From:

To:

Norfolk Boreas

Subject: Deadline 14 Submission

Date: 25 August 2020 14:47:01

Attachments: Boreas Plans Monday 24 08 20.doc

Windfarm plans.zip

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

Further to your request for updates on my dialogue with Vattenfall I received a revised set of drawings.

After having these printed, on review I am still not assured of the safety of the proposed HIS. I have responded with further considerations and questions to Vattenfall today and attach all for your reference. I would strongly draw your attention to drawing TP -PB5640-DR066

- 1. For an indication of how far I will need to travel into the road to gain sight of a yielded vehicle
- 2. For position of the yielded vehicle in relation to the access/ exit of Chapel Street
- 3. The travel path as drawn which denotes the HGV travelling west is actually riding against the kerb

Thank you

Polly Brockis IP reference number 20022632

Hi Jake, Andy,

Thank you for the revised drawings changing vehicles to HGVs and technical notes.

I see that on all these new drawings it is consistently acknowledged that the passenger side corner (leading edge) of my vehicle has to be 1.7 metres into the road before I can see the proposed HGVs travelling eastbound. The previous drawings stated only 1 metre out. I appreciate this has been corrected to a reality that can be physically measured but the phrase "no change" over these drawings is misleading. HGVs travelling in this direction are not a current occurrence. Vehicles are not heading to pull over into a yield/ hold position, I see vehicles in transit travelling along the High Street. This new scenario has HGVs beginning their movement from behind a corner out of my view.

Drawing DR065

In the technical notes your bullet point for this drawing it states a 27metre requisite forward visibility is required for the HGV to see a vehicle leaving our driveway. That measurement seems to be taken from the trailer, rather than the cab to the very corner sighting of my vehicle. From the drivers position to an actual visual of the car (when that driver is actually focused on looking for another HGV some 90m down the road) will be significantly less than that visibility requisite and stopping distance – and as drawn I am totally reliant on his/ her visual of me and stopping, I have no sight line of the vehicle at that time.

On this drawing the yield point is shown to completely block the entry/ exit to Chapel Street. An immediate log jam scenario. Again I ask has anyone spoken to the businesses on Chapel Street, how many winery lorries have to make that turn daily? Are the yielding HGVs going to reverse to allow access? Could they?

Drawing DR067 – existing situation

This drawing shows **existing** visibility stating I currently have to come into the road by 1.7m to see a HGV travelling east. Currently I rarely see HGVs travelling in this direction, it must be acknowledged that traffic is far less than proposed and currently "larger" vehicles, i.e tractors or buses will travel down the centre of the road and I am able to see these way down the High Street before pulling out to any significant distance.

Please note the blue parking bays detailed on this plan are overstated. Vehicles do not park directly opposite the Chapel Street access way because of the turning circle required by the winery lorries.

This existing visibility drawing shows a bus driving west past my property. It is drawn as actual, taking that required road position slightly over the centre line to get the angle to drive down the High Street and avoid pedestrians on the one sided narrow pavements.

Drawing DR066 – proposed with HIS in place

With the HIS in place the HGV driving west past my property is drawn riding the kerb. A 90cm pavement against a high wall. If the HGV is placed in the same position from the kerb as the bus in DR067 and adding the width of wing mirrors into the equation there is conflict

with my proposed forward position. The HGV at the triangle yield position will not be able to see beyond either of us to see what is following, yielding.

Drawing DR017

Plans at 1:500 are difficult to view and cannot be accurately scaled without the CAD package that they are drafted on. Marked visibilty lines here pass over parking bays and skim wall/ pavement edges, indicating clear visibility distances that cannot be accomplished without eliminating all other traffic or parking. The scheme relies heavily on a sequence of vehicles waiting for opposing ones in a known pattern. Driver compliance may make this a possibility for the HGV drivers but you are proposing this for a village which already has a difficult road because of width and bends. There is everyday traffic in this scenario and they will not understand the dance. There are no get out points in the scheme as drawn. In scenarios of traffic conflict how is it eased?

This drawing shows the yield point at the eastern end of the village, this is past the Norwich Road, the view to exit that road onto the main traffic route is again difficult, has consideration been taken as to how traffic enters and exits here, their situation is somewhat similar to that of exiting my drive and will be coming between two yield points.

I initially stated that the proposed HIS raised the level of risk for us entering and exiting our property. I appreciate the drawings, time and information given however these offer no reassurance. I am ever more concerned about the scheme. On your notes you state "the highway realignment in the vicinity of Chapel Street and the defined parking bays provide better pathways for vehicles affording **adequate** forward visibility and potential to react to highway hazards"

The realignment offers visibility for the yielded vehicles to see one another but does not take into consideration vehicles from my driveway, Chapel Street and Norwich Road, the visibility for all of us will be questionable adequate and we in fact become those highway hazards.

I request all involved look at the scheme with a view of not just getting the HGVs through but the risks and impacts on other drivers/ vehicles attempting to join this traffic "flow". As I have previously said, I do not know how you mitigate this scheme to make it safe but I question that it can be accepted as such and believe all concerned, Boreas, NCC and Highways look at the drawing detail but make time to come and view the problems in 3D reality.

Regard	S
--------	---

Polly Brockis







