

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Hornsea Project Three](#)
Subject: Hearing 25th March
Date: 27 March 2019 14:16:33

Thank you for allowing me to speak at the hearing and the opportunity to back up my thoughts here. This is of course supplementary to the points I made in my original email and I will try not to repeat comments you already have on file from me.

On the subject of historic buildings in a designated conservation area and health and safety of village residents:-

Vibrations.

My home is a grade 2* listed building built around 1700. The * is because of internal features of architectural interest especially an ornate staircase, oak panelling and fire surrounds, amongst others. Some of these features are fragile and liable to shifting and cracking. The property, like many on High Street sits on a large cellar. Floors have already dropped, and in one part of the cellar we have had to have a concrete pillar to hold up the beam supporting the floor above.

Already when we have a lot of HGV's and farm traffic through the High Street, my house shakes a lot and I have on occasion noticed fresh cracks in panels and walls appear. Thankfully these traffic movements are seasonal and due to harvests. I am absolutely sure that the volume of HGV's Orsted are proposing will seriously damage my house and other similar properties on High Street.

Noise.

Constant noise from these traffic movements would make living here intolerable for those of us who love the peace and quiet of this conservation village. In fact it is why many residents moved here and is also the reason I have guests in my small B&B. Orsted's proposals would destroy my business and others along High Street which rely on tourism.

On a personal note, I have [REDACTED] which means I get [REDACTED] so peace and quiet is very important to me for that reason.

Air quality.

The respiratory damage caused by diesel fumes from this volume of HGV's is well documented and understood, and why governments are acting to lessen this risk. The narrow high Street with narrow pavements (where there are pavements) will cause these HGV's passing problems and there will be much engine idling spewing out fumes. In the Summer especially people like to open their windows. This would no longer be possible.

My cellar has a large grate onto the pavement above. Diesel fumes from idling HGV's, waiting to pass each other come into the cellar through the grate and up through the floor above into my living room. Imagine If this is constant! Orsted want to deny us fresh air and expect us to breathe diesel fumes.

Because of [REDACTED] I don't have enough healthy [REDACTED] around and I need all I can get, I certainly do not want to be breathing diesel fumes. Therefore air quality is very important to me.

Breathing diesel fumes would also be a health problem for people walking on the pavements. Children walking to the playground and village hall on such narrow pavements, right up next to these HGV's are particularly at risk because of their height.

Safety.

This pavement on the way to the village hall is very narrow and the road is narrow with a blind bend on the railway bridge. This poses a real risk to life if there is a large volume of large vehicles as wheelchairs and some pushchairs have to go onto the road as the path is too narrow. This is also the case with some other parts of the pavement on High Street and in some places there is no pavement.

Even for people walking on the pavement there is a strong possibility of being clipped on the shoulder by a wing mirror. This has happened to me walking back to my house from the post office where the pavement is very narrow and there is a pinch point. (This pinch point is also the place winery vehicles get stuck on a regular basis). If these plans go ahead I doubt any parent would be able to let their children walk anywhere in the village.

Inadequate traffic plans and magical thinking.

Orsted's plans do not really take into account the various pinch points, blind corners, narrowness of pavements and High Street or existing volume of traffic even if they say they do. This is obvious from their so called solutions.

The current parking on the high street would make it impossible for a large volume of HGV's to get through yet Orsted have not provided any workable solutions. Most of the properties do not have off road parking and any Orsted plans I have seen involve removing or restricting existing parking without providing enough spaces for alternative parking. They also do not take into account disabled residents needing to park outside their homes.

Orsted expect two HGV's to be able to pass in places that we know from experience just aren't possible. The traffic back up and congestion would cause major problems and especially for emergency vehicles needing to get through.

Marriott's Way is a long distance footpath and cycle route popular with residents and tourists. There are two entrances to Marriott's Way in Cawston, both will become very difficult to get to should these plans go ahead. The entrance on the bridge with the blind corner will become a serious risk to life as there is no pavement on either side and one must cross the road on the blind corner.

I found Orsted's response to my concerns totally inadequate and unacceptable. They are making it as difficult as possible for residents to raise concerns and challenge the plans. That Orsted waited until the last minute to publish their answers and revisions so no one would get a chance to read them before the hearing is a good example.

I do not believe their tests and monitoring on vibrations caused by the proposed HGV traffic took into account the age of these buildings or the fact that they are sitting on large empty spaces.

I do not believe Orsted's tests and monitoring have given an accurate representation of air quality and emissions from a constant flow of HGV's stopping and starting along the length of our narrow high street.

I do not believe Orsted's tests and monitoring have given an accurate representation of the noise levels we will be subjected to.

I do not believe Orsted have undertaken any research into the detrimental and even devastating affect their proposals will have on the physical and mental health of residents in this Conservation village.

I do not believe Orsted care about Cawston residents concerns or residents of other affected villages. Their only focus seems to be to get these plans passed as it is their cheapest option.

I would like to see the results of some truly independent and unbiased tests on noise, vibrations and air quality.

I believe, if passed these plans would destroy Cawston village, destroy small businesses reliant on tourism and destroy our quality of life. I would want to move because I couldn't live under these conditions but I have been advised the value of my property has already dropped by about £100,000 because of these plans.

Nicola Banham