



Easton Parish Council

www.eastonparishcouncil.co.uk

Mr Rooke
Broadland District Council
Planning Department
Thorpe Lodge,
1 Yarmouth Road,
Norwich, NR7 0DU

23 July 2018

Dear Mr Rooke,

Discharge of conditions application is 20181177

We note with interest that a revised proposal for partial approval of condition 2.20 of the Local Development Order (LDO) detailing S278 work to be undertaken in relation to the site entrance to and improvements to Church Lane.

While we welcome the fact that a revised proposal has been submitted and accept that the entrance to the site in its self is within the boundary limits of the LDO the majority of the necessary improvements are outside of the LDO's consented area of development and as such should be conducted in an open and transparent manner with full public consultation.

We would like to raise the following matters that we believe need to be considered before the discharge of any conditions.

1. It is unclear from the accompanying application who will be acting as the developer. The s106 agreement is in the name of William Young (Dereham) Limited, the drawings name the Client as Ian Alston, the site is being marketed under the name of Food Enterprise Park Limited and the e-mail is from James Alston who is a director of both the above named companies as well as Honingham Thorpe Farms. Obviously this is an important factor for the s 278 Agreement. Please confirm who the developer of the site is.
2. Of the six elements under condition 2.20, the first two, "Realignment/change of priority at the junction of Dereham Road/Church Lane" and "A right turn lane from Dereham Road into Church Lane" are alleged as not necessary at this time due to the modest traffic movements. The application states that this has been confirmed by highways engineers. Please confirm whether this confirmation is that of the Highways Authority or Rossi Long Consulting. If the former, please confirm what material changes have occurred or new information provided to

justify effective withdrawal of this condition. The design of the road works should reflect the total proposals for the whole of the LDO site. Any deferment of part of the totality of works can be covered by the triggers under condition 2.21.

3. Element six, the closure of Blind Lane is alleged as not necessary at this time due to the uncertainty of the proposed A47 dualling works. Again this is stated as determined by highways engineers. Please confirm whether this confirmation is that of the Highways Authority or Rossi Long Consulting. We consider that the uncertainty of the A47 works means that the current conditions which determined the requirement by the Highways Authority that Blind Lane should be closed are still relevant. This requirement should only be reconsidered when actual changes to the A47 and surrounding roads have been completed, which we understand is unlikely before 2023.
4. Plan 2 of the Routing Agreement between Broadland and William Young (Dereham) Limited permits HGVs to use the full length of Church Lane and Red Barn Lane but the road improvements under this application are restricted to Church Lane only. Please confirm whether a new s106 is required restricting HGVs to Church Lane only or whether suitable road improvements will be proposed for Red Barn Lane.
5. Condition 1.18 of the LDO states that the Routing Agreement, and therefore by association the s278 works in connection therewith, applies to both construction and occupation. The references on the drawing that the visibility splays are to be established and effective prior to occupation of the first tenant violates the construction aspect of this condition. We consider that for compliance of condition 1.18 all road improvements must be in place before commencement of the works. Proposals for and programming of all works is critical to understanding the likely construction traffic. The lack of information means that we are being asked to take matters on trust. Unfortunately, any trust which we may have had in this scheme or planning processes no longer exists.
6. We are pleased to note that the developer has recognised the need to consider other road users with the introduction of a Trod which was absent from the withdrawn 20180471 application. However, we are concerned with the adequacy of the proposals.
 - 6.1. South Norfolk has determined that a system of 3m wide paths for combined pedestrian, cycling and wheelchair use was necessary for the village as part of the application for 890 new homes. We consider that these uses are also pertinent to the road improvements and access to the LDO site. These proposals should be aligned with and link into the pathways proposed by South Norfolk to the east of the village, including upgrading existing intermediate footpaths where these are inadequate.

- 6.2. The proposed 1.5m wide Trod does not even allow for cyclist passing. The minimum width recommended by Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design is 2.5m to allow cyclists to safely pass. With the share usage, we support South Norfolk in its requirement for 3m wide pathways.
- 6.3. What is the trigger point for the Trod to be converted into a footpath?
- 6.4. We are alarmed at the proposal that the Trod and the highway merge at a number of points placing pedestrian in direct conflict with oncoming potentially fast moving traffic as this is a 60mph zone. In the interests of public safety the Trod and the highway should not share common space. [See detail of passing bays 1,2, 3 and 4]
- 6.5. Passing bay two will have an entrance to the existing field, a passing zone and funnelled pedestrian route directly onto the highway. This is contrary to condition 2.20 and 2.21 which was agreed in the interests of highway safety.
- 6.6. How will passing bay 2 accommodate a footpath and cycle path in the future?
- 6.7. No safe cycle provision has been provided, what is the trigger point for this within the scheme of works?
- 6.8. Does the land owner or highways control enough land to establish a shared footpath/ cycleway when the trigger point is reached and if not what is BDC going to do to ensure that this condition is met?
7. The proposal near the Grade 1 Listed Church of St Peter (marked insert A, drawing no CL-1010 Rev P3) indicates that a critical part of the existing screening will be removed and is contrary to Policy 1 and 4 of the Easton Neighbourhood Plan. This proposal would potentially lead to degradation in the setting of the Church of St Peter and as such is contrary to ENP Policy 1. The developer has not provided any satisfactory evidence to prove that this is not the case and does not seem to have considered Policy 4 of the ENP which requires development proposals in the immediate vicinity of the Church should demonstrate that they have been designed so that they do not generate substantial harm to the setting of the building. Development proposals should ensure that their arrangement of open space and landscaping are designed in a fashion that would protect and enhance the setting of the Church. This proposal also goes against the stated aims of condition 2.20 and 2.21 *having regard to the rural setting*.
8. The issue of car parking at the church has still not been addressed. Should the current proposal be agreed it will make the area around the church dangerous for anyone trying to visit. To illustrate this I have attached two photographs taken of

the volume of cars parked outside the church. One of the aims of policy 2.20 and 2.21 is to safeguard residential amenity. With the potential loss of parking outside the church this is not being achieved.



9. No details of improvements have been provided to ensure that the entrance and exit to the existing parish allotments as seen in Insert A has been considered. This is not in line with condition 2.20 and 2.21 which was agreed *in the interests of highway safety and to safeguard residential amenity.*
10. With regard to insert B drawing no CL-1010 Rev P3 which shows a pram crossing, given the proximity to the bend a more formal approach to crossing the road at this point needs to be constructed. We believe in the interests of safety for pedestrians who have difficulty crossing a road within a few seconds a better solution is required at this position where vehicles are still decelerating out of the 60 mph zone.

When considering this application 20181177 we must also consider the implications of application 20181090 and the potential damage to the local area, Easton Parish Council opposes the current proposal as it does not meet conditions 2.20 nor 2.21 and does not comply with Policy 1 and 4 of the Easton Neighbourhood Plan.

We look forward to receiving the answers to our questions in the very near future.

Yours sincerely



Cllr Peter Milliken
Chair Easton Parish Council