

From: [Matthew Rooke](#)
To: ["norfolkvanguard@pins.gsi.gov.uk"](mailto:norfolkvanguard@pins.gsi.gov.uk)
Subject: Broadland District Council deadline 4 submissions
Date: 13 March 2019 09:41:08
Attachments: [Vanguard response to examining auth. questions deadline 4.doc](#)
[Rep1-SOCG-3.1 Norfolk Vanguard SOCG with Broadland DC final deadline 4.docx](#)

PINS ref: EN010079

I attach the District Council's signed Statement of Common Ground and the written responses to the Examining Authority's written questions.

Any issues please contact me.

Regards

Matthew

Matthew Rooke

Planning Manager (West)

t. 01603 430571 e. matthew.rooke@broadland.gov.uk



This email and any attachments are intended for the addressee only and may be confidential. If they come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone. Please advise the sender by replying to this email immediately and then delete the original from your computer. Unless this email relates to Broadland District Council or South Norfolk Council business it will be regarded by the council as personal and will not be authorised by or sent on behalf of the councils. The sender will have sole responsibility for any legal actions or disputes that may arise. We have taken steps to ensure that this email and any attachments are free from known viruses but in keeping with good computing practice, you should ensure they are virus free. Emails sent from and received by members and employees of Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council may be monitored.



Ask for : Mr M. Rooke
Direct Dial : 01603 430571
Email : matthew.rooke@broadland.gov.uk

Our ref : Vanguard /deadline 4
Your ref : EN010079
Date : 12 March 2019

National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Dear Sir/Madam

Application by Norfolk Vanguard Ltd. for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm Project

I write with reference to your letter dated 27 February 2019 in which you set out the Examining Authority's (Ex. A) further written questions. This letter gives Broadland District Council's written responses at this stage.

For ease of reference, in each case the ref. no. and question is set out in bold, followed by Broadland District Council's response.

Ref: Q13.159

What implications does Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/A/14/2212257 have for the proposed development? Was the impact of noise and vibration on the Old Railway Gatehouse taken into consideration?

Response:

It is considered that the Inspector's decision to dismiss the appeal (PINS ref: APP/K2610/A/14/2212257) is particularly relevant as the applicant's proposed route of vehicular access for heavy goods construction vehicles and staff vehicles to and from the proposed cable logistics compound and the mobilisation compound on Heydon Road which connects to The Street and in turn connects to the junction with the B1149 is the same as that considered for the dismissed appeal. In addition, The Street is also proposed to be the route from the B1149 to the main construction compound for Orsted's wind farm proposals which will accommodate heavy goods construction vehicles and staff vehicles to and from their compound. The appeal proposal was for an anaerobic digester (AD) plant on the former Oulton airfield and The Street was identified for the delivery of maize and grass for the AD plant, it is noted that the appeal proposal was to install 6 passing places along the length of The Street and that the harvest period for maize is between September to October and the grass harvest is June to early August. The appeal inspector in describing The Street set out that: *'the carriageway is not wide enough for any vehicle larger than a car to pass any other vehicle except at the existing informal 'passing places'*. He also noted that the area is a *'highly agricultural area, some movement of crops in large vehicles –tractor/trailer combinations, tankers or other HGV – is normal and to be expected by other road users'*. He concluded on the highway safety and convenience issue that the appeal proposal *'would be likely to result in harm to highway safety and convenience'* and that *'despite the proposed highway works, the cumulative impacts of the proposed development would be severe'*.

The impact of noise and disturbance was taken into consideration, but vibration was not specifically taken into account during the appeal. In terms of noise and disturbance the appeal inspector concluded that *‘the proposed development would, on balance, be likely to result in material harm to the living conditions of residential occupiers of The Old Railway Gatehouse with reference to noise and disturbance’*.

Therefore it is considered that the dismissed appeal does have implications for this application as the shortcomings of The Street have been established by the Planning Inspectorate and the cumulative effects of the Norfolk Vanguard and Orsted wind farm proposals will cause a significant intensification of traffic including HGV’s and abnormal loads along The Street, substantially more than would have been associated with the AD plant.

The full impact of noise, disturbance and vibration from vehicles travelling along The Street in both directions, on the occupiers of The Old Railway Gatehouse, which is located immediately adjacent to The Street, together with any mitigation measures, will need to be taken into account including the cumulative impacts of traffic associated with the Orsted wind farm proposals and the local traffic which already travels along The Street.

Ref: Q18.33

Horizontal Directional Drilling is not proposed at the crossings of two further Norfolk Trails, the Wensum Way and Weaver’s Way, nor the majority of the crossing points of the general Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network.

Do you agree that the County Council as the Highways Authority should be the relevant local authority to agree the management of PRoW’s including the Trails network?

Response:

Part of the Wensum Way is in Broadland District, and it is agreed that Norfolk County Council as the Highway Authority should be the relevant local authority for these works. The Weaver’s Way is outside of Broadland area.

Ref: Q20.131

Please consider and comment on the response of the Applicant in ISH3 [REP3-005] as to construction hours set out in R26 and inform the Ex. A of any further concerns and consequential proposed amendments to R26.

Response:

No comment, see response to 20.132 below.

Ref: Q20.132

What is understood by the term “non-intrusive” and is it intended to exclude activities that would have some limited but adverse impact? Is there merit in separating out the “essential” and “non-intrusive” activities in R26?

Response:

Non-intrusive activities would be those activities that are quiet and don’t disturb local residents. There is considered to be merit in specifying the activities that would be considered as essential and non-intrusive activities to avoid misunderstanding once works begin.

I trust that this response on behalf of the District Council satisfactorily responds to each of the examining authority's questions at this stage, please contact me if you require any further information in this respect.

Yours faithfully



Mr M Rooke

West Area Planning Manager