

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Norfolk Vanguard](#)  
**Subject:** As requested further to public hearing 24/04/2019  
**Date:** 25 April 2019 14:51:43

---

I am putting in writing the main points I made at the PINS public hearing in Dereham on 24th April on the subject of historic buildings in a designated conservation area and health and safety of village residents.

I am seriously concerned about the possibility of over 130 HGVs a day coming through our narrow high street with narrow pavements and many listed buildings. Cawston High Street is totally unsuitable for this proposal and the health safety of the children and villagers of Cawston, and the integrity of our historic buildings must come first. The majority of houses along the high street are around 300 years old.

Vibrations.

My home is a grade 2\* listed building built around 1700. The \* is because of internal features of architectural interest especially an ornate staircase, oak panelling and fire surrounds. Some of these features are fragile and liable to shifting and cracking. The property, like many on High Street sits on a large cellar. Floors have already dropped, and in one part of the cellar we have had to have a concrete pillar to hold up the beam supporting the floor above. This is sufficient under present circumstances but added vibration will be detrimental.

Already when we have a lot of HGV's and farm traffic through the High Street, my house shakes a lot and I have on occasion noticed fresh cracks in panels and walls appear. Thankfully these traffic movements are generally seasonal and due to harvests. I am convinced that the volume of HGV's Orsted and Vattenfall are proposing will seriously damage my house and other similar properties on High Street. I've raised my concerns with Broadland District Council Historic Buildings and while they have concerns I've been told it's above them. The Historic Environment Officer, Barbara Hornbrook has recommended that all the properties on High Street should get a structural survey done prior to commencement of Orsted's and Vattenfall's traffic movements and she has given me details of a few structural engineers. I would like to know if Orsted and Vattenfall will pay for this.

Noise.

Constant noise from these traffic movements would make living here intolerable for those of us who love the peace and quiet of this conservation village. In fact it is why many residents moved here and is also the reason I have guests in my small B&B. The volume of HGVs and other work traffic going through our narrow High Street from 6am - 11pm would destroy my business and others along High Street which rely on tourism.

On a personal note, I have [REDACTED] which means I get [REDACTED] so peace and quiet is very important to me for that reason.

Air quality.

The respiratory damage caused by diesel fumes from a high volume of HGVs is well documented and understood, which is why governments are acting to lessen this risk. The narrow high Street with narrow pavements (where there are pavements) will cause these HGVs passing problems and there will be much engine idling spewing out fumes. In the Summer especially people like to open their windows. This would no longer be possible.

My cellar has a large grate onto the pavement above. In the past we have had diesel fumes from idling HGVs waiting to pass each other come into the cellar through the grate and up through the floorboards above into my living room. Imagine If this is constant!

Because of [REDACTED] I don't have enough [REDACTED] to carry oxygen around and I need all I can get, I certainly do not want to be breathing diesel fumes. Therefore air quality is very important to

me.

Breathing diesel fumes would also be a health problem for people walking on the pavements. Children walking to the playground and village hall on such narrow pavements, right up next to these HGVs are particularly at risk because of their height.

Safety.

The pavement on the way to the village hall is very narrow and the road is narrow with a blind bend on the railway bridge. This poses a real risk to life if there is a large volume of large vehicles as wheelchairs and pushchairs have to go onto the road as the path is too narrow. This is also the case with some other parts of the pavement on High Street and in some places there is no pavement. Even for people walking on the pavement there is a strong possibility of being clipped on the shoulder by a wing mirror. This has happened to me walking back to my house from the post office where the pavement is very narrow and there is a pinch point. (This pinch point is also the place winery vehicles get stuck on a regular basis). If these plans go ahead I doubt any parent would be able to let their children walk anywhere in the village. How would children be able to get to the playing field or village hall? How could children safely ride their bikes in the village?

Inadequate traffic plans.

Orsted's traffic management plans, which I assume Vattenfall will also want to use, do not take into account the various pinch points, blind corners, narrowness of pavements on the High Street or the existing volume of traffic, even if they say they do. This is obvious from their so called solutions. The current parking on the high street would make it impossible for a large volume of HGV's to get through yet Orsted have not provided any workable solutions. Most of the properties do not have off road parking and the last plans I have seen involve removing or restricting existing parking without providing enough spaces for alternative parking. They also do not take into account disabled residents needing to park outside their homes. The plan shows only 16 parking spaces for some 34 dwellings within the marked area and cannot possibly work. All but three of these properties have no off road parking and there is nowhere else to park. Two of the proposed parking bays are directly in front of a driveway with dropped curb [REDACTED]. This reduces the number of possible parking spaces to 14. Where are all the other cars going to park? Yesterday evening I counted 34 cars parked safely and legally on the road within the marked area. There is enough space for around 40. I have not included the triangle where 6 or 7 cars can park as the proposals will leave this the same. The proposed Traffic Management solution involves having a one way priority scheme as the various pinchpoints are too narrow for two HGVs to pass. This will mean there will be heavy congestion and a lot of idling engines, fumes, noise and vibrations. Orsted's plans can be found in on PINS, Hornsea Project Three, Appendix 27, Development of Cawston Traffic Intervention Scheme.

Those of us who run B&Bs and holiday accommodation will have nowhere for guests or customers to park. This and the constant noise, vibration and fumes from HGV's will certainly destroy our businesses. For the cafe and deli to carry on they need adequate parking as well.

There are 3 driveways on the pub side of the road. One services 3 properties and these plans make an already hazardous exit, extremely dangerous. This is even worse when you consider the large volume of HGVs coming round the blind bend. On the other side of the road there are two driveways and again these plans make one of them more difficult to drive out of into oncoming HGV's ,and as I have already mentioned, Orsted have completely ignored the other one and put two bays in front of it!

Currently parking arrangements in Cawston work very well. These plans will destroy my small business and others, and make our lives hell. In fact Orsted's and Vattenfall's plans for Cawston would completely destroy our village. I urge / beg you to not let this happen.

Orsted expect two HGVs to be able to pass in places that we know from experience just aren't possible. The traffic back up and congestion would also cause major problems for emergency vehicles needing to get to or through the Hight Street.

Marriott's Way is a long distance footpath and cycle route very popular with residents and tourists. There are two entrances to Marriott's Way in Cawston and both will become very difficult to get to should these plans go ahead. The entrance on the bridge with the blind corner will become a

serious risk to life as there is no pavement on either side and one must cross the road on the blind corner.

I do not believe the tests and monitoring on vibrations caused by the proposed HGV traffic took into account the age of these buildings or the fact that they are sitting on large empty spaces.

I do not believe the tests and monitoring have given an accurate representation of air quality and emissions from a constant flow of HGVs stopping and starting along the length of our narrow high street 17 hours a day.

I do not believe the tests and monitoring have given an accurate representation of the noise levels we will be subjected to.

As the owner of probably the largest property with the largest cellar, and right in the middle of High Street why was I not approached for vibration, noise and air quality monitoring? [REDACTED]

I found Vattenfalls response regarding the monitoring totally inadequate. Who undertook it and how was it done? How independent was it? I would like to see the results of some truly independent and unbiased tests on noise, vibrations and air quality that take into account the cumulative affect of emissions of up to 20 HGVs an hour passing through our narrow streets.

I do not believe Vattenfall or Orsted have undertaken any research into the detrimental and even devastating affect their proposals will have on the physical and mental health of residents in this Conservation village. Because of my own health and because my livelihood depends on tourism I want to move if this goes ahead as I do not feel I could live under these conditions. Unfortunately properties along High Street have already lost value because of these plans and will be hard to sell.

I do not believe Orsted or Vattenfall care about Cawston residents concerns or residents of other affected villages. Their only focus seems to be to get these plans passed as it is their cheapest option. Vattenfall's representative said last night that an offshore ring was never looked into as it was not an option given them by the national grid and now there isn't enough time to be able to meet their deadlines. This is a ridiculous response considering the unnecessary devastation of Cawston and other Norfolk villages and countryside. As there will be other windfarm companies in the future wanting to do similar construction through Norfolk the offshore ring option must be the only logical solution.

Nicola Banham