

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: 20 February 2019 08:40:22

May we respond to the Outline CMTP and Appendix 25, published on 11th Feb?

As Dr Johanson is reported to have said, "the road to Hell is paved with good intentions". This CMTP is based on the Applicant's intentions to promote the orderly flow of construction traffic with little regard for the real interests of residents, for whom the B1145 will surely become the road to Hell.

This Plan addresses the superficial detail without recognising the underlying structural issues of a road that is too narrow for this level of traffic, with dangerous bridges, blind bends, and a busy village centre with school, senior school bus stops, narrow (and in some places, no) footpaths, and properties close to the road.

We welcome the proposals to re-site signage, add gateway village signs and introduce a 20 mph speed limit in the village centre. These changes are probably due in any event, though there have to be concerns over the practical ability to enforce a 20mph limit.

It is encouraging that the Applicant has understood the need to retain parking around the Market Square area, which could have significant impact on local businesses, albeit we have reservations about the practicality for articulated vehicles turning in and out of Chapel Street.

The proposal to introduce yellow line parking restrictions in the village centre is another matter. It may look good on a computer model but, in the real world, on the ground it will be impossible to enforce and cause many more problems.

This parking restriction is described as being "to improve pedestrian amenity", but the road is so narrow that any pedestrian who is there when two vehicles try to pass, even at 20 mph, will be in serious danger. There is also a significant risk of damage to property. Nor is there any suggestion of a benefit to residents.

In a rural village there is a constant ebb and flow of deliveries, with drivers unlikely to respect the yellow line, and residents will still feel a need to stop there to load/unload and access their properties.

People who are displaced from longer term parking will have to park in narrow and unsuitable side streets, bringing congestion and access problems, and then be faced with the difficulty of pulling out safely onto the B1145.

The Applicant promises to programme their own vehicle movements to avoid clashes in sensitive spots but even if they manage that 100%, which we doubt, they cannot control other traffic, so there will undoubtedly be many such clashes.

We note that Appendix 25, para 3.11, suggests that the CMTP proposals are "considered to reduce the potential impacts to a level which is not significant". We feel that this glib statement is, at best, premature when, as far as we are aware, the CMTP has not been agreed with stakeholders, noise and vibration surveys had not been carried out and structural assessments of the bridges and the road itself have not been done.

Noise and vibration surveys have subsequently been completed; one site was at our house. We await the results with interest, but meanwhile would point out that the noise reverberating in the narrow sections in the village centre will be exacerbated if there is an unrestricted two way flow. Air quality, too, is bound to suffer.

We attach a photo of the bridge between Cawston and Salle, showing recent traffic damage. Is it reasonable to expect there will be no serious incidents with the proposed volumes of construction traffic? We think not. The bridge in Cawston also crosses the Marriotts Way footpath, a potential danger to walkers.



Appendix 25 has summaries of daily traffic in Tables 2.1 (normal distribution) and 2.2 (sensitivity distribution). If you discount link 208 (The Street, Oulton), which is recognised as a special case, then Cawston has, by far, the lowest base traffic numbers and, again by far, the highest percentage increases in HGV traffic (289% / 389%).

No reasonable judgement could dismiss this as being "not significant".

We suggest that there has been insufficient consideration of alternatives which would take traffic away from Cawston centre, such as the re-siting of the compounds, the use of a network of minor roads - with a bit of development and an imaginative traffic circulation plan - and greater use of the haul road itself.

While we support wind farms and renewables in principle, this must not be at the expense of riding roughshod over and destroying the quality of life in local communities like Cawston.

Thank you

Helen & Chris Monk
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

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