

Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation

New, Revised and Small Sites for the GNLP 29 October – 14 December 2018

Objection to inclusion of sites: GNLP 2153 and GNLP 2127

I am objecting to the inclusion of the above sites: Reference Nos: GNLP 2153 and GNLP 2127 for housing development.

My reasons for objecting are as follows:

GNLP 2153: South of Burgate Lane

Planning History

A planning application was submitted to South Norfolk Council by Gladman Developments for a proposed development of 165 houses on site GNLP 2153 in November 2017.

The South Norfolk Council reference for this planning application is: **2017/2652**.

Consent for this planning application was refused in April 2018 and an appeal has been lodged.

There was overwhelming objection to the planning application by local residents and other consultees.

Existing Use and Location

This site is currently agricultural land, being part of a larger farmed field, and is outside the development boundary for Poringland.

Density

The proposed development of 165 dwellings on this site is the same number as put forward in the planning application.

The proposed development density is completely out of keeping with the adjoining developments which abut the eastern development boundary for the village.

The applicant stated in the planning application that the proposed development represents approximately 32 dwellings per hectare. The neighbouring developments are approximately 11 dwellings per hectare.

The applicant's artist's impressions of the development bore little resemblance to reality with regard to the number of cars on the development. Each property is likely to accommodate two or more vehicles. With high density developments, the vehicles will not all be parked within the curtilage of the houses and will, inevitably, become part of the street scene.

Highways

The site is at the furthest eastern edge of the village and a mile away from the main B1332 highway through the village.

On a conservative estimate, the development of 165 homes on this site will generate 200 cars minimum.

Burgate Lane is an unclassified country road. It is a narrow road (single carriageway) for most of its length and is regularly used by large agricultural vehicles. It is totally unsuitable to access the development proposed and to carry the volume of traffic that will be generated from the development.

The vast majority of the vehicles from the proposed development will be travelling to the junction of Burgate Lane with Upgate/Hall Road. This junction is very dangerous with no highway vision-splay areas. This makes accessing Upgate/Hall Road a very cautious procedure with vehicles having to edge out slowly from the junction (from Burgate Lane) before drivers can safely see both ways. Coupled with this, there are motorists who travel along Upgate/Hall Road at speed, which adds to the danger of exiting this junction.

At peak times, the traffic generated by this proposed development will be backed up Burgate Lane for a considerable distance, exposing residents to unacceptable levels of pollution from car engines.

Not only is this junction unsafe for motorists but it places pedestrians, including parents walking young children to school at peak times along Upgate/Hall Road, in danger.

There is no footpath along Upgate/Hall Road, from close to the corner of Rectory Lane to Long Road, to safeguard pedestrians.

During the winter months, snow and icy conditions place motorists and pedestrians in a dangerous situation at this junction with the lack of adequate vision splays. In addition, as Burgate Lane is an unclassified lane, the junction is not treated against adverse winter conditions and is often very icy as you approach the junction from Burgate Lane.

Burgate Lane has also become blocked with snow in the past preventing vehicular movement.

As an unclassified road, it is not 'treated' by the Highway Authority nor is snow cleared.

From Norwich and the A47: the filter lane to Bungay and Poringland (B1332) at the traffic lights on the A146 Trowse By-Pass is inadequate to cope with the existing volume of traffic turning off it, especially at peak time. Traffic is frequently left queuing in the outside lane of a dual carriageway, which is extremely dangerous.

Any additional development in Poringland and Framingham Earl will only exacerbate these problems and compromise safety.

Drainage

The site slopes from north to south. It is known locally that there are drainage problems and it may well be that a high density housing development on this particular site will exacerbate existing problems and impact on residents adjoining the site and beyond.

Environment & Ecology

The proposal for the development of the site is completely out of keeping with the character of the area and is creeping urbanisation of a rural location. Despite what the applicant said in the planning application, in no way does the proposed development enhance the environment.

The applicant stated that there is no ecological value in the land because it has been farmed. This statement does not reflect the reality of a landscape that supports an abundance and wide variety of wildlife and bird life, including bats and owls.

The farming fraternity have been encouraged by Government to engage in farming practices that promote biodiversity, support wildlife and enhance the environment.

Once this landscape is lost to development and built upon, it is lost forever to future generations.

Infrastructure and Services

The applicant's planning statement relied on the Government's current policy to build more and more houses, whilst failing to acknowledge how much residential development Poringland and Framingham Earl have already delivered and which continues to be delivered under planning consents already granted (see further below under the heading "Impact of existing housing developments on Infrastructure, Services & Public Health").

GNLP2127: Orchard Farm

The HELAA document which details the "Site Suitability Conclusions" for this site (page 277) states that this is a greenfield site but it is agricultural land with buildings on it.

My comments under the heading "Highways" for site GNLP 2153 also apply to this site.

I note that the Highway Authority considers this site to be remote and the local road network lacking capacity.

I would add to this that, to the north of the site, there is a 'blind' 90 degree turn to the west.

Being so "remote", how can this site be "accessible to bus services, employment and two primary schools", other than by car?

The speed limit on this part of Burgate Lane is 60 mph and, with no footpath, the narrow road (single carriageway) makes walking to bus stops, workplaces and schools unrealistic from this rural location.

There would be an almost total reliance on the use of cars to and from this site, which will only add to the highway problems that already exist and have been covered in my objections to site GNLP2153.

Impact of existing housing developments on Infrastructure, Services & Public Health

The villages of Poringland and Framlingham Earl have already absorbed a disproportionate amount of new housing development from high volume developers, including Norfolk Homes, David Wilson Homes, Bennett Homes and Charles Church.

With the housing development that has already taken place in the villages, and the continuing development of sites that have already been granted permission, there is already a noticeable strain placed on the facilities and services in Poringland and Framlingham Earl. The further expansion of the two villages is unsustainable.

There is not the space for additional pupils, nor is there the capacity for site expansion, in the villages' schools. The two Health Practices cannot absorb even more patients on their lists from more new developments without detrimentally impacting on the services they can provide to their patients. Already there can be a wait of three weeks plus to see a GP.

With patients unable to get a Doctor's appointment for weeks, the A&E Department at the Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital often becomes the default first contact point for many patients, putting an additional strain on the Hospital's finances and its resources.

The volume of traffic that flows through Poringland on the B1332 has increased hugely with the amount of housing development that has already taken place in the two villages, leading to congestion and queuing at peak times.

Inevitably, the volume of traffic will continue to increase from the completion of sites already under construction where there is still a considerable amount of building work to be completed.

It is well documented and publicised that vehicle pollution is a major public health risk. Pedestrians and cyclists are the worst affected. The detrimental impact on the health and well-being of residents caused by ever-increasing volumes of traffic needs to be taken into account in planning for new housing developments.

Strategic Overview

Local Planning Authorities need to acknowledge **now** that they are always going to be playing 'catch up' with Government policy imposing higher and higher house building targets.

Meeting one Government Department's policy and targets on housing without due consideration being given to the detrimental impact on the provision of the associated services provided by other Government Departments e.g. the NHS, Education and Transportation is totally illogical.

It is local communities that suffer as a result of the lack of any strategic 'joined up' thinking at Central and Local Government level.

Instead of identifying sites in existing villages for more and more housing development without acknowledging, or providing for, the inevitable negative impact on infrastructure and services, the local planning authorities should be grasping the nettle and identifying an area or areas in Norfolk where a new village or villages can be built - with adequate infrastructure and services to meet the needs of the proposed population.

A much greater percentage of the cost of the new infrastructure and services should be met by the developers. One only has to read the newspapers to see the eye-watering profits that developers are currently making from new builds.

This should be the planning priority for the future to cope with higher and higher Government imposed targets.

It has been done in Cambridgeshire with the creation of Cambourne. The proposed development of Bourn Airfield to create a new village is currently under consideration.

Presumably, similar development of new villages to meet housing demand has been done in other parts of the country so it is a mystery why it is something that Norfolk seems unable to deliver.

G Newman