

## Greater Norwich Call for Sites Submission Form

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY	
Response Number:	
Date Received:	

This form is to be filled out by any interested parties who want to promote a site for a specific use or development to be allocated in the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

Only one form should be submitted for each individual site i.e. it is not necessary for a separate form to be completed for each landowner on a single site in multiple ownerships. However, a separate form must be completed for each individual site submitted.

Your completed form should be returned to the Greater Norwich Local Plan team no later than **5pm on Friday 8 July 2016**.

By email: [callforsites@gnlp.org.uk](mailto:callforsites@gnlp.org.uk)

Or, if it is not possible submit the form electronically,

By Post to:

*Greater Norwich Local Plan Team*  
PO Box 3466  
Norwich  
NR7 7NX

The responses received as part of the Greater Norwich Local Plan Call for Sites will be published and made available for public viewing. By submitting this form you are consenting to the details about you and your individual site(s) being stored by Norfolk County Council and shared with Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk District Council, and that the details of the site will be published for consultation purposes.

Further advice and guidance can be obtained by visiting the Greater Norwich Local Plan website or by contacting the Greater Norwich Local Plan team directly:

Website: [www.greaternorwichlocalplan.org.uk](http://www.greaternorwichlocalplan.org.uk)

E-mail: [callforsites@gnlp.org.uk](mailto:callforsites@gnlp.org.uk)

Telephone: 01603 306603

<b>1a. Contact Details</b>	
Title	
First Name	
Last Name	
Job Title (where relevant)	
Organisation (where relevant)	
Address	
Post Code	
Telephone Number	
Email Address	

<b>1b. I am...</b>	
Owner of the site	Parish/Town Council
Developer	Community Group
Land Agent	Local Resident
Planning Consultant	Registered Social Landlord
Other (please specify):	

<b>1c. Client/Landowner Details</b> (if different from question 1a)	
Title	
First Name	
Last Name	
Job Title (where relevant)	
Organisation (where relevant)	
Address	
Post Code	
Telephone Number	
Email Address	

<b>2. Site Details</b>	
Site location / address and post code  (please include as an attachment to this response form a location plan of the site on an scaled OS base with the boundaries of the site clearly shown)	
Grid reference (if known)	
Site area (hectares)	

<b>Site Ownership</b>		
<b>3a. I (or my client)....</b>		
Is the sole owner of the site	Is a part owner of the site	Do/Does not own (or hold any legal interest in) the site whatsoever
<b>3b. Please provide the name, address and contact details of the site's landowner(s) and attach copies of all relevant title plans and deeds (if available).</b>		
<b>3c. If the site is in multiple landownerships do all landowners support your proposal for the site?</b>	Yes	No
<b>3d. If you answered no to the above question please provide details of why not all of the sites owners support your proposals for the site.</b>		

<b>Current and Historic Land Uses</b>		
<b>4a. Current Land Use</b> (Please describe the site's current land use e.g. agriculture, employment, unused/vacant etc.)		
<b>4b. Has the site been previously developed?</b>	Yes	No

**4c. Describe any previous uses of the site.** (please provide details of any relevant historic planning applications, including application numbers if known)

--

**Proposed Future Uses**

**5a. Please provide a short description of the development or land use you proposed** (if you are proposing a site to be designated as local green space please go directly to question 6)

--

**5b. Which of the following use or uses are you proposing?**

Market Housing	Business & offices	Recreation & Leisure
Affordable Housing	General industrial	Community Use
Residential Care Home	Storage & distribution	Public Open Space
Gypsy & Traveller Pitches	Tourism	Other (Please Specify)

**5c. Please provide further details of your proposal, including details on number of houses and proposed floorspace of commercial buildings etc.**

--

**5d. Please describe any benefits to the Local Area that the development of the site could provide.**

--

<b>Local Green Space</b>
--------------------------

If you are proposed a site to be designated as Local Green Space please complete the following questions. These questions do not need to be completed if you are not proposing a site as Local Green Space. Please consult the guidance notes for an explanation of Local Green Space Designations.
---

<b>6a. Which community would the site serve and how would the designation of the site benefit that community.</b>
---

--------------

<b>6b. Please describe why you consider the site to be of particular local significance e.g. recreational value, tranquillity or richness in wildlife.</b>
--

--------------

<b>Site Features and Constraints</b>
--------------------------------------

Are there any features of the site or limitations that may constrain development on this site (please give details)?
--

<b>7a. Site Access:</b> Is there a current means of access to the site from the public highway, does this access need to be improved before development can take place and are there any public rights of way that cross or adjoin the site?
--

----------

<b>7b. Topography:</b> Are there any slopes or significant changes of in levels that could affect the development of the site?
--

----------

<b>7c. Ground Conditions:</b> Are ground conditions on the site stable? Are there potential ground contamination issues?
--

----------

<b>7d. Flood Risk:</b> Is the site liable to river, ground water or surface water flooding and if so what is the nature, source and frequency of the flooding?
--

----------

<b>7e. Legal Issues:</b> Is there land in third party ownership, or access rights, which must be acquired to develop the site, do any restrictive covenants exist, are there any existing tenancies?
--

----------

**7f. Environmental Issues:** Is the site located next to a watercourse or mature woodland, are there any significant trees or hedgerows crossing or bordering the site are there any known features of ecological or geological importance on or adjacent to the site?

--

**7g. Heritage Issues:** Are there any listed buildings, Conservation Areas, Historic Parklands or Schedules Monuments on the site or nearby? If so, how might the site's development affect them?

--

**7h. Neighbouring Uses:** What are the neighbouring uses and will either the proposed use or neighbouring uses have any implications?

--

**7i. Existing uses and Buildings:** are there any existing buildings or uses that need to be relocated before the site can be developed.

--

**7j. Other:** (please specify):

--

**Utilities**

**8a. Which of the following are likely to be readily available to service the site and enable its development? Please provide details where possible.**

	Yes	No	Unsure
Mains water supply			
Mains sewerage			
Electricity supply			
Gas supply			
Public highway			
Broadband internet			

Other (please specify):	
<b>8b. Please provide any further information on the utilities available on the site:</b>	

<b>Availability</b>	
<b>9a. Please indicate when the site could be made available for the land use or development proposed.</b>	
Immediately	
1 to 5 years (by April 2021)	
5 - 10 years (between April 2021 and 2026)	
10 – 15 years (between April 2026 and 2031)	
15 - 20 years (between April 2031 and 2036)	
<b>9b. Please give reasons for the answer given above.</b>	

<b>Market Interest</b>		
<b>10. Please choose the most appropriate category below to indicate what level of market interest there is/has been in the site. Please include relevant dates in the comments section.</b>		
	Yes	Comments
Site is owned by a developer/promoter		
Site is under option to a developer/promoter		
Enquiries received		



Site is being marketed		
None		
Not known		

<b>Delivery</b>	
<b>11a. Please indicate when you anticipate the proposed development could be begun.</b>	
Up to 5 years (by April 2021)	
5 - 10 years (between April 2021 and 2026)	
10 – 15 years (between April 2026 and 2031)	
15 - 20 years (between April 2031 and 2036)	
<b>11b. Once started, how many years do you think it would take to complete the proposed development (if known)?</b>	

<b>Viability</b>			
<b>12a. You acknowledge that there are likely to be policy requirements and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) costs to be met which will be in addition to the other development costs of the site (depending on the type and scale of land use proposed). These requirements are likely to include but are not limited to: Affordable Housing; Sports Pitches &amp; Children's Play Space and Community Infrastructure Levy</b>			
	Yes	No	Unsure
<b>12b. Do you know if there are there any abnormal costs that could affect the viability of the site e.g. infrastructure, demolition or ground conditions?</b>			
<b>12c. If there are abnormal costs associated with the site please provide details:</b>			
<b>12d. Do you consider that the site is currently viable for its proposed use taking into account any and all current planning policy and CIL considerations and other abnormal development costs associated with the site?</b>			

12e. Please attach any viability assessment or development appraisal you have undertaken for the site, or any other evidence you consider helps demonstrate the viability of the site.


**Other Relevant Information**

13. Please use the space below to for additional information or further explanations on any of the topics covered in this form

<b>Check List</b>	
Your Details	
Site Details (including site location plan)	
Site Ownership	
Current and Historic Land Uses	
Proposed Future Uses	
Local Green Space (Only to be completed for proposed Local Green Space Designations)	
Site Features and Constraints	
Utilities	
Availability	
Market Interest	
Delivery	
Viability	
Other Relevant Information	
Declaration	

<b>14. Declaration</b>	
<p>I understand that:</p> <p><b>Data Protection and Freedom of Information</b></p> <p>The Data Controller of this information under the Data Protection Act 1998 will be Norfolk County Council, which will hold the data on behalf of Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk District Council. The purposes of collecting this data are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To assist in the preparation of the Greater Norwich Local Plan</li> <li>• To contact you, if necessary, regarding the answers given in your form.</li> <li>• To evaluate the development potential of the submitted site for the uses proposed within the form.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disclaimer</b></p> <p>The responses received as part of the Greater Norwich Local Plan "Call for Sites" will be published and made available for public viewing. By submitting this form you are consenting to the details about you and your individual sites being stored by Norfolk County Council, and the details being published for consultation purposes. Any information you consider to be confidential is clearly marked in the submitted response form and you have confirmed with the Council(s) in advance that such information can be kept confidential as instructed in the Greater Norwich Local Plan Call for Sites Response Form Guidance Notes.</p> <p>I agree that the details within this form can be held by Norfolk County Council and that those details can be shared with Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk District Council for the purposes specified in this declaration.</p>	
Name	Date





Ordnance Survey © Crown Copyright 2016. All rights reserved. Licence number 100022432. Plotted Scale - 1:7500



## Technical Note 1

**Date:** 03 May 2013  
**File Ref:** Mill Lane, Kirby Cane, Development Sites  
**Subject:** Development Proposals and Access  
**Planning Ref:** South Norfolk Council "Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD"

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Create Consulting Engineers Ltd has been commissioned by Savills to prepare transport-related evidence in connection with a cluster of three sites for potential future residential development allocations.
- 1.2 The sites are located off Mill Lane, Kirby Cane, Norfolk and referred to as 309, 310 and 1174 as part of South Norfolk Council's "Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Cumulatively, 309, 310 and 1174 would deliver in the order of 15 dwellings being shared equally between all three sites.
- 1.3 Sites 309 and 310 are currently in agricultural use and site 1174 currently provides land for keeping horses with associated stables.
- 1.4 At this stage, it is anticipated that sites 309 and 310 would be provided with direct frontage private drives connecting to Mill Lane. Site 1174 would be served via a residential estate road extension of Florence Way that itself already connects with Mill Lane via a T-junction arrangement (constructed circa 2003).
- 1.5 All three sites were previously referred to as "Preferred Options". However, in their current consultation South Norfolk Council propose to delete all three sites citing an objection from Norfolk County Council (NCC) as Highway Authority. The current consultation plan for Ellingham & Kirby Cane is included at Appendix A of this report.

- 1.6 NCC has been contacted directly concerning the outstanding Highway Authority objection (with respect to all three sites) and this is set out in its entirety below:

*"Mill Lane is unsuitable to cater for additional development pressures and the site is unsuitable for allocation. The combined impacts of the three preferred sites, 309,310 & 1174 is unacceptable."*

- 1.7 The comments raised by the Highway Authority (above) in respect of sites 309, 310 and 1174 are lacking in detail and do not appear to be supported by any specific highway safety and/or capacity assessment.
- 1.8 Nevertheless, this report considers the implications for the local section of Mill Lane in the light of the potential allocation of sites 309, 310 and 1174. This report also provides further commentary with respect to the wider highway network. Additionally, consideration is given to how future residents of these sites would potentially be served by walking, cycling and public transport links and local services and facilities.

## 2.0 SURROUNDING ROAD NETWORK AND EXISTING ACCESS

- 2.1 In the immediate vicinity of sites 309 and 310, Mill Lane is a rural single carriageway road narrowing to approximately 3.5m in width and is subject to the national speed limit. Immediately to the north, the road becomes subject to a 30mph village speed limit and is characterised by frontage residential development. Along this "village section" the road widens up to approximately 5.0m leading northwards to the Mill Road/Mill Lane T-junction.



*Photograph 1: Mill Lane (looking north from the southern extents of sites 309 and 310)*

- 2.2 Florence Way (that would be extended to serve site 1174) connects to Mill Lane on the west side of the carriageway via a simple T-junction. Florence Way is a modern cul-de-sac with its estate road constructed to contemporary standards. The T-junction was constructed specifically for a new housing association scheme comprising 8 dwellings and granted planning consent circa 2003 (planning application ref: E07/03/2098F). The housing association scheme is now constructed and has been fully occupied for several years.



*Photograph 2: Mill Lane (looking north towards the Mill Lane/Mill Road T-junction)*

- 2.3 In combination with those existing developments off Florence Way and Mill Road, Mill Lane currently serves approximately 40 dwellings directly. Even in the absence of a continuous footway, the “village section” of Mill Road operates successfully as shared-spaced serving the requirements of pedestrians, cyclists and motorised vehicles.
- 2.4 In order to determine actual traffic speeds on the “village section” of Mill Lane, independent traffic speed surveys were carried out w/c 29 April 2013 by 360 TSL Ltd. The speeds of free-flow vehicles were recorded between Florence Way and Mill Close – the results of the survey are available in full upon request. Over a continuous 5hr survey period between 10am - 3pm vehicle speeds north and southbound were recorded and found to be in the range 11mph and 22mph. The results of the traffic surveys clearly demonstrate vehicle speeds to be significantly lower than the posted 30mph speed limit.
- 2.5 As part of the traffic speed surveys, traffic volumes were also recorded north and southbound on Mill Lane. During the 5hr survey period, the average rate of two-way traffic was less than 12 vehicles per hour. Whilst weekday AM peak (0800-0900) and PM peak (1700-1800) hours would likely see increased traffic flows on this road, any traffic capacity-related issues associated with Mill Lane or its junctions would appear to be highly unlikely.
- 2.6 The results of the traffic survey reinforce the point that the “village-section” of Mill Lane functions successfully as shared-space. The straight alignment of the road with extensive levels of visibility, low vehicular speeds and traffic volumes means that Mill Lane already provides a suitable environment for walking and cycling.



- 2.7 To the south of sites 309 and 301, Mill Road becomes essentially rural in character primarily serving surrounding agricultural fields. This “rural section” appears to have no particular strategic purpose for the distribution of general traffic locally and it appears to be subject to only minimal use - as is evident by the build up of silt along the crown of the road.



*Photograph 3: Mill Lane (“rural section” looking west)*

- 2.8 A small number of informal vehicle passing places have developed on the “rural section” of Mill Lane serving to facilitate two-way movements on those seemingly infrequent occasions where there has been opposing traffic flow. However, our observations indicate that agricultural vehicle tracks appear to be principally responsible for verge erosion rather than passenger cars. This further supports the case that the “rural section” of Mill Lane is not used frequently by general traffic.
- 2.9 The sites’ rural location in Ellingham & Kirby Cane means that immediately surrounding services and facilities are naturally limited when compared to a more urbanised setting. However, the local village community is served by a public house (The Olive Tree) with restaurant, recreational ground, village shop and Ellingham VA primary school.
- 2.10 The nearest bus stops to the three sites are on Mill Road adjacent to the village shop and located less than 400m from the southern extents of sites 309 and 310. The bus timetable indicates these stops serve the 580 Beccles route to “Diss via Bungay & Harleston”.
- 2.11 The three sites would also have convenient access to the A143 Principal Route for trips further afield to Norwich, Beccles and Lowestoft, for example.

2.12 It is reasonable to assume that members of the local village community already carry out informal car-sharing for retail and employment trips beyond the village and this would likely extend to future residents.

2.13 Future residents of sites 309, 310 and 1174 would have access to local community and leisure facilities, public transport services and would also have convenient access to the wider highway network.

### 3.0 DEVELOPMENT TRIP GENERATION AND ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS

#### *Trip Generation*

3.1 An individual two/three bedroom residential dwelling in a rural location could be expected to generate a "worse-case" maximum of 8 to 10 vehicular traffic movements per day. However, on a daily basis this level of activity is highly unlikely to be generated by each and every dwelling within a rural residential development.

3.2 Typical residential trip rates from the TRICS database would indicate an average of up to 6 vehicular traffic movements per day per dwelling. Each site (comprising 5 dwellings) could be expected to generate up to 30 traffic movements per 24 hour day – realistically no more than two traffic movements per hour on average. Even when considered cumulatively, the three sites would lead to only modest increases in pedestrian, cyclist and motorised vehicle activity on the local highway network compared to the existing situation. With regard to the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and motorised vehicles the village would continue to retain its quiet, rural character.

3.3 Considering the surrounding village settlement pattern and the position of the A143 Principal Route, it is reasonable to assume the overwhelming majority of additional traffic generation associated with sites 309, 310 and 1174 would be assigned to/from the north. There is little to suggest that the "rural section" of Mill Lane to the south would be subject to anything other than negligible increases in traffic demand.

3.4 Along Mill Lane and the surrounding village area our observations on site indicate that at certain locations, two-way traffic flow can be momentarily compromised. However, this occurs principally on account of occasionally parked cars and/or narrower sections of road as part of the historic fabric of a typical village. Our observations do not indicate any sustained traffic capacity issues at local junctions and the modest increases in traffic associated with the development proposals considered in this report would have only minimal impact on the local highway network.

### ***Access Arrangements and Associated Improvements***

- 3.5 It is anticipated that sites 309 and 310 would be provided with direct frontage private drives connecting to Mill Lane. Site 1174 would be served via an extension of Florence Way that itself connects with Mill Lane via an existing T-junction.
- 3.6 Whilst overall levels of traffic impact associated with the proposed sites is likely to be minimal compared to the existing situation, it is acknowledged that the narrow section of Mill Lane in the vicinity of sites 309 and 310 is currently of insufficient width to readily accommodate unhindered two-way traffic flow. To improve this situation would also serve to provide a more conducive situation for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 3.7 In conjunction with sites 309 and 310, it is proposed to widen the section of Mill Lane to a width consistent with the “village section” of the road immediately to the north. Additionally, it is proposed to extend the existing village 30mph speed limit to the southern extents of the two sites. Whilst general traffic speeds at this location have already been shown to be below 30mph, this measure would serve to act as a “gateway” treatment. In combination, the proposed highways works would effectively extend the “village section” of Mill Lane further southwards. Sites 309 and 310 would, therefore, form a logical extension of the existing residential development frontage along this road.
- 3.8 A further measure is proposed in conjunction with site 310 on the east side of Mill Lane in that land would be set aside on the inside of the 90 degree bend in the road towards the southern extent of the site. This would significantly improve forward visibility through the aforementioned bend compared to the existing situation and should be welcomed by the Highway Authority.



*Photograph 4: Mill Lane (improvements proposed to forward visibility at this location)*

- 3.9 Site 1174 would be served via a new estate road stemming from an existing turning head at Florence Way to form an extension of the cul-de-sac. Florence Way connects with Mill Lane via a recently constructed T-junction and we note the give-way line of this junction has been set back behind the channel line of the major arm. An improvement to T-junction visibility at this location could be achieved by setting the give-way line to its correct location - approximately 500mm further towards Mill Lane.
- 3.10 The comprehensive package of highway-related measures described above is indicated on Create drawing 505/03/100 attached to this report.

### ***Highway Safety***

- 3.11 The five year accident record (Appendix B) recently obtained from NCC Highways shows no incidents having occurred within a 500m radius of the three development sites and no patterns or clusters of accidents on the local highway network. Only a small number of scattered, non-related accidents are recorded within a wider 1.25km radius of the three sites over the past five years. This must be acknowledged by the Highway Authority as being a very salient point in their consideration of the development proposals. It is difficult to see how there would be any significant increased risk of accidents on the local rural network given the very modest levels of additional traffic arising from site 309, 310 and 1174.
- 3.12 The single incident (ref: T100/140) that did occur on Mill Lane during the five year review period involved a rear-end collision between two vehicles. The description of this incident and the location at which it occurred suggests driver error was the causational factor rather than any inherent safety issue with the road itself.
- 3.13 We note that when consulted on the planning application for the Florence Way housing association scheme in 2002/2003, the Highway Authority raised concerns that the proposed T-junction access arrangements without extensive improvements to visibility onto Mill Lane "would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety".
- 3.14 The accident data provided by NCC Highways clearly offers no support for those concerns raised in connection with the aforementioned planning application given that not one single incident has been recorded at this location. Consequently, it is difficult to see how a modest intensification of traffic demand using this existing access (arising from site 1174) could realistically lead to any substantiated concerns with respect to highway safety in this case.
- 3.15 It can be concluded that there would be no significant increased risk of accidents occurring on the local highway network on account of the modest scale of residential development considered in this report associated with sites 309, 310 and 1174.

#### 4.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 4.1 Create Consulting Engineers Ltd has been commissioned by Savills to prepare transport-related evidence in connection with a cluster of three sites for potential future residential development allocations.
- 4.2 The sites are located off Mill Lane, Kirby Cane, Norfolk and referred to as 309, 310 and 1174 as part of South Norfolk Council's "Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. Cumulatively, 309, 310 and 1174 would deliver in the order of 15 dwellings being shared equally between all three sites.
- 4.3 Future residents of sites 309, 310 and 1174 would have access to local community and leisure facilities, public transport services and would also have convenient access to the wider highway network.
- 4.4 In terms of highway safety, traffic flow and highway maintenance the impact of each individual development on the local rural road network will be negligible. Even when considered cumulatively, the three sites would lead to only modest increases in pedestrian, cyclist and motorised vehicle activity on the local highway network compared to the existing situation. With regard to the movement of pedestrians, cyclists and motorised vehicles the village would continue to retain its quiet, rural character.
- 4.5 Nevertheless, a comprehensive package of measures is proposed in conjunction with sites 309 and 310 as described above is indicated on Create drawing 505/03/100. These works would comprise widening of the narrow section of Mill Lane, extension of the existing village 30mph speed limit and improvements to forward visibility through an adjacent 90 degree bend in the road. Additionally, an improvement to the Florence Way/Mill Lane T-junction is proposed in connection with site 1174.
- 4.6 In the light of the existing situation and in view of the highway measures proposed, there can be no significant highway safety, capacity or maintenance issues that should cause the Highway Authority undue concern with respect to these three sites (309, 310 and 1174) either individually or cumulatively.
- 4.7 The objection raised by the Highway Authority in connection with sites 309, 310 and 1174 is unfounded and unsupported. The findings of this report are based on a comprehensive assessment and we conclude that there are no significant highway safety, capacity or maintenance issues that should prevent this small cluster of sites (309, 310 and 1174) in Kirby Cane from being allocated for future residential development.

**Author:** Mark Allen, BSc (Hons), MRTPI, MCIHT

**Checked By:** Philip Porter, IEng, MCIHT, AMICE

**Date:** 03 May 2013

**APPENDIX A**

**South Norfolk Council Consultation Plan**


**APPENDIX B**

**Highway Accident Data**

**PLANS**

**Create Drawing 505/03/100**

### Ellingham & Kirby Cane




- Key to
- Preferred Options
  - Preferred Development Boundary
  - Deleted Development Boundary
  - Preferred Site for Residential
  - Reasonable Alternative Site for Residential
  - Parish Boundary

© Crown copyright and database rights 2012 in data Ordnance Survey Licence no 100019483

NOTES:

1. DESIGN AND DIMENSIONS (ALL IN METRES) ARE APPROXIMATE AND BASED ON SITE NOTES AND ORDNANCE SURVEY.



RETAIN CONSISTENT VERGE WIDTH FOLLOWING ROAD WIDENING (APPROX. 1.5M)

WIDEN "VILLAGE SECTION" OF MILL LANE TO 5.0M TO IMPROVE TWO-WAY TRAFFIC FLOW

RE-SET BACK OF VERGE TO GIVE MINIMUM 25.0M (SSD) FORWARD VISIBILITY THROUGH BEND

REPOSITION EXTENTS OF EXISTING 30MPH VILLAGE SPEED LIMIT (REQUIRES TRO)

© Crown Copyright 2012. All rights reserved. Licence number 100020449

Create Consulting Engineers accept no responsibility for any unauthorised amendments to this drawing. Only figured dimensions are to be worked to. COPYRIGHT © RESERVED

PROJECT SITE ALLOCATIONS SOUTH NORFOLK LOCAL PLAN	DATE 02.05.13	DRAWING STATUS INFORMATION	
	SCALE(S) 1:500	DESIGNED MDA	DRAWN MDA
DRAWING TITLE MILL LANE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS	JOB NO. 505	CHECKED DDP	APPROVED DDP
CLIENT SAVILLS	DRAWING NO. 03/001	REVISION	




www.createconsultingengineers.co.uk



ORIGINAL SHEET SEE - A3 FORMER

DO NOT SCALE





	1	2	3	4	5
Reference Number	0053 279	0057 748	T100 135	T100 140	0063 475
Date / Day	Fr28	Mo09	Fr29	Mo08	Fr18
Month	Aug	Aug	Oct	Nov	Nov
Year	2009	2010	2010	2010	2011
Time	2222	1400	1708	1850	1500
Severity	Fa	Se	Sl	Sl	Se
Dark  / Lit					
Weather Conditions					
Road Surface					
Special Conditions					
Carriageway Hazards					
Vehicle Manoeuvres					
Vehicle 1 5 e					
Vehicle 2 6 t					
Vehicle 3 7 c					
Vehicle 4 8					
Casualty /age					
Failed to Give-Way					
Signal Ignored					
Loss of Control					
Hit Object <u>IN</u> C'way					
Hit Object <u>OFF</u> C'way					
Vehicle Left C'way					N
Breath Test					
Contributory Factors	1/2				
	C1**C1** 809 805	V1**V1** 405 510	V1**V1** 307 703	V1**V1* 103 405	V1**V1* 501 502
			V1*V1* 602 408	V1* 410	V1**V1** 601 901
* possible, ** very likely	5/6				
School No./Ref.					
User fields:	1	2	3	4	
	91	32	65	64	64