

Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Position Statement on Meeting with Cawston Parish Council

Applicant: Norfolk Boreas Limited
Document Reference: ExA.AS-2.D13.V1
Deadline 13

Date: July 2020
Revision: Version 1
Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Photo: Ormonde Offshore Wind Farm

Date	Issue No.	Remarks / Reason for Issue	Author	Checked	Approved
23/07/2020	01D	Draft for internal review	ES	CD/AR/VR	JL
29/07/2020	01F	Final version for Deadline 13	ES	CD	JL



Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
2	Topics Discussed at Meeting on 20th July 2020 and Status.....	1
	Appendix 1 - Meeting Norfolk Boreas and Cawston Parish Council 20th July 2020 Agenda and Meeting Notes.....	10

Glossary of Acronyms

AILs	Abnormal Indivisible Loads
CPC	Cawston Parish Council
DCO	Development Consent Order
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
HIS	Highway Intervention Scheme
HP3	Hornsea Project Three
OFH2	Open Floor Hearing 2 held 2 nd July 2020
OFH3	Open Floor Hearing 3 held 16 th July 2020
OTMP	Outline Traffic Management Plan

1 Introduction

1. During Open Floor Hearing 2 (OFH2) held virtually on 2nd July 2020 and Open Floor Hearing 3c (OFH3) held virtually on 16th July 2020, Cawston Parish Council and other interested parties raised a number of specific concerns regarding the proposed Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) for Cawston.
2. A virtual meeting was held on the 21st July 2020 to discuss the matters raised during OFH2 and OFH3. Cawston Parish Council, Interested Parties (residents of Cawston) and the Applicant, attended the meeting. Councillor Greg Peck (Norfolk County Councillor for Reepham Division and Broadland District Councillor for Eynesford Ward) was invited at the request of Cawston Parish Council but was unable to attend. An agenda was agreed in advance of the meeting and this is presented in Appendix 1, along with the notes prepared by the Applicant following the meeting. The meeting notes were shared with all attendees following the meeting however they have not been agreed as formal minutes and represent the Applicant's understanding of the meeting and not necessarily that of Cawston Parish Council.
3. During OFH3 the Examining Authority requested Cawston Parish Council and the Applicant to submit a record of the matters discussed and matters agreed and not agreed at Deadline 13 (29th July 2020). This position statement has been produced by the Applicant to fulfil this requirement and document the Applicant's position on the matters discussed during the meeting. This document is not a statement of common ground, it presents the Applicant's understanding and positions, it does not represent the views of Cawston Parish Council (CPC), who will be submitting their own submission at Deadline 13.

2 Topics Discussed at Meeting on 20th July 2020 and Status

4. Table 1.1 provides details on each of the topics discussed at the meeting and the Applicant's evaluation of the status of each of those topics.

Table 1.1 Topics Discussed at Meeting on 20th July 2020 and Status

Topic	Discussion	Status
Confirmation of HIS across projects and communications with Hornsea Project Three		
Confirmation of HIS across projects	<p>CPC requested confirmation from the Applicant at OFH2 that the latest version of the HIS for Norfolk Boreas will be applied across all projects, i.e. Norfolk Boreas, Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea Project Three (HP3).</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that all three projects – Norfolk Boreas, Norfolk Vanguard and HP3 - are committed to implementing the most recent version of the HIS, as detailed in the Norfolk Boreas Outline Traffic Management Plan (OTMP) (Version 5) [REP10-017]. The Applicant identified that this version of the HIS has been agreed with Norfolk County Council (NCC).</p> <p>The Applicant indicated that Requirement 21(5) of the Norfolk Vanguard DCO as made was proposed for inclusion by Norfolk Vanguard Ltd to ensure that the most recent version of the HIS would be applied consistently across both projects. This ensures that Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard have the same HIS commitments. The Applicant indicated that, as previously explained, alternative options 2, 3 and 4 could not be accommodated by Norfolk Vanguard (or HP3) because this would require land outside of those projects Order limits and had not been environmentally assessed by those projects, and therefore could not be applied to mitigate cumulative impacts. This restriction is reflected in Requirement 21(5) of the Norfolk Vanguard DCO.</p>	CPC acknowledged that the HIS developed by Norfolk Boreas would be adopted by Norfolk Vanguard and HP3.
Hornsea Project Three commitment on working hours and Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL)	<p>CPC asked for confirmation that HP3 have agreed to the working hour restrictions set out in the HIS and what HP3's position was with respect to Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILS).</p> <p>The Applicant stated that HP3 have agreed to the working hour restrictions as set out in the HIS.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that their assumption on the HP3 commitments around AILs was based on the HP3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [HP3 REP10-048] (paragraph 2.1.3.6) which states that HGV's through Cawston cannot be "<i>greater than 44 tonnes, or greater than 3.3m in width</i>". This indicates that AILs as defined by 'The Road Vehicles (Authorisation of Special Types) (General) Order 2003' would not be utilised. However, the Applicant has asked HP3 to reaffirm this commitment.</p>	CPC acknowledged that HP3 have agreed to the working hour restrictions in the HIS. Awaiting HP3 to reaffirm their commitment regarding AILs.

Topic	Discussion	Status
Technical points raised over the HIS in Open Floor Hearing 3		
Reduction in Car Parking	<p>CPC raised a concern around a reduction in the capacity of kerbside car parking and parking within the triangle at Chapel Street in Cawston. CPC explained that kerbside car parking is of importance to smaller businesses trade and used an example of the local delicatessen.</p> <p>The Applicant reassured CPC that the capacity of car parking within the triangle would not be reduced.</p> <p>The Applicant noted CPC's concerns around a reduction in kerbside car parking, but explained that the results of the kerbside parking surveys undertaken by CPC indicated that there will be adequate parking throughout the scheme. The Applicant further explained that the concerns around a loss of kerbside parking on local business were taken onboard when the HIS was first proposed and the original design was amended to ensure that kerbside capacity was not compromised in the vicinity of the delicatessen by the inclusion of parking spaces outside it.</p>	<p>The Applicant clarified how sufficient provision for kerbside parking has been made. CPC acknowledge their survey was used to inform the allocation but remain concerned it will be insufficient.</p>
Accident Data	<p>CPC voiced concerns surrounding people's perception of risk as well concerns over the accident data used within the surveys, such as type and date and why the data used only went back 5 years.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that all highways schemes in the UK assess risk in the same way, through looking at historic accident data, namely Police data (known as Stats 19). The Applicant further stated that after undertaking data analysis of the accident data regarding Cawston the baseline accidents were so low that statistical analysis with the additional construction traffic would not return a material increase.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that it is convention not to go back more than 5 years (which is the time period applied in the assessment of risk) when looking at accident data due to changes in the highway environment and vehicles. The Applicant confirmed all types of accidents within the study area were looked at as part of the Application and environmental assessment and those which were showing patterns were analysed in detail by examining the Stats 19 data.</p> <p>The Applicant described different methods that could be used to look at accident figures in relation to pedestrians, but also explained that the models would be unfruitful at a local level, as the baseline accidents are so low. The Applicant advised CPC of open source data (Crashmap</p>	<p>The Applicant followed the recognised convention and used the tools available to judge the accident risk is low. CPC remain concerned over the risk of accidents.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Status
	<p>website) that presented the Stats 19 data albeit in a less detailed format. CPC acknowledged this and stated they had accessed the data.</p> <p>CPC went on to query why 2 accidents which had happened within Cawston had not been included within the analysis. The Applicant explained that this is because only clusters of accidents are included within analysis, which are considered to be 3+ incidents, because this indicates a pattern which can potentially be mitigated. The Applicant summarised that the recognised convention was followed in the assessment and the tools we have available were used to judge the risk to all road users.</p>	
20mph zones / speed limits	<p>CPC questioned the effectiveness of a 20mph speed limit and referred to data previously submitted which proves that 20mph speed limits do not lead to a large reduction in speed. CPC raised concerns with the large section of 20mph speed limit zone, particularly that there are not proposals for enforcement.</p> <p>The Applicant stated that the basis of a 20mph zone is to provide drivers with a longer reaction time to avoid potential conflicts.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that the research presented by CPC is not applicable in this case as the research focuses on 20mph speed limits not 20mph zones. The Applicant stated that the difference between 20mph zones and 20mph speed limits were covered in the response to Deadline 6 submissions [REP7-016]. However, the Applicant provided a recap, stating that a 20mph speed limit is just a speed limit change to free flowing conditions by means of signage, where as a 20mph zone is self-enforcing through traffic calming measures such as bumps or chicanes. The Applicant explained that there is research showing 20mph zones to be over 80-85% effective. There is also notably research from organisations such as the Transport Research Laboratory and the Royal Society for the Protection of Accidents.</p> <p>CPC acknowledged the difference between 20mph speed zones and limits, however questioned where the traffic calming measures were being introduced in Cawston. The Applicant explained that bays for parked cars which will be formalised as part of the HIS will act as 'chicanes' which is a legitimate form of traffic calming.</p> <p>CPC expressed concerns regarding traffic coming from the West (Salle) not experiencing any traffic calming measures before they arrive into the centre of Cawston. The Applicant stated that</p>	The Applicant considers the 20mph zone will be effective mitigation. CPC do not agree.

Topic	Discussion	Status
	<p>traffic calming is focused on the centre, where there is the most foot fall, and that there is a bridge that road users have to slow down for when coming into Cawston from the West (Salle), but noted concerns.</p>	
Monitoring and Compliance	<p>CPC explained that they understood the monitoring would only be reviewed after 3 months.</p> <p>The Applicant reassured CPC that this is not the case and that there will be continuous real time monitoring for the first 3 months of the scheme alone or the first 3 months of any cumulative overlap with HP3. The Applicant went on to explain that if there were any compliance issues within this 3 month period, monitoring would be extended by 1 month.</p> <p>CPC acknowledged the monitoring periods. CPC went on to question what the corrective action would be if there was a problem getting vehicles through the village.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that the latest version of the OTMP (version 5) [REP10-017] which was submitted at Deadline 10, section 5.6 (page 52) includes a monitoring and intervention scheme specific to Cawston. The Applicant went on to show the latest version of the OTMP on screen and outline the intervention measures proposed to ensure CPC fully understood the commitments made by the Applicant. The further intervention measures of particular note were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in the cumulative HGV cap (239 HGV movements) by ensuring Norfolk Boreas and Hornsea Project Three traffic demand does not overlap. • Incrementally reducing the volume of traffic passing through Cawston from 239 HGV movements through targeted intervention informed by monitoring and consultation with the Highway Authority. <p>CPC accepted that the OTMP covers intervention measures which may be required but remain concerned. CPC then went on to question traffic peaks when considering all three projects, stating that the peak numbers were high and that an increase in duration was a worry.</p>	<p>The Applicant has secured measures for monitoring and compliance of the HIS, which were acknowledged by CPC but they remained concerned.</p>
Wing Mirrors	<p>CPC raised concerns around the width of HGV's wing mirrors used in the assessment. CPC explained that some wing mirrors on HGVs have been measured at 350mm.</p> <p>The Applicant reconfirmed the position set out at Deadline 10 that the maximum dimensions are a 2.55m HGV with a 250mm maximum projection of the wing mirror from the body or trailer, and</p>	<p>CPC acknowledged the assessment undertaken in line with legislation.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Status
	<p>that this is the widest projection permitted under EU/UK legislation and therefore has been applied to the assessment and swept path analysis. The Applicant acknowledged that a wing mirror itself could be measured at 350mm, due to the tapering of the cab but the projection from the body can only be 250mm in accordance with legislation.</p> <p>CPC expressed concerns that a HGV with these dimensions would have problems traversing the High Street without oversailing the pavement if a large SUV vehicle (over 2.1m) was parked in the bays at a section of the High Street that is 5m wide. The Applicant queried the dimensions but notwithstanding, HGV wing mirrors are designed to be mounted at a much higher level than a private car (and SUVs) thus avoiding a conflict. If an exceptional circumstance did occur wing mirrors are required by law to be manually adjusted from the driver's position.</p> <p>The Applicant reiterated the stated position that the HIS has achieved the design aim of securing adequate pathways for HGVs to safely traverse Cawston.</p>	<p>CPC still have concerns that in practice wing mirrors will oversail the pavement.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the HIS has achieved the design aim of securing adequate pathways for HGVs to safely traverse Cawston. CPC do not agree.</p>
Platooning	<p>CPC voiced concerns over potential for platooning of traffic through Cawston and that the OTMP identifies pullover places as a mitigation but these have not been formally identified.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that the pullover places are part of a package of measures which will be in place to reduce the likelihood of platooning. Such pullover places will be identified once contractors are able to confirm their fleet and that at this stage of the examination that level of detail is not available.</p> <p>The Applicant reassured CPC that the forecasted arrival rates of HGVs do not anticipate occurrences of platooning because the HIS scheme has been designed with background road users and HGV traffic from all three schemes.</p> <p>The Applicant went on to provide further examples of the HIS robustness such as two parking bays having been removed from the west end of Main Street to provide larger 'reservoirs' (holding areas) for HGV's, which further reduces the potential for platooning.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the mitigation measures against platooning to be robust.</p> <p>CPC still has concerns over the risk of platooning.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Status
Practical concerns of entrance and egress onto the B1145		
Concerns over entrance and egress onto B1145 from properties	<p>An interested party raised concerns over being able to safely exit their driveway onto the B1145 including the impact of taking 1m out of the parking triangle on the Market Place impacting visibility.</p> <p>The Applicant and the interested party reviewed this through displaying Google Maps on the screen so that the situation could be fully understood. The Applicant noted the concerns and agreed to consider this further and then provide comments to the interested party.</p> <p>A site visit to discuss the matter further with the interested party is scheduled for the 24th July 2020 (observing all necessary COVID-19 protocols).</p>	<p>The Applicant noted the concerns and will review access and egress to the property.</p> <p>A site visit to discuss the matter further with the interested party is scheduled for the 31st July 2020.</p>
Additional Mitigation Measures		
Additional mitigation measures	<p>CPC raised concerns that mitigation had been offered for residents of Old Railway Gatehouse but not for the residents of Cawston who would likely be most impacted. CPC clarified that proposed mitigation could cover structural surveys (and a commitment to pay for repairs), double glazing (acoustic glazing), external maintenance (cleaning, painting etc.).</p> <p>The Applicant provided the rationale behind the Old Railway Gatehouse being offered optional enhanced additional measures by HP3 due to the location of Old Railway Gatehouse being on a road which accesses HP3's main construction compound and the subsequent nature and type of traffic it will experience. The Applicant went onto explain that Vattenfall agreed to adopt the same measures due to the agreement between the three projects to implement the Oulton Highway Intervention Scheme as agreed between NCC and HP3 , and that these measures were an optional component but were not necessary to mitigate any identified impact. The Applicant explained that the optional measures proposed are noise barriers – essentially a fence, which is an improvement to and extension of an existing fence - along the boundary of the property that runs adjacent to the road and glazing options. These measures are potentially appropriate, pending agreement by the property owner, because they are deliverable in that particular case and locality. With respect to Cawston, due to the Conservation Areas status and there being no suitable locations for noise barriers, these measures are not considered to be applicable.</p>	<p>CPC believe that mitigation should be provided to the residents of Cawston who will be most affected.</p> <p>The Applicant maintains that in relation to noise and vibration no significant impacts have been identified in the ES and therefore no mitigation is required or proposed under the DCO.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Status
	<p>The Applicant explained that vibration assessments undertaken [see Clarification Note REP8-028] have concluded a non- significant impact and that the levels are much lower than those which would cause structural damage. Therefore, no mitigation is required or proposed under the DCO in relation to structural surveys.</p>	
Community benefit	<p>CPC stated that there should be funds available for the communities affected by Norfolk Boreas and suggested that some of the money should be specifically for Cawston due to the disruption CPC believe the project will have.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that the Project will deliver wide ranging community benefits, including those that are considered part of or material to the planning process, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socio-economic benefits – local supply chain stimulation, local job creation, local skills training, apprenticeships, education, • Material benefits – actions taken directly related to the development such as improved infrastructure, <p>as well as benefits that are delivered voluntarily, and are not material to the planning process, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits in-kind – voluntary benefits which a developer and principal contractors can provide to a community such as funding of local events, improved community amenities, habitat enhancement, and • Community Benefit Funding – a monetary contribution from the developer. The Applicant’s desire is to provide support to encourage and enable communities in Norfolk hosting the Project to work on locally appropriate schemes promoting and delivering climate-smarter living. The Applicant intends to consult with communities and stakeholders to inform the appropriate administration and governance to be established, and also to inspire and stimulate sustainable and innovative schemes. <p>Further details on the discussion in relation to community benefits are provided in the meeting notes prepared by the Applicant at Appendix 1, this includes reference to where the Applicant has undertaken some beneficial local project working collaboratively with CPC, including the parking survey and replacing old street lighting with new LED lights.</p>	The Applicant is committed to providing a Community Benefit fund but this is outside of the DCO process.

Topic	Discussion	Status
Any Other Business		
Confirmation on construction programmes	<p>CPC asked for clarification of the project timeframes following the extended examination for Norfolk Boreas and the delays to decision making on Norfolk Vanguard and HP3.</p> <p>The Applicant explained that there have not been any significant changes. The Applicant stated that if both Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard proceed to construction, i.e. Scenario 1, Norfolk Vanguard pre-construction activities will begin in 2020/2021, with the main duct installation starting in 2022 for two years and then cable pulling for two years after that (2024/2025). This would be followed by further two years cable pulling for Norfolk Boreas (2026/2027).</p> <p>Under Scenario 2 Norfolk Boreas' main duct installation would start in 2023, one year after that proposed for Norfolk Vanguard, followed by two years of cable pulling (2025/2026)</p> <p>However, activity will not be continuous but during different times throughout this period.</p>	Timeframes acknowledged and understood.

Appendix 1 - Meeting Norfolk Boreas and Cawston Parish Council 20th July 2020 Agenda and Meeting Notes

Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Cawston Parish Council Meeting

Microsoft Teams telecon

Monday 20th July 2020

14.30-16.30

Attendees

██████████	Cawston Parish Council
██████████	Cawston Parish Council
██████████	Cawston Parish Council
██████████	Councillor for Eynesford Ward
██████████	Cawston Resident
██████████████████	Vattenfall
██████████	Vattenfall
██████████	RHDHV
██████████	RHDHV
██████████	RHDHV

No.	Description	Lead
1	Introductions and Purpose of Meeting	████ All
2	Confirmation of HIS across projects and communications with Hornsea Project Three	████
3	Technical points raised over the HIS in Open Floor Hearing	████
4	Practical concerns of entrance and egress onto B1145	████
5	Additional mitigation measures	████
6	Summary of topics discussed and agreement status	All
7	AOB	All

Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm Cawston Parish Council Meeting Notes

Microsoft Teams telecon

Monday 20th July 2020

14.30-17:00

Attendees

[Redacted]

Cawston Parish Council

[Redacted]

Cawston Parish Council

[Redacted]

Interested Party (Cawston Resident)

[Redacted]

Interested Party (Cawston Resident)

[Redacted]

Vattenfall

[Redacted]

Vattenfall

[Redacted]

RHDHV

[Redacted]

RHDHV

[Redacted]

RHDHV

Apologies

[Redacted] [Redacted]

Norfolk County Councillor for Reepham Division and
Broadland District Councillor for Eynesford Ward

These notes have not been agreed as formal minutes and represent the Applicant's understanding of the meeting and not necessarily that of Cawston Parish Council.

Notes

No.	Discussion
1	<p>Introductions and Purpose of Meeting</p> <p>Introductions from all</p> <p>■ – will join late due to council meeting (NB- did not join meeting)</p>
2	<p>Confirmation of HIS across projects and communications with Hornsea Project Three</p> <p>■ – All 3 projects (Hornsea Project Three (HP3), Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard) are committed to implementing the most recent version of Highway Intervention Scheme (HIS) as detailed in the Norfolk Boreas OTMP (Version 5) [REP10-017]. HIS has also been agreed with NCC.</p> <p>■ – HIS talks about AIL and working hours, are HP3 buying into this?</p> <p>■ – Yes HP3 committed to HIS and therefore they are committed to the stipulated working hours.</p> <p>■ – The Applicant's previous comments regarding HP3 Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) were based on the weight and width restrictions secured in the HP3 Construction Traffic Management Plan [HP3 REP10-048] (paragraph 2.1.3.6] which states that "No HGV movements greater than 44 tonnes, or greater than 3.3 m in width" will be permitted through. This indicates that AILs as defined by 'The Road Vehicles (Authorisation of Special Types) (General) Order 2003' would not be utilised. However, the Applicant has asked HP3 to reaffirm this commitment by Deadline 13 (29th July 2020) if possible.</p> <p>■ - Requirement 21 (5) of the DCO ensures that Norfolk Boreas ad Norfolk Vanguard will have the same commitments in terms of the HIS. This requirement was proposed by Vattenfall in the Norfolk Vanguard DCO to ensure that the most recent version of the HIS was secured and consistent across projects.</p> <p>■ – Because Requirement 21 (5) commits Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard to the same HIS, to the extent that is can be accommodated within the Order limits and environmental Statements. As such, the alternative options 2, 3 and 4 would not be possible within the Norfolk Vanguard DCO limits.</p> <p>■ – Confirmed understanding of the point made about Vattenfall's interpretation.</p>
3	<p>Technical points raised over the HIS in Open Floor Hearing</p> <p>■ – Asked if CPC would like to recap the points raised during the open floor hearing.</p> <p>■ – Happy for ■ to provide responses to points raised and would add anything further as required.</p> <p>■ – Confirmed he had listened to the recording and will go through the technical points raised by SC at the open floor hearing (16th July) but would welcome any additional points or comments .</p> <p><u>Reduction in Car Parking</u></p> <p>■ – Yes, concern over total capacity as parking demands goes up and down and taking the widest 1m out of the triangle at the market place.</p> <p>■ – The capacity of the triangle has not been reduced, however we do note your concerns around the reduction in curb side capacity for car parking. The results of the kerbside parking surveys undertook by CPC indicate there will be adequate capacity</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>throughout the scheme. The Applicant listened to concerns regarding loss of passing trade for the deli, and amended the original scheme design to ensure current kerbside capacity was not compromised in the vicinity of that business.</p> <p>■ – That is the basis of our concerns, the viability of the deli and the loss of passing trade. It's that 10% that we are worried about them losing as that's what makes them viable. Long term sustainability of the Village is being threatened.</p> <p>■ – Noted. There is a wider issue there that the Applicant will take away.</p> <p><u>Accident Data</u></p> <p>■ – People's perceptions are also being damaged and that affects their behaviour. We were talking about perception of local residents that informs how they behave. Cawston is just being treated as 'collateral damage'. How is the risk assessed?</p> <p>■ –. All highway schemes in the UK assess risk through looking at historic accident data and from that forecasting if there is an increase in risk and accidents. The traffic sector doesn't have data such as near misses, to inform the process. The data used for assessments was all up to date, and it was Police data (known as Stats 19 that ■ commented on and that there was no record of pedestrian accidents. The application undertook a review of the detailed police data to establish causation factors and patterns. [With regard to Cawston] No further statistical (prediction) model analysis was undertaken as the baseline accidents are so low there will not be a material increase returned when the additional construction traffic is added. Accidents could have been forecasted to look at the prevalence of different types of accident but weren't because the narrative was strong enough.</p> <p>■ – Do models include adjustments for very narrow pavements. Are there accident figures relating to that?</p> <p>■ - There are a couple of models that could be applied, for example whether the increase in intensity is likely to lead to increased accident rates. The accident rates could be calculated could then be compared to annual national statistics for different types of road/junctions. However, in the case of Cawston the current accident rate is very low. If the number returned was above the national average then it would be looked at to see if it is a real concern. Police statistics (Stats 19) are also useful to understand causation of accidents. Police who arrive at accident scenes note in the road safety log what the cause was, from the perspective of the officer. Based on the Stats 19 data in the case of Cawston the intensity of traffic added will not add to that risk of increased traffic accidents.</p> <p>There is another model that again, wouldn't be appropriate for this project that looks at factors in changes to speed limits and junctions to assess if they will improve safety. This model has been designed to be applied to major highway schemes and is unlikely to be sensitive to the parameters of Cawston. It is noted that CPC raised difficulties in resources to obtain data but there is an open source of data – CrashMap. CrashMap is the same Police data that the Applicant utilised minus the causation factors.</p> <p>■ – When looking at CrashMap there were a scattering of accidents near Holt Road and more near the top roads, and obviously these will happen over time but when</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>somewhere is going to see an increase in traffic they will only increase. Why didn't these accident appear in the analysis? Why were only 5 years of data used?</p> <p>■ – It is convention not to go back more than 5 years, some local authorities say 3 years because of changes in the highway environment. Whilst the actual highway might have not changed, there has been exponential change in vehicle technology to consider that benefit both the driver and other road users.</p> <p>■ – To summarise then for this analysis there were only concerns with pedestrians, not with collisions with other cars?</p> <p>■ – All types of accidents within the study area were looked at as part of the Application and environmental assessment and those which were showing patterns were analysed in detail by examining in the Stats 19 data.</p> <p>■ – On CrashMap there were 2 accidents outside the pub, 1 was classed as serious, one in 2016 and one in 2017. They would have been within your analysis?</p> <p>■ - 2 accidents don't make a cluster and it is always clusters that are analysed as there needs to be a pattern to identify effective mitigation. Normally 3 or more accidents with similar characteristics are classed as a cluster and the 3 accidents would have had to occur within a 5 year period. Even after finding a cluster some patterns cannot be determined. In summary, recognised convention was followed and the tools we have available were used to judge the risk to all road users.</p> <p><u>20 mph zones/speed limits</u></p> <p>■ – The basis of design for a 20mph zone is to give drivers a better reaction time to avoid potential conflicts. It is appreciated that the 20 mph analysis submitted was based on severity, that was not suggesting that it doesn't matter if someone is struck at 20mph (or injuries would be limited), the basis is to give the motorist more time to avoid the potential conflicts thus avoiding accidents. There is no research that conclusively says 20 mph zones reduces 'X' amount of accidents because if there is not an accident it is not reported. So, severity is used as a very good proxy of forecasting the benefits of 20 mph speeds zones in terms of reducing accidents.</p> <p>■ – There is lots of research that proves that 20 mph limits don't lead to large reductions in speeds. Difficultly in Cawston is that there is such a large section of 20mph. Enforcement of 20 mph is almost non existent and there are no proposals to say that it will be enforced.</p> <p>■ – 20mph limits and zones are different, this was covered in the Response to Deadline 6 submission [REP7-016] in response to the research presented by ■. A 20mph limit is just a speed limit change in free flowing conditions, where as a 20mph zone should be self-enforcing through traffic calming measures such as bumps or chicanes. The research referred to is 20mph speed limits not zones. Norfolk County Council (NCC) did their own research and found that with speed limits the best reduction is 2-3mph on average. With zones on the other hand there is lots of research such as the early Dutch work that says they are 80-85% effective in reducing accidents. There is also notably research from organisations such as the Transport Research Laboratory and the Royal Society for the Protection of Accidents.</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>■ – The difference between zones and limits is understood but what traffic calming measures are being introduced in Cawston?</p> <p>■ – The parked cars are acting as a ‘chicane’ (term reluctantly used), even in current conditions. This will be formalised under this scheme through marking out the bays which is a legitimate form of traffic calming.</p> <p>■ – Thinking about travelling from the West (from Salle) coming past the village hall, that will be part of the 20mph zone. From that way people won’t have encountered traffic calming measures until they get to the high street centre.</p> <p>■ - Yes, traffic calming is focused on the centre, where there is the most foot fall.</p> <p>■ - Coming in from that way, where there is large footfall due to the playing fields, and one of the narrowest pavements, the zone will not be established there due to there being no traffic calming measures that way. The speeds people manage to achieve there are high.</p> <p>■ – Road users have to slow for the bridge, so between the bridge and the hall they would have to really pick up their acceleration if they were to reach high speeds.</p> <p>■ – That does happen with cars.</p> <p>■ – Concerns noted.</p> <p><u>Monitoring and Compliance</u></p> <p>■ – To clarify the monitoring commitment, there will be continuous real time monitoring for first 3 months of the scheme alone or first 3 months of any cumulative overlap with HP3. ■ mentioned in the OFH that the data would only be reviewed after 3 months?</p> <p>■ – Yes, that’s how it was read personally.</p> <p>■ – The commitment is 3 months real time monitoring and if any time a compliance issue is identified in that period then it will be extended by 1 month. There will be continuous monitoring of speeds and compliance issues. This is in direct response to the safety audit to reduce perceived risk.</p> <p>■ – Could a scenario of what might happen if there was a problem getting through the centre of the village be outlined? What would the corrective action be?</p> <p>■ – The latest version of the OTMP (version 5) [REP10-017] which was submitted at Deadline 10, section 5.6 (page 52) includes monitoring and intervention scheme specific to Cawston.</p> <p>■ – Suggested sharing on screen and would be happy to forward link to the latest version if that’s helpful as well.</p> <p>■ – (Shows paragraph 169 and runs through measures). This is a commitment to have real time monitoring cameras for a minimum of 3 months. Afterwards the monitoring regime will be reduced in agreement with NCC. The further intervention measures were outlined of particular note was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reduction in the cumulative HGV cap (239 HGV movements) by ensuring Norfolk Boreas and Hornsea Project Three traffic demand does not overlap.

No.	Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incrementally reducing the volume of traffic passing through Cawston from 239 HGV movements through targeted intervention informed by monitoring and consultation with the Highway Authority. <p>■ - To make sure Norfolk Boreas and HP3 do not overlap?</p> <p>■ – Confirmed and it would apply to Norfolk Vanguard as well.</p> <p>■ – The worst case is always assessed and in this case it is Norfolk Boreas and HP3.</p> <p>■ – The Norfolk Boreas and Norfolk Vanguard absolute peaks only occur for 1 week.</p> <p>■ – The secondary peaks are only slight less and occur for 22 weeks.</p> <p>■ – Avoidance of all peaks is preferable. The aim is to bring traffic down as much as possible for as long as possible.</p> <p>■ – There is a conflict of the duration and the peak traffic (i.e. reduction in peak traffic +longer haul durations).</p> <p>■ – We are looking to reduce numbers by avoiding overlapping of peaks for project and cumulative figure of 239 reduces.</p> <p>■ – Peaks would reduce by sending at different time rather than removing the traffic.</p> <p>■ –The decoupling of peaks is being looked at, less of a duration issue and more about coordination.</p> <p>■ – 239 is the number being moved away from hopefully, but that still seems like a very large number.</p> <p>■ – Its what's known as the 'Rochdale envelope', the worst case has to be considered it is unlikely to be the actual numbers.</p> <p>■ – Interested to understand how much longer duration might be if you can't get things through. Martin Dixon from NCC Highways said that if the traffic can't be brought through the duration may increase, that's not an attractive option.</p> <p>■ – Contractors are used to working with these constraints and increased duration would not be any more palatable, e.g. a scheme in Suffolk where they ended up backloading at a power station site because of these kinds of constraints. Real time monitoring also helps to drill down into any problems and their causes to enable daily profiles to be refined.</p> <p><u>Abnormal Indivisible Loads</u></p> <p>■ - ■ has discussed the issue over AIL's.</p> <p>■ - If HP3 don't agree, will we see another version of the HIS?</p> <p>■ – We will have to wait and see what they come back with. [As confirmed by ■ HP3 are committed to the implementation of the Norfolk Boreas developed HIS].</p> <p><u>Wing Mirrors</u></p> <p>■ – In open floor hearing CPC referred to use of 2.55m wide HGV with 80mm wing mirror.</p>

No.	Discussion
-----	------------

	<p>■ – Could not confirm the source of the 80mm reference, notwithstanding, there is a pattern in Norfolk for protectors to be put on wingmirrors and this questions some finely drawn lines on the Application drawings.</p> <p>■ – Will re-look into reference to 80mm. However, the position was clarified at Deadline 10, a 2.55 maximum width and 250mm maximum wingmirror (projection of a wingmirror adjusted has been assessed. All of this is set out in EU/UK legislation, ■ indicated at OFH had measured some at 350mm?</p> <p>■ - Yes</p> <p>■ - That could be the case, but they can't protrude out more than 250mm from truck body or trailer, this is the widest allowed in EU legislation. May be bigger due to the cab tapering but the protrusion must not be greater than 250mm.</p> <p>■ – What does your swept path show?</p> <p>■ – The swept path shows the 2.55 width and the 250mm maximum wingmirror protrusion.</p> <p>■ – What do you class as a safe passing space between vehicles?</p> <p>■ - There isn't a 'safe' amount, there is no standard clearance width, use of swept analysis path analysis has moved away from standard led geometry. The Road Safety Audit is an independent review to check validity of analysis.</p> <p>■ – What if 2 cars are passing and 1 has to pull over and the wingmirrors overlap the path, has that been considered?</p> <p>■ – Yes, which is why we have give way / yield points identified in the scheme to avoid the occurrence.</p> <p>■ – Yes, but what about going up the Old Forge, narrowest parts on the bend.</p> <p>■ – Confirming the maths, a 2.55m truck, with 2 wing mirrors (0.5m) will equal a truck that has a 3.05m total width. Say if that lorry passed a car such as a Honda SUV at 2.15m width, that would be 5.2m and in some places the road is 5m max width.</p> <p>■ – Need to check the max width 2.15m seems exceptional. In that situation the wingmirrors on a HGV will be higher than the car, so they would be above it. Also, mandatory that wingmirrors mounted to be adjustable and so can be folded if necessary.</p> <p>■ – That's not very reassuring.</p> <p>■ – The swept path analysis and topographic information indicate that HGV pathways can be secured throughout the scheme, fulfilling the design brief.</p> <p>■ – We will find out in real time...where it might be too late.</p> <p><u>Platooning</u></p> <p>■ –Pullover places will be identified by the contractor once they have a better idea of their fleet by formalising existing pull over areas or introducing new pull off areas. It is not something that we could go into detail about prior to determination.</p>
--	---

No.	Discussion
	<p>■ – Pullover places are being relied on to avoid platooning, coming in from Salle there are no spaces for pullover places, the bridge is already a pinch point.</p> <p>■ – Wouldn't say we're relying on it, but it's part of a packet of measures to reduce the likelihood of platooning.</p> <p>■ – How do you get rid of platooning?</p> <p>■ – Based on the forecasted arrival rates don't anticipate this happening. The scheme has been designed with background HGV traffic as well as the HGV traffic from all 3 schemes.</p> <p>■ – What about vehicles which aren't HGVs?</p> <p>■ – The scheme has taken all vehicles into consideration.</p> <p>■ – Did you take into account other road users such as cyclists for example?</p> <p>■ – Forecasting included any number of randomised traffic events; the scheme has a robustness built in.</p> <p>■ – There's no extra space to create passing places, there is no slack or robustness.</p> <p>■ – There is robustness in the scheme, for example following the parking analysis two parking bays were removed from the west end of the Main Street (in the vicinity of Booton Road) to provide a larger 'reservoir'(holding area) for HGVs thus reduce the likelihood of blocking back. this was built in to increase robustness. If there are any issues than driver compliance measures identified.</p> <p><u>Visibility</u></p> <p>■ - The 50m clear visibility was also questioned in the OFH, the UK standards have a safe stopping distance for HGVs travelling at 20mph and that is 26.7m, and that is what has been applied.</p> <p>■ – It's not that they can't stop it's that by the time they have stopped they will already be in a narrow area and if they are in a platoon that makes this even more difficult.</p> <p>■ – Safe stopping distance include calculations for reaction time and is therefore a useful proxy.</p>
4	<p>Practical concerns of entrance and egress onto B1145</p> <p>■ – Thankyou ■ for waiting. We might have to provide some answers written due to the limited amount of time.</p> <p>■ – Explained that he had carefully listened to the open floor presentation and would appreciate further clarification on the matter.</p> <p>■ – Live in the white house that looks out diagonal over the market place. Semi-detached, front garden, no steps, only access and egress is the drive way. To take 1m out of the parking triangle on Market Place would make it very difficult to pull out of the drive. Family are at risk.</p> <p>■ – Reviewed on google maps.</p> <p>■ – Usually I reverse in and then inch out, but my line of sight would be gone.</p>

No. Discussion

■ – Can you explain the interaction with other traffic again?

■ – There will be 2 way traffic watching each other on the main road and then there is also the Chapel Street stream of traffic and then they will come zooming past my house (potentially jumping the queue) without realising I'm trying to get out.

■ – Totally understand the concept, I will have to take that away and look at it further, and come back to ■ with a response.

■ – Something else that came up at the open floor (16th July) was the gentleman talking about the winery. Have they been approached and asked about the scheme? They have HGVs so will have useful information.

■ – No they haven't been approached. Their gentleman's agreement is something we looked at the start of the scheme, but was ruled out as was diverting traffic from a main distributor road onto a lesser route.

■ - I wasn't suggesting that, but the HIS proposed might conflict with their HGV's, probably sensible to have conversations now to avoid conflicts later on.

■ – There is a commitment to engage with them as part of the communications strategy post-consent and this is also contained within the OTMP (version 5) [REP10-017].

■ – Have you been in contact with them yet?

■ – No.

■ – Also, my understanding is that an open cut method will be used on Chapel Street, have provisions for that been considered?

■ – There is no road closure planned along there, so for the open cut method, half of the road would be closed and a bypass lane created for traffic. Half of the carriageway would be completed at a time. This is where the communications plan comes in, discussions will be had with other road users so that disruption is kept to a minimum.

■ – ■, should ■ have any queries would you like us to contact you directly or through the Parish Council.

■ – Happy either way. Whatever the standard way is.

Light Vehicles

■ – ■ at the OFH concerns over volume of lighter vehicles. Here again a Rochdale Envelope is applied, assume 1 person to a vehicle for personnel traffic to forecast the maximum number of vehicles on the road network, Then when we see that junctions are experiencing capacity problems the first thing that we can do is encourage car sharing to reduce personal traffic. In the Outline Travel Plan [APP-700] there is a commitment to revisit personnel numbers once they have been established post determination. The measures would be parking constraints, mini buses, crew vans, all typical of modern construction methods. There is no way that a contractor would provide 200 parking spaces, the first thing they would do is provide shared vehicles. Equally, the local highway authority would not sign a travel plan that doesn't have constraints on single occupancy car use. A range of 1.5-2.5 individuals per vehicle is

No.	Discussion
	<p>realistic to assume. HP3 have made a similar commitment in their Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>■ – Yes, good, as it's the 2 projects together that builds up. And we're still looking at a significant flow of traffic early in the morning.</p> <p>■ – Yes it will be early. The plan will be signed off by the district and county councils.</p>
5	<p>Additional mitigation measures</p> <p>■ –Some residents are more impacted by noise and vibration than others. For example, the Old Railway Gatehouse which has had provisions. I would like to declare an individual interest and register these views from my personal perspective (rather than on behalf of the Parish Council). I would like to see measures such as: structural survey (and a commitment to pay for repairs), double glazing (acoustic glazing), external maintenance (cleaning, painting etc.). When considering all 4 schemes (including Equinor) it wouldn't cost much to developers.</p> <p>■ – It might be useful to provide some context around Old Railway Gatehouse.</p> <p>■ –The additional measures that are proposed are optional measures and were developed by Orsted and are because of the frequency of traffic including Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) from that project on the route to the HP3s main construction compound. Cawston is not on the route of the HP3 main construction compound at Oulton, so the potential impacts are not directly comparable. Vattenfall has committed to the optional measures at the ORGH because there is an agreement between the three projects to implement and to remove the Oulton scheme (as there is with the Cawston HIS) dependent on the order of construction. Therefore, it was agreed by Vattenfall to adopt the same measures for the ORGH as proposed and agreed by HP3. The further/ optional mitigation measures proposed are a noise barrier – essentially a fence, which is an improvement to and extension of an existing fence - along the boundary of the property that runs adjacent to road and some glazing options. These measures are potentially appropriate, pending agreement by the property owner, because they are deliverable in that particular case and locality. With respect to Cawston, due to the Conservation Areas status and being no suitable locations for noise barriers, these measures are not considered to applicable.</p> <p>■ – Appreciate that this is difficult but in summary, with respect to ORGH the measures are optional and are not necessary to mitigate any impact. At Cawston our assessments have not identified any significant impacts with respect to noise. With respect to vibration/structural surveys the vibration assessments we have undertaken indicate that levels are much lower than those which would potentially result in structural damage . Therefore, under the EIA process, no mitigation measures are required nor proposed, under the DCO. However, this is not to say that we rule out seeking locally appropriate, informal improvements and how the scheme is perceived by residents, post consent.</p> <p>■ – You made reference earlier to Community Benefits, and also to matters relating to local resilience and local community sustainability, and that in a sense the topics we are discussing have an effect on these measures, as indeed our current experience of</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>Covid-19 and how we are adapting to it may have an impact on all local communities, and working practices and so on. I'd just like to outline to you how we in Vattenfall consider the very broad topic of community benefit. In its overarching sense, we believe our projects with the inward investment of several billion pounds to build nationally significant infrastructure offers a tremendous socio-economic opportunity for the region. That is why we are working with a number of local organisations, including the County Council, LPAs, the LEP and others to ensure the workforce and the supply chain are ready to take advantage of these local opportunities, and through their work, to keep money in the local economy as far as possible. We are also investing in skills provision – to ensure Norfolk and the young people of the East of England develop the appropriate skills to work in this burgeoning sector. Beyond that during construction, and in the planning of construction works, when we are in close dialogue with local stakeholders and communities about implementation, that fits with other local road users and also tries as far as possible to align with other local priorities, including those of communities like Cawston. In our experience, working with local communities and our local contractors, during the construction phase there are positive actions that can be identified in collaboration, and implemented that deliver on particular local interest and needs, and are classed as benefits in kind, which are often about how we do things, or how we solve problems together to deliver local improvements, that last beyond the construction period, in many instances. These types of schemes need to be done when the detailed design is being undertaken, and with a much fuller understanding of all relevant constraints, opportunities and timings – we are not there yet. We would envisage discussions with the Winery for example, which you brought up earlier, would happen during this stage. It may be difficult for you to understand why we do not commit to these types of activity in the DCO. However, we do commit in the DCO to liaison and meaningful dialogue throughout the pre-construction and construction process. You have already experienced some small benefits that can emerge from constructive dialogue, for example you highlighted to us some difficulty in attaining funding to replace old / not-working high-energy street lighting, with new LED lights, and you explained the lighting was important in relation to routes to school taken by local pupils and other pedestrians. We agreed to provide most of the funding to enable the PC to replace the deficient lighting, because we felt it would support local priorities and help build trust and serve to assist us to keep talking to one another. Also, in order to help you have confidence in our traffic and parking assessments, we organised for an independent specialist from RHDHV (not connected to the Project) to provide training and guidance on conducting parking surveys. This enabled you to undertake the surveys, and for us all to maintain an appropriate level of confidence in the surveys, again, to assist the engagement and dialogue process. I point these out, just as examples where we go beyond legal commitments, and use our discretion and honour what we have agreed. I am trying to make the point, that just because something is not in the DCO doesn't mean it won't happen. Further to this, you are correct, we do intend to establish some type of Community Benefit Funding to acknowledge the role of local communities in hosting the infrastructure that is enabling the UK to take important steps towards a climate smarter future, and to meeting our C-emission reductions targets, and our national commitment to Net Zero by 2050.</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>■ –The open floor hearing (2nd July) people from Necton said Dudgeon had a community benefit fund and saw none of it. Would the community benefit fund you're proposing be for everyone or some be ringfenced for Cawston?</p> <p>■ – To be completely frank with you, at this stage, I don't know. We intend to consult with local communities along the cable corridor about how we shape the Community Benefit Fund, and that type of question is most certainly one, we will ask people. For example, on some of our projects, in consultation with local people and stakeholders it has been deemed appropriate to earmark a proportion of the fund for communities living closest to the onshore project substation – as this is the only above ground permanent infrastructure that people will perceive over the long term. It could be that other options are also appropriate, however, we do not tend to think that splitting the funding up, across very small divisions such as parishes is appropriate, as what that does is dilute the impact of the fund, and means only lots of small schemes can ever be supported. All this consideration will be done – in consultation with you and others – over the coming years, so that we have a well thought up process, with good governance and administration in place, by the time construction begins. This being the case, communities can bid in proposals that meet the fund's criteria and enter the competitive process</p> <p>■ –We have no problem participating in a competitive process and already have a shopping list of things we would like to invest into the community. I will send it over. You will find it hard to find another community in Norfolk that will have this much construction traffic moving through it.</p> <p>■ –The phrase 'no significant impacts' doesn't play very well when you're sitting here listening to the traffic going by. The term 'concentrated losers' describes the village very well.</p> <p>■ – For relatively brief periods of time you may feel that you are being imposed upon, because you live right next to a major road in Norfolk, I totally empathise with your position, but in the longer term Vattenfall's intention is that there will be positive impacts, nationally, regionally and locally, associated with our Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas projects.</p> <p>■ – All well and good looking at the longer term but we are living in the short term so have to consider it.</p> <p>■ –We are being left out to dry for the longer term scheme.</p> <p>■ – Norfolk Vanguard's project manager has been quoted as saying that: you "understand that some people are going to be impacted a little bit but we've done all we can". But on this project, to us, it doesn't feel like that at all.</p> <p>■ – As I said, I can only reiterate, that for now, while we are trying to describe, mitigate for, and achieve consent for the worst case scenario, you may well feel that only negatives will emerge from the projects. No doubt this feeling is exacerbated by the fact</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>that a number of developers are at a similar stage in project development right now, and of course, we can't speak for them, but we are committed to working in the area for the duration of these projects lifetimes, with an O&M hub here, and we intend to be good neighbours. There will be opportunities for you to seek support for community projects and also potentially for identifying other benefits in kind that help to ease the burden of what you will experience. The schemes aren't coming through your village for several years, the impacts will be at weeks or months at a time, rather than continually over years. We will continue to keep working with you to do what we can. In the interim, we need to comply with Highways Authorities, and their independent safety assessments and to come up with a scheme that satisfies national regulations.</p> <p>■ - The HIS has only been developed to get the trucks through. We've tried to engage constructively but not much has changed, at least it doesn't feel like it. We have tried to engage with you at every turn, but we don't think you are really listening to us.</p> <p>■ – I'm sorry we haven't got the answers that you want to hear. The HIS has evolved considerably since it was first proposed. Within the constraints of what is legal and achievable, we will continue to try to and work with you, and despite your current frustration, we hope that there will be a stage when you feel your efforts have been constructive.</p>
6	<p>Summary of topics discussed and agreement status</p> <p>■ – We will send out the notes from the meeting rather than review all the points now.</p>
7	<p>Another Other Business</p> <p>■ – What are the time frames now?</p> <p>■ – No changes to construction programmes. The decision will be coming about April time.</p> <p>■ – When will the lorries be turning up?</p> <p>■ – Norfolk Vanguard pre-construction activities in 2020/2021, will main duct installation starting in 2022 for two years and then cable pulling for two years (2024/2025 and then or Scenario 2 Norfolk Boreas cable pulling two years (2026/2027). However, activity will not be continuous but in different times throughout this period.</p> <p>For Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2, i.e. Norfolk Vanguard doesn't proceed to construction, cable route duct installation works would commence in 2023.</p> <p>■ – Is there any plans for a meeting between the three projects in the near future.</p> <p>■ – HP3 aren't in the same position as Norfolk Boreas as they are outside the examination process so there are no short-term plans</p> <p>■ – Once all the projects have been given consent, more likely to all have meetings across projects.</p> <p>■ – There have been commitments made for all projects to work together, however this probably won't be in the short term.</p>