

**Comments to Site Proposals Consultation Document GNLP. Regulation 18
Consultation General Response Form. Page 3 Site Ref GNLP0547 Carleton Barn
Carleton Rode**

I refer to the above consultation and wish to register my concerns over this site proposal for the following reasons.

1. A smaller version of this proposal for 2 houses was submitted in 2014 (SNC planning application ref 2014/2418. Please see my attached letter of objection 16 Dec 2014. This application was withdrawn by the applicant when the planning officer (Robert Webb) advised the applicant that SNC were minded to refuse the application on the grounds of various planning policies and that Highways objected on the grounds of sustainability. The attached letter from RW refers.
2. In the present site proposal submission (GNLP0547) para 12e says the application was withdrawn because of residents and our Parish Council concerns about precedent and it being outside the village boundary. It makes no mention of the main concerns from SNC about conflicting with planning policies or Highways objection on sustainability grounds. It fails to note that SNC were minded refusal per RW's letter above.
- 3 In para 13 of the submission it notes the need for the landowner to obtain legal consent from adjacent landowners to cut back vegetation to ensure adequate sightlines over their land. The main owner in question said he would not provide the agreement for the previous application, and will not for this new proposal.
4. SNC were minded to refuse for 2 houses why would they accept this for up to 15 on exactly the same area with the same plans for access onto the apex of a dangerous bend on the B1113? If GNLP do consider inclusion of this site will they please have a site visit to see how dangerous this bend is before deciding.
5. The Carleton Rode Parish Council unanimously objected to this proposal for the above reasons on Tuesday 13 March 2018.
6. In summary this application is outside the development boundary, on a greenfield site, in open countryside where a smaller application was minded for refusal by SNC, is not a sustainable location with significant Highway safety issues and could act as a precedent to other similar applications.

Please note these concerns when considering this application

Thank you

David Watson

16 March 2018

Objection to Planning Application 2014/2418

2

Thank you for the Neighbour Consultation sent to me on 26 November 2014. I am a near neighbour to the proposed development and have lived here for over 10 years.

I have considered carefully the Information provided on the planning website and also provided by Mr and Mrs Dennis to their neighbours. I have also inspected the site and road access from the B1113.

I wish to object to this proposal on the following grounds:-

1. Highway Safety.

The proposed access is on the apex of a long sharp bend where visibility onto and from the busy B1113 is at its worst. Traffic travels very fast around this bend. It is difficult to access this road from Rode Lane, where I live, in safety and visibility is better here than at the new proposed junction with the proposed development. My main concerns are:-

1.1 Sight Lines.

The plan provided by PW Moore shows these but only from one access point whereas there are in fact 3 the proposed new road to the houses and the 2 on and off the proposed new bus lay-by. Should there be three measurements of these sight lines not just the one shown? Looking at the proposed lay by on the P W Moore drawing it looks as if adequate sight lines are difficult to achieve

Standing in the present gateway I was surprised at the short sight line especially in the Norwich direction.

When the Planning Application for Romany Meadow (app 2009/0086) was being considered sight lines from the then existing access were considered insufficient and a new access was then proposed further away from this bend. Even then sight lines only just met Highway recommendations. When I visited the sites recently it seemed the sight lines at the Romany Meadow are far better than at this new proposed development.

I attach a drawing of sight lines from App 2009/0086 together with NCC Highways letter and you can see they seem much longer than on the drawing from PW Moore.

NCC Highways checked the average road speed at the time and found the average was 57 and 58 mph, faster than the 50mph they originally thought. As this was an average then presumably a significant number of motorists were exceeding the 60mph limit. If the hedge on the road is removed to improve visibility the traffic already on the B1113 could well travel even faster.

With reference to 2009/0086 referred to above, I see that sight line distances for speeds between 55 and 60 mph should be 215 metres not 160 used by PW Moore.

With reference to NCC's letter dated 15 Dec 2014 they state that 160m is required. Does their advice need to be reviewed requesting 215m as in App no 2009/0086F and does this need to be redrawn ?

Who will check the accuracy of the sight lines? In App 2009/0086 this was a controversial issue and NCC checked them. Will they do so in this case?

Para 7.1.1 of the Design and Access Statement notes that legal agreement will have to be reached with neighbours either side of the proposed development in order for sight line regulations to be met.

In the NCC letter they note a formal s106 agreement will be necessary from 3 or 4 adjacent land owners. What happens if they do not agree? I gather from you there is no statutory obligation to force them to agree, would this then mean the application should be rejected?

1.2 Hedgerows/Ditches

The hedge along the B1113 is high and mature especially to the East, acts as a good sound barrier and an important amenity. Its removal will dramatically affect the adjacent properties concerned. The ditch to the East is always full and does not appear to drain effectively. To resolve these issues could be expensive and will require regular maintenance at the cost of the owners who presumably would be liable in case of accident if not kept up to a high standard. This will apply to all future owners possibly affecting resale ability. This is especially important with the proposed new footpath and the risk of pedestrian injury.

This ditch is full of Greater Reedmace which grows to over 6 feet high and could affect visibility. This is difficult to remove and keep under control and could be expensive. Is this the responsibility of the landowners?

1.3 Proposed Footpath

The Plan from P Moore shows this outlined in red as part of the proposed development but it only goes part of the way towards where pedestrians to/from Romany Meadow would have to walk as the entrance is considerably further to the West. Either this is an error or it is proposed they will have to walk on the grass verge - not easy in high vegetation in Summer or in slippery winter conditions. Will SNC please clarify the extent of this footpath and if it is as shown on the plan are SNC and the people in Romany Meadow agreeable to school children walking part way on the grass verge and the footpath?

The verge which would carry this footpath is very narrow about 2 feet with a deep ditch by the side. Does this raise safety concerns?

Who will be responsible for the creation and maintenance of the footpath, is it SNC or the applicant who says she will make a contribution?

1.4 New Lay-By

This will be expensive. Several years ago a lay-by was created by the Church in Carleton Rode costing £30000. This one could be a lot more expensive. Who would pay for it and be responsible for maintenance-the applicant, Highways, SNC or the Parish Council? If out of public funds is this really a good use in time of austerity?

There are no plans for a lay-by on the other side of the road for buses coming in the other direction so are they expected to cross the carriageway which seems dangerous especially as the door that children would exit the bus will be on the roadside ?

How will motorists be stopped from using this lay-by especially for using mobile phones? There is a lack of pull-off areas on the B1113 so this could be frequent? What would the bus do; find somewhere else to park; difficult if they have already passed one of the existing drop-off points. Is SNC going to ask the parents/children from outside the proposed development if they are happy to use the proposed replacement service? The children in Carleton Coppice would be alright but others less so. Future use by children is likely to increase as a number of new families with young children have moved into the area.

I note the letter from NCC dated 15 December and my response earlier today raising these issues.

2. Development Boundary.

The Design and Access statement admits this proposal is outside the development boundary. It tries to make a case for an exception. It cites two other local planning approvals. Firstly Romany Meadow (2009/0086F) where a special

4

dispensation was given for a Traveller site where a previous application for a residential property was refused. This recognising the special local need for the Travelling Community. However strict conditions were applied, only caravans and amenity blocks; no houses. Secondly Cooks Garage 2010/1776/O) a redevelopment of a brown field site (a redundant garage). In both cases these were redevelopments of existing developments. Neither were greenfield sites. They are unable to give an example of the precedent of approval of a greenfield site development locally. The only one I am aware of is the Saffron Housing affordable housing in Flaxlands. Again an exception was made because of the pressing need for affordable housing.

The whole idea of creating development boundaries is to plan for growth in specific areas where issues of sustainability, use of common facilities and crucially to prevent urban sprawl.

3. Need

The Design and Access Statement raises issues of local delivery/supply of housing. However SNC have already provided clear plans including two sites for 10 new houses where landowners have proposed land availability, the 5 units already given permission at Cooks garage and the 9 affordable houses already built and occupied by Saffron Housing. In addition there have been other windfalls eg Laurel Farm Rode Lane which used to be a farm of two people which has been redeveloped in recent years and now has 5 separate homes. No doubt SNC will review this issue and provide the latest information when considering the proposal.

4. Visual Amenity

The proposed traffic lay-by is not appropriate for a rural setting. It gives a suburban feel to the development out of keeping with the rural nature of the area.

The overall development would be visually intrusive over a wide area including the nearby Tas Valley Way long distance footpath especially if the mature hedgerow is removed. Its replacement would not be allowed to grow significantly as it would affect Highways Safety so it would a permanent deterioration.

5 Sustainability

I believe Carleton Rode is not a sustainable location for development. Nearly all journeys are by car, bus services are very limited, and there are no train services, shops, pubs, mains gas supply or main sewage. This is why main development is planned in the bigger towns locally.

However the main concern is infrastructure. No mention is made of the problems with telephones where we understand the underground cable system has difficulty coping. We are yet again now without a telephone service; we were off for a week a month ago, some neighbours have recently been down for 3 weeks. This is exacerbated by very poor mobile phone coverage; important with an ageing population in need of emergency phone access. Broadband is also affected. Water supply has also been a problem.

I note NCC have advised this is not sustainable and conflicts with the NPPF.

6. Precedent.

If permission is granted for this application it could act as an important precedent for allowing many more and larger development proposals which would be against the principals of the new planning policy (NPPF) leading to a significant deterioration in the rural environment.

7. Declining population

The D and A Statement says Carleton Rode has a declining population. This was true comparing it with 100 years ago; a period of large families and high employment on farms, however this is not so in the last 10 years with a number of new families with children, redevelopment of existing structures and the affordable housing near Flaxlands.



8. Biodiversity

I disagree this would be improved. At present Barn Owls regularly hunt on this meadow; an ideal habitat. They bred for the first time in 2014 very close by. The mature hedges are a specific requirement for breeding Turtle Doves and gleaning insects for feeding Bats. All of these are of special biodiversity concern because of steep population declines in recent years and would be adversely affected by this development.

Conclusion

For the above reasons I object to this proposal and ask that my comments are taken into account by our Parish Council in the public meeting on the 6 January, and by South Norfolk Council

Thank you

David Watson

Distribution

Robert Webb - SNC Planning Officer for Application 2014/2418

Peter Jeffrey - Carleton Rode Parish Council Meeting 6 January 2015

Beverley Spratt - District Councillor for CRPC 6 Jan 2015 and consideration by SNC.

From:Robert Webb

Subject:Application 2014/2418, Land North West of The Turnpike, Carleton Road

Dear Mr Moore,

Further to our telephone conversation yesterday I write to set out my position with the above planning application.

The application is assessed under the relevant development plan policies contained within the South Norfolk Local Plan and the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. The site lies within open countryside and is outside any development boundary within the South Norfolk Local Plan. It is also not allocated for development and remains designated as open countryside within the emerging Site Allocations and Policies Document, which when adopted will form part of the new local plan for South Norfolk. The site is within the "Rural Area" of South Norfolk as defined by the Joint Core Strategy, where the Council is able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land.

There is therefore a presumption against development on this site because the proposal for new private market housing conflicts with the provisions of policy ENV 8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan and policy 17 of the Joint Core Strategy. Having reviewed the application documentation, I do not consider that there are material considerations in this case that suggest a departure should be made from the provisions of the development plan.

The Highway Authority have objected to the proposal on the basis that it is not a sustainable location for development. Further information is included within the NCC Highways formal response to the application which is available to view on the South Norfolk website – www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

For the above reasons, the application will be recommended for refusal on or prior to the 8- week deadline of the 14th January.

Should you wish to withdraw the application, I would be grateful if you would let me know as soon as possible, preferably by the close of play on Monday 12th January.