

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Norfolk Boreas](#)  
**Subject:** The Old Railway Gatehouse  
**Date:** 30 April 2020 19:55:29

---

To the Norfolk Boreas Case Team at PINS:

We have been asked a question by the Examining Authority in Round 4 of their Written Questions.

Question 4.12.2.1 (c)

*“Old Railway Gatehouse - Do the proposed physical alterations to your property offered by the Applicant address your concerns ?”*

Our response to this question is as follows:

We object to this project in the strongest possible terms. If this project is given approval, then we maintain the position that our lives here will be made intolerable, even with the proposed physical alterations to our property.

In addition, these alterations are very limited, only even attempting to deal with the southern side of the property, and in no way addressing the noise and emissions which we will receive from HGV traffic approaching from the north. None of these alterations will reduce in any way the vibration we will feel from the passing HGVs. Already we have discovered with the extra HGV traffic due to the potato store affects us with the noise. We feel that Vattenfal offering a few triple glazed windows is a joke as we can hear the traffic passing our house in every single room. It is unacceptable that they think this is a viable offer when they have not even spoken to us! The acoustic wall to go round the garden on the South of the property? What about the North side when the HGV vehicles travel from the direction of the compound back past our property? The supposed offer has clearly been made by persons who have not even visited the property to make any assumptions in keeping with their total disregard.

However, if the Secretary of State is minded to approve, then we shall need all the help we can get.

In that case, we request that the proposed physical alterations to our property be expanded to include the northern side of the property and all windows triple glazed including the skylight window and that all mitigation be changed now from “Optional” to “Mandatory”.

The Applicant has never made any direct contact with us, up to this date of

writing, and so we obviously cannot provide “landowner agreement” at this stage, without discussion of the details with them.

Regards,

Clive and Nikki Searson

