GNLP1001 - version 2

Outside the development boundary.

Contrary to GNLP Policy 2 issue 1 as the site cannot provide “safe, convenient and sustainable access to ... local services and facilities including schools, healthcare, shops, leisure/community/faith facilities” without the use of a car.

Contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 347 as there is no safe walking route to school. Highways confirm it is not feasible to provide an off-carriageway pedestrian facility to enable safe journeys to school.

The sewerage system in the village is at near capacity already.

The road infrastructure to and around the village is not suitable for a permanent increase in traffic.
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GNLP1001 - for email submission

Due to the 100 word limit in the online submission box Reedham Parish Council would like to expand on their objections to GNLP1001:

It is outside the development boundary for the village.

It is contrary to GNLP Policy 2 issue 1 as the site cannot provide “safe, convenient and sustainable access to on-site and local services and facilities including schools, healthcare, shops, leisure/community/faith facilities and libraries” without the use of a car.

It is Contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 347 as there is no safe walking route to school. As per the Discussion of Submitted Sites “Sites which do not have a safe walking route to school, or where one cannot be created, will not be considered suitable for allocation”. Highways have confirmed it is not feasible to provide an off-carriageway pedestrian facility to enable safe journeys to school.

The sewerage system for the village is at or nearing capacity. Tankers are required on a near daily basis, in the peak season it is sometimes several times a day, to remove waste from the station on Low Common. Without additional capacity the Parish Council feels up to 30 additional households on this site is unreasonable and a hazard to health and the environment.

The road infrastructure to and around Reedham is not suited to additional traffic. The roads to the village are, at best, classed as “Road generally more than 4m wide”, not even “Secondary road” as per OS map designation. Most roads in the village are “Road generally less than 4m wide” and do not have pavements. Extra car traffic from an additional 20 - 30 houses from this site, and a possible 60 overall for Reedham, would not be safe for both vehicles and pedestrians.

There are regular trains to Norwich and Lowestoft but there was no service to Great Yarmouth for 18 months. Busses are infrequent and slow. This limits the options for accessing employment and increases the likelihood that a reliance on the car will be necessary for those moving to Reedham and is contrary to the GNLP Climate Change Statement. The ambition of the GNLP for more working from home and more greener transport is currently just an ambition. There are no policies in place or proposed to make this happen and until there are, and these ambitions are achievable, it is not realistic to include Reedham for housing development.