

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Norfolk Vanguard](#)
Cc: [Cawston PC](#)
Subject: Cawston Parish Council - Deadline 7 submission
Date: 02 May 2019 21:39:29
Attachments: [Cawston Parish Council - Deadline 7 submission - Written submission of oral case and update on progress of discussion with applicant.pdf](#)

Dear Sir

Please find attached Cawston Parish Council's Deadline 7 post hearing submission and confirmation of oral case.

Yours faithfully

Simon Court
For Cawston Parish Council

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Cawston Parish Council wishes to make this submission for Deadline 7. It also serves as our confirmation of oral evidence at the hearings on 24th April and the requested update of progress in our discussions with Vattenfall.

MEETINGS WITH THE APPLICANT

We had a meeting with Vattenfall in Cawston on 11th April, which was their first available date. We felt we had a full and open discussion, and were able to demonstrate some of the issues on the ground. Their response was then received on the 23rd, and there are still many differences between us.

We welcome commitments by both the Applicant and Norfolk County Council to engage and share information with Cawston Parish Council. Vattenfall are aware that we can be available at any reasonable time to continue discussions and we are waiting for them to propose the next meeting date. Unfortunately, at the time of writing (1700, 2nd May), we have not heard anything.

1. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

We have previously suggested alternative routes to avoid Cawston centre, and we consider that these have not been properly evaluated by either Vattenfall or Orsted. We maintain our position that, regardless of a notional road classification, the B1145 around Cawston is simply not a practical route for the proposed levels of traffic.

CPC is concerned that this issue is only being considered by the two Applicants late in the examination process; it could, and should, have been identified and addressed much earlier. We recognise that there is not a simple solution but feel that solutions to unacceptable and unworkable traffic levels in Cawston are possible to achieve. This will require willingness from the applicant to approach reducing vehicle movements through the village constructively and to accept the costs involved as being necessary.

We note that there is a general agreement to take 50% of traffic out of Horsford village by a diverted route. In Horsford the road and pavements are much wider than Cawston, houses are set further back from the road and the proposed number of HGVs is lower.

In Cawston, Vattenfall are still relying on the Orsted plan. This is already at v5 with no real progress. A Road Safety Audit has been done, but we only know this because there is a Norfolk County Council response on the Hornsea PINS site; the actual report itself has not been published there.

We have asked Orsted several times for a copy but it has not been provided. Vattenfall also claimed not to have a copy we could see. The Norfolk County Council response does give some clues to the content of this report; apparently it includes ... *"if just one car was to park badly, this could prevent a large vehicle manoeuvring successfully, resulting in an obstruction to the High Street"*.

The report also suggests that there is not room for the Orsted plan's proposed improvements to footpaths, and that parked cars provide some protection for pedestrians, but it then suggests that parking restrictions should be considered. This had been rejected in a previous version of the plan; it is going round in circles.

Even then, NCC generously suggest that a workable scheme can still be developed, though this one is not it. That is the quote that Vattenfall choose to pick out in isolation. CPC disagrees, Orsted have had months to come up with a scheme, have tried five times and have failed, for all the fundamental reasons previously discussed and demonstrated on the ASI.

NCC Highways is concerned with traffic flow, not residents' amenity; if you succeed in the former you fail in the latter. Broadland District Council, dealing with residential amenity, assumed that all proposed mitigation measures, including the use of Heydon Road, were necessary; we have already shown that the proposed traffic mitigation measures do not work.

2. NOISE & VIBRATION

Cawston Parish Council maintains the position outlined in our submission dated 3rd April.

Broadland District Council's conclusion rests on Orsted successfully implementing ALL of their mitigation measures. These are the traffic scheme - which we have just seen will not work - and a "cumulative traffic threshold" which will miraculously edge the increase in noise just down to the 3db level!

CPC has no confidence in this, based on our experience to date. The Orsted report, section 2.15, quotes advice on Community Relations ... good relations are of "paramount importance". To date there has been no attempt by Orsted to achieve this and Vattenfall have yet to show they are willing to respond constructively to community concerns.

Any traffic scheme, even if agreed by NCC and BDC, will still rely on the consent and goodwill of Cawston residents for its success. Contributions at the Open Floor Hearing show that there is a long way to go.

While we fully support wind farms and renewable energy in general, this does not give carte blanche to put residents in danger and destroy the village way of life.

Cawston Parish Council
2nd May 2019