

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Re: Norfolk Boreas Offshore Windfarm Application

I hereby respond to the Examining Authority's questions directed to Interested Parties (ExQ2)

**14.TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT.** Do IPs wish to comment? Yes

My comments and questions cross over most of the subsections in question 14 and therefore are written as one statement. As a Cawston resident my focus here is on our village, specifically the central conservation area.

From the Document reference; ExA.AS-2.D4.V1 (Technical Note Revised Cawston Highway Intervention Scheme – hereafter detailed as HIS) and the site visit on 24.01.20 I am aware this is still “a work in progress” with further detail due at deadline 5. Many of the initial mitigation measures proposed have been disregarded.

Pavement widening has been abandoned because OS plans do not relate to site measurements. A speed restriction of 20 miles an hour seemingly deemed sufficient to offer protection to pedestrian amenity. Even at 20 miles per hour the stopping distance of a HGV is twelve metres, the length of three parked cars, safety of pedestrians is not assured.

Point 16. HIS: *It is also considered that at the narrowest points of the footpath protection is afforded by parked vehicles.*

One of the narrowest (and lengthy) sections of pavement, 90cm wide, is opposite our home, there is no protection from parking offered here, a pedestrian is sandwiched between the kerb edge/ vehicle and a high wall.

On the drawing TP-PB5640-DR019 at the same position the note reads

*Potential two-way Articulated HGV and car conflict area*

This is reworded from the Orstead Hornsea 3 HIS REP4 – 028 that stated HGVs cannot pass simultaneously here, as the person who lives adjacent to this point I can state the “potential” should be struck through. There is conflict if a bus and car attempt to pass here.

The HGV measurements detailed on drawing TP-PB5640-DR018 state overall width of a UIO articulated vehicle as 2.55 metres. I understand this is the measurement excluding wing mirrors. The mirrors would protrude a further 0.2 metres on either side, with close proximity mirrors being a necessity to see pedestrians or cyclists. On plans that have already shown tight margins, that negated pavement widening, shouldn't all calculations be made on 2.95 metres width?

Multiple agencies have raised concern over the safety of my home and we are yet to see a mitigation proposal, which reduces the possibility of a collision.

The road will be resurfaced and ironworks raised to be flush, however the sub structure of storm drains, sewers etc. were not installed with the thought of a constant heavy traffic flow above. What contingency has been allowed in the times schedules for excavation works for such repair. In the outline plan it infers drivers would be made aware of diversion routes. Have all these diversions been considered for a primary route?

I do not think the HIS mitigates the Boreas scheme alone, or scenario 1.

I continue to advocate that a transport route through Cawston is not practicable or safe and an alternative should be sought.

I have made submissions to previous examinations which I feel should be expressed within the following question points

**5.6 Schedule 15: Arbitration Rules**

Once a scheme is passed who will arbitrate for the residents in disputes about traffic movements, impacts, noise etc. I understand there are exclusions for traffic noise in the EHO's remit. Who is accountable if a threshold is exceeded, who monitors, who arbitrates, and who enforces restrictions? A widely available Communications Plan and team to disperse easily understandable information are needed.

**Q2 13.4.1/. 2 Noise levels** – There are still so many unanswered questions about noise and vibration levels for Cawston. Our property was one of the four that were used for the three-day survey of noise and vibration and left us deeply concerned. The effects of noise are significant for our family. I repeat multi agency requests that monitoring and calculations should be made again with the revised proposals of traffic flow, size, and mitigation measures, averaging data over traffic operational hours rather than eighteen hour smoothing.

**Q2.13.4.2 Human health**

Professor Barnett touched on wellbeing in a submission from Corpusty and Saxthorpe Parish Council, stating that the process of infrastructure planning is beyond most of our knowledge base. We are trying to engage in a decision that has huge impacts on our future without a base of experience from which to do this. A stressful position to be in. As an individual involved I can say the impact on residents should not be underplayed. There are many like me, attempting to stay up to date with information and repeating our consistent offerings to the different projects. Over time our focus has become limited to the elements that directly affect us, therefore minimising our wider view of the schemes, our county or neighbours – this is an isolating experience. With deadlines being postponed people are left hanging in fight/ flight mode, many have expressed a wish to move rather than live in a village which will become a construction corridor. Some have already left. I do not think this is personal to our village. In effect the application process is beginning to break down communities - before decisions on the projects are made. The need for community in a person's wellbeing is high. Living with so many unknown factors, and fluctuating information, the lack of control is creating a heightened level of anxiety. I am merely a receptor in this plan, however I believe the applicants statements re implications on Human Health needs more consideration.

Thank you for your time and attention

Polly Brockis