

Necton Parish Council

Parish Office, Necton Community Centre
13 Tun's Road, Necton. Norfolk. PE37 8EH



Report of: The Parish Council

To: Local Plan Working Group – 12 July 2016

Author: Gabrielle Joyce, Parish Clerk

Subject: Selection of preferred development sites in Necton

Purpose: To clarify to the working group, the views of both residents and Parish Council of the proposed site allocation for the village

Recommendation:

That the preferred and alternative site listing be amended to incorporate the considered views of the Parish Council and the residents of Necton as identified in this report.

That the current proposed 75 new allocations be reduced to incorporate any new planning applications between now and when the Local Plan comes into force.

Background

The previous public consultation (Jan – Feb 2016) identified that the then 'reasonable alternative' sites LP[067]005 and LP[067]003 were not welcome by residents. The main reasons being:

- Lack of safe, unrestricted site access
- Development of prime agricultural land
- Loss of village amenity and rural outlook
- Loss of an essential land area that maintains stable water drainage in an already high risk flood area
- Inability of village services to accommodate such a large scale development

On 7 April 2016, Cllr David Matthews, representing the Parish Council, met with Phil Mileham, Breckland Planning Manager and Neil Campbell, Capita. Cllr Wilkin and the Parish Clerk were also present. It was recognised that 5 new homes in Necton for the duration of the plan was unrealistic and some low level growth would be beneficial. It was confirmed that the new allocations number would take into consideration the existing commitments within the village. Cllr Matthews advised that the village could

accommodate up to 100 more dwellings in addition to the already committed applications (219) at that point.

Since that meeting, planning applications are in progress for 8 new dwellings and we understand that at least two more applications will be presented which between them are likely to total 60 houses. Assuming all of these are agreed, then it would be appropriate to consider that Necton will have achieved at least 60% of its target before the Local Plan comes into force in 2017.

In anticipation of this meeting (12 July), the Parish Council again consulted with residents and attached in appendix 2 are their emailed responses. The consensus confirms that the development of sites on Ramm's Lane is not acceptable.

Specific Sites

LP[067]004 School Road: This site is located immediately adjacent to the graveyard. The allocated portion is also the area that is most prone to flooding being the lowest point of the entire land area. School Road is already suffering from congestion due to lack of adequate parking facilities for the school and there are a further 10 new dwellings planned for the road, within very close proximity to this site.

- **Recommendation:** That this site be removed from the list of alternative sites and maintained for a future community need, such as car parking for school and/or extension of churchyard.

LP[067]007 Hale Road: This site currently laid out as natural lightly wooded area has good direct access to Hale Road, providing direct links to public transport and village services.

- **Recommendation:** That this site be upgraded to the status of 'preferred site'.

LP[067]005 & LP[067]003 Ramm's Lane: Both of these sites have restricted access with routes only through existing estates or a single track road. Ramm's Lane is a single track, primarily used as an amenity route for walkers. The Parish Council have recently invested in the installation of a track along Hale Road to provide a circular walk encompassing Ramm's Lane, supporting the Council's aim to promote healthy lifestyle choices. This area forms part of a rural outlook for a significant number of existing properties. It is also an area of outdoor green space for the village. Recent findings of a Breckland Council commissioned report identified that Necton has insufficient open space provision for its current capacity. Removal of these two sites would reduce the quality of life for neighbouring residents. See Appendix 1 for a detailed assessment of these sites.

- **Recommendation:** That these two sites be downgraded from 'preferred and alternative' and be removed entirely from the Local Plan Site Allocations.

LP[067]011 North Pickenham Road: Currently a mix of managed arable and woodland area, obscured from existing development by trees. This site has direct access to a main

road and close proximity to village services. It is situated on the eastern side of the village and development on this side would balance the village on either side of its main road.

- **Recommendation:** that this site be considered an 'alternative' site.

LP[067]010 North Pickenham Road: Currently regarded as a brown field site, with a derelict farm and outbuildings. The Parish Council has already received a proposal for development on this site. This proposal is positively regarded by the Parish Council and many residents. This site is likely to provide approximately 40 new dwellings, with a mix of sizes and incorporating a number of affordable housing units to support local need. There is also suggestion of a number of self-build sites. Included in the proposal is a 5-acre site as a wildlife haven to be ceded to the Parish Council for community benefit.

- **Recommendation:** that this site be considered a 'preferred' site.

LP[067]013 Hale Road: This site is outside the settlement boundary and immediately adjacent to a poultry farm. The Parish Council agrees with the absence of this as an 'alternative' site.

LP[067]012 Hale Road: This site is outside the settlement boundary. There are other more viable sites. The Parish Council agrees with the absence of this as an 'alternative' site.

LP[067]002 Town Farm: This site is currently under consideration within the planning process and the Parish Council have provided their comments.

LP[067]001 Mona Hamlet: This site is outside the settlement boundary. There is an argument to consider some low impact development in this hamlet, with conditions relating to style and size.

LP[067]008 adjacent to A47: This site is outside the settlement boundary but adjacent to a recently agreed new development. There may be an argument to introduce a slip road from the A47 west-bound carriageway and a larger scale development may qualify for some s278 contribution to this.

- **Recommendation:** That this be considered an 'alternative' site.

Appendix 1 – Analysis of sites

LP[067]005 adjacent to settlement boundary on eastern side of Necton (Breckland Council preferred development site)

LP[067]003 adjacent to settlement boundary on eastern side of Necton (Breckland Council alternate development site)

Analysis of these sites against criteria for selection of preferred development sites as listed in report by Stephen Ottewell, Director Capita Planning and Building Control – Settlement boundaries and preferred sites.

- 1. Will the allocation for development be in accordance with the locational strategy?**
Necton is a Local service centre and would qualify for some build through the life of the plan. The total proposed allocation is 75 new dwellings to 2036 (in addition to current commitments of 161 still to build). This allocation would be better delivered on the development of the already identified brown field site LP[067]010 and the wooded area LP[067]007.
- 2. Could the development have an impact on European and international environmental designations?** No.
- 3. Planning history:** Identified as a long-term development area back in the 1960's but it was challenged by the Parish Council and a 25 year restriction was placed on application consideration.
- 4. Could the development allocation impact upon other environmental designations?**
Yes. Increased traffic through the conservation area of the village, School Road, being a primary access route.
- 5. Is the site well related to the existing settlement boundary?** It is immediately adjacent to the boundary. The size of the site suggests a development of significantly more dwellings than the level indicated in your policy on development adjacent to settlement boundaries PD05a.
- 6. Is the site deliverable?** No. The current access routes are restricted by weight (7.5 limits on St Andrew's Lane) and by road width of 3.5m (tarmac surface) on parts of St Andrew's Lane and Ramm's Lane. See photos.
- 7. Is the site available for the proposed use and when could it reasonably be expected to be delivered?** Unknown. The land is currently farmed and providing revenue to the owner.
- 8. Could the allocation for development have an adverse impact upon the local highways safety?** Yes. Access routes to the site are along estate roads, built in the early 1960s, mostly in need of repair, designed to old size specification. They are not capable of taking large plant and machinery needed to develop this site. See photos.
- 9. Current use of land** – Grade 3 arable in constant use, surveyed as such about 3 years ago.

10. What impact will the site have on infrastructure capacity? The site sits higher than the adjoining development of Brackenwoods. Development of this area would impact the current water table balance and pose an increased risk of flooding for existing properties that have old water drainage systems (shallow inclines, narrow pipes)

The size of this site dictates that it would be a significant development; therefore the number of vehicles would impact on the current congestion caused by school traffic, access to/from the A47 junction.

11. Can this impact be overcome? No.

12. Will the development allocation have an impact upon amenity? This development would remove an area of peaceful enjoyment for residents. Ram's Lane is a much used walking route as part of a circular walk within the village and as access to roam the fields on the permissive rights of way.

The development would remove a rural outlook for over 39 existing properties that are directly adjacent to this site. This is a material consideration when deciding on planning applications.

Could the amenity of new development on the site be affected by existing features?

There is no existing amenity or green space within the adjacent estate of Brackenwoods or the road of Kett's Hill. A new development on this site would have to incorporate green space in accordance with current guidelines. Additionally it would need to provide for the loss of green space (by its very development) for the adjacent estate.

13. Is the allocation for development in a location which has easy access to key services? Road access is difficult for emergency vehicles (congestion of parked cars, old narrow roads). There are no direct routes for entry/exit of village. There would be walking routes to shop and surgery, but not direct, which may not help to promote walking.

14. Will the development allocation have a detrimental impact on the landscape? This is a very subjective criterion. In the view of residents and PC, it would as it removes an open green space that is currently enjoyed as a source of outdoor recreational exercise.

15. Could the allocation for development impact upon the historic environment?
Probably not.

16. Would the allocation for development result in a loss of accessible open space?
Definitely yes.

17. Would the allocation of the site for development result in a loss of employment land?
Yes.

18. Other constraints: This site was strongly objected to in the initial public consultation. That view or the reasons for objection remain unchanged. Highway restraints, congested access/exit route through established estates, loss of amenity space for existing residents, use of green field site over other brown field sites that have received resident/PC support.

Access photos



Above – Ram’s Lane junction to Hale Road.

Opposite – Ram’s Lane looking towards Kett’s Hill.



Above – Ram’s Lane mid-point.

Opposite – Chantry Lane restricted access.





Above and opposite –

Various points along St Andrew's Lane indicating restricted width and limited visibility. This road also has a weight restriction.

Appendix 2 – representations from residents

In our view there are 3 major points to consider :-

- a) The limited flexibility of the existing road layout to safely absorb more traffic.
- b) The ability of the school to further increase its capacity.
- c) The ability of the Doctors surgeries to cope with increased patient numbers.

We are assuming, possibly naively, that the capacity of the utility services to cope has been explored by the relevant authorities !

These points need addressing if the amenity value of Necton as a pleasant place to live is to be maintained. In particular the preferred + alternative areas LP (067)005 + LP (067)003 would cause significant issues.

In our opinion if development were implemented here, this would require a new traffic management system to be imposed; involving some one-way traffic.

Ramm's Lane has limited vehicular capacity and is greatly valued by pedestrians (enhanced by the recent addition of the trod).

Mill Street is already under increased pressure & dangers as part is a single track road with two poor visibility bends, a narrow bridge& partial pedestrian pavement, plus the lack of visibility at the junction of Mill Street & Hale Road. This is already a concern to us personally; especially with the increase in commercial vehicles using it as a short cut.

The alternative access onto Tuns & School Road is also problematic with again poor visibility at the junction of Tuns Road & School Road and parking outside the row of cottages.

Finally, a viable solution to providing safe access to/from the A47 needs to be addressed in the face of increased volume of traffic.

We hope you will put these points strongly at your meeting.

AJ & SK Scholey
Beespit Cottage, 33 Mill Street, Necton

Barney & Sheila Bell

From: "Barney & Sheila Bell" <barney.sheila1@uwclub.net>
To: <nectonparishcouncil@gmail.com>
Sent: 06 July 2016 20:07
Subject: Your EMail dated 6 Jul - Local Plan Working Group - Inviting comments.

Dear Ms. Joyce.

Thank you for your E Mail, inviting comments.

Firstly, I must declare my interest on LP(067)007. I have put this forward as a potential site for residential development. The site is approximately 3.5 acres including the village main drain which divides it into 1.9 acres adjacent to Chantry Lane and 1.6 acres adjacent to Hale Road where my house stands. We are currently preparing an outline planning application. Both pieces are planted with young trees and it is likely that the planning application will be for low density housing, leaving some specimen native trees.

We should all be concerned that good agricultural land, suitable for working with modern machinery, is being taken for residential development when there are other pieces of land that could be used for small developments. In some cases it may mean going outside the village planning guidelines. The village has lost approximately 20 acres of good agricultural land for the Sub Station but this is essential if we all want carbon free electricity.

LP(067)001. I believe this to be Rose Farm, Ivy Todd. This is no longer a working farm, the land having been added to other farms. Probably suitable for a small development with cottage-style houses.

LP(067)002. I believe this to be Town Farm. No longer viable as a farm. Ideal for development.

LP(067)003. This is a piece of overgrown land. Best left as nature reserve.

LP(067)004. Part of a field which produces food. Best left as agricultural land.

LP(067)005. Good agricultural land. Should not be developed.

LP(067)008. Not suitable for food production. Should be developed.

LP(067)010. The N part - ex Erne Farm. No longer a viable farm, the land having been added to an adjacent farm plus some offered for sale. Although out of the village planning guidelines, should be developed but development should not be allowed to 'creep'.

LP(067)010. I understand that the S part has been offered to the village. If the village can afford to develop it - village woodland / wildflower meadow etc - it would be an asset. I suggest PC considers the offer.

LP(067)011. Appears to be a small piece of land adjoining village development. Should be developed.

LP(067)012. Agricultural land which has not been cropped for several years. Should not be developed.

LP(067)013. Agricultural land which has not been cropped for several years. Should not be developed. It adjoins the poultry unit which does smell rather badly when the units are being cleaned out and if houses are built any closer to the unit, the PC is likely to receive complaints, perhaps calling for closure of the unit. The poultry unit was there first and if we want cheap chicken, that is how it has to be produced.

There are several sites suitable for small developments and single houses in Ivy Todd - large gardens, ex small farms, redundant farm buildings etc. perhaps we should be looking at allowing development of these with cottage style dwellings to fit in as far as possible with the existing houses, rather than taking good agricultural land.

Lastly, any development, large or small, within the catchment area of the watercourse that flows through Necton, will produce surface water which has to pass through the culvert in Chantry Lane. This was first a problem in 1982, plus several times since. Breckland Council and Norfolk County Council are well aware that the culvert is too small for the amount of surface water that has to pass through the culvert during heavy rain. Perhaps Anglian Water should be made aware that at times the Fire Brigade has had to pump water, including raw sewerage, downside of the culvert to prevent houses being flooded in Chantry Lane. May I suggest that this is brought to the attention of Breckland Cllr. Mr. Nigel Wilkin and NCC Cllr. Mr. Mark Kiddle-Morris?

My thoughts. Hope you have a good meeting.

Bernard Bell.

06/07/2016

Dear Sir/madam,

We are writing with our concerns as to the above proposed as follows:-

Access. Chantry Lane already has a narrowing access allowing only one car to pass at any one time. Obviously this would only become more of an issue if more traffic were using it. Mill Street has the same issue at one end, at the other end it has a very dangerous exit onto Hale Road as it is close to a blind bend.

Neither of these roads could cope with construction traffic or more cars in the future.

A47 Junction. This is already a problem to existing residents due to the amount of traffic exiting Necton.

The Village School. This is full to capacity and children living in Necton are already having to travel to schools further afield. Surely this can only get worse with further development. This problem also applies to other amenities e.g. Doctors Surgeries.

As a village we are in the process of promoting "20 is plenty, 30 can hurt me" but at the same time expecting the village to cope with potentially another 200 cars per day in and out of the village.

In the first instance, if we must have further housing, why aren't the planning permissions that have already been granted being acted upon, before consideration is given to developments that are currently outside the village boundary.

We would be very grateful to be kept updated on any further information regarding the above planning application.

Yours faithfully,

Robert & Alison Land
Kett's Hill

Dear Gabrielle

I understand that you will be attending the Local Plan meeting on Tuesday. I would be grateful if you could raise our concerns as outlined below about the proposed development of approximately 90 homes on Ramms Lane/Brackenwoods.

We feel we have to write to express our strong objection to the proposed housing development in Ramms Lane/Brackenwoods, Necton.

The following points are all our opinion, but ones we believe are valid.

- Insufficient infrastructure in the village to sustain additional housing.
- Insufficient amenities in the village to sustain the additional residents.
- Prospect of an additional 200 cars in the village, the average household has 2 cars, then take into account the additional collections and deliveries for those houses, traffic chaos.
- Personally we don't believe the local GP's surgeries would cope with additional patients, repeatedly hear from conversations around the village, how difficult it is to get an appointment with a GP now.

The prospect of more families taking their children to school and the increase in parking and congestion that would cause for any through traffic is quite daunting.

We have heard that if there's a demand for extra GP's then the surgeries will have to make arrangements, or if an additional shop is required someone will open one, or additional spaces at the local school, again the local education authority would have to make arrangements to accommodate demand. We think that's very presumptuous, it's assuming that those organisations will have the relevant funds available to implement those requests.

As we understand it, the parish council has given the highways agency the "Welcome to Necton" land situated at the A47 junction, for them to make a slip road for vehicles leaving the village, so helping with traffic congestion. This is what we mean by presumptuous, even though the parish council has saved the agency thousands of pounds, they apparently still don't have the available funds to make the necessary junction alterations.

All we've mentioned doesn't take into account all the building traffic that will inevitably be around for the duration of the development; lorries, diggers and alike, nor does it take into account all the other building applications that have already had planning and developing permission.

One opinion we have above all else though, this is a paper exercise and that the decision to proceed with the development has already been approved, any issues mentioned that could occur will be glossed over or will be the case of live with it.

Kind regards

David, Jackie and Christopher Vear
21 St Andrews Lane
Necton
SWAFFHAM
PE37 8HY

Members

I am writing to the Parish Council to express my objections to the proposed building of housing in Ramms Lane and rear of Ketts Hill in particular and Necton in general. My objections are as follows

- infrastructure

Necton does not have the infrastructure to cope with a large development such as this

- Roads

The lanes and roads required to access this development just do not have the capacity to enable the large volume of traffic that would be utilising the development. The volume of traffic for the development would also be severely hampered in gaining access to and from the A47. I also believe additional traffic on any of the developments would face this problem, bringing additional problems to an already congested village.

- Schools

The local school does not have the capacity to take the additional numbers of children the development would bring.

- Surgeries

It is my understanding that the surgeries in the village are already full and do not have the complement of GPs to cover such additional numbers.

The development at Ramms Lane does not make any sense to me and would only bring problems to the village which would not benefit anyone.

Yours

Colin Greenway

22 Ketts Hill

Dear Members of Necton Parish Council,

It has been brought to my attention a proposal to build 50 houses on the first field on the right hand side of Ramms Lane as you proceed down from the Ketts Hill junction.

My immediate reaction to such a proposal was NO but having considered the proposal I feel I have a better reasoned argument on why I feel it should be NO.

Has anyone considered the impact such a development would have on the householders who would back on to such a development ? Householders on Ramms Lane; the householders on Ketts Hill who would have this development at the bottom of their gardens; the people who live in Brackenwoods who would have the same issue. Many of these people are retired or reaching retirement age who have purchased their homes for the peace, quiet and rural aspect it offers .

Has anyone considered the traffic issue at all ? 50 homes would bring with them approximately 100 additional carswell a narrow junction at Ketts Hill/Ramms Lane could not be widened so an obvious no entrance there; using the other end of Ramms Lane onto Hale Road would require considerable road building and cause an equally blind spot at that junction and if overcome what would that do to traffic through the village ? ; yes there is the possibility of an entry/exit through from Brackenwoods but what would that do to traffic and public safety on Chantry Lane ?

While dealing with traffic issues it is difficult enough to get in and out of our village at present onto the A47 due to a totally inadequate junction brought about by increased traffic flow. Developments at the old garden centre and the Hungry Horse site are already threatening to increase the bottle neck.

The drainage system of this village is working at its maximum now and may struggle with developments before this Ramms Lane proposal; likewise the sewerage issue.

Facilities within the village would be the next concern :- homes bring families and children ! Our village school is at or reaching capacity now so where would additional children go ? Swaffham, Dunham, Litcham, Dereham and therefore additional traffic.

Try and get a doctors appointment now and you will be put off as long as possible due to over capacity of people per doctor. An aging village will need greater medical support and so would an additional 50 families. Has the NHS locally been asked if they would be able to cope with such an increased demand ?

The local shops are probably the ones who would benefit from increased housing but has this village got the range of support structures which would attract people to and keep them in the village of Necton.

Recreation would also be impacted upon.....could the village cope at present level ? what could be done to develop amenities further ? , where and who would meet that cost and run them ?

So in conclusion I think the proposed site is not suitable. maybe the only winner would be those selling the land!

Understanding housing is required across the country and maybe there is a demand for people to move to Nectonso have other sites around Necton been considered ? At the bottom of Ramms Lane, off Hale Road and village side of the poultry complex, is an area of land which is not as productive as that of Ramms Lane and which has a more senior graded road than Ramms Lane is; there are areas of land which would be more suitable for building upon in Ivy Todd although road and drainage/sewerage would be an issue; if housing is to be built on the Hungry Horse site why not build 50 additional houses on the farm land adjacent to that proposal which would then permit a separate access onto the A47 (possibly a roundabout).

My thoughts expanded from my initial No into those you read above....and more than ever I would respectfully suggest the development is turned down giving sound reasons why and alternatives to the greater housing issue

I submit these thoughts as a concerned member of Necton village where I have lived for the past 32 years.

Ralph Hedley

39, Ketts Hill, Necton, Swaffham, Norfolk, PE37 8HX 07411431713

Attention Gabrielle Joyce, Necton Parish Clerk.

I have been told that (LP/067/005) is now being declared a preferred site in the village. This is at this moment in time being used for farming, for the amount of houses that were being suggested previously and the disruption and traffic chaos it would cause to Brackenwood and Ramms Lane, which is used by the whole village for walking their dogs and just general walking, is unbelievable, most of the people living in this area are retired and did not buy their properties to live in the middle of a housing estate. I know it was said that the school could be expanded, but the mayhem when mothers are dropping off their children then around 3pm waiting to collect them is horrendous, what would it be like with so many extra families in the area, it does not bear thinking about. The cars have churned up the roadside where they have parked, mothers open doors without looking to see if anything is coming, I just await an accident to happen. The queues to get on to the A47 are getting worse and even with a slip road the amount of traffic on the A47 at certain times of the day is unbelievable. Viable farmland should not be used for farming just because it is there and farmers should not be allowed to sell it off because they want to, it is about time quality of life was taken into account for existing residents in such villages as Necton. There are not many of them left which portray such community spirit, it should not be lost.

We have already had many, many new houses built in the village, some at the back of Masons Drive which are out of sight, but must be taken into account, and more are planned for the old Nursery and the 'Hungry Horse'. You say there are two surgeries in the village, indeed there are, but I have tried to book a specific doctor and have proof that I cannot see him for 6 WEEKS, if you wish urgently to see a Doctor you can ring before 8.30 and you will get an 'emergency' doctor, but on the last occasion I got a newly trained doctor who had to call another doctor in to help.

We went to Diddlington yesterday and passed all the new houses on the left hand side in Swaffham, there are empty fields available for even more houses, with enough land to build new schools but how you are suddenly going to find jobs and train new doctors/dentists I do not know. But at least they can get on to the A47 with easier access.

Whilst writing to you, I was wondering if it had been put to you that the two seats on the area near the A47 are never used by anyone and I thought it would be useful if at least one of them could be moved outside the shop in Necton. Many walk for their papers and would appreciate a little sit down before continuing their journey home, I know I would, I have asthma. Perhaps something the Parish Council will think about.

Yours sincerely
Margaret Woodall
4 Ramms Lane
Necton

Dear Gabrielle,

Through word of mouth I have heard about the forthcoming meeting to discuss planning. Due to the short notice I cannot attend but would very much want to. Dismayed to see that LP[067]005 is now highlighted as the preferred site for development in Necton. Preferred by whom?

The consultation period had barely closed and the land was being surveyed by BBS who would only say they were acting on the instructions of an architect in Norwich. All very worrying and I wonder if Breckland Council is just paying lip service to the residents of the various villages, giving the impression we have a say, when in all reality the decisions have already been made.

I appreciate that housing is needed but how can Necton accommodate the residents of 98 extra dwellings, their cars and children? What about the roads, the school, GP surgeries and the sewerage system (already a problem for some of my neighbours)? There are already residential planning permissions as indicated on the map and I believe the Erne Farm site is earmarked for development too.

I made comments during the consultation period and stand by them, probably more so now. This proposed planning does not make any sense and I'm bitterly disappointed that Mr King, who farms the land, feels that he can sell it after losing land to the sub station development.

Only this morning, I walked the dog along Ramm's Lane and watched a sparrow hawk hovering and hunting. It's not unusual to catch sight of a deer, a barn owl and any number of bird species. All will be disrupted if this development goes ahead and our lovely corner of Norfolk spoilt forever.

Kind regards,

Hazel Marks
18a Ketts Hill.

I have looked at the map for Necton and found it somewhat confusing. Are the areas highlighted in blue, ones where planning has been applied for, or are they the sites that the council are saying could be developed?

I have e-mailed the council and aired my views on their approval of the three sites in Swaffham for development, with my concerns that most people have about the overloading of services in that area that already struggle with demand.

I also voiced my opinion on stopping any more developments in Necton for the same reasons, but more importantly the fact that there is only one exit on to the A47 from the village, and the volume of traffic that we have to cope with already with the village being used as a rat run, and the fact that Norfolk County Council are denying us a desperately needed roundabout. So far I have not had a reply! I noticed this week that there are some signs up in Toftwood against the building of more homes there. What on earth is the matter with Breckland Council - are they hell bent on ruining our small towns and villages!!

I was not able to attend the PC meeting last Monday for family reasons I'm afraid, but hope to attend in August.

Sincerely

Maggie Taylor

Dear Necton Parish Council

I feel that any development that opens onto a single track road (such as Ramms Lane) will cause issues with both traffic and drainage. I am sure these issues have already been noticed by the Parish Council.

Jenny Smedley
St Andrew's Lane

With reference to the subject matter regarding the proposed preferred site for Necton - LP/067/005

I list below the reasons why this proposal for housing in Necton will be unsustainable.

1. Farmland: good crops are grown on the proposed site. This produces barley/wheat/beet etc which is essential to our needs for food. Also good for the economy and the area of East Anglia
2. The proposed site is behind a housing estate where the roads are unsuitable for heavy plant which will be required to build new properties. The existing estate would not be able to cope with any additional traffic this proposed site will cause.
3. The materials required to build this site would have to be brought through the existing roads ie. Brackenwood. The upheaval this would cause to this small residential area would be catastrophic .
4. Ramms Lane is also unsuitable for construction vehicles.
5. The Victorian drain system for Necton would not be able to cope with any additional development. We already have a problem with the drains and nothing has ever been done about it. A new site would only add to the problem.
6. If built the volume of cars would increase drastically causing further delays exiting onto the A47. Also this increased traffic would cause huge problems in the village itself. The roads are narrow single file .
7. The local school is already full to capacity - already taking pupils from outside the village. A new housing estate will inevitably bring more children into the village. How will the school cope with the influx of even more children. There is already serious congestion outside the school at the start and end of the day. More children will cause more congestion.
8. The doctors are already full to capacity - patients already have to wait 4+ weeks for an appointment. Dentist are also over subscribed.

I would like to express my concern that had it not been for a neighbour informing me of this proposed meeting - myself and many other residents would have absolutely no idea that this meeting was taking place. This is a very important issue which affects the whole village and i am extremely disappointed that that information has not been given more of a priority in the village. Residents should have been notified long before this. It seems to me be a cloak and dagger affair - with the council trying to implement the building without giving residents of this beautiful village a chance to express their concerns. The village cannot cope with any more building !!

regards
Roy Campbell
01760 723578

To the Clerk of The Necton Parish Council

From: Ruth Paul & Roger Davies

8 Brackenwoods Necton

We understand that the Settlement Boundary for additional development in Necton is up for discussion at a Meeting of the 'Local Plan Working Group' on Tuesday 12th July, and that an area listed as LP/67/005 which borders: Brackenwoods, Ketts Hill and Rams Lane is being put forward as a 'preferred site' for future development. Listed below are reasons and concerns that we believe render such a proposal/decision inappropriate and harmful, not only to the immediate area but the community at large.

WATER

The area holds within its boundary a 'spring'

Storm water from Rams Lane is piped away through this area to the Brackenwoods 'ditch'.

The area bordering Brackenwoods has a water course (ditch) which collects all this excess water

A 12" drain takes this water away under No's 8 and 9 Brackenwoods into the storm water system of the village

Residents are obliged to keep this 'ditch clear of any obstruction

THIS DRAIN IS IN CONSTANT USE. The sound of gushing water is a very common event.

Instances of flooding have occurred in the past due to excessive amount of water this area 'throws out'

ANY DEVELOPMENT CAN ONLY ESASPIRATE AN EXSISTING SITUATION WHERE FLOODING IS KNOWN>

Any additional water brought about by development would end up in the lower reaches of the village

Adj. to the known flood plain and areas already known to be prone to flooding (e.g. Chantry Lane)

ACCESS

Access to the area would be more than likely via the 'top most' cu de sac in Brackenwoods (between No's 5 and 6

The road is system is total inadequate for the resulting additional traffic from any development

Access from School Road which at times is nearly impassable due to the location of the school, is via the Chantry Lane 'bottle neck'. The alternative of using the lower end of Chantry Lane, then Brackenwoods would bring additional dangers. (We would note that the roadway in Brackenwoods is in a deteriorating condition as it is).

We note that there are alternative sites within the village which do not appear on any settlement plan but have the benefit of better location for development and amenities for the community. One such area is the former farm and associated buildings in North Pickenham Road, which I understand is going for permission, access to which is greatly less problematic than the 'Brackenwoods/Rams Lane location.

In conclusion we would request that the Parish Council makes the above known to all the relevant parties involved in any decision on increased 'settlement boundaries'

Additional signatories: Robert and Brenda Hammond

7 Brackenwoods Necton

Denis Hardiman

9 Brackenwoods Necton

A couple of questions

1. Is the meeting next week a public meeting – if so I will be present
2. If not my comments are as per my previous comments to the consultation

The proposed development LP[067]005 (Preferred) and LP[067]003 (Alternative)

The proposed development is Outside the Parish boundary

On PRIME agricultural land – as surveyed only 3 years ago, providing valuable food and investment for the local economy

Access is via a very narrow lane and the alternative (Chantry Lane) also has width restrictions and narrowing just north of the Brackenwoods turning

Necton services – school, surgery – drainage, access, egress from the already busy A47 junction will not be able to cope with a development of this scale

Necton is a quiet rural village with the proposed development backing onto an estate of bungalows and would be totally out of place and character.

I would be interested to review any plans that have already been drawn up reference the site – I have noted on several occasions surveyors from Local architects surveying the field. Did they have the owner's permission?

Regards

Robert J Flute MBA FEPS FICPEM
20 Ketts Hill

Members

I am writing again as I did to Breckland council expressing my objections to the proposed building adjacent to Ramms Lane and to the rear of Ketts Hill in Necton. The village does not have the infrastructure to cope with such a large development, nor has any thought gone into the effect that another estimated 150 vehicles in the village will have nowhere to go as they will all predominantly require access to the A47. I personally have regularly "parked" there for ten minutes or more waiting for traffic to clear. The school must also be looked at, as well as other amenities such as sewage and drainage to cope with this rapid expansion of the local population. I must also mention the local wildlife which would also be affected by the proposed expansion project.

We do not need any further disruption to our wonderful village, we've already had it just recently in Ketts Hill with the road being dug up to supply power to the electricity windfarm project (we supply electricity or they cannot feed in electricity? Hey Ho). No one wanted the project in the Dunhams so we got stuck with it, to no benefit to the village and now they want to put up an estate of houses were no one wants them , no thank you.

As an interested party, please keep me informed of the results of the parish meeting, thank you.
yours

Boris Sowinski, 18 Ketts Hill, Necton

I have recently been passed an email asking us to inform you of our comments with regard the proposals for future residential building in Necton.

For any quantity of houses to be built in the village consideration will have to be given to the amenities available such as the school, which is, apparently, already full with no more places available.

The road layout of the village and it's ability to take all of the extra vehicles, which new developments are sure to bring, in safety as we have all seen and experienced I'm sure the chaos at the school at various times of the day.

Access to the A47 from the village. Will this be improved as currently at different times of the day you can wait up for up to between 5 to 15 minutes to get onto the A47 so if there are more homes in the village it surely follows that there will be more vehicles wanting access to the A47?

As we all know GP's everywhere are having a hard time coping with current workloads so how will our village GP facilities manage to cope any more substantial residential developments in the village?

Would the current water and sewerage systems be able to cope with developments of this size?

A real bonus for the village of course are the excellent bus services which are available and seem to have spare capacity for more customers, so this at least could probably manage to cope with extra village residents.

Now for particular areas which have been proposed.

For LP[067]005, the preferred option, and LP[067]003, an alternative option. If either of these sites were to go ahead where an earth are the people living at these sites to gain access to the properties? I know that access points are 'built in' so to speak in the design of the Brackenwoods estate but are these roads really suitable for the use of potentially an extra 3 to 4 hundred cars a day. I'm just guessing on numbers here based on the size of the areas concerned and how most households nowadays have more than 1 car.

As I live at 5 Ramms Lane I know that this road, in it's current configuration, just could not take the extra traffic which these 2 areas would produce.

For LP[067]004, alternative option, the residents would have to access the road at a point which is so close to the school that it will add to the traffic chaos there for 5 days a week.

For LP[0067]007, alternative option, this appears to me to have the easiest access route option of all the mentioned sites which I am assuming would be direct onto Hale road.

I like a lot of other villagers truly believe that Necton cannot at this time, without some very significant changes being made to the infrastructure of the village, take residential developments of this size.

Trevor Banham, 5 Ramm's Lane