

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Norfolk Boreas](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Oulton Parish Council ref:20022619 /deadline 5  
**Date:** 25 February 2020 08:26:56  
**Attachments:** [BOREAS Deadline 5.docx](#)

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached Oulton parish Council's (OPC) response to the ExA written questions.

OPC wish to attend and speak at the issue specific hearing on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> March (onshore matters) if applicable,

And also to attend the accompanied site inspection on Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> march.

Regards,

Susan Mather

Oulton parish Council

## OULTON PARISH COUNCIL response at Deadline 5

Oulton Parish Council wish to respond to the following ExA written question:

### **4.1 Onshore cumulative effects of other proposals (construction)**

#### Q2.4.1.1

- 1. Could an alternative view be that activities happening at the same time which would reduce the length of time over which the impacts occurred, could be deemed preferable to local communities and therefore the worst-case scenario might be one that extends over the longest time period of time?***

For communities at or near to the crossover between HOW3 and Vanguard/Boreas, ALL scenarios are worst case, because of the traffic impacts.

A shortened time frame would in the case of Cawston and Oulton cause the traffic to be more concentrated than currently proposed, and this would extend to the wider highway network. Currently all projects are proposing a joint traffic management plan for cumulative traffic, whilst coordinating with agricultural traffic specifically at 'harvest' periods. OPC already view the likelihood and feasibility of this "coordinated" approach with some doubt, without the added issue of concentrated traffic from introducing a narrower construction period; the highway congestion and dysfunction caused would have an even more detrimental effect on local communities' ability to access road routes to work, schools, health services etc. without requiring lengthy detours.

If all the proposed projects' (HOW3/Vanguard/Boreas) construction period extends to the 8-10 years window, as is currently proposed, then this will also be problematic to local communities. 8-10 years is a long time for communities to be expected to 'put up' with disruption and, with further projects even now preparing to go through the examination process, this adds even more uncertainty, anxiety and disruption for even more years. Local communities have been told by developers that this level of disruption from constant HGV traffic is "acceptable" in planning terms because the construction period is "only temporary". But Norfolk is being bombarded with several more so-called "temporary" projects, and communities currently cannot see the light at the end of the tunnel.

8 – 10 years (and more projects in the pipeline) is a very lengthy concept of "temporary".

Hornsea Project Three, which is awaiting decision, has chosen a more protracted approach to their construction, as they are using HVAC and phased trenching, without ducting at phase 1 for phase 2, requiring more cables than those proposed by Vanguard or Boreas, and the digging up of the same cable trench twice. Therefore, the outcome would appear to be 'worst case scenario' whichever way you look at it, as the two companies are using very different approaches to their construction process.

Because of the above, the idea of somehow "concentrating" the construction periods for these two developers into the same timeframe would, therefore, appear to be a non-starter.

The tables below show the cumulative traffic numbers for Link 68:

---

**Project peak traffic numbers for Boreas scenario1 or 2/Vanguard/HOW3**

**Boreas scenario 1 Link 68**

68        The Street / Heydon Road        105 all vehicles/ 65 HGV

**Boreas scenario 2 Link 68**

68        The Street / Heydon Road        160 all vehicles/ 80 HGV

**Vanguard Link 68**

68        The Street/Heydon road        176 all vehicles/96 HGV

**HOW3**

(Link 68)    The Street        248 all vehicles/118 HGV

*\*The list below shows Peak traffic numbers for Link 68 if projects were constructed at same time according to project scenarios....*

**\*BOREAS SCENARIO 2 + HOW3....**

**Boreas scenario 2....** 160 all vehicles/80 HGV AND **HOW3** 248 all vehicles/118 HGV's  
**Total = 408 all vehicles/198 HGV's**

**VANGUARD + HOW3.....**

**Vanguard** 176 all vehicles/96 HGV AND **HOW3** 248 all vehicles/118 HGV's  
**Total = 425 all vehicles/214 HGV's**

**BOREAS SCENARIO 1 + HOW3....**

**Boreas scenario 1** 105 all vehicles/65 HGV AND **HOW3** 248 all vehicles/118 HGV's  
**Total = 353 all vehicles/183 HGV's**

---

It should be noted that if Norfolk Vanguard goes ahead as planned, then the ducting for Boreas would have been installed at that stage.

OPC questions whether there might be a scenario where Boreas cables might be installed at the same time as those for Vanguard?

If so, such a scenario would increase the HGV and all-traffic numbers for Link 68.

Finally, OPC would like to remind the ExA that the Planning Inspector in 2014 (Appeal on refusal of an Anaerobic Digester using Link 68 as its access route) dismissed the Appeal on the grounds that Link 68 was unsuitable for regular use, even with Passing Places, by HGV traffic in two directions. The Inspector judged that such use would lead to highway dysfunction and danger.

---