

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Norfolk Boreas](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Oulton parish Council ref:20022619/Deadline 9 submission  
**Date:** 29 April 2020 17:56:48

---

## Norfolk Boreas

### Oulton Parish Council's submission at Deadline 9

It is with regret that Oulton Parish Council (OPC) is obliged to express its severe disappointment that the Secretary of State has not seen fit to respond to the many representations made to it by many registered Interested Parties, including at all tiers of local government, councillors and Members of Parliament, requesting a temporary suspension of this examination in light of the Covid-19 crisis. These requests were made several weeks ago.

In requesting such an extension ourselves, it has in no way been our intention to try to undermine the examination process - quite the opposite. We have sought only to ensure that the ExA is in a position to receive all appropriate input, including the fully considered written responses of all Interested Parties, the representations at a final Open Floor Hearing, the evidence collected through an Accompanied Site Visit, and the interrogation of all that material - where appropriate - through the additional medium of Issue-Specific Hearings.

With only 12 days now remaining, many issues of great significance to local people remain unresolved.

OPC has been well aware of the unwieldy nature of the examination that this ExA has been required to carry out - coming as it has done at the end of a wave of three of such NSIP applications (with a fourth in the offing) - all impacting on the same areas onshore and likely to overlap in timescales. An adequate assessment of cumulative impact has been well nigh impossible.

In spite of this, the Parish Council has been consistently impressed by the depth of analysis of the evidence before it that this ExA has carried out, and the incisive nature of many of its questions.

For this very reason, we can only express our dismay that this otherwise scrupulous examination is being brought to its close in such a truncated and inglorious fashion.

May 12th represents the end of three years (at least) of sustained hard work by interested parties - some paid, some unpaid - throughout this county, as they taught themselves in to the technology, costs and benefits of offshore wind and its onshore grid connections, consulted with their communities, attended meetings and working parties - and learned how to navigate and respond to the mechanisms of the NSIP planning process.

The stakes are high - the work has been relentless - and that work was worthy of a better end than this.

However, we must continue to represent the interests of our community as best we can until this examination closes, and so we submit the representation below at Deadline 9.

Oulton Parish Council note the very recent submission of further written questions from the ExA and further information from Norfolk County Council, all of which are still being considered.

OPC hope to respond to relevant issues at deadline 10, and at deadline 11 if appropriate.

OPC at deadline 9 have the following comments relating to the Applicant's responses at deadline 7:

<p><b>OPC</b> <b>3. Outstanding Issues</b></p> <p>The Applicants still have not answered OPC in regard to the unexplained extra vehicles on Link 75 for Scenario 1: viz: 110 all vehicles/70 HGVs. OPC wish to understand why this is the only scenario which requires 40 (daily) extra vehicle movements along this route. An explanation is needed as to where these vehicles are going, and why, within Norfolk Vanguard /Boreas scenario 2, these extra vehicles are not required.</p>	<p><b>Applicant (deadline 7): Norfolk Boreas (NB) Scenario 1</b></p> <p>During Scenario 1 – Link 75 is required to access Cable route sections 10 and 11. This equates to the following movements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cable section 10 = 36 HGV movements and 20 Employee movements</li> <li>• Cable Section 11 = 34 HGV movements and 20 Employee movements</li> </ul> <p>The destination of the total 110 total vehicle movements (70 HGVs and 40 employee movements) is to either AC75, AC77 or AC78.</p> <p><b>NB Scenario 2</b></p> <p>During Norfolk Boreas Scenario 2 – Link 75 is required to access one side of the River Bure Trenchless Crossing. This equates to the following movements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• River Bure Trenchless crossing = 72 HGV movements</li> </ul> <p><i>Further investigation revealed 20 employee movements have been omitted in error, which gives a cumulative total vehicle movements of 92.</i></p> <p>The addition of the 20 employee movements would not change the final assessed impacts</p> <p>The destination of the total 92</p>	<p><b>OPC comments at deadline 9:</b></p> <p>OPC notes the Applicant's response at deadline 7 relating to the error on <b>Link 75</b>, regarding the omission of employee traffic movements, and that the revised traffic movements are now stated as: <b>92 all traffic/72 HGVs in scenario 2.</b></p> <p>OPC believes that this error also appears in the <b>Norfolk Vanguard</b> application for Link 75 and has not been corrected.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>total vehicle movements are to either AC75 or AC77.</p>	
<p><b>REP7-070Oulton Parish Council</b> have gathered ten residents' responses to an open question regarding any "effects on local community" that they would like to comment on</p>	<p><b>The Applicant</b> notes and regrets the anxiety and worry reported by the ten individuals, quoted in Oulton Parish Council's submission. We note individuals attribute their anxiety to fear about potential impacts of our proposals, and those relating to other applications to which Oulton Parish Council's representation also refers. We consider proposed embedded mitigation documented in Outline Traffic Management Plan Section 4.3.1 (Version 4, submitted as Deadline 8) and Norfolk Boreas Limited Deadline 7 Submission - Applicant's Comments on Deadline 6 Submissions and Other Submissions [REP7-016] could provide reassurance to these parties with respect to our proposals. The Applicant has committed to ongoing engagement throughout preconstruction and construction phases of the project should it be consented and proceed to construction. An important remit of this ongoing engagement will be to ensure potentially affected parties, know what works are planned where and when, and understand the mitigation in place to limit any temporary impacts as far as possible.</p>	<p><b>OPC comments at deadline 9:</b></p> <p>OPC notes that the Applicant refers again to the impacts of this project as "temporary". Whilst acknowledging that the construction of this project will apparently be shorter than that of Hornsea 3, we are obliged to repeat that the impacts will be felt <b>for years</b> (not weeks or months) and will be so significant in any case that the favourite get-out of "only temporary" is entirely inappropriate here.</p> <p>We reiterate that the community will be "temporarily" impacted for 8-10 years, followed by the prospect of further "temporary" impact from yet another project (Equinor) succeeding HOW3, Vanguard and Boreas. This extended time period cannot of course be laid entirely at the door of this Boreas project, but it underlines our huge concerns about the lack of coordinated planning of these projects <b><u>onshore, and the inability of the NSIP planning process to adequately assess their cumulative impacts.</u></b></p> <p>Proposed road mitigations will not reduce the massively increased traffic going past The Old Railway Gatehouse, nor the potential for constant delays to the local community</p>

when peak cumulative traffic is accessing The Street (Link 68). Residents are rightly further concerned about the likelihood of displaced HGV farm traffic increasingly preferring to use the northern end of The Street - with no controls possible.

Oulton will be sandwiched between Link 68, including the B1149, which will experience cumulative traffic, and Link 75.

Finally, the Applicant offers (again) as 'mitigation' the gift of "ongoing engagement" during construction, including the forewarning of affected parties as to the what and when. We have already stated several times that this thought provides cold comfort to residents: being warned in advance that you will have your sleep disturbed is not the same as getting a good night's sleep; in some ways it compounds the felony through anticipation.