

From: [REDACTED]
To: HornseaProjectThree@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Written Submission for Issue Specific Hearing 9
Date: 10 March 2019 21:02:55
Attachments: [PIN hearing 07 03 19.pdf](#)

To whom it may concern,

Please find attached my written submission after speaking at the above referenced hearing on 08.03.19.

Could you please confirm I have sent this to the correct recipient.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Polly Brockis
Cawston resident

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

Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Farm
Issue Specific Hearing 9
08.03.19

Thank you for allowing me to speak at the above referenced hearing it has been explained to me that I am too late to be considered an interested party, however having spoken at the hearing my written submission may be considered; before deadline 7.

I am a Cawston resident who attended the hearing to find out about the proposed transport routes for Hornsea 3. On the morning of 11th February 2019 I was contacted to accept noise-monitoring equipment, which was then mounted outside of our property - [REDACTED] [REDACTED] It was only at that point I became fully aware the transport route was possibly coming through the village, I thought this would not be a viable route for so many factors, including a belief the Heydon Road was the primary consideration. At today's hearing it felt that the Cawston route was not a proposal but a fete a compli.

From the hearing I understand there are as yet no environmental assessments for Cawston and Oulton

In the Environmental **Statement: Transport Assessment 1.4 baseline environment**, when referencing Cawston it states

1.4.1.35 the B1145 routes through the village of Cawston and Reepham town centre which have a number of sensitive receptors including shops, narrow footways and residential frontages. The speed limit is reduced to 20mph as it routes through Reepham.

Cawston has many further sensitive receptors – primary school, nursery, graveyard, conservation area, historic properties, missing footways, tourist caravan park - all of these on the direct frontage of the road proposed as a HGV corridor. There are also numerous rural businesses based in the village

With particular reference to my home and similar properties Historicengland.org.uk state "*Recognising and understanding heritage value or significance at an early stage in a proposal means that there is an opportunity to avoid or mitigate negative impacts..*"

The fact we are a listed property is a material consideration in planning. At the hearing you heard myself and another affected resident of an historic property voice concerns about the effects of vibration from large HGV usage. We are a three storey elevated property on the corner of Market place vibrations at ground level are magnified in the upper storey. Have the impacts on the historically significant properties of Cawston been considered?

5b) Predicted Hornsea three traffic movements in Cawston, including fluctuations across the construction period and throughout each day

The map on screen was my first sighting of the proposed traffic intervention scheme; I understand this version was presented just before 9am on the morning of the hearing. Currently the revised plan REP6 -017 has not been updated on the website, should this not be in the public domain for people to comment upon?

My instant and emotive response was, and still is, how can this work? The Hornsea 3 requirement is for 127 daily HGV movements directly through the centre of the village ,plus associated vehicles. The widening of the pavement outside the pub and deli will provide a road that is not wide enough for two-way traffic. If vehicles can't pass further down High Street, because of HGVs in a holding position who knows how far the backlog of traffic would stop. Both directions of traffic then waiting a turn to drive along the High Street. How will the

flow of traffic be managed? I ask this with particular reference to the blind curve where High Street/ Aylsham Road meet, drivers will not be able to see the road or traffic ahead to work out whose turn it is to move. Traffic will also need to join this scenario from Chapel Street, other side roads and numerous driveways. Outside the Old Forge it appears long vehicles will have to drive into the side road to make the bend. Is this safe? How will that work for resident trying to exit their road?

Restricting traffic to 20mph past a school and through a village is in my opinion always a positive move. When in motion the HGVs will have to take the corners and hump back bridges into bends at a slower rate crossing onto the opposite side of the road to negotiate their turning circle, single file, stop start traffic behind such having no recourse than just to crawl along – Have calculations on traffic flow, timings taken all this into consideration? If VISSIM is what I understand it to be should not this be used to model the Cawston plan?

5c) Existing highway conditions and pedestrian movements within the village (including in relation to Cawston Primary School)

& 5f) HGV restrictions relating to pedestrian movements to/from schools

Four school buses currently converge on the market triangle for Reepham High School transport. The dispersion of those 90+ children includes those walking around the blind corner of our property, crossing the High Street and Chapel Street, with others heading out past the village hall - all directions have sections without pavement where people have to make multi crossings of the High Street/Aylsham Road to maintain pavement use. Similar routes are undertaken for the families walking to and from the primary school many with pushchairs and toddlers in hand. The comments regarding limiting HGV movement for school hours would be imperative. Safe access on the B1145 to the primary school, nursery and high school buses are needed for 200+ children. The safety of those children must be everyone's priority. The school hours are extended with clubs and the nursery at the primary school site finishes at lunchtime so time zones of heightened risk are not just the 7.30-9.am, 3-4 pm intimated at the hearing. Currently outside of school hours our village is full of children heading to the park, riding bikes around to friends, what we have to date considered normal village life. A traffic corridor of HGVs will have a significant impact on the lifestyle and daily movements of our community.

Outside my property there is no pavement, we currently cross from our gateway to the opposite side of the Aylsham Road to a narrow walkway against a high wall. The proposal to widen this and other sections of pavement would make them safer for pedestrians, but only if we can actually get across the road to access them. There are no solutions offered to the areas without pavements, currently a number of families have to walk on the roadside to access village amenities. The danger of doing so alongside a stream of HGVs is unquantifiable. Norfolk County Council have a great initiative where students can choose money towards a cycle rather than a bus pass to their high school or sixth form college, the prospective danger to students on cycles from this proposed transport plan must be highlighted. The Cawston to Reepham road is a cycle route well used by Reepham Cycle Club and seasonal tourists, has this been factored in as sensitive receptors?

The proposed route into the village goes directly in front of a primary school, the village graveyard, the beautiful listed buildings of the High Street, the village shop, deli, pub and the village hall. All well used sites villagers walk to. A continual stream of HGVs will inhibit access to and use of these. Exposure to additional pollution and dust are factors that have to be considered for our children.

Has it also been recognised that as a rural setting large sections of the B1145 through Cawston are without street lighting? In winter months residents access local amenities with the aid of torches. Heavy construction traffic will be passing them in near darkness.

5d) Noise and vibration assessment.

I was asked for permission to site equipment outside my property, I would like to be appraised of the information recorded and believe it would be a useful site for continued monitoring should this route go ahead.

Our listed property is directly adjacent to the road and on the road line we have a deep cellar. When a farm vehicle or lorry passes, vibrations can be felt in the rooms on that side. Our home was built in 1690; the road networks and vehicular transport came much later! I don't know how it will hold up to increased heavy traffic but it is a significant concern. I would expect the advise of the local conservation and environment officers officer to have been sought in reference to vibration implications for such properties.

My comment at the hearing about having cracking was in reference to our garden walls, the modern section has been repaired on a number of occasions before our purchase of the property because of current traffic levels. Over our four years in residence we have seen the listed exterior garden walls loose more of the facia, erosion then progresses at a speedier rate. Old Norfolk reds do not fair well with modern pollutants (Conservation officer and builder description) Additional road works and traffic of the volume suggested will expose us to further damage by way of corrosion or collision. How will this be mitigated? Any works required to the exterior of our property means road width has to be restricted, an occurrence no one wants.

5e.) Proposed highway intervention scheme

This proposal removes the High Street parking, where will residents now park? How will the one-way flow at a time be managed? The County Councillor referenced previous investigations into limiting parking on this stretch, limits were not put in place so surely the reasons for this and conclusions of those council investigations should be referenced.

5h) Scope for alternative HGV routing avoiding Cawston (including whether a proportion of HGV traffic could use alternative routing)

I urge all parties to look at any and all viable alternatives before allowing construction traffic of this scale and number to travel through the heart of the village of Cawston. I understand, to date, no alternatives have been scoped.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Polly Brockis