

Site Allocation GNLP2019

Response 08/03/2021

John Shirley  
(Address redacted)

GNLP2019 Rectory Road, Coltishall

At the time of writing, part of GNLP2019 site currently has a planning application dated 12.08.2020, Reference 20201627 awaiting a decision with Broadland District Council.

Quoted below is an extract from Crocus Homes'/Parker Planning's application (Question 11)

"Will the proposal increase the flood risk elsewhere? - Yes"

The full planning application (20201627) concerns the whole area of site COL1 and, as stated, part of land in GNLP2019, so to be clear, part of this application is proposed on land outside the redrawn settlement limit of the village.

The supporting Additional Addendum to Flood Risk Assessment by consultants Rossi Long clearly states (Para 4.46) "Properties on the western side of Rectory Road are predicted to flood due to run off from the highway". Currently this does not occur, even in the most extreme rainstorm events. The accompanying Q100 map in the assessment clearly shows water directed off site to the southern border as well as significant flooding to land surrounding the site. The proposed site design places heavy reliance on permeable brick weave, this is not a long term solution, as even the developer's own supporting statement stresses the need for regular maintenance of this surface.

Reading the above points together clearly shows regard for the significant negative effect on surface water drainage caused by development of this site to other properties. The proposed site GNLP2019 rises in level to its eastern boundary so surface water will run westwards towards Rectory Road, as is made clear in the application.

The application form and Flood Risk Assessments has caused serious concern to owners of neighbouring properties. I note that it is a requirement of the NPPF that the development does not increase flood risk elsewhere.

On this point alone the allocation GNLP2019 fails.

The following paragraphs summarise further points of objection to this proposal:

In early 2020 the GNLP consultation for GNLP2019 prompted around fifty responses, only one in "Support" (from Parker Planning), forty-four "Objection" and four "Comment" which erred on the negative aspects of the development of this site.

In spite of this, we find ourselves less than one year on with this site still being put forward, ignoring coherent and rational argument against it. It is as if the 2019 consultation never happened.

The supporting HELAA assessment for this site is inaccurate and emphasises the limitation of a desktop exercise and an apparent complete absence of local knowledge, I list below particular issues:-

**Access to Services – Green.** The school and doctors' surgery are in walking distance, however, the Post Office and General store recently closed permanently, the bus services are infrequent and do not operate in the evenings or provide a service to the nearest railway station. Bus stops are a minimum 400m walk away from the entrance to COL1, and due to traffic issues on Rectory Road not all buses even operate this on route now - how can this be "Green"?

**Utility Capacity/Infrastructure - Green.** Does this "Green" factor in the gas main leaks, water main leaks and electricity underground cable failures in the immediate vicinity of the site, and blocked main sewer in village in the last five years, into the HELAA assessment? And read on for the disruption any work on these services would create accessing the site.

**Flood risk – Green.** The eastern boundary of this field follows a small ridge, the land falls away towards Rectory Road (to the west), flood maps show that the surface water is accumulates behind the hedge beside the road, The current COL1+ application states that development of this site will increase the flood risk elsewhere, so adding more development to the higher part of the field behind will add to this. While a "Green" on the development maybe, the effect on the surroundings are "Amber" to "Red" in reality.

**Transport and Roads - Green.** The site is ultimately located on a narrow one way street, with a blind summit road bridge immediately to the north and a junction onto the busy B1150 with limited visibility. This will be negotiated by all traffic leaving the estate. There is a long history of accidents at this junction as well as on Rectory Road, in spite of data provided by the developer and their agents. Instances of several drivers running the wrong way on the one way section are a daily occurrence too.

Policy GNL2019 point 3 makes particular reference to the following; "Due to highway constraints in the vicinity of Rectory Road, submission of a transport assessment to assess the traffic implications of the proposed development on the surrounding road network demonstrating that the proposed scale of development can be accommodated will be required."

In Planning Application 20201627, the developer's agent did provide TRICS generic traffic movement data for sample areas around the Country to support the application, I cannot comment on the relevance of this data with our road network, geography and population, however, data from our SAM2 speed logger clearly shows the issues with traffic flows and speeding. That is before thousands more homes proposed are built in North Walsham, and hundreds more at Badersfield, traffic generated will still use the B1150 and the limited roads in the villages and Coltishall bridge.

Also, in the event of an underground utility repair on Rectory Road to the south of the estate access road, necessitating a temporary road closure, I would be interested if someone would enlighten me as to how the estate could be safely accessed both in and out from a narrow one way road with a blind bridge summit? This will obviously have to be resolved prior to commencement of any development on this part of Rectory Road which is too narrow to allow one way working with temporary lights, and alternating the traffic flow on the whole section is not practical as it risks the queuing traffic backing up onto the B1150. When the access was restricted in this way

previously, even then a few vehicles had to mount the “safe route to school” pavement to pass cars leaving the “cut-off” bungalows. These issues clearly make a “Green” classification for transport and roads ridiculous. And when was the Rectory Road bridge last inspected, and will it be damaged by the heavy construction traffic? “Red”.

**Compatibility with Neighbours - Green.** Opposite this site are a row of late 1960’s bungalows that have low pitched roofs, they sit lower than the trees behind and are in muted material hues. This is a complete contrast with the developer’s tall roofed proposal, bold material colours and the confused jumble of tall bungalows and taller houses. In spite of Rectory Road being a mixture of house types, there will not be a good relationship between these sites once developed and the existing properties and wider setting. The visual effect from the East and North will be completely out of character. The proposed schemes for Planning Application 20201627 and the remainder of land GNLP2019 will remain a legacy to the regrettable failure of the developer to engage positively with Coltishall’s population or its landscape.

The proposed access road and driveways to the site bisect the safe route to school footpath constructed 2012 at significant cost, and with the 30 houses on Planning Application 20201627 having 102 proposed parking spaces this allocation will increase that by around 60. This access road is also inconsiderately positioned directly opposite the lounges of the existing bungalows, therefore causing maximum nuisance. Again, the “Green” classification is completely wrong.

Development of GNLP2019 will dominate the landscape when viewed from St. James and Chapel Lane, the Bure Valley Railway and footpath immediately to the north will be overlooked by the houses at the top of the cutting, ruining the attractive aspect through the two bridges and into the station on this important tourism asset. This site is contrary to the reassuring noises made in the Joint Core Strategy 2014 Objective 9 “The use of previously developed land will be prioritised to minimise the loss of agricultural land and the countryside.” Clearly this point is being disregarded in Coltishall, where planners have repeatedly favoured COL1 and now GNLP2019 above other possible sites including a brownfield option closer to the village centre. In 2013 when development on this land (then considered as a single site) was first proposed, it was quickly given “Preferred” status, but subject to conditions;

The Parish Council were told though, that any local objection to this would carry little weight(!), and so it has proved - surely this too is completely against the spirit of the JCS.

The fact that in 2021 this site is not developed, is still promoted as the only suitable option in the villages (despite almost zero local support -see previous consultation comments and BDC Planning Application 20201627) shows how little ground has been covered in this matter in almost eight years.

Furthermore, there was an assurance that this “allocation would no longer apply” if development had not commenced within five to seven years (from July 2013). Clearly this point has slipped Broadland planners’ minds. Well it hasn’t slipped mine.

Since 2018 in Coltishall there have been twelve other planning applications granted and between five and seven dwellings have been constructed. These should be subtracted from the 20-25 requirement in the Greater Norwich Local Plan. SiteGNLP2019 does not need to be included, and it is deeply disappointing that despite repeated consultation comments and common sense argument from residents and out parish council, this site allocation is still being pursued.

The fact that the remainder of allocation GNLP2019 was reported by the developer in their consultation March 2020 as “going to happen” says it all.

What really is the point of this current consultation process? The residents in this part of Coltishall have endured almost ten years of concern and worry at these proposals and Broadland District Council just do not listen. It is very disappointing.