| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | David Humphrey |
| **To:** | "HornseaProjectThree@pins.gsi.gov.uk" |
| **Subject:** | Deadline 7 submission |
| **Date:** | 14 March 2019 16:31:56 |
| **Attachments:** | RE HOW03_BDC .msg<br>Response for SCC Deadline 7..msg |

Dear Hornsea 3 case team,

I attended the hearing on the 8th March in the morning.
At the end of the hearing we were asked to submit information.
I have attached an email with attachment dated 7th march that I sent to the applicant outlining my concerns. The applicant has returned this to Broadland as part of the SCC with their response and I have commented in green.
I am not familiar with the process here so I have attached a copy of my comments directly to you. You will find my comments in the attachment to my email dated today
I hope this is all in order.
Kind Regards
David Humphrey
EHO Broadland DC

**Outstanding Issues in connection with Hornsea 3 including D6 App at 23 07/03/2019**

## Temporary Roadway

The copy spreadsheet at D4 APP 7Annex C JNY8772 allows for 2 x 6m x 0.5 roadways and their removal. This equates to just over half a million tonnes of Type 1 material @1.8t/m3. My understanding (which may be incorrect) is that this type of material is in short supply in the county and that it is not uncommon for Norwegian Granite to be sourced from Great Yarmouth docks for example. I agree that the road thickness is generous and allows for makeup and parking and standing areas but if imported granite is used I am told that the density is nearer to 2.5 tonnes rather than 1.8 tonnes /m3 meaning that HGV movements could be higher and vehicle movements might be increased in urban/industrial port areas.

I understand that Orsted want/have to retain flexibility and that Sarah explained that it is possible that the cable corridor might be handed back to landowners in between the 2 construction phases. I do feel however that Orsted must give serious consideration to reducing the number of 2 way moves for the roadway construction which stands at just under 107000 movements. This figure could be even greater if ballast is stored at Oulton.

## Cable Ducting

Please can you confirm whether ducting will be directly delivered to the cable corridor and whether any ducting material will be stored at Oulton ?

Is there an opportunity to reduce HGV movements by moving the temporary road way material along the corridor once ducting has been installed in one area to allow access for the next length?

## Subsoil Removal

Can you confirm that no subsoil will be removed from the cable corridor?

## Oulton Compound

You confirmed that every cable drum will be delivered to Oulton where outer protection would be removed and the drum would be prepared for transport to site. Once the cable has been pulled the empty drum would return to Oulton for collection. So am I correct in assuming 4 HGV movements per drum for 800 drums?

I have had a chance to look at D1 App20 now and note that drums and ducting will be stored at Oulton so using D4 App7 Annex C JNY 8772 this will account for 9300 2 way journeys approx. ie 4634 x2. Is my assumption correct please?

I have also seen reference in Appendix 20: Main Construction Compound Briefing Note that there could be up to 1121 drums. Has any further work been carried out to calculate a more accurate figure?

App 20 states that aggregate will be stored on site. I would have hoped that this could be avoided in order to reduce potential noise and dust issues arising from tipping and reloading. Please can you confirm the quantities of aggregate that will be delivered and taken from the site? 1.6.2.39 of APP 159 makes an assumption that aggregates will not be delivered to Oulton.

In App 20 para 3.28 mention is made of WQ 1.11.2 and I wondered whether you could direct me to the submission regarding clarity on fluctuation of traffic flows please.
Please can you provide the spreadsheet for vehicle movements at Oulton please?

Where will treated sand for cable cover be obtained and where will it be treated. Will the Oulton compound be used?

D6 APP 23Gatehouse

It was agreed that a comparison with the recent recommendations of the WHO Europe for traffic noise levels be made so that the existing and predicted/measured noise levels can be compared eg Lden and Lnight?

My view is that measurement rather than prediction is possibly better but is the derived SEL representative of the proposed situation? There may be increased noise associated with passing places and the regrading of approaches.

L90 could be helpful as per first sight Cawston information seen on 27th Feb.

Agreed that early morning and late evening cable movements would be considered in the assessment given that Highways desires off peak travel time. Are full drum cables abnormal indivisible loads?

Non HGV movements have not been given an SEL figure. Please can you explain.

Notwithstanding mitigation plans escorted drums HGV speed could be reduced to 20mph if desired whilst passing the crossing cottage..

Is baseline speed data available for passing vehicles ?

Do the audio recordings provide evidence to suggest that the “hump” in the road is adding to noise levels?

My understanding from para 4.24 is that 118 HGV and 130 non HGV is the maximum peak 18hr weekday traffic flow but table 4.6 refers to AAWT which I assumes means Annual Average Weekday Traffic. Please can you clarify.

It would be helpful to see the spreadsheet for vehicle traffic movements arriving and departing from Oulton compound with a description of weekday traffic movements over the 30 month period at worst case. This would demonstrate for example whether the assumption at para 5.16 is valid.

The cumulative assessment does not use the potato storage movement figures in the Vissim assessment.

To summarise: The applicant has used the predictive method (CRTN) and noted its shortcomings. It has also measured results to derive an SEL to calculate an LAEQ 16h. My view is that the measurement method is probably more accurate. I also think that it’s possible that the assumptions made in paras 5.16, 5.17 and 5.18 may not be correct and that is the reason for most of my questions.

Cawston

Await noise and vibration reports plus traffic movement document not yet received from Paul (position unchanged nothing more received yet).

Paul has appraised school site and feels it is not necessary to restrict movements at drop off and pickup

So far as SCC goes I feel that we are still in discussion about these issues

Many Thanks

David Humphrey