

## **Objection to Planning Application 2014/2418**

As a neighbouring landowner on two sides of the proposed development I thought it would be a statutory requirement that I should have a Neighbour Consultation letter from South Norfolk Council. Why did I not have one? An objection responding to this letter would be more important.

In addition the site notice on the gatepost of the proposed site is in an obscure position. You cannot see it unless you walk along the road into the entrance. So passers-by will effectively know nothing about it. Also I believe this has only been up for about a week not for one month, as I believe is required, before the end of the consultation period.

However we wish to object to the above application for the following reasons:-

### **1. Access**

I have cut this meadow for over 40 years. It has the worst field entrance I have seen for access both to the meadow and from it onto the road. Going into it I have to park on the opposite verge to check traffic and ensure it is safe to cross. When coming out I have to have 2 people to see me out safely. I have often had to use Mrs Dennis's other exit from the field onto Rode Lane if I am unable to get 2 people to help.

When the hedges bordering this field along the B1113 were last cut about 30 years ago the traffic went faster round the blind bend especially towards Rode Lane. Accidents were frequent especially when approaching the cross road with Rode Lane as braking tended to happen later. About 20 years ago Mr White of Rode Lane was hit by a lorry and killed driving out of Rode Lane. I was the first on the scene but couldn't help him.

### **2. Sight Lines**

I do not agree to the sight lines shown in the plans going over my property. I am concerned that they cannot be achieved especially with the 2 other entrances for the bus lay-by. The new CAP rules for farmers cutting hedges and clearing ditches only allow this later in the year in future (August). So the vegetation growing in spring and summer will not be able to be cleared until then. If I decide to grow beans or rape which are tall crops the sightlines will not be clear so far up the road.

### **3. Footpath**

This is a disaster waiting to happen in both directions because the verge is not wide enough for safety and runs beside a six feet deep ditch which is often full of water because the drainage of the highway is insufficient to cope with rainwater run-off into the culvert under the B1113. I will not give consent for this footpath because of the danger of accidents. The telephone cable runs along the bank of the ditch and has already been damaged by ditch-clearing machinery.

### **4. Bus lay-by**

In my view, this is purely to enable Highways to allow access to the site and is potentially a form of blackmail to get permission.

The bunded area is just to prevent having to remove spoil from the building site.

**5. Visual Amenity**

I farm the field opposite and the plan suggests this development will not impact on the view but it will be in full view of this field, people using the Tas Valley footpath and users of the highway.

**6. Alternative**

There is room on Mrs Dennis's property for these houses to be built on a brownfield site which used to be used as a stackyard. If the development was on this site this would not act as a precedent for building on greenfield sites. Access could be via the existing entrance onto Rode Lane.

**7. Need**

In my view she says there is a need for one of the houses for her family but she has already sold two of her adjoining properties to other people. Why did she not reserve one of these for her family?

**8. Precedent**

The layout of the proposed two house development could lead to more development on the same field and adjoining fields using the same entrance.

Kevin Greenwood & Marina Mcdonald

15 December 2014

Copies to Carleton Rode Parish Council and Beverley Spratt.