31st August 2020

My Reference:- 220022632
Norfolk Boreas Project – EN010087

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I take this opportunity to comment on the responses at deadline 14.

In the applicants response to Q 5.14.1.1 in their own words they state

“the H.I.S has evolved substantially during the Norfolk Boreas examination and been subject to numerous revisions”

Could it please be confirmed at what point NCC gave technical approval and are they fully updated on the numerous revisions.

Within the same response the applicant states that they are mindful that traffic impacts have been assessed very much on a worse case basis. The “worst case” for the applicant often differs from the “worst case” foreseen by IPs.

I was given drawings showing 30mph car movements – the applicants perceived “worst case”, for vision and impact, for me leaving my drive.
I asked for revised drawings showing 20mph HGV movements because that is the scheme being proposed and worst case for me. These appear to show a HGVs required stopping distance measured from the trailer rather than the driving position of the cab.
What none of these drawings show is weather conditions. If it is wet or icy required stopping distances considerably lengthen which is not reflected on the drawings

There is no lighting near my property, hopefully my headlights crossing at 90 degrees to the traffic would get my vehicle noticed. When on foot exiting my property we are crossing to the narrowest section of pavement opposite, just 90cm and boxed in by a high wall. The latest drawings show HGVs hugging the pavements along this stretch of narrow road to achieve the stated sight lines. Pedestrians and school children using that pavement carry torches in the winter due to there being little to no lighting on these rural streets. The applicant has offered to upgrade existing lighting as mitigation, however please note there are no lights to upgrade on this section.

I am informed that I currently come out into the road by 1metre to see oncoming traffic and will need to be encroaching onto the road 1.7metres or “ very similar” to see the HGVs in the proposed scheme. Vattenfall have stated this in the technical note provided to PINs (Technical Note: Entrance and Egress onto the B1145, doc reference EXA.AS-5.D14.V1) although in the applicants response a marginal increase of 200mm is also noted. It must be noted this is me pulling out significantly across a line of oncoming traffic on a mere 5 metre wide road at the point of a blind bend.

To date I have had no response to my review of the second drawings and the letter I sent to Vattenfall, copied to yourselves for D14. I would like to ask what their conclusions are from the Technical Notes.

I would also like to ask if NCC and Highways are in acceptance of the yield point as shown within these technical notes, that Chapel Street entry/exit will not be impeded and traffic has appropriate visibility?

As I realise this may be my last submission I would like to thank the planning inspectorate for their time and attention. I do need to state the fact that like many IPs with the various windfarm examinations all requiring evidence presented independently I fear I have missed something relevant, whilst also repeating certain elements. In particular with the short timescale for response and large quantity of documentation at deadline 14 I would like to request the possibility to submit further before the end of the examination if on review I see necessary information.

Due to revisions to the H.I.S my concerns have become focused on being able to get into and out of my property, however concerns of the house being hit, noise, vibration and pollution effects to the building and my family, all still stand.

My concerns re noise effects were detailed for the Orstead examination; after obtaining professional interpretation of the results given for my property. I strongly support Broadland Council concerns over the methodology, data collection and interpretation. As my property was used originally I would be happy to be involved in further noise and vibration impact monitoring as proposed at ref 2 in Doc ExA.PD.D14.V1

Kind regards

Polly Brockis