

**Broadland District Council's responses to the  
Examining Authority's Fourth Round of Written  
Questions.**

---

**ExQ4: May 2020****Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Q4.1.2.1	<p><b>Noise and vibration effects on the Cawston Conservation Area and listed buildings:</b></p> <p>Following the applicant's submission of its Clarification Note providing information on the potential noise, vibration and air quality effects of the Cawston Revised Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) [REP8-028] and your written response to ExQ3.1.2.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Review the clarification note and submit comments confirming whether you agree with the applicant's findings; and</li><li>b) If you do not agree with the findings what further mitigation do you consider necessary?</li></ul>	<p>a) In terms of noise effects the District Council does not agree with the findings of the Clarification Note as it is considered that the basic noise level calculation assumes a speed of 20mph in free flowing traffic, in free-field conditions, with no account taken of the distance between source and receptor, nor façade or reflection effects. It is also not clear from the report whether the applicant has applied the CRTN definition of HGV's i.e. all vehicles with an unladen weight of 1525kg and above. Furthermore, the HIS requires all vehicles to brake, stop, idle and accelerate on multiple occasions along the High Street. It is therefore considered that it does not describe the actual noise levels that will be experienced by residents and pedestrians in the centre of Cawston, which will possibly be 4dBA higher when taking the façade and reflective effects as well as the closeness of dwellings to the road into account.</p> <p>In terms of vibration effects it is considered that these are acceptable based on the results of the H3 monitoring. It is suggested that the applicant undertakes its own measurement surveys prior to the commencement and approval of the construction traffic management plan.</p> <p>In terms of air quality, the District Council does agree with the findings of the Clarification Note.</p> <p>b) In order to mitigate the noise impacts the District Council consider that the applicant should reduce the number of construction HGV traffic movements through Cawston by the implementation of an alternative traffic routing agreement, see response ref: Q4.14.1.7 below.</p>
Q4.5.3.1	<p><b>Requirement 15: Scenarios, stages and phases of authorised development onshore:</b></p>	<p>No further comment.</p>

**ExQ4: May 2020****Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

ExQ1	Question	Response
	<p>The applicant provided responses at Deadlines 7 &amp; 8 to ExQ3.5.3.1 to ExQ3.5.3.5 [REP8-015], with additional wording for Requirement 15(4). Provide any further comment.</p>	
Q4.5.7.2	<p><b>Table of requirements, discharge authorities and consultees and discharge process map:</b></p> <p>Provide any final comments on NNDC's Timetable of requirements, discharge authorities and consultees and the Discharge process map [REP6-043, Appendix B and Appendix C].</p>	No further comment.
Q4.5.7.3	<p><b>Schedule 16:</b></p> <p>Parties to submit any additional information to assist the ExA in reaching its recommendation to the SoS.</p>	No further comment.
Q4.5.7.4	<p><b>Planning Performance Agreements.</b></p> <p>Provide final views from all parties since response to responses to further written questions provided by the Applicant [REP6-014, responses to Q2.5.7.1].</p>	A PPA with the applicant, which provides a consistent approach with all authorities involved in the discharge of the requirements of the DCO, is considered appropriate. No objection in principle to this including a single coordinator role and the mechanism for the applicant resourcing the discharge of the requirements by the authorities but further details from the applicant about the processes and mechanisms required are awaited.
Q4.14.1.7	<p><b>Alternative traffic movements through Cawston</b></p> <p>Do you have anything further to add regarding the possibility of using Option 5 [REP5-054] as further mitigation alongside Option 1 (current HIS), in light of the Applicant's response [REP7-017, ExQ3.14.1.8]?</p>	Given the stated concerns about traffic noise in the centre of Cawston, an alternative traffic routing agreement is required to reduce the number of construction HGV's. It is noted that NCC Highways have some technical concerns about the use of Option 5 due to road width and alignment of junctions. A combined Option 5 and Option 1 is the District Council's fourth preferred option. The District Council's order of preference for the stated alternative traffic movement options is: i)

**ExQ4: May 2020****Broadland District Council Responses****ID Ref. 20022881**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Option 2, ii) Option 4, iii) Option 3, iv) Option 5 (combined with the HIS of Option 1 to provide one-way construction HGV's through the centre of Cawston) and then lastly the HIS of Option 1; which provides two-way construction HGV's through the centre of Cawston.
Q4.16.0.3	<b>Statements of Common Ground:</b>  The ExA requires confirmation that all Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) which are submitted as final by the Applicant do represent the final position from the other party. If submitted final SOCGs are not signed by the party other than the Applicant, confirmation should be sent in responses to these ExQ4 or by e-mail to confirm the final status of the submitted SOCG at the latest by Deadline 11.	The final SoCG represents the District Council's final position.