Evolution, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Construction Materials	<b>Criteria for the construction materials option choice, that it should be based on whichever is the most efficient/economically suitable.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes the preference for whichever option is the most efficient/economically suitable. Borrow Pit Option Field 1 was the furthest distance from the main platform and it would have been necessary for construction machinery to have crossed Eastbridge Road. This field no longer forms part of the proposals accordingly.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b>, Alternatives and Design Evolution, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about Option 1 of the construction materials proposals, that it is located too far from the main development site.</b>	<p>SZC Co. notes concern for Borrow Pit Option Field 1. This field was the furthest distance from the main platform and it would have been necessary for construction machinery to have crossed Eastbridge Road. This field no longer forms part of the proposals accordingly.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6</b>, Alternatives and Design Evolution, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Construction Materials	<b>Positive comments about the lack of land take required for Option 1 of the construction materials proposals.</b>	<p>Borrow Pit Option Field 1 was the furthest distance from the main platform, the most visually exposed of all borrow pit sites and would have required construction vehicles to cross Eastbridge Road. This field no longer forms parts of the proposals accordingly.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6, Alternatives and Design Evolution, of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Construction Materials	<b>Positive comments about the close proximity of waste management services to the location of Option 1 of the construction materials proposals.</b>	<p>With the exception of arisings from tunnel boring, all suitable earthworks material is assumed to be reused on-site.</p> <p>The <b>Waste Management Strategy</b> is provided in <b>Appendix 8A of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Borrow Pit Option Field 1 was the furthest distance from the main platform, the most visually exposed of all borrow pit sites and would have required construction vehicles to cross Eastbridge Road. This field no longer forms parts of the proposals accordingly.</p> <p>Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6, Alternatives and Design Evolution, of Volume 2 of the</b></p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the air quality, noise and landscape and visual impacts from Option 2 of the construction materials proposals.</b>	Borrow Pit Option Field 2 is located directly to the east of Eastbridge Road. The effects of construction are assessed in <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) requires compliance with certain measures relating to construction activity.  Further information is contained in <b>Chapter 6, Alternatives and Design Evolution, of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N
Construction Materials	<b>Positive comments about the distance away from Eastbridge Road for Option 2 of the construction materials proposals.</b>	SZC Co. welcomes support for Option 2 (located east of Eastbridge Road). This field forms part of the DCO application and further information is contained within <b>Chapter 3 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N
Construction Materials	<b>Positive comments about the Option 3 of the construction materials proposals having the least impact on the environment including water,</b>	SZC Co. welcomes support for Option 3 (located north of Ash Wood). This field forms part of the DCO application and further information is contained within <b>Chapter 3 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	landscape and visual impact.		
Construction Materials	<b>Positive comments about the Option 3 of the construction materials proposals keeping the borrow pits closest to the stockpiles.</b>	SZC Co. welcomes support for Option 3 (located north of Ash Wood). This field forms part of the DCO application and further information is contained within <b>Chapter 3 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	N
Mitigation	<b>Concern that proposed mitigation measures for the proposed access road options are inadequate and will not prevent harmful impacts.</b>	SZC Co. recognise concerns about the impacts associated with the access road and have put in place a number of measures accordingly.  <b>The Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) requires compliance with certain measures relating to construction activity.	Y
Construction Materials	<b>Concern about the impacts of extraction and filling for construction materials, including borrow pits and spoil heaps.</b>	SZC Co. recognise concerns about the impacts associated with management materials on-site and have put in place a number of measures accordingly.  Stockpile heights are restricted by parameters, as set out in <b>Chapter 3 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). This chapter also contains further details of construction activity, including borrow	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>pits and stockpiles, which development will need to be in general accordance with.</p> <p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) also requires compliance with certain measures relating to construction activity such as drainage, soil treatment and materials management.</p>	
Coastal Processes	<p><b>Comments about the assessment of coastal processes, such as the lack of clarity regarding the existence of designated areas (e.g. no maps) and suggestions that further assessment is needed.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. provided more material at Stage 3 to provide further clarity on these matters. Please refer to <b>Appendices E.1, E.2, E.3 and E.4</b> to the <b>Consultation Report</b> (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>With regard to the DCO application, full details are contained within <b>Chapter 20</b> Coastal Geomorphology, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	N
Environmental Impact	<p><b>Comments that there will be an overall net benefit to the environment because of the proposed development.</b></p>	<p>The environmental impacts of the proposals have been assessed by the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which has helped inform design choices as well as enabled SZC Co. to define appropriate mitigation measures and compensatory measures where necessary.</p>	N



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Landscape and Visual	<b>Comments and suggestions about landscape and visual mitigation measures, such as screening and planting, and that the environment in general would benefit as a result of the proposed mitigation.</b>	<p>The landscaping and ecological proposals for the main development site have evolved since Stage 2 and are more fully explained in the <b>Design and Access Statement</b>, the Operational Masterplan and the <b>oLEMP</b>.</p> <p>The latter document explains how the operational proposals will deliver increased woodland and greater connectivity as well as extensive areas of acidic ‘Sandlings grasslands’ on areas which currently support intensive agriculture.</p> <p>These proposals will deliver ‘Biodiversity Net Gain’ as well as structural planting which will, in the longer term, help screen the main buildings from a number of views including some views from the west.</p>	Y
Landscape and Visual	<b>Comments and suggestions about light pollution mitigation, such as minimal lighting.</b>	<p>The <b>Lighting Management Plan (LMP)</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3B) developed for the application provides details of the approaches which will be used to minimise light spill both to nearby residential properties and to ecological receptors (such as adjacent woodlands) during both construction and operation.</p> <p>The LMP demonstrates that it is possible to minimise light spill to nearby hedgerows and woodlands, so minimising the impacts on foraging and roosting bats.</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Carbon Emissions	<b>Concern about the impact of increased carbon emissions from traffic and construction and the impact on Climate Change.</b>	During construction, there is a risk of proposed construction activities giving rise to emissions of dust and particulate matter, in particular the long-term earthworks and movement of materials, with potential for dust raising and vehicle exhaust emissions. Dust management measures are set out in the <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11) which will manage activities to minimise impacts of dust, including effective dust suppression measures and monitoring. With the implementation of these measures, no significant effects associated with emissions from construction works are considered likely.	Y
Access Road	<b>Concern about the impact of the proposed access road options on local residents' lives, due to disruption.</b>	The Site Selection Report, provided in <b>Appendix A</b> to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), presents a description of the site selection process which SZC Co. has undertaken in relation to development on the main development site.  The existing Sizewell power station complex access road to Sizewell A and B was not considered to be an option for the primary route to Sizewell C. This is because it would not be able to provide the regular capacity required during both the construction and	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>operational phases, due to its routing past Sizewell B. In addition, the space constraints around the main platform for the Sizewell C Project would limit the opportunity to provide operational car parking adjacent to a southern entrance to the station.</p> <p>There is a regulatory requirement for two separate accesses to the operational power station and the existing Sizewell power station complex access road would provide this secondary access.</p>	
Worker Welfare	<b>Concern about the impact on workers from the construction materials.</b>	<p>Throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project, SZC Co. has sought to ensure that worker welfare and safety is a priority. The Sizewell C Project is committed to zero harm and this will be reflected in the approach to health and safety and worker wellbeing.</p> <p>All contractors will be required to comply with health and safety plans and ensure project risk registers and task risk assessments and matrices are complete before work is undertaken.</p> <p>An on-site occupational health service will be available for all workers covering a wide range of services including assessment of fitness to work, ongoing health</p>	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>surveillance, GP, pharmacy, 24-hour nurse cover and treatment services. Mental and sexual health services will be included, including a chaplain/counselling service and mental health first aiders.</p> <p>Full details may be found in <b>Chapter 28</b>, Health and Wellbeing of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about the resulting impacts from traffic to and from the areas used for construction materials.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>Since Stages 3 and 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-Led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated</li> </ul>	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, provided in <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) sets out the transport impacts from the scheme. Mitigation has been proposed where necessary and the scheme designs have retained access to residential properties.</p>	
Community Impact	<b>Comments about the impact on people's</b>	SZC Co. recognise that there have been concerns regarding the quality of life for people as a result of	Y

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<p><b>quality of life resulting from damage to the environment.</b></p>	<p>damage to the environment.</p> <p>Following Stage 2, activities with the potential to impact upon the environment and the quality of life of local communities have been investigated and assessed through the individual technical disciplines. Preliminary Environmental Impacts (PEI) were presented at Stage 3, with full impacts set out in the <b>Environmental Statement</b>. These have informed the scope and focus of a health and wellbeing assessment which sets out ways in which the Sizewell C Project will aim to avoid, manage and mitigate potential impacts to, and disruption upon local communities, their amenities and facilities.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in <b>Chapter 28</b> Health and Wellbeing, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> <p>A Community Fund would also be provided to help compensate for intangible, residual or in-combination effects through schemes, measures and projects which promote the economic, social or environmental well-being of communities and enhance their quality of life.</p> <p>Further detail may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> Socio-</p>	

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		economics, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> .	

c. Rail Improvement Options

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Options	<b>Suggestions for alternative rail routes, such as the Sizewell B line, extending the rail line from Eastfields or a rail link from Leiston.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has liaised extensively with Network Rail throughout the consultation process to develop a rail strategy for the delivery of construction material.</p> <p>Any work proposed on the rail network is managed through the Network Rail ‘Governance for Railway Investment Projects’ (GRIP) process. The different stages run through feasibility, option selection, detailed design and construction. All proposals presented for the Sizewell C Project have been through the feasibility stage of this process. This takes into account the existing passenger service, the operational restrictions on the rail line, available rail capacity with regard to the feasibility of moving materials on the rail network and the necessary interventions required to facilitate this.</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Therefore, the options provided moving forward to the Stage 3 and Stage 4 consultations presented the most feasible solutions to mitigate impacts from the construction and operation of the temporary green rail route in association with the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement</b>, the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Property and Land Ownership	<b>Concern about the impacts on land owners and farms resulting from the temporary rail extension option.</b>	<p>SZC Co. have proposed to minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls. Only the land essential to deliver the scheme will be acquired from landowners.</p> <p>EDF and their agents continue to engage with landowners concerning accommodation works in order to minimise</p>	N





SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>impact on holdings as far as possible.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the 'Compensation Code' based on legislation, case law and pest practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned 'Compensation Code'. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Site legacy	<b>Concern about the lack of long-term legacy benefits from the temporary rail extension option.</b>	<p>The green rail route would be removed and land reinstated when it is no longer required. This would help to deliver the Sizewell C main development site with the least disruption to road traffic, whilst also removing any potential environmental impacts, including on visual and heritage impacts.</p> <p>However, there would still be junction improvements where the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line meets the East Suffolk line, to allow for a faster, quieter and more reliable transfer of trains between the lines.</p> <p>The eight level crossing upgrades on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch, and a replacement of the branch line track, would be permanent improvements to the line. Therefore, the line would be left in an improved state as a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapters 2 and 3 of Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Cost	<b>Positive comments about the cost-effectiveness and lack of construction required for the temporary rail extension option.</b>	The support is welcomed. Consultation comments received from the local community informed the selection of design options for the green rail route. Please refer to the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.	
Environmental Impact	<b>Positive comments about the temporary rail extension option having the least impact on the environment and local community, and being the most safe.</b>	The support is welcomed. Consultation comments received from the local community informed the selection of design options for the green rail route. Please refer to the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) for further details.	N
Public Access	<b>Concern about access issues resulting from the new, temporary rail terminal option, such as access onto Abbey Road, Buller Road and to Sizewell Beach.</b>	Abbey Road, Buller Road and Sizewell Beach would remain accessible during construction works.  The green rail route includes a level crossing at B1122 (Abbey Road), which would take approximately nine months to complete.  A temporary highway alignment would be put in place to avoid long-term road closures of this section of road construction. The temporary highway alignment will be approximately 300m in length and 5m wide, including the	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>connections to the existing highway. Both B1122 (Abbey Road) and Lover’s Lane would remain open to traffic for the duration of the level crossing construction works, with the exception of short closures to allow connections to/from the temporary alignment.</p> <p>Further details on the temporary rail extension between the existing Saxmundham to Leiston branch line to the proposed B1122 (Abbey Road) level crossing inclusive are set out in <b>Chapter 2, Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.10).</p> <p>The temporary rail terminal within Land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate comprises self-contained work construction and operational works on land already identified for construction and activity and would not adversely affect access onto Abbey Road, Buller Road or Sizewell Beach.</p> <p>Further details of this element of the proposed rail works are set out in <b>Chapter 3, Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Soil and Agriculture	<b>Concern about the impact of the new,</b>	The green rail route and the rail spur at Land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate are temporary and will be	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	temporary rail terminal option on land and farming, for example, from compaction of the soil.	<p>removed at the end of the construction phase. Land will be reinstated to agricultural use, with appropriate measures put in place to ensure that the land is fit for purpose.</p> <p>Further details on removal and reinstatement are set out in <b>Chapter 2, Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.3) and <b>Chapter 3, Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Site legacy	<b>Concern about the lack of long-term legacy benefits of the new, temporary rail terminal, as it may not be necessary in the long-term.</b>	<p>The green rail route and the rail spur at Land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate would be removed and land reinstated when they are no longer required. This would help to deliver the Sizewell C main development site with the least disruption to road traffic, whilst also removing any potential environmental impacts, including on visual and heritage impacts.</p> <p>However, there would still be junction improvements where the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line meets the East Suffolk line, to allow for a faster, quieter and more reliable transfer of trains between the lines.</p> <p>The eight level crossing upgrades on the Saxmundham to Leiston branch, and a replacement of the branch line track, would be permanent improvements to the line. Therefore,</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>the line would be left in an improved state as a lasting legacy of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Further details on removal and reinstatement are set out in <b>Chapter 2, Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.3) and <b>Chapter 3, Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Size of Rail Site	<b>Concern about the size of the site for the new, temporary rail terminal will be too small for its required use.</b>	<p>The main development site is suitably sized to accommodate the temporary rail terminals, including the rail terminal at Land east of Eastlands Industrial Estate.</p> <p>Further details are set out in <b>Chapter 3, Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). <b>Figure 3.8</b> contains indicative details of the main development site layout during construction.</p>	N
Site legacy	<b>Positive comments about the benefits to the local area through the long-term use of the new, temporary rail terminal option.</b>	<p>These positive comments are welcomed. Whilst the rail terminals are temporary, they will allow trains to deliver freight directly into the main development site, thereby removing some freight from roads, including roads in the local area. Further details are set out in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.3).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Rail Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the potential to deliver higher volumes of material with the new, temporary rail terminal.</b>	These positive comments are welcomed. The rail terminals will freight to be delivered directly into the main development site, thereby removing some freight from roads. Further details are set out in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc. Ref. 6.3).	N
Public Access	<b>Concern about access routes resulting from the rail transport proposals, such as the Leiston Abbey to Abbey Road footpath, on Sizewell Hall Road and Lovers' Lane.</b>	<p>Footpath diversions would be in place during the construction, operation and removal and reinstatement of the green rail route. None of the existing crossing points (both PRowS and roads) would be permanently stopped-up or diverted and access across the site would be retained.</p> <p>The existing footpaths would all be reinstated to their current alignment following removal of the green rail route. To the west of the B1122 (Abbey Road), the footpath diversion to the south of the proposed rail extension route, linking Footpaths E-363/006/0 and E-363/010/0 would be retained following completion of the Sizewell C Project as a permanent legacy benefit to the existing footpath network.</p> <p>Both the B1122 (Abbey Road) and Buckleswood Road would remain available for access. Whilst the level crossings would cause some short delays during periods</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>when the road is closed to allow trains to pass, the relatively small number of train movements means that disruption is not expected to be significant, especially as train movements would predominantly be at night.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 2 of Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p>	
Feasibility	<p><b>Concern about the feasibility of the proposals for the rail transport proposals, including ability of current rail lines to handle predicted rail traffic.</b></p>	<p>Network Rail have undertaken detailed feasibility studies to confirm the interventions required to deliver additional capacity to operate freight trains on the East Suffolk line. This work has fed in to the proposals presented at consultation. Freight trains will operate around the passenger service and not require any timetable changes as a result.</p> <p>Any work proposed on the rail network is managed through the Network Rail ‘Governance for Railway Investment Projects’ (GRIP) process. The different stages run through feasibility, option selection, detailed design and construction. All proposals presented for the Sizewell C Project have been through the feasibility stage of this process. This takes into account the existing passenger service, the operational restrictions on the rail line, available rail capacity with regard to the feasibility of moving materials on the rail network and the necessary</p>	N



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>interventions required to facilitate this.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Chapter 4 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement, the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 8.5) and the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 8.4).</b></p>	
Landscape and Visual	<p><b>Concern about the landscape and visual impacts of the rail transport proposals, including from Leiston Abbey and near Buckleswood County wildlife site.</b></p>	<p>It was acknowledged during the consultation process that there would be some potential for impacts on the setting of Leiston Abbey. However, further investigation has shown that any impact would be sufficiently mitigated. Any impact would also be temporary as the green rail route would be removed and the land reinstated to agricultural use once it is no longer needed.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures, including landscape bunds, are incorporated into the design of the green rail route to prevent impacts on users of the footpaths and local residents in general in terms of heritage, the visual landscape and ecology, including on Buckles Wood.</p> <p>Further to consultation feedback and design development, SZC Co. has removed the conveyor over King George's Avenue. SZC Co. has chosen to proceed with the rail spur as it will enable longer trains to deliver to LEEIE.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details can be found in <b>Volumes 2 and 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3 to 6.10).	
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about the impact of light pollution from the rail transport proposals, including from rail terminals, and the impact on people and wildlife.</b>	<p>Embedded mitigation measures, including landscape bunds, are incorporated into the design of the proposed rail extension route to minimise impacts on users of the footpaths, nearby residents and local wildlife from light pollution.</p> <p>The green rail route would only be lit at the temporary level crossings in accordance with Office of Rail and Road safety standards. The remainder of the route would be unlit.</p> <p>On the Saxmundham to Leiston branch line, no new lighting is proposed on this existing rail infrastructure.</p> <p>Further details can be found in <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10).</p>	N
Economic Impact	<b>Concern about the economic impact resulting from the rail transport proposals, specifically on the viability of farm</b>	SZC Co. have proposed to minimise impacts of construction and operation at source where possible through best practice, embedded mitigation and controls. Only the land essential to deliver the scheme will be acquired from landowners.	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	businesses.	<p>EDF and their agents continue to engage with landowners concerning accommodation works in order to minimise impact on holdings as far as possible.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the ‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and pest practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination.	
Safety	<b>Positive comments about improvements in safety and air quality from the rail transport proposals, from removing traffic from the roads.</b>	<p>These positive comments are welcomed.</p> <p>The <b>Integrated Strategy</b> would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>Once the construction of Sizewell C is complete, the green rail route would be removed and the land restored. Please refer <b>Volume 9</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.10) for further details.</p>	N

d. Sea Transport Options

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Cost	<b>Concern about the cost of the sea transport</b>	The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>options, particularly the use of the beach.</b>	<p>from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised (non-significant) scour will occur at the piles but our assessments show no broader scale impacts (erosion or accretion) from the presence or operation of the beach landing facility.</p>	
Marine Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the efficiency and speed of transporting materials by sea.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs).</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised (non-significant) scour will occur at the piles but our assessments show no broader scale impacts (erosion or accretion) from the presence or operation of the beach landing facility.	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the sea transport options, that the proposal should be the most efficient and effective.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised (non-significant) scour will occur at the piles but our assessments show no broader scale impacts (erosion or accretion) from the presence or operation of the beach landing facility.</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Coastal Processes	<b>Concern about the flood risk due to the sea transport proposals, due to impacts on coastal erosion, and the lack of assessment for potential flooding.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea. Some localised (non-significant) scour will occur at the piles but our assessments show no broader scale impacts (erosion or accretion) from the presence or operation of the beach landing facility.</p> <p>Regardless, SZC Co. will be required to monitor local coastal processes and mitigate any impacts; the monitoring plan and mitigation would include any potential impacts from the beach landing facility.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 20</b> Coastal</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Geomorphology and Hydrodynamics, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concern about the intrusive nature of all proposed sea transport options, for at least ten years.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment.</p> <p>Although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs).</p> <p>The BLF would include a temporary deck structure that can be removed when not in use, leaving minimum visible elements.</p> <p>Fender piles with cross beams and piled mooring dolphins would be located immediately adjacent to the BLF to aid safe berthing. A ramp, which would comprise a short steel constructed bridge (up to 6m in length) would provide a connection to the cross beams. A 5m taper section would then provide a ramp onto the barge. If required, fixed structures in the water (e.g. dolphins or lateral pillars) would be lit.</p> <p>When not in use for extended periods of time, the modular</p>	N



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>sections of the BLF including the ramp and the taper would be removed. When the BLF deck is removed for storage, several elements would remain and be maintained for the operational life of Sizewell C. These would consist of piling structures and a ground beam connection from the BLF to the access road. The height of pile projections, including fender piles and mooring dolphins would be up to approximately 1 metre above mean high water tide. The pile and ground beam furthest into the beach would be within the existing dunes and so would typically not be visible.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 3</b> Description of Construction of Sizewell, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>	
Security / Safety	<p><b>Concern about the security risk of transporting materials by sea, for example terrorists landing at the ports and the roughness of the sea making delivery unpredictable.</b></p>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the <b>Marine Strategy</b> was rejected after Stage 2 consultation due to concerns over construction impacts on the marine environment. However, although the jetty was removed from the proposals, the beach landing facility (BLF) has been retained to allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). In addition, SZC Co. propose to bring rock armour and containerised equipment and material to site by sea.</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>SZC Co. is applying for a temporary harbour empowerment during the construction element when deliveries are being made by sea. The temporary Harbour Authority would mean the offshore area immediately in front of the proposed development would legally operate as a harbour area and have a Harbour Master appointed with powers to direct vessels etc. The Harbour Master will manage all deliveries to the construction site.</p> <p>Further details are contained within <b>Chapter 24</b> Marine Navigation, of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>All vessels arriving at the beach landing facility will be thoroughly checked by security and only licensed and reputable contractors will be utilised.</p>	
Marine Suitability	<b>Concern that even with sea transport the development will still require a large amount of road traffic, especially when seas are rough.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>Since Stages 3 and 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the Integrated Strategy over the Road-led Strategy, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the integrated strategy allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the Integrated Strategy provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during</p>	

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		construction of the Sizewell C Project.	
Marine Strategy	<b>Positive comments about the reduced environmental impacts from sea transport, especially from reduction of road transport and infrastructure.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>Since Stages 3 and 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	
Marine Strategy	<p><b>Positive comments about the reduced safety impacts from sea transport, due to less road traffic, also because it could be used as an emergency evacuation route.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>Since Stages 3 and 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-Led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a significant advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the roads themselves.</li> </ul> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Costs	<b>Positive comments about the costs saved with the wide jetty option.</b>	<p>Paragraph 5.13.10 of NPS EN-6 states that “<i>Water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the Project, where cost-effective</i>”. The feasibility of a marine led strategy has therefore been considered. As part of Stage 1 consultation a wide jetty was one of the three options proposed for a marine delivery facility. A wide jetty would have enabled the delivery of bulk materials, containerised goods and abnormal indivisible loads (AILs) by sea during the construction phase. The narrow jetty would not have allowed the type of material needed during construction and therefore would not have been able to make any meaningful contribution to the construction phase.</p> <p>The preliminary environmental assessment of these options was undertaken between Stages 2 and 3, and identified several significant environmental impacts associated with a wide jetty. Whereas the BLF is predicted to have a more limited impact on the environment.</p> <p>SZC Co. therefore discounted the narrow and wide jetty options following Stage 2 consultation and progressed with a BLF, in order to retain the ability to deliver AILs by sea that would be too large to be delivered by road or rail.</p>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Coastal Processes	<b>Concern about the impact on coastal processes from the narrow jetty option.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the marine strategy was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. This means that the jetty will not be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty was removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine ecology.</p> <p>Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Marine Ecology	<b>Positive comments about the reduced environmental and marine ecology impacts of the narrow jetty option, for example less damage to sea bed.</b>	<p>The majority of sea transport infrastructure was removed from the proposals when the <b>Marine Strategy</b> was rejected after Stage 2 consultation. Although the environmental impacts of the narrow jetty were reduced compared with the larger jetty, the impacts were still not deemed acceptable. This means that neither jetty will be included in the proposed design and instead rail and road will form the basis for transport of materials to site.</p> <p>The jetty options were removed from the proposals due to concerns over its impact on coastal processes and marine</p>	N



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		ecology.  Further details are contained in the Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Marine Strategy	<b>Concern that beach landing facility option will not be sufficient to transport construction material.</b>	<p>SZC Co. has undertaken transport modelling which provides an assessment of the transport proposals.</p> <p>Since Stages 3 and 4, SZC Co. have undertaken further analysis and have considered the potential advantages of the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> over the <b>Road-Led Strategy</b>, in addition to consistency with the clear policy preference. The key benefits are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased proportion of material transported by rail: the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> allows for 38% of construction materials (by weight) to be transported to the main development site by rail, or 39% by rail and sea. This is 9% more than that possible under the road-led option and provides a <b>significant</b> advantage in terms of overall sustainability.</li> <li>• Reduction in HGV movements: the integrated strategy would reduce the busiest day HGV limits by a third, from 750 to 500. This reduction in HGVs would substantially reduce noise and air quality impacts to the receptors along the HGV routes, along with reducing the amount of traffic on the</li> </ul>	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>roads themselves.</p> <p>SZC Co. concluded that the <b>Integrated Strategy</b> provides an appropriate strategy to move materials for the construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p> <p>The details of this assessment are contained in <b>Chapter 10</b> of <b>Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3) and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). The Site Selection Report, <b>Appendix A</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4), then sets out the rationale for the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> proposed during construction of the Sizewell C Project.</p>	
Site Legacy	<b>Positive comments about the long-term lifespan of the beach landing facility option.</b>	The beach landing facility (BLF) will allow delivery of very large, abnormal indivisible loads (AILs). The beach landing facility is a simple, open-piled structure which will not cause significant erosion or accretion locally. The beach landing facility will be retained throughout operation of the proposed development for occasional deliveries by sea.	N

e. Park & Ride Options

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	<b>Concern about the lack of mitigation measures proposed for the park and ride schemes, for example concerning light pollution, planting and landscaping.</b>	<p>This comment is noted. SZC Co. have worked to develop site-specific mitigation for each of the park and ride sites, responding to a number of site-specific issues including light pollution, planting and landscaping.</p> <p>Mitigation for construction impacts is found in the <b>Code of Construction Practice</b> (Doc Ref. 8.11). Mitigation for other issues is found in <b>Chapters 4-12 of Volumes 3 and 4 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	N
Traffic Flow	<b>Concern about the proposed 'pick-up points' for the park and rides, such as Lowestoft, and the subsequent impacts, for example on car parking.</b>	<p>Pick up points for the park and rides sites would be at the sites themselves and the only pick up points in Lowestoft or Ipswich would be for the direct bus services to the construction site.</p> <p>The <b>Construction Worker Travel Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.8) and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7) set out further details.</p>	N
Site Restoration	<b>Positive comments about the park and rides being temporary, and that the sites will be restored to their</b>	<p>Positive comments welcomed. SZC Co. continue to propose that the park and ride facilities will be temporary and restored following the construction period.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning</b></p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>original state.</b>	<b>Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Environmental Impact	<b>Concerns about the proposed postal consolidation facility, that it would add to development on a rural site.</b>	<p>SZC Co. continue to propose a postal consolidation facility at the site of the southern park and ride at Wickham Market.</p> <p>This is considered to offer efficiencies for the Sizewell C project. The postal consolidation facility will provide a helpful role in reducing traffic by eliminating many Light Goods Vehicle movements and is therefore considered necessary to propose.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N
Decision Making	<b>Challenging the process which led to the proposal for the two park and ride locations, such as lack of consultation, trying to cut costs.</b>	<p>The geographical distribution of the workforce estimated by the gravity modelling work supports two park and ride developments to help reduce traffic from construction workforce movements. One is needed to intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the south, and one is needed to intercept traffic travelling on the A12 from the north. Both park and ride developments would intercept traffic movements from locations west of the A12.</p> <p>EDF have continued to consult on the proposals for the park and ride facilities throughout the evolution of the Sizewell C Project and have utilised the feedback to</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>inform the proposals.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Alternative Options	<p><b>Suggestions for an alternative approach to park and rides for transporting workers to the main development site, such as car sharing, more dispersed parking along the A12 or having one site rather than two.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. anticipate that there would be some car sharing by construction workers travelling to the park and ride sites.</p> <p>However, experience at Hinkley Point C is that so far such sharing is limited, though it is expected to grow as the workforce grows. The park and ride strategy of a site for A12 north and south has been consistent since Stage 1 – subsequent consultation has been to determine the best sites rather than alternative approaches.</p> <p>The northern and southern park and ride sites are described and assessed in <b>Environmental Statement Volumes 3 and 4</b> respectively (Doc Ref. 6.4 - 6.5). Smaller dispersed sites would spread the demand and require more buses and more drivers to provide the same frequency of services, so was not proposed.</p> <p>A single park and ride site would necessarily involve longer drives than would two sites and add traffic to the local road network, so again was not proposed.</p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The <b>Construction Worker Travel Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.8) and <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7) set out further details.	
Site Suitability	<b>Concern about the Wickham Market park and ride being too far away from the main development site.</b>	The Wickham Market site is described in <b>Environmental Statement Volume 4</b> in (Doc Ref. 6.5).  The site is located so as to reduce traffic impacts on a significant part of the local road network, particularly through Marlesford, Little Glemham, Stratford St Andrew and Farnham as the <b>Transport Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) indicates. Sites closer to the main construction site would not relieve the local road network to the same extent.	N
Site Suitability	<b>Concern about the distance of both park and ride sites from the main development site.</b>	The Darsham and Wickham Market sites, described and assessed in <b>Environmental Statement Volumes 3 and 4 of Book 6</b> , are located so as to reduce traffic impacts on a significant part of the local road network as demonstrated in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5).  Sites closer to the main construction site would not relieve the local road network to the same extent.	N
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the proposed park and rides, that they should be based on local</b>	The park and ride sites proposed at Stage 1 were assessed across a range of factors including evidence, site observations and professional experience on highway access. This was supplemented by any Stage 1 public	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>knowledge and opinion.</b>	consultation responses that were based on local knowledge. In Stage 2, the sites were narrowed down to preferred sites at Darsham and Wickham Market. Public consultation responses informed the decision to confirm these as the sites presented at Stage 3 and 4. These sites are described and assessed in <b>Environmental Statement Volumes 3 and 4</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 - 6.5) as part of the DCO submission.	
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for the proposed park and rides, that cultural heritage should be protected in their development.</b>	<p>Following Stage 2, SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the Sizewell C Project, including on buried archaeology and designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Where possible, impacts are proposed to be avoided or reduced by design or by embedded mitigation measures such as screening. Where required, additional mitigation will take the form of agreed schemes of archaeological investigation or s106 commitments.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> Historic Environment, of <b>Volumes 3 and 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 – 6.5).</p>	
Site Suitability	<b>Positive comments about the southern</b>	The park and ride facilities need to be located a sufficient distance from the main development site to intercept	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>park and ride site being close to the railway line and the main development site.</b>	<p>optimum levels of traffic in order to reduce traffic levels on roads close to the main development site.</p> <p>The purpose of both park and ride sites remains to reduce construction worker traffic on the A12 between the park and ride sites at Wickham Market and Darsham and on the B1122 between Yoxford and the construction site, including at Theberton and Middleton. The northern park and ride would also reduce construction worker flows through the villages of Blythburgh and Westleton. Similarly, the southern park and ride would reduce these flows through Snape and Tunstall on the B1069, Leiston and surrounding settlements.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and <b>Volume 3</b> Northern Park and Ride at Darsham, and <b>Volume 4</b> Southern Park and Ride at Wickham Market, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.4 -6.5).</p>	
Heritage Impact	<b>Positive comments that the southern park and ride will reduce impact of the development on local heritage assets.</b>	This comment is welcomed. Evaluation trenching has identified some remains associated both with the known Romano-British settlement of Hacheston and its Late Iron Age precursor on the proposed site. However, these are far less concentrated than the extensive archaeological	



Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>remains suggested by geophysical survey on the Stage 1 site.</p> <p>Where archaeology is present, this will be mitigated through an agreed scheme of archaeological investigation (preservation by record) comprising excavation and post-excavation assessment and analysis, followed by public dissemination of the results. The scope would be agreed with SCCAS and they would also monitor this work. Nothing that requires preservation in situ has been identified on the site.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9</b> Terrestrial Historic Environment, of <b>Volume 4</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.5).</p>	
Site Legacy	<b>Concern about the legacy benefits and future use of the northern park and ride scheme, as most of the parking spaces will be removed after the development and will devalue the quality of</b>	<p>Both park and ride facilities will be removed at the end of the Sizewell C Project construction and returned to agricultural use.</p> <p>The application for the development consent is made on that basis and the <b>Environmental Statement</b> has been undertaken on that basis.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning</b></p>	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	land.	<b>Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).	
Site Legacy	<b>Concern about additional development taking place on the southern park and ride site, such as petrol stations or fast-food outlets, and the destruction of the area may leave it open to development after its use for the Sizewell C Project.</b>	<p>Both park and ride facilities would be removed at the end of the Sizewell C Project construction and returned to agricultural use. No petrol stations or fast-food outlets are proposed by SZC Co..</p> <p>The application for the development consent is made on that basis and the <b>Environmental Statement</b> has been undertaken on that basis.</p> <p>Further information is contained in the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	N

f. Transport: Road Improvements – A12

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Alternative Options	<b>Suggestions that congestion on the A12 could be improved by the provision of adequate public</b>	Park and ride sites at Darsham and Wickham Market were confirmed in the Stage 3 consultation. These will reduce the number of construction worker car trips on the A12 south of Darsham and north of Wickham Market. These sites were chosen as the preferred option due in part to	N

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	transport options.	<p>the fact that they offered the greatest catchment area for providing public transport access to the main development site. Further information on the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>SZC Co. also propose direct bus services to site from Lowestoft and Ipswich, together with pickups from Saxmundham rail station. These facilities and services are only available to construction workers, not the general public, but would reduce A12 traffic associated with the Sizewell C Project as the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) indicates. Provision of public transport options is a matter for Suffolk County Council. Further information can be found in the <b>Construction Traffic Management Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.7) and the <b>Construction Worker Travel Plan</b> (Doc Ref. 8.8).</p>	
Cost	Comments and concern about the cost and funding available for A12 road improvement proposals, including comments about funding for a four-village bypass.	The highway infrastructure proposed by SZC Co. would be fully funded by SZC Co.. Additional measures beyond that those needed to mitigate the predicted impacts set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5), such as a four village bypass, would not be funded by SZC Co..	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for proposals involving the A12, that environmental assessment and expert opinion should be taken into account for road improvements.</b>	<p>Traffic modelling has been undertaken to assess the traffic effects of the construction phase. This has informed the mitigation (including road improvements), which is proposed to reduce impacts on local communities.</p> <p>Full details are contained within the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.3).</p>	N
Decision Making	<b>Criteria for proposals involving the A12, that land take should be minimised for road improvements.</b>	<p>SZC Co. aimed at the Stage 3 proposals to minimise land take where possible, commensurate with the need to provide some design flexibility through the limits of deviation, sufficient working space to enable the contractor to build the scheme quickly and efficiently, and incorporate essential design features including space for drainage, accommodation works for affected landowners and contractor compounds.</p> <p>More information about the Two Village Bypass can be found in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y
Site Legacy	<b>Comments about the benefits to the community, long-term legacy and safety</b>	The Farnham bend widening (Option 2) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme (Option 4 at Stage 2) forms part of the DCO application. This is	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>benefits of the Farnham bend road widening option.</b>	<p>detailed in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>Further information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	
Timescale	<b>Comments about the benefits of a shorter timescale for the Farnham bend road widening option.</b>	<p>The Farnham bend widening (Option 2) was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application. The two village bypass scheme (Option 4 at Stage 2) forms part of the DCO application. This is detailed in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p> <p>Further information is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y
Amenity and Recreation	<b>Concern about the impacts amenity and recreation from the one-village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, by taking up amenity land.</b>	<p>The one-village bypass options would have reduced the amount of recreational space at the Riverside Centre that is available as well as impacting the user experience with changes to visual, noise and air quality baselines expected.</p> <p>As a result, the one-village bypass scheme was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application.</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The two village bypass emerged as the preferred option and is part of the DCO submission. Details on the two village bypass can be found in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p> <p>Further details are contained within the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Economic Impacts	<p><b>Concern about the economic impacts from the one village bypass options for the A12 road improvements, as businesses will lose passing traffic.</b></p>	<p>SZC Co. recognises that changes to road infrastructure has the potential to change the operation of some businesses that rely on passing trade. Where there is a potential effect that can be evidenced, businesses have the right to raise a Part 1 claim for compensation. SZC Co. will work with potentially affected businesses in these cases to determine the effects.</p> <p>The one-village bypass scheme was discounted after Stage 2 consultation and does not form part of the DCO application.</p> <p>The two village bypass emerged as the preferred option and is part of the DCO submission. Details on the two village bypass can be found in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>The Sizewell C Project has been designed sensitively to reduce the potential adverse effects on local economies by providing physical mitigation measures that will improve the strategic road network.</p> <p>Further details are contained within the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about the increase in light pollution from the one village bypass options of the A12 road improvements.</b>	<p>Option 3A, the one village bypass, was dropped after Stage 2 in favour of Option 4, the two village bypass. The two village bypass is further away from most properties in Farnham than the one village option and will be unlit, other than at roundabouts, which will help to minimise light spill.</p> <p>The two village bypass now forms part of the DCO submission.</p> <p>Further information on the site selection process can be found in the Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) and further information on the two village bypass can be found in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y
Safety	<b>Suggestions for the</b>	Option 3A, the one village bypass, was dropped after	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>one-village bypass options of the A12 road improvements, such as the inclusion of an underpass, slip road, safety refuge, reduction in speed limit, roundabout at A1094 and extending the dual carriageway.</b>	<p>Stage 2 in favour of Option 4, the two village bypass. This scheme has been developed further and subject to consultation at Stage 3 and Stage 4. It is a single carriageway scheme but does include a roundabout at the A1094 junction.</p> <p>Further information is in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	
Community Impact	<b>Concern about the community impacts from the two-village bypass option, because of destruction of amenity land including ancient woodland and footpaths.</b>	<p>The initial assessments considered the Two village bypass to improve air quality overall, and would likely result in improvements in both Nitrogen Dioxide, and particulate matter concentrations. It was noted that this option would have some negative effects on biodiversity, including the loss of habitat, but these effects could be reduced through mitigation measures. This option would have an adverse impact on the character of the landscape, but sufficient landscaping would lessen the impact.</p> <p>Whilst it was considered that this option would result in the potential loss of some heritage assets, including a historic field system, these are considered to be of low archaeological value. It was noted that this option would improve the setting of historic assets within the village of</p>	N



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>Farnham.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to the Site Selection Report, which is appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4).</p>	
Landscape and Visual	<b>Concern about the increase in light pollution impacting residences and wildlife from the two-village bypass option.</b>	<p>The two village bypass was selected after Stage 2. The two village bypass is further away from most properties in Farnham than the one village option and will be unlit, other than at roundabouts, which will help to minimise light spill, both to residences and to important habitats such as woodlands. The bypass will be in deep cutting between Farnham Hall and Foxburrow Wood, which will help minimise lighting impacts from headlights on nearby homes and the ancient woodland of Foxburrow Wood.</p> <p>A full assessment of the ecological effects of the two village bypass scheme can be found in <b>Chapter 7</b> Terrestrial ecology and ornithology, of <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	N
Site Legacy	<b>Concern about the lack of long-term legacy from the two-village bypass option, as it would reduce the</b>	<p>SZC Co. are required to mitigate the impacts of the Sizewell C Project during construction and operation, as described in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5). An extension of SZC Co.'s two village bypass, described and assessed in <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental</b></p>	N

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>likelihood of a future four-village bypass.</b>	<b>Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6), to create a four village bypass would be a matter for Suffolk County Council as Local Highway Authority to address.	
Traffic Flow	<b>Concerns about the inadequacy of the proposals to upgrade the A12 to handle the predicted amount of construction traffic.</b>	<p>The two village bypass (Option 4 at Stage 2) was taken forward into Stage 3 consultation, and now forms part of the DCO submission, as the most appropriate option to mitigate the impacts at Farnham. The scheme has greater capacity than the existing A12 so would be more attractive than the existing road to drivers, encouraging them to use the A12 rather than other roads. The new road would be designed to current design standards (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges) and have a lower accident rate than the existing road.</p> <p>Further information is in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).</p>	Y
Property Value	<b>Concern about property blight and decrease in value near the A12 as a result of increased traffic and transport infrastructure.</b>	<p>In developing our transport strategy, SZC Co. has sought to take account of the nature of the local highway network in the development and design of our proposals. Opportunities have been sought to limit and mitigate the traffic and traffic-related effects of moving goods through the use of non-road based transport where feasible.</p> <p>Compensation arrangements are set out in the</p>	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		<p>‘Compensation Code’ based on legislation, case law and best practice. The relevant legislation provides that those whose property will be directly affected by the scheme are entitled to compensation under the aforementioned ‘Compensation Code’. SZC Co. has and continues to work closely with those affected landowners to negotiate compensation terms if this is appropriate.</p> <p>Any party who feels that they may have a claim for compensation is recommended to seek professional advice or contact SZC Co. who will be happy to discuss individual situations in further detail.</p> <p>In order to provide additional assistance SZC Co. developed a Property Price Support Scheme to provide assistance to homeowners, within agreed criteria, who sell their properties and can demonstrate a loss arising directly from the Sizewell development.</p> <p>This was launched in December 2019 and applications can be made once the application for Development Consent Order has been accepted for examination. SZC Co. have committed to periodically reviewing the Property Price Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to be appropriate.</p>	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		The two-village bypass mitigates the impacts of the increased traffic on the A12 at Farnham and Stratford St Andrew. Mitigation measures have been built into the design of the two village bypass. Further information is contained in <b>Volume 5</b> (Two Village Bypass) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.6).	

g. Transport: Road Improvements Yoxford / B1122

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Cost	<b>Concern about the cost and SZC Co.'s ability to supply funding for the B1122 road improvements.</b>	As set out in the <b>Funding Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 4.2), SZC Co. is confident that there will be funds available to support the development including associated development and highways improvements	Y
Safety	<b>Suggestions that an emergency route for the B1122 should be identified and included within proposals.</b>	At Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		flows, reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during the Sizewell C Project construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7). It would be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency.	
Safety	<b>Suggestions that the B1122 should be widened.</b>	At Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows, reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).	Y
Further Information	<b>Requests and suggestions for more information about the B1122 proposals and</b>	At Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO	Y

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	impacts, such as whether the strength of the road surface has been tested, traffic estimates and modelling and mapping of potential scenarios.	submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows, reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C Project construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7). It would be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency.	
Traffic Flow	Comments agreeing with or questioning the need for improvements on the B1122, for example that improvements are needed even without Sizewell C.	At Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows, reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during Sizewell C construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7). It would be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency. Any improvements needed in advance of the Sizewell C Project would be the responsibility of	Y



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Need Case			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Suffolk County Council as local highway authority.	

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Heritage Impact	<b>Concerns about the impact on heritage assets and their setting from the Yoxford roundabout option.</b>	<p>Following Stage 2, SZC Co. has undertaken a full assessment of the potential historic environment impacts of the proposed roundabout. Loss of heritage significance through change to setting has been assessed for individual designated assets and the Conservation Area. No significant residual effects are predicted following mitigation in the form of the introduction of appropriate landscape proposals and standard code of construction practice measures to limit noise disturbance.</p> <p>Further information may be found in <b>Chapter 9 of Volume 7</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).</p>	N
Safety	<b>Concerns about safety issues from the Yoxford roundabout option as it will lead to faster traffic speeds.</b>	<p>At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. Roundabouts have the lowest accident rates of any at grade junction. The scheme forms part of the DCO and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref.</p>	N

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		6.3).	
Site Legacy	<b>Concerns about the lifespan and long-term impacts of the Yoxford roundabout option.</b>	At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) explains how and why this option was chosen over other options. The scheme forms part of the DCO and is described and impacts assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). It would not be removed at the end of the construction period.	N
Site Restoration	<b>Comments about the benefit the signalised junction option as being able to be removed after the end of construction.</b>	The signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction was not taken forward after Stage 2. At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The Site Selection Report appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 8.4) explains how and why this option was chosen over other options. The scheme forms part of the DCO submission and is described and its impacts assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). It would not be removed at the end of the construction period.	Y
Traffic Flow	<b>Concerns about access issues and disruption</b>	The signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction was dropped after Stage 2. At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed	Y



Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
	<b>to the movement of people from the signalised junction option.</b>	that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The scheme forms part of the DCO submission and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and in <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	
Noise and Vibration	<b>Concerns about the noise impact from the signalised junction option, from static engines and ‘second hand music’.</b>	The signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction was dropped after Stage 2. At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The scheme forms part of the DCO submission and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3). Noise at this junction is assessed in <b>Chapter 4 Noise, of Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	Y
Pedestrian / Cycle Access	<b>Suggestions for the signalised junction option at Yoxford, that pedestrian and cycle facilities should be accommodated.</b>	The signalised junction at the A12/B1122 junction was dropped after Stage 2. At Stage 3, SZC Co. confirmed that the roundabout was the proposed solution and some further refinements were proposed at Stage 4. The scheme forms part of the DCO submission and is described and assessed in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) and in <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.3).	Y
Length of	<b>Concern about the</b>	In Stage 3 consultation, SZC Co. proposed the Sizewell	Y

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
Project	amount of time the B1122 will be in use by construction traffic, for at least ten years and longer if the Sizewell C Project overruns.	link road to relieve the B1122 of Sizewell C construction traffic. This proposal was included in the Stage 4 consultation proposals and forms part of the DCO submission. It relieves the B1122 of all construction traffic and attracts some existing traffic too, so B1122 traffic flows reported in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 8.5) will be lower during the Sizewell C Project construction than current levels. The Sizewell link road connects to the B1122 west of Middleton Moor and east of Theberton, bypassing both settlements. It is described and assessed in <b>Volume 6</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.8).	
Compensation	Comments suggesting that those affected by the impacts on the B1122 should be given compensation.	In developing our <b>Transport Strategy</b> , SZC Co. has sought to take account of the nature of the local highway network in the development and design of our proposals. Opportunities have been sought to limit and mitigate the traffic and traffic-related effects of moving goods through the use of non-road based transport where feasible.  Opposition to the use of the B1122 as the main route for construction traffic has led to the Sizewell link road being progressed, this new road would go from the A12 to site thereby reducing traffic volumes and property impacts through Yoxford, Middleton Moor and Theberton.	N



SIZEWELL C PROJECT – CONSULTATION REPORT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

---

Theme: Alternative Site Assessment			
Topic	Summary of Comments	Response	Change
		Further information is contained in <b>Volume 6</b> , Sizewell Link Road, of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> (Doc Ref. 6.7).	

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED