

## Response from Little Melton PC in respect of Planning Applications -

- 2012/1836 – site 104 – Gibbs Close
- 2013/0086 – site 101 – Mill Rd
- 2013/0092 – site 619a – Ringwood Close

### Summary

- PA 1836 was submitted in 2012 and the PC objected to it as being outside the current development boundary.
  - Two further applications that are also outside the development boundary have been submitted in early 2013.
  - The recent approval of 1200 homes for Hethersett, outside of the current development boundary, shows that the 5 year housing deficit takes precedence over the LDF (which is still being finalized) - and that LM will have to accept some new housing.
  - The PC is committed to minimizing the scale of new development because of –
    - The wishes of parishioners as expressed in the 2006 Parish Plan
    - The roads within the village are barely adequate for current traffic
  - The GNDP designated LM as a service village suitable for 10 to 20 houses. Residents can't understand why 68 houses are now being proposed.
  - All three PAs will discharge traffic onto Mill Rd and the PC regards the road as being the limiting factor. Highways have stated that in its present form the crossroads can only sustain 20 additional houses. The PC considers that Mill Rd itself can only sustain a maximum of 30 new houses in total – even if the crossroads are improved.
  - The PC suggests that an appropriate compromise is –
    - 15 houses at site 104 (only 10 before the crossroads are improved)
    - 15 houses at site 619a (only 10 before the crossroads are improved)
    - No additional development should be permitted at either site.
- Draft

### Factors that apply to all three PAs

#### 1. Traffic

- 1.1. The forecasts used by developers do not accord with observed behaviour, probably because of the poor provision of public transport in LM and the high ratio of car ownership – Appendix A includes the observations already made in respect of PA 2012/1836
- 1.2. Mill Road is single track in parts and already serves the recent developments at Gibbs Close, Homecroft and Ringwood Close in addition to the houses along Mill Road itself. Mill Road carries traffic to events at the Village Hall, the Church and the Playing Field and is used as a through route by traffic from LM Business Park and Hethersett, that is going to proceed West on the Watton Rd. Events at the Hall/Playing Field/Church can coincide and can attract in the order of 100 cars, resulting in traffic jams and parking problems.

Mill Rd is poorly drained, which results in large patches of ice on an un-gritted road. Several parts are prone to flooding and in winter the PC is continually harangued by irate residents. Highways seem unable to resolve the flooding issues as the road dips in the middle, between the ditches that ultimately take the water from the drains.

- 1.3. Planning approval for developments at Hethersett and the NRP have made **no forecast** about the traffic that will affect LM – this is clearly unrealistic as the houses to be built at Hethersett are as close to the centre of LM as they are to the centre of Hethersett and they will adjoin the roads to LM. Much concern was expressed by the SNC Planning Committee about the strategic gap between Hethersett and Cringleford, which is the other side of the A47 but no concern about the much smaller gap between Hethersett and LM!

- 1.4. Traffic (both local and rat running) has to leave Little Melton either via Rectory Lane or Green Lane onto the B1108, which has a 60mph speed limit. Both these junctions are dangerous – visibility at Rectory Lane is very poor – Green Lane exits across traffic accelerating away from the roundabout into traffic queuing for the roundabout. During rush hours there is queuing down Green Lane. The entrance to the garden centre between Green lane and the roundabout is a further hazard and traffic queuing to leave the garden centre blocks visibility from Green Lane.
- 1.5. The PC would like funding from all local developments (including Hethersett) to provide measures that will discourage rat running via School Lane - which passes the School, pub and shop, all of which have associated traffic problems. Mill Road should have a 20mph limit.
2. Maintenance of play areas, ecology buffers and open spaces. The PC has no provision for funding additional maintenance and is constrained from increasing the precept. There must be clarity about how such areas are to be maintained.
3. Several of the PAs include external lighting of some areas. There is no street lighting elsewhere in the village and it would not be appropriate to have one part lit, which would make the rest look dark, by comparison. The PC feels that the global warming costs of street lighting are not justified in a rural village.

#### Factors that apply to individual Pas

##### 2012/1836 – site 104 – Gibbs Close

The development should be limited to 15 houses due to the access via multiple junctions at Homecroft/Gibbs Close/Mill Rd

##### 2013/0086 – site 101 – Mill Rd

- Drainage – the plans appear to show a reliance on discharging surface water into the Mill Road drainage and into the ditch that runs through the allotments and discharges via a pipeline under the properties along Gt Melton Rd. Both these channels are woefully inadequate and have been the subject of complaints to Highways and SNC Flooding Officer over many years – parishioners have produced photographic evidence of floods from the 1990s. The PC is strongly opposed to making these problems worse.

The developers state that a sophisticated system of attenuation ponds and flow control structures will ensure that the rate of discharge into the ditches will not cause problems. However there are already many ditches and pipelines within the vicinity of Mill Road where the SNC Flooding Officer has not been able to establish responsibility for maintenance and the PC would need assurance about the long term maintenance of any additional drainage systems associated with any new development.

- Junction with Mill Rd. The plan to create a staggered junction with Gibbs Close is flawed and will lead to accidents. Complaints are already made to the PC about parking on the road in the vicinity of the Gibbs Close junction.
- Infilling of the open space on Mill Road with a junction leading to an estate, will have a more detrimental effect on the rural character of the village than either of the other two proposed schemes would.

##### 2013/0092 – site 619a – Ringwood Close

- 28 houses will impose an unacceptable burden on the residents of Ringwood Close and no provision should be made for further development on adjoining plots. In particular the residents of 23/25/27 Ringwood should not have the double burden of traffic past their front and two new houses/garages at the end of their small gardens! A single bungalow should be provided in place of 1/2/3B, with some hedgerow screening.
- An exit onto Gt Melton Road for some of the houses would mitigate the effect of traffic on Mill Rd and Ringwood Close.

## Appendix A

### Comments made in respect of PA 2012/1836 Transport Statement

The PC makes the following observations in respect of the traffic impact analysis. The figures generated by the TRICS database are not in accord with the observed behaviour of the current residents of LM. Most households that are economically active have two cars and those with school age children frequently make trips in addition to journeys to work. The impact analysis only considers one hour of the peak traffic, whereas the morning traffic starts as early as 07:00.

A survey on 12<sup>th</sup> November of cars entering and leaving Gibbs Close gave the follow results that support our observations. Gibbs Close and Homecroft together are 34 houses with a similar distribution of house types to the proposed development. The results have been factored by 20/34 in order to give comparable data. These results give a total of 20 vehicle movements between 8-9 compared to the 10 forecast in table 4.3 of the Traffic Statement. The survey also predicts 10 vehicle movements between 7 and 8.

<b>ProRata (*20/34)</b>	<b>Arrive</b>		<b>Depart</b>	
	7-8	8-9	7-8	8-9
Cyclists	0	2	1	1
Motorcycles	1	0	1	0
Car/light van	2	6	8	14