

I strongly object to the preferred housing allocation for Lingwood and Burlingham on site GNLP0379 (land north of Post Office Road, Lingwood) for the following reasons:

1. HIGHWAYS - BLOFIELD ROAD - VOLUME OF TRAFFIC AND SAFETY CONCERNS

Blofield Road (a main entry/ exit road to Lingwood) is a narrow road with passing places. I drive this road every day to work and with the current level of traffic using this road, it is a dangerous road with what I consider, a high risk of collision/ accident. There was sadly a fatality earlier this year. Traffic on this road includes bicycles (children cycle to and from Blofield), cars, buses (school and other), vans, lorries and farm vehicles.

With the planned changes to the A47 (duelling parts of the road and closing existing roads into/ out of Lingwood i.e. Lingwood Lane), traffic volumes using this road are already likely to significantly increase and this will be further compounded by increasing housing numbers in Lingwood and its surrounding areas. I understand from a recent Parish Council meeting that Norfolk Highways have no plans to improve/ development Blofield Road and in my opinion, increased traffic on an already dangerous road will produce a significantly increased risk of accident.

East of England has the joint highest number in the country of cars per household (source Statista 2020). Duelling of the A47 and changes to local road use and new housing development in Lingwood will result in a significant increase in traffic in and around the village. **How are you going to mitigate the risks to road users safety?**

2. POST OFFICE ROAD - SITE ACCESS, WIDENING and SAFETY

In an email response from Highways on 13/06/2019, they said and proposed:

- Potential highway issues with Post Office Road due to it being narrow in places. Post Office Road is not a very good standard.
- Initial highway evidence has indicated that a suitable access could be achieved, and that any impact on local roads could be mitigated. **I would like to know how they would achieve this?**
- Removal of bank and trees to achieve acceptable visibility, carriageway widening to 5.5m, 2.0m frontage footway and pedestrian improvements to Post Office Road/Post Office Close junction.

GNLP0379 is opposite Millennium Green Park, a large and well-used play/ park area. It is used by young children and families, dog walkers, cyclists, teenage children and others. People come to use the park from other local areas and there is already an issue with parking (or lack of it!) next to the park. A development on GNLP0379 is likely to result in road widening and also significantly increase the volume of traffic using this road. The number and speed of vehicles will pose a significantly increased risk to pedestrians (including children using the park) also road users. We are a 'dark village' so I understand that street lighting and speed bumps are not an option. **Is it possible to mitigate these issues/ risks to ensure safety for pedestrians and also the road users? How is a wider road going to encourage a reduction in vehicle speeds?**

3. FLOOD RISK

Gov.uk website (on 13th March 2020) identifies Post Office Road as a medium flood risk.

In an email response from Highways on 13/06/2019, they said:

- There are areas within the site (GNLP0379) at risk of surface water flooding.
- RofSW mapping indicates that the site is affected by a surface water flow path in all return periods. In the 3.33% event the flow path appears mostly on the boundary of the site. In subsequent events there is a greater ingress into the site. The flow path affects the eastern side of the site to a depth of 0.3m.

There are frequently large volumes of water at the south side of the field (GNLP0379) and onto the road. Removal of ditches (with road widening), loss of hedgerow and trees is likely to increase the flood risk to neighbouring properties and the surrounding area. Residents in a new development in Blofield have already experienced severe flooding in their homes as flood risks were not properly managed. **Can this reasonably be mitigated in the design of a site at GNLP0379?**

4. SEWAGE CAPACITY ISSUES

In an email response from Highways on 13/06/2019, they said: 'It is likely that the sewerage infrastructure network would need to be upgraded.' Developing GNLP039 and any site in Lingwood would place increased pressure on a sewerage system that appears to already be over capacity. I have been told that our current sewerage system is old (circa 40 years) and was built for the village when there were a lot fewer houses. I understand that it is already at maximum capacity and any increase in the number of residences in the village will put severe strain on the system and its ability to cope. **Are you going to upgrade/ put a new sewage system in the village to support the increased housing proposed?**

5. VILLAGE INFRASTRUCTURE

Lingwood village has a small range of facilities but I do not believe that it has the capacity for the additional housing proposed, especially in terms of medical facilities and schooling. I do not believe that our school would be able to accommodate the possible number of primary school children in the village if the proposed developments took place (circa 104 homes).

6. POLLUTION AND EFFECT OF DEVELOPMENT ON WILDLIFE, TREES AND BIODIVERSITY

Wildlife

Our garden is adjacent to the east side of the proposed development and we have deer, bats, a tawny owl and other hawks, pheasants, partridges, hedgehogs and a wide variety of wild birds visit our garden. Many of these animals come into our garden directly from the field (GNLP0379). The local wildlife will be significantly affected by a housing development on GNLP0379 due to loss of natural habitat and harm to the biodiversity of the area.

Trees and hedging

Development of this site is likely to require removal established and mature hedgerows and very old trees (that may also have preservation orders on them). We should be protecting our precious trees and hedgerows. New planting will not recreate the same value e.g. carbon offset, for many years.

Pollution - environment, light and noise

Significant increased housing development in Lingwood will adversely affect our environment in terms of environmental, light and noise pollution. We are a dark and peaceful village. Increased traffic will increase environmental pollution.

Conservation

There is a scenic footpath to the west side of the field that is used by many walkers. Local countryside walks are an important part of living in Norfolk. **How will this be protected?**

The National Planning Policy Framework, (NPPF) 2012 (section 11) - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment), states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment. In addition, under plan making section paragraph 170 states where appropriate, landscape character assessment should also be prepared, integrated with assessment of historic landscape character, and for areas where there are major expansion options assessment of landscape sensitivity. Building on this site will change the view, natural environment and rural landscape forever.

7. LOSS OF AGRICULTURAL LAND GRADE 1 AND 2

The agricultural value of the land is graded by ALC as Level 1 to 2, meaning 'land of no or minor limitations'. A very wide range of agricultural opportunities and high yields are possible and less variable than on land of lower quality.

Isn't Grade 2 land preferred for development?

The GNLP even quotes that it will seek to use brown-field rather than greenfield sites.....'We will continue to protect the most valued parts of our area and enhance green infrastructure for nature and people. To help to do this, the GNLP will maximise the amount of development on brownfield sites and make sure that new development improves the green infrastructure network. Where we have to identify Greenfield sites for development, we will base our decisions on evidence which will enable us to provide new green space, protect valuable landscapes' - this doesn't appear to be true for this site - if you build on this site it will be lost forever!

The village has a brownfield site - the Old School on Chapel Road - this needs to be included in Lingwood's development allocation.

8. HERITAGE ISSUES

There is an unspoiled view of St Peters Church from Post Office Road and from properties adjacent to the proposed site. St Peters Church is a Grade 1 Medieval church (possibly Norman or Saxon) over open farmland.

In the Broadland District Council document - Landscape Character Assessment Documents (part 3 of 5) from 2019 - it states:

The following Inherent landscape sensitivities have been identified:

- predominantly open, rural character
- sparse settlement in the form of ancient dispersed Hamlets and isolated farmsteads. Their landscape setting and cohesive building materials is vulnerable to unsympathetic additions or extensions, which would disrupt the largely intact built character.
- Subtle features of the historic landscape, such as ponds pits hedgerows, tracks, which are not protected, and are vulnerable to change and loss.
- landscape setting of Manor houses, halls and churches.
- Wide expansive views over a fast and simple landscape with sweeping arable fields
- Exposed character in peripheral parts with partial views over descending wooded slopes to the Broads and associated strong but low horizon.
- Smooth and predominantly uninterrupted skyline.
- Sense of peace and isolation throughout the area.

Landscape Planning Guidelines

Refer to 'Strategic Gap', with identified and fully documented intrinsic landscape character value 3.6.28 the following landscape planning guidelines applied to the Freethorpe Plateau Farmland Landscape Character Type:

- seek to conserve the open, rural character of the area

- resist new development that would result in any depletion of the sparsely settled nature of the area or in any reduction in the sense of peace and isolation within the area which is devoid of large settlements
- seek to conserve subtle features of the historic landscape, including hedgerows and tracks
- seek to conserve the landscape setting of Manor houses halls and churches seek to maintain key views towards churches which are often key landscape features
- seek to conserve the landscape setting of Lingwood
- seek to ensure new development does not disrupt the smooth, predominately uninterrupted skyline within the area
- seek to conserve open views across the farmland
- Seek to maintain the traditional character of isolated farmsteads
- seek opportunities for the restoration of hedgerows where fragmented
- seek to ensure that potential new developments comprise a fully integrated landscape and urban design strategy, which is consistent with the local landscape character and screen protected harsh settlement edges

The original submission of site -GNLP0379 by NPS (Andy Scales) in July 2016 is inaccurate as it says 'None' to heritage issues e.g. 'listed buildings..on the site or nearby'.

We must protect this precious part of our history for now and future generations.

9. OTHER ISSUES

Development at GNLP0379 will have a significant adverse effect on adjacent residential properties. Any development will immediately impact on my privacy with properties overlooking my garden. My property will be devalued.

I have to question whether there is a conflict of interest and Norfolk County Council can be impartial in its actions relating to GNLP and the proposed development at GNLP0379. NCC owns the land and its' development company, Repton Property Developments Ltd., will develop the site. Seeling this land will generate income for NCC, so how can it be impartial?

There are several issues highlighted as Amber in the HELAA. These need to be mitigated.

I have read that the site is considered 'centrally located in the village, adjacent to the existing settlement limit and has a safe walking route to Lingwood Primary School'. I would argue that GNLP0379 is at the north side of Lingwood village and that other sites are equally adjacent to the existing settlement limit and with a safe walking route to Lingwood Primary School.

Site Allocations DPD (2016) - Service Villages - Broadland Assessment Booklets - Lingwood and Burlingham - Settlement Overview states:

'Lingwood is identified as a Service Village in the Joint Core Strategy (Policy 15). The JCS states that Service Villages should accommodate small scale housing developments subject to form and character considerations (10-20 dwellings up to 2026). Alternatively 20 dwellings may be exceeded where a specific site is identified which can clearly be demonstrated to improve local service provision ... and sustainability' **Why then do we have a proposal for possibly 104 new homes?**

If Blofield Road is improved/ widened then perhaps GNLP0380, combined with the Old School site on Chapel Road could provide the necessary number of dwellings. Though the Village infrastructure and traffic issues are still a significant concern. GNLP3080 does not have a park

with children next to it, it does not have a view of a grade 1 listed, medieval church, it is lower grade agricultural land and it would minimise traffic through the village.

If a larger site is needed, then GNL0296 has already been identified as a possible development site in 2018 - **What changed to take away the preferential status of the site?** <https://gnlp.oc2.uk/readdoc/refs/4808> GNL0296 is closer to the small number of facilities we have and would be even closer (walking distance) to the school. Although the village infrastructure, road congestion and facilities issues would still need to be mitigated.

I have noted a 'Support' document from developer submitted on 13/03/2020. This submission should have been given a lot earlier in the process to give residents of the village time to read and understand the proposals. Submitting it on 13th is not in the spirit of transparency and working closely in consultation with Lingwood residents.

In my opinion, there are many reasons why Lingwood should not have an additional 104 homes built here in the coming years. If building does take place then site NLP0379 should not be the site preferred for allocation, as there are other suitable alternative sites in Lingwood to meet capacity of the cluster.