

## Hornsea Project Three

Open Floor Hearing Monday 25<sup>th</sup> March

### Written submission of Oral representation from Susan Mather on behalf of Oulton Parish Council, including supporting information (Appendix 1 attachment)

In the last few weeks Oulton Parish Council has read documents relating to cumulative impact, which were submitted by Orsted and Vattenfall. In these documents both projects had sought to justify that on roads where there would be cumulative traffic, it would not be detrimental to residents in terms of route sensitivity, noise and vibration and that those roads could cope with the impact of greater volumes of traffic, especially HGVs.

OPC were shocked to find on reading the cumulative traffic reports, that although the same methodology and traffic data has apparently been used for each report (baseline traffic data 2022), the outcomes appear to be very different; there were differing percentage increases in all traffic numbers and especially for HGVs.

In Orsted's Cumulative Impact Assessment for Oulton there was a 548% increase in HGV's, according to Appendix 28 and a 594% increase for the same Link in an earlier Appendix 25 - so there is some confusion as to what the actual increase is. Vattenfall's CIA for Oulton was a 487.2% increase, so huge variations using the same data. It should be noted that all outcomes would fall within the IEMA guidelines showing that a greater than 30% increase in traffic needed further assessment. (**\*\*see Appendix 1 for supporting information.**)

Incidentally LINK 208 appears not to have been assessed for air quality, which is surprising considering the increase in HGVs using that route and given the close proximity to the road of one property. (**\*\*see Appendix 1 for supporting information.**)

Rather surprisingly then, given the percentage increase for LINK 208 'The Street,' was the noise assessments carried out by Orsted at one property, where the outcome was; 'moderate adverse' but with proposed road intervention mitigations, re-grading the road, reducing the speed limit to 30mph, the results were reduced to 'minor'. I think residents find it hard to understand how, with an obvious increase in traffic numbers generated by both of these projects, on previously quiet rural roads, the outcome for noise or route sensitivities can be 'minor' or 'negligible'. The more cynical amongst us would think that this is a result of statistical smoothing.

Oulton has recently learnt, on reading Orsted's latest outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, that although there will be NO Abnormal Load deliveries at night TO the cable corridor FROM the Main Construction Compound, they have not excluded abnormal load deliveries TO the compound at night FROM the port. This

makes a complete nonsense of the core working hours. OPC therefore can only conclude that the main construction compound will be operating 24 hours a day, bringing with it the potential for night time noise and light pollution from those deliveries. This will have implications for Oulton residents and *for all of those living along the cable delivery route from the port*, wherever that might be.

Both projects have, in their CIA documents, produced a map of roads in Norfolk that would be impacted by cumulative traffic. This map is a stark reminder to Norfolk residents and businesses just how this traffic might impact their lives for several years. Many of the major routes in North Norfolk will experience delays and increased traffic. This includes the tourist routes on A148/A140 between the cable route landfall areas of Happisburgh and Weybourne, and will also impact Cromer. Further inland at the cable corridor crossover point, the impact will mean possible diversions, as roads are closed at sections while trenching and ducting is carried out, especially as Vattenfall does not intend to use trenchless crossing at some roads.

While the two projects will no doubt arrange how they can manage to work in the same areas, for local businesses, especially for Norfolk farms, there would be the need for careful planning, especially for those crops where time related harvesting is crucial. For example, the pea harvest needs to be picked and arrive at processing plants in hours....not held up by an AIL (Abnormal Indivisible Load) along its route! The issue of agricultural traffic on the same roads and the increase in HGVs from these projects has been underestimated.

In this final phase of this examination process many residents must feel that their lives really do not matter, when assessments and mitigations seemingly can be steered in favour of a beneficial outcome to the developer.

Susan Mather, Oulton Parish Council.