

From: [REDACTED]
To: HornseaProjectThree@pins.gsi.gov.uk
Subject: Oral Submission for Hearing 25.03.19
Date: 01 April 2019 09:11:43
Attachments: [PIN hearing 25.03.19.docx](#)

Dear Sirs

Please find attached my written submission in regards to the above hearing. Could you please confirm receipt of this email. With the imminent deadline if there are items i have to remove to allow submission could you please contact me at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

Your sincerely

Polly Brockis
[REDACTED]

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
Open Hearing
25.03.19

Thank you for allowing me to speak at the above referenced hearing please accept this written submission in relation to my oratory, for acceptance before deadline 10.

I am a Cawston resident who attended an earlier hearing on 07.03.19, becoming aware of the Cawston Traffic Plan after noise and vibration-monitoring equipment was placed outside my property in mid February for three days. On attendance at this hearing 25.03.18 I had not seen any response to my written submission to the earlier hearing. I managed to obtain the Cawston Noise and Vibration report from the PINs website days before this open hearing and spent the available time seeking advice to explain the terminology, calculations, methodology of noise assessment to myself, a lay person. I am incredibly worried by what I have learnt and continue to read about this traffic proposal. I feel I must state that like most of the participants at the hearing on 25.03.19 we had no knowledge of the update (version 5) of the TP, or and as I write this I am still no clearer as to whether I will face 254 HGVs passing my window or if some return journeys will take another route.

As I am sure you are aware when offering a verbal submission it is somewhat daunting, and trying to not repeat items others have mentioned, and stick to a five-minute session adds additional stress meaning certain items are not given the emphasis one intends. I therefore submit my printed crib sheet, for this is what I was trying to say and includes the notes for myself to explain terminology/ references. I now know I miss quoted the WHO guidelines 45db is the level in a bedroom that would disturb sleep in my oral presentation I say 95db !

Alongside this I must state that as one of the last speakers I began by saying I re-iterate everything the other residents had said. What I need to add in here is that people who were not sitting in the room had also requested your attention be brought to items. I believe other residents eloquently covered most of those issues so I did not take up further time. The room was indicative of the feeling running through the village however it is fair to say that many people with responses as strong, and personal, were unable to attend. My neighbour was absent because she was looking after my children, she put her faith in the fact I would speak for her! Another mum emailed me her concerns as I arrived at the venue., which I attach at the end of this submission. I sincerely hope you will consider her message, as the position of her home is very significant when considering the impact of areas of no pavement and the safety of using the designated 44 tonne bridge. Although other Cawston residents mention pedestrians, safety of children and minimum width pavements I did not get the Stokes family's specific points over and am unsure that anyone else could have.

Thank you all for your time and consideration.

Polly Brockis

Questions for open hearing

General

Noise and Vibration

1. Has the collated data been reviewed or to be reviewed by a 3rd party, consultant/subject matter expert as is usually the case with technical data?
2. Has this report been presented to the environmental officer?
3. Are the calibration Certificates available and up to date at the time of reading taken?
4. White house farm was part of the tests the microphone was placed outside our property was close to the wall, has this been taken into consideration as it will have given higher readings than exist
5. **3.5db** is stated as the estimated noise increase, outside our home an increase of this magnitude is an extremely audible change.
As the predicted increase is an averaged over an 18hr period the real peaks in time will be massively greater.

LEQ = Average over time (In this case 18hrs)

L10t = Minimum Value not to be exceeded for 10% of the time – Usually Max allowable value

L90t = Minimum Value not to be exceeded for 90% of the time – Usually considered as background noise

6. Can LEQ really be compared to DBRM as they are different quantifiers

General Impacts

Will HGV corridor impact on Residents in the form of?

1. House Prices and the ability to move if the increases in environment are too great.
2. Insurance prices

1. Buildings

In the case of Buildings especially listed building insurance like our own we are required to disclose any known risks – we would have to state collapse of cellar/ side of house,

HGV Collisions with the walls directly bordering the road

2. Cars – Increased traffic – danger to vehicles parked in the village

Mobilization

Figure 5.6 Working Hours: 7am – 6pm Week Days, 7am – 1pm weekends, 1Hr Mobilization either side

(60db measured outside would be considered 45 inside)

World Health Organization classes before 7am as NIGHT PERIOD they also state that 45db in a bedroom will disturb sleep.

Based on that fact a single lorry / event of any type , before 7am could breach this.

Will Lorry's or any size be involved in the mobilization periods, what types of vehicles will these be?

World Health Organization – Dwelling (4.3.1)

White House Farm

Is located at one of the biggest pinch points on the high street, the corner of the house being direct on the road.

Widening of the adjacent pavement will reduce the road size pushing HGV's closer to the property, currently without any road/pavement alterations 1 HGV and 1 Car cannot pass each other without hitting each other or our property

Our cellar is ft away from the road.

1. We request Noise monitoring inside the house to analyze if the proposal will breach the WORLD Health organization guidelines
2. Request a Defect Report be carried out on our property to clarify it is capable of withstanding the type and frequency of the new traffic.
3. Huge concerns with the Vibrations from a Low Loader and the impact in our cellar.

Vibration cannot be just analyzed on peaks – numbers of events at a level over time are more damaging than isolated peaks even if within a guideline.

Mitigation

How often and by whom would monitoring take place to make sure ESTIMATED values are reality once in operation?

(6.2)

States the applicant is **considering** Mitigation! Has anything actual been done to reduce the possibility too less than 3db.

(6.3)

Vangard and Orsted – combined traffic threshold,

Is there anything in writing/ agreement between the 2 companies?

(6.4)

What is the considered allowable threshold of combined traffic/Noise/Vibration – how where these figures calculated? (As the current Orsted estimates require mitigation how would the combined work)?

In the case of an exceedance of the threshold found during operation – what would be done, how soon, how would it be managed, policed and monitored.

Have the reported use of Low Loaders been considered on the assessments as they have smaller harder tires and do create greater vibrations.

Is there a noise or vibration difference between laden and unladed movements?

Has the road condition been assessed for suitability of Low Loaders with these types of load?

Drains (Dropped or other)

General road condition

Hi polly

In case you get the opportunity to say something, please feel free to convey rob and my concerns:-

1. Safety for children walking across the bridge.

There is no pavement and the bridge is not very wide so for all the residents of Glebe crescent this is already unsafe and the children are at risk of not being seen and possibly hit. The amount of hgv traffic will substantially increase this risk and the children will need to be stripped of their independence in order to keep them safe.

2. Narrow pavements.

Pavements from the bridge into the village are very narrow again causing a risk to pedestrians as the roads are also narrow and there is a risk of traffic mounting the pavement in order to pass the hgv (I have witnessed this before with larger vehicles on the road).

3. Corner before the bridge.

Over the 7 years of living at [REDACTED] we have witnessed numerous occasions where vehicles have lost control and swerved to avoid oncoming traffic resulting in damage to the bridge which has had to be repaired numerous times. This is due to the bridge being directly next to a blind corner. Increased hgv traffic will increase the risk of collisions.

4. Traffic congestion

This route is already a bus route for sanders buses which often caused congestion and standstill Traffic on the bridge. This amount of proposed hgv traffic will be sure to cause even more congestion and this will cause high levels of stress for residents.

5. Weight in bridge

We'd like to be assured that the bridge has been surveyed to take the weight and number of proposes hgvs