

## **Cawston Parish Council, Confirmatory Points following Issue Specific Hearing 3, Norfolk Boreas Inquiry, Deadline 4 Submission**

Cawston PC wishes to make the following submission for Deadline 4. This includes confirmation of points raised in oral evidence at the Hearing on 21<sup>st</sup> January.

Our D2 submission asked for a definitive and unambiguous up to date Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) for Cawston. Instead we were faced at the Hearing with the Hornsea 3 version from May 2019 which had already been examined (twice), failed a Road Safety Audit and been generally rejected by all parties. Similarly, the Applicant offered a Hornsea 3 report on Noise & Vibration which is a year old, which has been examined before and yet was presented with no acknowledgement of the critiques and caveats previously discussed.

At the Hearing the Applicant confirmed that a revised HIS would be published "in due course". We welcome the ExA Action Points 1 to 5 and look forward to the meeting with the Applicant, NCC & BDC, which has been arranged for February 12th, to address these issues.

Can we reiterate our request for an additional Open Floor Hearing to give residents an opportunity to comment on the revised plans?

We understand that any study of noise and vibration issues cannot be properly considered until a final HIS is agreed with NCC. For example, we believe that the width of the footpath will be an important factor; at the time the Hornsea 3 report was carried out the HIS rested on widening footpaths significantly to improve pedestrian safety. We also believe there will be issues arising from traffic speeds and/or traffic pulling away from being stationary in the inevitable gridlocks if passing places are introduced.

Environmental impacts of construction traffic include noise, vibration, air quality and public health, both physical and mental. We refer you to the submission from Prof. Barnett on these issues.

There has been much reliance by the Applicant on the NCC quote from some time ago, lifted out of context, that it "*believes a suitable access strategy can be produced that mitigates impact however ... the scheme needs several changes*". This refers to NCC approval of the traffic flow but conveniently ignores the equal requirement to satisfy BDC on environmental issues; the more you do to achieve the former, the further you move away from the latter.

We would like to offer our own NCC quote (page 23 of the SOCG) - "*The Applicant's position is somewhat misleading*". In other places they use the phrase "simply not true". There are many examples of misleading statements in the Applicant's documents; we mention here just a few examples...

**The claim that "Enhanced street lighting" is part of mitigation** - On investigation this appears to refer to 3 x LED conversions to street lights in a residential area far from the traffic route – it is misleading to suggest that this has any bearing on construction traffic.

**The claim that, because the B1145 is a "Main Distributor Route", the applicant has carte blanche to send any amount of traffic along it** - This is a good example of desk based thinking, looking at a map without ever testing the actual road. Cawston is not the only location of pinch points and difficult junctions along this route.

We are aware of other villages on B roads where there are restrictions on HGV activity. East Harling, in Norfolk, is just one example.

**The claim of a “significant” reduction in traffic after the 2 week peak** - In fact, it goes down from a peak of 239 to 22 weeks at 222. This is only a 7% reduction, which we would suggest is not “significant” and does not offer much relief to the unfortunate residents of Cawston.

**To submit various documents, such as the SOCGs and responses to submissions, which rely on the HIS which they know will be completely revised, “in due course”** - In his paper, Prof. Barnett has raised the issue of “Death by Data”. Here we have been faced with thousands of pages of conflicting information, across three schemes, Hornsea 3, Vanguard and Boreas, with many cross references and links to previous documents, making it very hard to disentangle and pick out the relevant and current pieces of data.

Cawston Parish Council will continue to participate constructively with the applicant’s representatives, Norfolk County Council and Broadland District Council, in the meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> February as we continue to seek a workable solution to meeting the applicant’s construction traffic demands while avoiding and mitigating its impact on our community.

**Cawston Parish Council**

**29<sup>th</sup> January 2020**