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Outside the development boundary.

Contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 347. Highways confirm it is not feasible to provide a footway to enable safe journeys to school.

Highways confirm it is not feasible to provide a safe access for this site as the carriageway is narrower than required for 2-way traffic. There is not enough room to provide an adequate visibility splay.

There is no evidence to support Mill Road being “lightly trafficked”.

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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Due to the 100 word limit in the online submission box Reedham Parish Council would like to expand on their objections to GNLP3003:

It is outside the development boundary for the village.

Building houses on this site will permanently remove valuable agricultural land.

It is contrary to GNLP Policy 7.4 347 as there is no safe walking route to school. The Discussion of Submitted Sites states “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 a footway to enable safe journeys to school as there is no scope for improvements within the highway.

The single entrance access is too narrow with no scope to widen. Highways confirm it is not feasible to provide a safe access as the carriageway is narrower than required for 2-way traffic and there is limited site frontage to the highway.

The HELAA Conclusion states that Mill Road is “relatively lightly trafficked”. However when queried with members of the GNLP it was confirmed that there is no evidence to support this statement. Mill Road has a blind summit over a hump back bridge and is only 3.2m wide at one point.

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 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 to 30 houses on this site, and up to 60 houses 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.