

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Additional Submission on Vanguard from Interested Party No 20012710
Date: 14 January 2019 11:49:12
Attachments: [Additional Submission on Norfolk Vanguard from Interested Party No.20012710.docx](#)

14th January 2019

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached a submission which is additional to my Relevant Representation dated 13 September 2018.

Regards

Peter Soldan

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Additional Submission on Norfolk Vanguard From Interested Party No 20012710

Dated 14th January 2019

This submission is in addition to my Relevant Representation (RR) dated 13 September 2018. That RR presents my primary points and remains valid, this submission provides additional information on those points and brings my comments in line with my submission to the Boreas Formal Consultation.

In my RR I suggested that the Mobilisation Area be moved closer to the B1159 to reduce the impact of the projected HGV traffic on the Happisburgh Road. I understand from discussions with Vattenfall representatives, since I submitted my RR, that the construction period for the duct installation is minimised if the MA is halfway along the section under construction. In this case between Happisburgh landfall and the drilling under Witton Woods. I support this objective, however, consider that the potential problems for local residents and farmers and for the construction suppliers and contractors caused by 2-way HGV traffic on Happisburgh Road warrant further consideration of the siting of the MA. My suggestion in the Boreas consultation is reproduced in the paragraph below.

“The vast majority of roads between North Walsham and the land fall site at Happisburgh are too narrow and 'soft at the edges' for regular two way HGV traffic. The Happisburgh Road is not suited to two way HGV traffic and moving Mobilisation Area 11 closer to the B1159 will significantly reduce the impact on the local and farm traffic that use this road on a regular basis. Purely from a transport viewpoint the best location for MA11 is adjacent to the B1159, however, this would place it close to houses along that road and create a problem for those residents. A compromise would be to move MA11 300 metres east (from its current position) with the access opposite Back Lane (now called Reed Way). The road is wider between the B1159 and Reed Way; from Reed Way west the road steadily narrows until it enters Ridlington. Also, reducing the distance from the B1159 to MA from 700metres to 400metres would significantly reduce the probability of two way HGV traffic. It would also reduce the time to construct the running road from MA11 to the B1159 and this could then be used for access to the MA; this would remove all construction HGV traffic from the Happisburgh Road.”

I would also wish to re-iterate my support for both renewable energy and the Vattenfall decision to adopt the HVDC solution. Adoption of HVDC has removed the major concerns associated with the project for me and my neighbours. My neighbours who live closest to the MA site feel that Vattenfall, having made the HVDC decision should now “be allowed to get on and do it”.

Opposition to this project would have been significantly greater from the Ridlington/Witton area without the HVDC decision.