

Reedham

- 1) Reedham is a remote village some distance from centre of population (Norwich /Great Yarmouth) where workplaces generally exist. Although public transport ,including a railway station, is in existence the timings and frequency of these services does not generally encourage use by working people.
- 2) Reedham is acknowledged by the GNLP as having no footway links to the village services that do exist. The possibilities of providing any footways are very limited given the already narrow roads that are found in the village. It is a basic planning Policy requirement that safe and accessible footways are available to local services.
- 3) Reedham has a Primary School which the GNLP makes great weight of having capacity. The actual number of children attending the School is detailed in attached e-mail from the **Parish Council which is based upon information provided by the School Head. The number of children at the School has risen in the last year from 41 (which is believed to be the number the GNLP have based their assessment of capacity on) to 60.** The School is housed in Victorian premises on a cramped site and although there is still some capacity the recent upturn in numbers would appear to bring the School much closer to the 'official capacity of 77.' If the School continues to improve its performance there is a strong likelihood is that the School role would increase from existing families in the area.
- 4) Reedham has a large number of rental properties as acknowledged in the emerging Neighborhood Plan. This reflects its Broads/riverside location with some of these rentals being used as holiday accommodation or second homes. The aim of the GNLP is to provide full time accommodation for all types of occupiers including families and workers which given Reedham location it is highly questionable that it has traditionally encouraged or would do so in the future.

Preferred Sites (GNLP 1001 & GNLP 3003)

- 1) It is highly questionable whether Reedham, a remote and isolated village not on a through route, is suitable for the proposed increased housing numbers of 68-88. (40-60 on new Sites plus existing allocations & windfall sites) suggested by the GNLP.
- 2) Reedham has no footway provision to services (a basic Policy requirement for all housing development) and this cannot be rectified. In accessing any village service pedestrians have to walk in the carriageway of narrow roads which, are often, busy.
- 3) It is my understanding that only the two above sites were put forward in this area of the correct minimum area (0.5ha). Whilst Site GNLP 1001 is a continuation of previous housing allocations Site GNLP 3003 has a significant number of constraints which gives the impression that this site has been listed as Preferred option purely to make up the area location numbers.

Constraints of Site GNLP 3003

- 1) The site has no satisfactory means of vehicular access. Visibility at the both the existing access points to Mill Road & Holly Farm Road have negligible visibility to both directions. The indicated means of vehicular access to this Site from Mill Road requires acquisition of road frontages over a minimum of two neighboring dwellings. There is no guarantees that this can, or will be able to, be provided. Norfolk County Council as Local Highway Authority have said in their comments to the GNLP that it is not feasible to provide a safe access. Development Management commented that providing safe access would be compromised due to requirement to acquire third party land and this could be a decisive constraint.
- 2) No footway links to services are available and are unfeasible to provide. Walking in the carriageway of both Mill Road and Holly Farm Road is unsafe especially at school pick up and drop off times.
- 3) The site has a potential flood risk (amber in the HELAA Comparison Table).
- 4) Reedham has a problem with sewage disposal, although not apparently documented or acknowledged by AW the local pumping station has frequently to carry raw sewage away via road. The sewers links to the pumping station have blocked in recent times possibly due to insufficient capacity etc.
- 5) The Site carries a HGV overhead cable running east to west which will need to be diverted should the site be developed.
- 6) The site is bounded by a railway line and cutting to the east. This potentially constrains development on the site by reason of noise and stability of the banks.
- 7) Site is adjacent to the Broads Authority Administrative Area and within the buffer distances of of a SAC, SPA , SSSI, Ramsar and National Nature Reserve.

The GNLP refer to ‘development of around 50-60 dwellings being considered suitable depending on the quality of sites put forward ‘ Site GNLP 3003 has a significant number of constraints that questions its ‘ quality’ and why, when a basic requirement of a site being included is that it should be practically deliverable, this site is actually in the consultation at all.

Individual Reasons for objection to SNLP 3003 being considered

- 1) Pedestrian access to the site is indicated as being from Holly Farm Road, I suggest this has been included as a 'sweetener' to offer apparent pedestrian access to the School. In actuality the distance from the main School gate to the track at Holly Farm Road (114M) is greater than that at the access to Mill Road (72m). The access to Holly Farm Road is on the inside of a bend, immediately adjacent to the Railway bridge and a rise in the road. The carriageway of Holly Farm Road at this point is only some 3.3m this width continuing for some 30m towards the school.

The route from the proposed pedestrian access to the School via the carriageway of Holly Farm Road is used by vehicles accessing the School for turning (the alternative being to turn in private driveways or travel some distance eastwards to seek a turning space) and then for pick up, drop off and all day staff school parking (See attached photographs). **This is not a safe pedestrian route.**

In addition any pedestrian route from Site GNLP 3003 via the narrow track to Holly Farm Road would be immediately adjacent to our property. We have a number of windows to this side of our property which presently provide views over open fields. Any footway running alongside our property would remove our privacy and quality of life and we will be strongly resisting this.

The proposed pedestrian link via Holly Farm Road to the site is both a safety issue and makes no consideration for existing residents. There is no benefit whatsoever in this suggestion.

- 2) Site GNLP 3003 is in actuality a much larger site on a single ownership field of 3.37ha (GNLP information) the site is split into two to fit in with the present GNLP development allocation numbers. If carried forward for development the actual development scale would be circa 50 dwellings NOT the 20-30 dwellings stated in the GNLP consultation. There is no justification for such a convoluted arrangement on what is a constrained site being considered as a preferred housing allocation.

Conclusion

The proposed Housing numbers for Reedham are based upon presently incorrect school numbers information and considering the location are an overdevelopment.

Site GNLP 3003 has significant constraints which given the excessive housing numbers proposed in the Village makes the inclusion of this large site unnessecary

Should Site GNLP 3003 remain as part of the village housing proposals any pedestrian footway linking Site GNLP 3003 to Holly Farm Road is considered unsafe and a blight on our rights as existing neighboring residents and will be very strongly opposed.