

PORINGLAND PARISH COUNCIL – PUBLIC CONSULTATION

NORFOLK HOMES – AREA A and AREA D

The Parish Council has been instrumental in seeking the views of its parishioners of the initial plans provided by Norfolk Homes in consultation with South Norfolk District Council. The following report reflects views expressed. Not every comment is included although some extracts are, together with copies of some of the typed returns, for the information of Council. The detailed written returns are available in folders which will be available at the meeting.

For ease of reference the report has been deliberately split into the separate areas A and D.

AREA A Land rear of Heath Loke and Spruce Crescent, including Spine Road to Stoke Road

1. Spine Road junction with Stoke Road comments:-

Although building the spine road may manage to avoid further traffic build up on The Street, there will still be a lot of congestion near the Railway Tavern roundabout while people try to filter in and the traffic on the main road past the High School and on to the bypass is likely to get unmanageable. Are there any plans to extend the spine road further towards the bypass so people could join the main road in a few different places to avoid congestion?

Increased traffic towards Stoke Holy Cross and towards Fiveways roundabout, long queues toward Fiveways roundabout, will have to give way to long queues of traffic from the right. Traffic already breaks speed limit in Stoke Road. Parked traffic around Mill Surgery causes congestion already.

Increased traffic onto Stoke Road and likely opening to Fiveways roundabout.

There remains concern re access and egress to and from some Stoke Road properties.

2. Development design comments:-

2.1 Emergency Access

The general consensus of opinion is that an alternative access should be considered. This would be open to to unsocial activities and possible motor bike access with resultant concern of residents with bordering properties.

2.2 Spruce Crescent

The vast majority of residents from Spruce Crescent do not support an extension to the play area and are totally against any form of access to or from the site.

Very concerned re proposed linking of play areas between Spruce Crescent and Area A. Spruce Crescent already suffers from parking problems associated with P.H. and Chip shop. School will make this far worse and also foot traffic and cycles will use this link as a cut through. This will turn a quiet, safe cul-de-sac into a busy thoroughfare – noise, traffic etc.

2.3 Drainage

There is already inadequate drainage and there needs to be assurance that an adopted good and adequate drainage system is included.

Concerned that drainage from Lakes is considered.

3. Other Comments:-

If a future new school is planned on this site how would it be decided which children from which homes go to this or the existing school?

Doctors very overloaded at the moment, are there plans to expand the existing surgeries?

AREA D Carr Lane to Shotesham Road including Spine Road

1. Potential Footpaths

The consensus of opinion was that there should be no footpath (access or egress) to either Church Close or Saxonfields.

We oppose the proposal for any footpath/cycle path access into Church Close from any developments nearby. A great proportion of the residents in Church Close are elderly and could well feel intimidated by people walking/cycling through from public houses and take aways late at night. We also hope that the new development would be in keeping with existing properties.

Totally object to any access cars or foot traffic using Church Close. We bought the property because it was in a peaceful location and was a Close, this would all be destroyed by having Tom, Dick and Harry passing our home to go to the take aways. This will cause interference with properties and devalue our property as well, so a strong NO.

More noise, litter, vandalism. I have lived in Church Close for 16 years and it is litter free with friendly people and after speaking to someone in village where their areas had been opened for pedestrians they ended up having a noisy place, as motorbikes were using it.

We strongly oppose a footpath or any access through Church Close. This is a very quiet Close with more than a third of the residents retired. Past experience has shown a footpath would lead to noise and break-ins and many other problems.

Oppose footpath for Saxonfields.

Large oak tree with a preservation order at the end of Saxonfields and could suffer damage from close proximity to the footpaths and potential vandalism.

Oppose footpath for Church Close. The property which this footpath crosses is owned privately, half from No. 33 to the middle of the Close by myself, the other half from the middle of the Close to No. 28 by my neighbour opposite. This proposal has caused a great deal of distress and concern to the residents of Church Close with the potential disruption this access could bring, in particular late at night with people going to and returning from the take aways and public house. Access from Carr Lane or Shotesham Road would not prove too onerous as this would only be a 10 minute walk from the proposed point of access to the facilities mentioned. Additionally would object to high density housing being located along the border between Church Close and the proposed development, which the provisional plans indicate could be the case. I have no objections to the development in general, as long as it is done sympathetically as far as the residents are concerned.

Oppose both footpaths. It seems pointless to have the additional footpaths when Carr Lane is going to be left as a green pedestrian route and is less than 100 metres from one of the proposed footpaths; also Shotesham Road is not that far off in the other direction, giving access to the Church.

Oppose footpath to Saxonfields. Adequate footpaths through village. Would interfere with the enjoyment and safety of my property.

Oppose footpath to Church Close & Saxonfields. Object strongly to cyclists/motor cyclists/skateboarders who will inevitably use Church Close as part of a circular race track. Object to constant foot traffic thro' to the street and resulting rubbish from takeaways. Object to car parking once school is established.

2. Carr Lane prohibition of motor vehicles option preference

Plan 1 – 1

Plan 2 – 4

Plan 3 – 6

Plan 4 – 3

Alternative – 11

It remains relatively unclogged As long as there is no access on to it from spine road or new estate, why does it need blocking off at all?

I prefer to keep Carr Lane as a Green Lane for as much of its length as possible.

Ideally Carr Lane should be developed as a 'green' lane without motor traffic. It promises a good walking route.

Need to keep a decent area to walk. We are a village after all. Not appropriate to have to drive everywhere just to take a walk.

2. Spine Road junction to Shotesham Road

Agree as shown on plan 11

Agree alternative at current gate 8 (does not include signed list from Brenda)

Disagree both – don't extend estate. What is prime reason for a spine road?

The one furthest towards Shotesham and away from Poringland village.

3. Proposed Commercial Development design comments:-

Not in keeping with the area.

Seems a good idea. With all these extra people in the village is a good idea to give them somewhere to work. Assume it will be something like the business parks, one rear Hall Road which is fairly unobtrusive.

Would not favour heavy vehicles. Would rather not commercial development at all.

Good idea.

Would like to know further about what these properties will be – look like industrial units from plan.

More shopping facilities?

Don't think it is necessary in the village or remotely appropriate. Risk of increased traffic that we already can't cope with.

I agree provided South Norfolk DC ensures effective management, cleanliness, repair and in keeping with the village.

5. Development design and Other comments:-

Lagoon safety

Shotesham Road

While the placement of the new houses and the new spine road makes sense, my main concern is that as the spine road will be quite wiggly and speed bumped, people will choose to come out the Shotesham Road junction, meaning 500+ extra households will be driving past my close to get to Norwich or the school/doctors. That road is busy enough as it is and gets flooded in bad weather. People will go to any lengths to avoid speed bumps! Is there any incentive planned to encourage people up the spine road and

away from Shotesham Road? Will the new estate link with the existing Norfolk Homes estate so people would have the choice to filter out onto The Street via Budgens mini roundabout?

Shotesham Road is very busy. There is a Playbarn for children, a home/flats for the elderly. No One seems to adhere to the speed limits.

My concern is with the staggered junction of the Shotesham Road and the B1332. The parked cars at the shops provide a hazard and vehicles turning into Shotesham Road already use the pathway as part of the Road. It would be better to provide lights for busy periods.

Junction Shotesham Road and Bungay Road is already very busy and despite the spine road there will be extra traffic especially at peak times. Why can't the commercial development be with the recent development near The Dove, rather than heavy commercial traffic in a residential area? Seems madness to have commercial traffic as well on minor roads. Joined up thinking required!

Drainage

DRAINAGE Area D will stand much higher than Church Close. We already have great drainage problems, with much flooding during wet weather (Anglian Water cannot or will not attend this problem). We earnestly hope Norfolk Homes will pay careful attention to drainage to ensure the new development does not exasperate our already existing problem.

There is already inadequate drainage and there needs to be assurance that an adopted good and adequate drainage system is included.

6. Whole scheme Other comments:-

Will you be including a local shop on each of the new developments? It would be good to have somewhere to pop for bread/milk without having to tramp all the way to Budgens. Also, Shotesham Road shop and P. Office reopening could be a good benefit to not only me, but people living down bottom of new estate.

Some concerns about more traffic along Shotesham Road, bus running every half hour. Calming measures, hopefully.

Concerned about width of 'green corridor' from Lake to open countryside as promised by Terry. Also concerned that drainage from Lakes is considered.

My only concern is that the traffic on the main road through Poringland during peak times is very congested, particularly during term time. I would like to ensure that the affect of these additional homes as well as the commercial units does not make this matter worse and that traffic congestion calming facilities are put in place – the roundabout at the top of Stoke Road is a key culprit. I would like to also ensure that schools and other local public amenities are improved sufficiently to accommodate the increase in number of pupils etc. My daughter will start Poringland Primary school in

2013 and I don't want her place jeopardized because of new people in the village, but not enough new teachers/improved facilities. Generally I am in agreement with the plans overall.

Concerns regarding no privacy, graffiti, anti social behaviour, fly tipping, mopeds using as a race track, dog poo where people from new estate will walk their dogs and will not pick it up, fences used as toilets by members of the public who are too lazy to use the pub toilets on their departure, people chucking rubbish over fences.

To avoid long tail backs in the morning towards Bungay traffic already detours around Rectory Lane/Upgate/Hall Road/Long Road route so as to get easier access on to the Fiveways roundabout. This will probably increase and impact on this area of village.

Too much housing. We are turning into Taverham/Thorpe Marriot and if I had wanted to live in such an area would have moved there. We should maintain some rural elements which are rapidly disappearing. No more housing until road links improved. The traffic through the village at peak times is ridiculous and getting worse. My understanding had been that the properties already built were to use access coming out on the other side of the village – Stoke – but not yet materialized. Road needs to be done before anything else. Getting very dangerous.