

From: [REDACTED]
To: NorfolkVanguard@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Deadline 8 - Norfolk Vanguard
Date: 22 May 2019 15:42:17

As the Norfolk County Councillor for the Reepham Division which includes a number of parishes through which the cable route passes I would like to make the following comments.

1) Location of the storage depot in Oulton. This site is totally unsuitable and I suggest that any approval of this project makes a requirement that a more suitable site is chosen by Vattenfall. A previous application for an Anaerobic Digester on the Airfield, on the opposite side of the road servicing this site, was turned down by the Norfolk County Council Highways Department on the grounds that the service road to access the Holt/Norwich Road, even if modified, was totally unserviceable for the number of traffic movements involved. The traffic movements for Vattenfall's planned site would be even greater. Especially when Orsted will be using the exact same site as where the anaerobic digester was proposed during the same time frame. Thus the cumulative effect of both projects would make a bad situation worse. I request that should you be minded to approve this project you insist that the applicant finds a more suitable site for their storage depot.

2) Cawston - increased/unacceptable traffic movements. Further to the unsuitability of the two planned Depots locations in Oulton, this would also lead to unacceptable additional traffic movements through Cawston, Salle and other nearby villages. Specifically I know that the inspectors have viewed the potential route through Cawston and must surely acknowledge that the narrowness of the main street and the proximity of very old Georgian houses close to the road make this an entirely unacceptable route for any of the traffic from and to the Oulton Depots. Again, if you are minded to approve this scheme I would request that you insist on a traffic management plan for the applicant which ensures that traffic will not pass through the village. Again the easiest way to do this is to insist on the applicant relocating their depot.

3) Cross over point of Vattenfall & Orsted projects at Salle. There has been a reluctance by both applicants to talk to each other in respect of the chosen technologies and any problems which may arise from them both choosing different solutions. In spite of my and the agent for the majority of effected landowners in my division along the route, trying to broker a meeting with all parties present, the applicants still do not appear to be communicating with each other in any meaningful way. Surely it is essential that any approval for this application should be predicated by an insistence that both parties work together to find an acceptable solution.

3) Consultation Process. I wish to register that I think the consultation process was flawed. It appears to me that a lot of meetings with myself, the the District Councillor for Reepham, the MP, numerous meeting with effected Parish Councils, local residents and Landowners (as mentioned in item 3) have been registered by the applicant as evidence of consulting local communities. However, most of the meetings I attended, and others confirm that they have had the same experience, was that we left those meeting with very little more information than we had before the meeting and many questions went unanswered, even when the applicant was advised in advance of the questions we would like addressed. Significantly neither applicant seemed aware of the previous history of planning applications on the site chosen for the depots, ie; of having been turned down by highways, until after they had selected the site and it was pointed out to them by myself and others. So much for due diligence!

I would ask that you consider all my comments before you make your final decision.

Regards,
Cllr Greg Peck,

Reepham Division, Norfolk County Council

[REDACTED]

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