

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Norfolk Vanguard](#)  
**Cc:** [Cawston PC](#)  
**Subject:** Cawston Parish Council's Submission for Deadline 9  
**Date:** 06 June 2019 19:50:29  
**Attachments:** [Cawston Parish Council Deadline 9 Submission.pdf](#)

---

Dear Sir

Please find attached Cawston Parish Council's Submission for Deadline 9

Yours faithfully

Simon Court  
For Cawston Parish Council

[REDACTED]

## CAWSTON PARISH COUNCIL DEADLINE 9 SUBMISSION

Following a necessarily brief review of the many papers submitted at Deadline 8, Cawston Parish Council wishes to offer some comments on key points raised and a summary of our position at Deadline 9.

CPC remains strongly in support of renewable energy initiatives in principle, but would expect them to be implemented showing the same level of environmental considerations throughout the project, as suggested in the Applicant's statement of October 2017.

### *7.1 Our principles*

*Vattenfall recognises the importance of engaging with stakeholders, including communities, through its work. Our principles, which are adhered to throughout all our projects, including Norfolk Vanguard are:*

- Openness and transparency*
- Providing opportunities to get involved*
- Sharing information and understanding*
- Listening and responding*
- Respect"*

However, the construction project for the cable route falls far short of this standard.

Both Vattenfall and Orsted have behaved with cynicism, arrogance and contempt towards local communities throughout the process, as shown by the lack of real consultation and engagement, ignoring concerns based on local knowledge, dismissing many practical suggestions that might have required a change to their original plan and finally threatening enforcement action in Cawston to impose their unworkable traffic plan.

CPC fully supports the proposal that an Offshore Ring Main would be a far better strategic solution for the nation as a whole, with specific benefits that would be felt across the County.

Turning to the Deadline 8 submissions, in their Responses to the Exa's Rule 17 Requests for Further Information (4.2), the Applicant refers to a need to "remove double parking" in Cawston. There is not, and cannot be, any double parking; the road is too narrow! They then produce a table of assessed db changes, suggesting that the impact with idling vehicles will 'only' be 2.8 db.

This approach to impacts runs throughout their submissions; to paraphrase Dickens' Mr Micawber, "result 2.8 = happiness, 3.0 = misery". It is seen in all their replies on noise, air quality and vibration. Real people do not experience these issues in this stepped way.

We suggest that these desk based theoretical assessments using averaging and smoothing and adjusting variables to achieve the desired result will bear no comparison to the actual experience of residents on the street.

Appendix 3, the response to questions 5.4 and 5.5, repeatedly refers to "Church Close" as a key point. There is no "Church Close" in Cawston. This is just one example of the Applicant's lack of diligence; we also note, for example, that the traffic flow details are recorded as being on the B1146.

The applicant's response 9 suggests that *"a delivery strategy that would ensure that Norfolk Vanguard HGVs would be released onto the network at even spacings to lower the probability of meeting an opposing HGV."* Sadly this strategy has little chance of being effective as it does not extend to coordinating the considerable numbers of Hornsea Three HGV movements or the B1145's existing HGV traffic.

In their response 10 the applicant asserts that *"With the implementation of the HIS potentially significant pedestrian amenity impacts associated with the increase in daily HGV movements can be reduced to minor adverse significance."* The features of the HIS designed to mitigate the potentially significant pedestrian amenity impacts have been called into question as they would work against the measures in the HIS designed to help hundreds of additional HGVs negotiate the narrow High Street in Cawston.

There is resistance to the provision of wider footways to protect pedestrians in Norfolk County Council's comments on the Highway Intervention Scheme and it is called into question by the Road Safety Audit which suggests that parked cars can act as a barrier to prevent pedestrian injury. The HIS proposes to reduce on street parking and thus eliminate some of the protection parked cars afford the unfortunate pedestrian who dares to walk along the High Street during the long hours of operation of the applicant's HGVs. Where HGVs struggle to pass each other on narrow roads their wing mirrors could not be better, or worse, placed to cause head injuries to, or at best the intimidation of, pedestrians where footways are narrow .

Question 5.5 refers to "the route through Cawston Village". We would take this to mean the length of the village from Aspen Vale in the east to go past the Marriotts Way bridge in the west, arguably it should include the black spot at the double bends and bridge a little further out. The Applicant has chosen to interpret it as a short length of road from the mythical Church Close to Norwich Road, conveniently ignoring several other problem areas.

Cawston Parish Council reiterates its view that the proposed alternate single line working in the HIS is unworkable. The narrow roads and poor vision on bends in the centre of Cawston prevent HGVs passing safely in any of the scheme's three designated "passing places". The road is not made wider by the draconian parking restrictions the applicant is set upon imposing on residents in the face of well-founded concerns about the impact on businesses and residents' quality of life.

Cawston Parish Council views as hopelessly optimistic the applicant's prediction of the likely time for HGVs to traverse Cawston in view of the narrow roads, limited passing spaces and the presence of additional traffic. HGVs will inevitably arrive in Cawston, from both east and west, as a platoon. With current HGV numbers platoons form, having collected faster moving traffic on the narrow stretches of the B1145 approaches to the village from east and west. Perhaps significantly, the applicant's calculations do not include the effect of the arrival of a second platoon from east and west before the initial platoons have traversed the village.

In their Comments on Deadline 7 Submissions, and elsewhere, the Applicant mentions "enhanced pedestrian facilities (such as footway widening)". This ignores the Road Safety Audit conclusion, together with CPCs previous evidence, that the road is simply not wide enough to allow a wider footpath to be introduced. On the ASI it was seen that larger vehicles regularly mount the present, narrow, footpath.

The Joint Position Statement with Broadland District Council – Cawston Conservation Area refers to most of the "mitigation" measures as temporary and reversible, though road resurfacing and footway widening would be permanent measures. It has already shown that the proposed footway widening is not possible, so it is puzzling that the Applicant still places such emphasis on it. Road resurfacing is surely a maintenance item that NCC would be responsible for in any case.

The “temporary and reversible” measures will last 2-3 years, though presumably that might be extended by the Boreas scheme. This is acknowledged as causing harm to the Conservation Area and is likely to result in damage to local businesses and employment which will be permanent.

We thank the Inspectors for their diligence, patience and advice throughout the Examination process, which can be a daunting experience for residents faced with such a life changing prospect.

We conclude with another recent example of real traffic in Cawston:-

On 29<sup>th</sup> May BT replaced a damaged BT Duct Access Cover on the narrow pavement in a location where heavy vehicles sometimes mount the kerb when negotiating oncoming traffic.

As well as having a very narrow footway, this is a narrow point of the B1145, 5 metres from the bend outside The Forge at the west end of the High Street.

As a responsible organisation, and presumably in accordance with Norfolk County Council requirements, pedestrian access was maintained by a system of ramps and barriers.

The position of BT’s work mimics the proposed road narrowing in this location as part of the alternate working arrangements for the west end of B1145 Cawston High Street.



Pictures of the BT works are shown, together with a feature missing from the applicant’s Highway Intervention Scheme, a system of temporary traffic lights to regulate traffic which is unable to see oncoming traffic due to the bend.

In the proposed Highway Intervention Scheme traffic is expected to negotiate the bend and oncoming traffic which is out of sight, without the assistance of traffic controls. This would seem to be a reckless approach when hundreds of additional HGV movements are predicted each day.

Cawston Parish Council

6<sup>th</sup> June 2019