

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Inspectorate Hornsea; Hornsea Project Three](#)
Subject: Deadline 10 personal submission
Date: 01 April 2019 21:52:42

Can we make a final personal submission at Deadline 10? We do not want to repeat detailed arguments that have previously been made by ourselves, Cawston Parish Council and other residents, but to summarise briefly some key areas and our experiences of dealing with the Applicant, with particular reference to the High Street and centre of Cawston.

This submission also serves as a confirmation of oral evidence given at the Hearings on 25th and 26th March.

It seems that Broadland District Council and Norfolk County Council are proceeding, with some caveats, on the basis that “mitigation” measures proposed in the latest CTMP are all implemented in full. We trust, for example, that the Road Safety Audit mentioned by NCC would be carried out by a completely independent assessor, and available for all to inspect.

The statement from BDC is “ made on the assumption that the Highway Authority accept the traffic numbers and traffic management proposals for Cawston and that all the proposed mitigation measures including the use of Heydon Road as an alternative construction access route is maximised to reduce the traffic associated with the Orsted proposal passing through Cawston and also have a reducing effect on the noise and vibration levels.”

Meanwhile there are some fundamental problems with the CTMP which, in our opinion, render it unsupportable in its present form. It concentrates on the centre of the village, a Conservation Area, and ignores the many issues that have been noted elsewhere, particularly on the western side around the village hall and old railway bridge.

The Applicant confirms the need for wider pavements, minimum 1.2 metres (from the current [REDACTED]). They also recognise the necessity to retain parking for residents in the High Street. Government recommended width for a parking space is 2.4m. The road here currently measures 5.1m. If we lose 0.3m to pavement and 2.4 for parking this leaves **only 2.4m** as a carriageway for HGVs whose standard width is 2.5m, plus wing mirrors.

These HGVs will be heading past one single lane pinch point, (signage still “to be agreed”) to a holding area by the Market Square and on to another pinch point (signage “to be agreed”). After years of preparation the Applicant still has no real idea how this will work in practice. We foresee gridlock in the village centre, with stationary vehicles also causing noise and pollution problems.

During the ASI larger vehicles were already seen mounting the kerb. This is a common everyday occurrence and will happen much more under the proposed scheme, with increased danger to pedestrians.

A further issue is that it is likely that the kerbs will be better defined. The noise and vibration generated by the extra traffic mounting, then dropping off, the kerbs will be far greater than anything recorded in the Applicant’s brief testing period.

We remind you that this disturbance will be taking place throughout the day, six days a week. Nor has the Applicant explained how they propose to run abnormal loads through the village, but we imagine this will require huge disruption, with out of hours working, parking suspended, and possible one way road closures.

In reviewing noise and vibration at our particular property, the Applicant states (Appendix 26 to Deadline 7, par 6.6 & 6.3) that the increase in cumulative noise would be classified as “moderate”, but mitigation by inclusion of a cumulative traffic threshold would bring it down to just on the permitted limit. This is “subject to discussions with Norfolk Vanguard”.

Para 3.25 states that “with the exception of 27 High Street” VDV levels are within permitted levels. There has been no attempt to explain any of this to us, and our understanding is that we must already have unacceptable VDV plus the worst noise readings, with a promise of a vague attempt at “mitigation” that inspires no confidence. We also question the use of average figures in this way.

Bearing in mind the concerns we have over additional noise and vibration from traffic mounting the kerbs, we ask you to insist on strict and enforceable conditions to monitor these levels throughout the projects and that the Applicant provides adequate and robust mitigation measures from the outset.

We turn to the actual roadworks required to make these changes and resurface the road. When challenged at the Hearing, the Applicant stated that it would not be necessary to close the road to do this work, and suggested temporary traffic lights with an escorted convoy system would enable single lane operation. This in itself would cause major delays, but given the road dimensions noted above we do not see how it can be possible while ensuring the safety of pedestrians, motorists and the workers themselves.

Can we refer you to the oral evidence and written confirmation given by [REDACTED] for Corpusty PC, regarding public health effects, pollution and air quality, and the real costs to society. If you substitute Cawston for Corpusty, the B1145 for B1149 and new developments in Aylsham for Holt, this evidence is completely relevant to the situation in Cawston, and we ask you to read it in this context.

[REDACTED] has since added ...

“My friend [REDACTED] who was with us at the meeting said something interesting along the lines that if this were a military operation (NATIONAL infrastructure) they’d do it differently.

He has a serious point – they would build an alternative road system across farm land – calculation of compensation costs for that is extremely easy and inducements could be big enough to make it attractive to farmland owners who would lose some land area and access for a few years but receive the income they would have had anyway – and use the NDR for part of the process.

That way we move the cost from local communities to easily compensated landowners and the lower cost associated with imposing it on local communities is replaced in the cost/benefit and cost/effectiveness analysis to more accurately reflect the true cost of this impressive climate friendly project.”

This is very similar to the Cawston PC suggestion based on the haul roads.

Throughout this process the Applicant has behaved like a typical teenager with a new computer game. (S)he has put off doing her homework (eg noise and vibration studies), then done the minimum possible and tried to hide behind a wall of jargon. (S)he leaves everything till the very last minute (eg v3 - 5 of the Traffic Plans). When challenged, (s)he blames someone else ("Norfolk CC said it was alright") or twists other comments to look as if they agree with her when they have major reservations.

The computer game requires you to get your lorries through on time without triggering penalties for casualties, delays, noise, and vibration damage, so you have to manipulate the variables to stay within limits. Lorries seem to be able to pass within millimetres of pedestrians, property and each other with no danger or damage. The road dimensions, geography, and time itself, have an elasticity that only exists in a simulation.

In Cawston we are residents, not receptors, real people, not avatars. If you make a mistake, knock us down or reduce our house to rubble it is final. You can't come back tomorrow to re-boot and start again.

We ask you to recommend that the Applicant develops another Traffic Plan which avoids Cawston, and we note that NCC "believes it would be possible to develop an alternative access strategy by increasing the use of Heydon Road (beyond that already proposed by Hornsea Three) and developing a suitable highway intervention scheme to address current limitations on use."

Thank you

Helen & Chris Monk



Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad