

From: [Greater Norwich Local Plan](#)
To: [Local Plan](#)
Subject: FW: Cluster in Gillingham, Norfolk
Date: 02 August 2021 14:32:33

.
-----Original Message-----

From: >
Sent: 02 August 2021 12:26
To: Greater Norwich Local Plan <GNLP@norfolk.gov.uk>
Subject: Cluster in Gillingham, Norfolk

WARNING: External email, think before you click!.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am having trouble submitting an objection to proposals due to technical issues downloading forms so I am sending them via email as deadline is 17:00 today

I wish to object to further development of Gillingham SN4078 etc. for following reasons. It is unsuitable because:

1. Plan is not clear is this 1 or 4 developments. States site SN0478 but map is SN4078 and other sites (SN0274A/B) are not even shown on map for people to assess. Numbers say 35 dwellings on 1.4 hectares yet later state 25 on 2 hectares. It is not clear information. What is to stop this drip feed of housing?
2. We already had our cluster allocation with 22 houses being built on a site that stated only 10 should be built.
3. Flooding: with climate change and loss of agricultural land due to the retail development nearby this is a major issue. Flooding events are happening far more often than predicted and in any event predictions say without intervention Gillingham along with masses of this area will be under water as close as 2030. The garage was flooded recently and the levels of water along the A146 were the worst I had seen in 30 years. While we keep getting told in documents produced by Norfolk County Council including this that it is "not appropriate to allocate a larger site "due to the surrounding land being at higher risk of flooding" and no more than 10 houses should have already been allowed to "reflect the form and character of existing built development" yet 22 ended up being built. How can the area sustain more houses without detriment to the existing ones and their occupiers?
4. The school in Gillingham is at maximum capacity and doctors/dentists are to. A recent article in the EDP citing NHS data (Jan 2020) stated that 70% of Norfolk/Waveney surgeries had more patients than the national average and with 1 in 4 people on Norfolk coast aged over 65 the burden on these services will only increase. Another report showed that out of 103 surgeries shown 3/5 with the most patients per Doctor were within 17.5 miles of Gillingham and Beccles was in the top 10 also. This situation will only be exacerbated by 950 houses likely to built at Ellough and the lack of GPs being trained.
- 5 Traffic issues. Getting out on my road is already dangerous and there have been several accidents at the junction of Loddon Road, Gillingham and the A146. The proposed site is very near two narrow 90 degree bends. Traffic on the roundabout A146/A143 in 2018 had increased by 33% (Dept of Transport cited in EDP 19/11/1918). More vehicles will concomitantly result in noise noise pollution, air pollution, congestion and accidents.
6. Proportionately this is not a small number of houses. In 2011 there were 294 houses occupied by 676 people. The 22 new ones was a 7% increase and another 35 dwellings is 11% of the now 316. 57 houses in total is a 19.4% increase in houses based on 2011. This is effectively equivalent to the planned 950 at Ellough (950/4789=19.8%) and Beccles has far more infrastructure. The properties already built are in general larger than those in the vicinity and so will disproportionately alter the village population. The homes are not for local families as they could not afford them despite the few carrots being dangled to a minority.

7. Character of village has already been damaged by a retail area that already detracts from the beauty of the village with a Conservation area, The Broads and the other sites of interest nearby. Further building will constrain the area for wildlife even further.

Yours faithfully

--

To see our email disclaimer click here <http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer>