

From: [REDACTED]
To: NorfolkVanguard@pins.gsi.gov.uk; [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Subject: Norfolk Vanguard - Deadline 5 submission
Date: 20 March 2019 09:43:19

Can we make a personal Deadline 5 submission? This is based upon our recent submission to PINS Hornsea Three, but, as there does not seem to be a CTMP for Cawston on file from Norfolk Vanguard yet, we feel it is important to draw to your attention the fundamental flaws in the recent Hornsea plan. In terms of impact on Cawston the two proposed schemes cannot be viewed in isolation.

The published Plan for Hornsea Three is constantly changing, these comments were prepared at v3.

We have contributed to, and fully endorse, the Hornsea Three submissions by Cawston Parish Council, especially their concerns over safety and impacts on local businesses. However, there are also issues that are particular to the small section of the central High Street which includes our house, one of many 18th century properties. This is a Conservation Area and most properties are listed.

The latest traffic plan from Hornsea Three proposes to widen the footpath on both sides of the road and create a single lane section. They might argue that this merely formalises what happens now, but 'what happens now' does not include the additional traffic from Hornsea Three and Norfolk Vanguard.

It is also achieved by residents parking their vehicles outside their homes. Under the proposals this parking will be lost. Displaced vehicles will have to park elsewhere; the obvious choice is the narrow Church Lane, which will become congested as a result, probably blocking the three driveways (five households) that exit onto it.

Hornsea Three described their traffic as "only" 12-14 HGVs per hour at peak, reducing to 8-10. We would question the arithmetic here, if the promise to respect school times is kept, but in any event

- this does not mention pre existing traffic, which doubles the HGV number
- it does not mention Norfolk Vanguard, which could run simultaneously (240 HGV pd at peak, falling to 96).
- it is based on the normal rather than sensitivity distribution; we still have reservations that, while numbers might not double, they may increase.

Even taking Hornsea's best view, 8-10 per hour becomes 16-20 when you add pre existing and at least 24-30 with Vanguard. That is best case, off peak; a worst case peak figure could easily be as high as **over 50 HGVs per hour, all day, continuously.**

All this traffic will be running up and down a single lane with houses close on both sides, in a busy pedestrian area. This will create a hour glass effect, with clusters of traffic building to the east and west of a pinch point in the central High Street. We don't understand how this can be managed safely.

Smaller traffic has to be added to the mix, hundreds more vehicle movements daily with

significant peaks at either end of the working day. There will be no respite. We only just received the results of the noise and vibration survey carried out a month ago, and an assessment of any proposals for mitigation is still to be done.

What has not been mentioned yet is the effects of the road works necessary to implement the plan. Widening pavements, re-siting and adding signage and resurfacing the road will all bring further noise and chaos. It is hard to imagine how this work might be done without completely closing the road, and we would hope that no one has the temerity to do it at night in the middle of a residential area!

If they have to close the road they will have to set up an alternative route. Which begs the question, if they can find an alternative for that purpose, why can't they use the alternative for the wind farm traffic and avoid Cawston in the first place?

All the houses here are occupied throughout the day, there is a mix of retired, people working from home and families. One resident is over 100 years old.

We also want to note the issue of the mental health of these people, subjected to a daily barrage of noise and vibration, six days a week, for months if not years. How does this fit with the Human Right of peaceful enjoyment of property?

It seems almost spiteful to inflict this misery on Cawston residents when there are clear alternatives. The Offshore Ring Main proposal would save the whole county from widespread disruption, and locally several alternative approaches have been suggested by the Council and residents, using roads through open country.

We request the ExA to insist that, as a matter of urgency, Norfolk Vanguard publishes its detailed proposal for dealing with traffic in Cawston, and that all alternatives are fully explored and costed.

Thank you

Helen & Chris Monk

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]