

8165/1C1

47 Manor Road  
Long Stratton  
Norwich  
Norfolk  
NR15 2XS

2<sup>nd</sup> February 2011  
L S 01508 532543

Re :- Joint Sore Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.  
IC1 Para 6.18 Completion of a Bypass is a pre-requisite for the scale of growth in Long Stratton.

I write this letter as an individual, and would advise that I know that there are other people who are now aware of the current situation regarding the matter of a bypass for Long Stratton, who are as concerned as I am in that the current proposal for provision of a bypass are for a single lane, shorter distance one, which it is indicated could be provided from £20m funding – this when it appears that the exact line of the road is not yet known!!

One therefore questions the information given!!

There would of course need be other infrastructure costs to be met - fact there would need to be a lot of funding for this as with more than doubling the size of Long Stratton there will virtually need to be the repeat of facilities and services such as are provided now. The costs would of course be in addition to the cost of a bypass . A proper dualled bypass is required, and it is considered must be provided before any further significant development takes place.

I believe that a single lane bypass would be a waste of public money – a further bypass would need to be provided in the not too distant future – there are a lot of vehicles that now avoid coming into Long Stratton from the east but if there were to be a bypass would need to use it to get into Norwich or travel further on from there, or, indeed to travel south – this large number of vehicles would immediately increase the number of vehicles to use the bypass as they would be in addition to the vehicles that would hopefully be using the bypass and not be coming through Long Stratton.

The policy is that Saffron Housing Trust is looking to provided more affordable homes in the smaller villages – there would then be even more vehicles accessing the bypass than now from the east anyway.

A single lane bypass would create danger for the users.

Heavy vehicles on a single lane bypass would create dangers as other drivers would be wanting to pass!!

It can be seen that such a road would create dangers fo the users, and not only that with 1800 houses and the other buildings that would be necessary for Long Stratton to be

sustainable, the use of which would attract workers from other areas, and the amount of traffic (even before the whole of the 1800 were to be built) would be such that another bypass would be needed in the not too distant future

Not only that, there would be great effect on the roads off the A140 – i.e: Flowerpot Lane where traffic is a worry due to the number at busy times and the speed of the vehicles.

Swan Lane where there are the V.C Middle School, the Long Stratton Surgery, Saffron Housing Trust Offices, their works depot, South Norfolk House, The Leisure Centre, the Fire Station. There is access to St Michaels Road which is to gain access to South Norfolk shopping Centre, access to the East of England Cooperative store, some other shops and a Bistro, and also the Pharmacy off Swan Lane. There are also residential dwellings and to add to the amount of traffic coming out onto the A140 at the Long Stratton area would create big problems here .

There is real concern at the proposal that there should be a single lane, shorter distance bypass, as with the large number of dwellings being ‘pushed’ for , there would be a great amount of traffic needing to come into Long Stratton from the west . It can be envisaged that another bypass would be needed in the not so distant future!

It is being stated that a single lane, shorter distance bypass and improvements to the Hempnall crossroads could be provided from funding of £20m, but this statement is being made not knowing the line of the bypass – one wonders how such a statement can be made!!!!

There would of course be the need for other infrastructure costs to be met – this in addition to the provision of a bypass – and with the number of houses (1800 or would it eventually be more? as it is stated at some points at least 1800) there would be the need for a lot of infrastructure provision to even keep up with what is s essential and the village already has.

**It is considered that it would be folly, and indeed a waste of money in the long run to provide a single lane, shorter length bypass – costs will increase the longer a bypass is awaited, and if, as it would appear would be likely if only a one lane one were to be provided, a further one would be required in a few years time when costs have again risen. I therefore put it to you that *there should be re-instatement of the planning permission in order that works on the originally proposed bypass can be commenced as soon as possible after – certainly not to let another 5 years go by and further costs for planning application and all the modelling etc to be added to that already spent. Of course a bypass must be a pre-requisite and be in place before there is any further development or there will be absolute gridlock here at times, and before too long (and villages other than Long Stratton will find that there are more problems in accessing the A140) .***

There is often gridlock along the A140 here at Long Stratton now due to the sheer volume of traffic, and it can clearly be seen that a ‘proper’ by pass is required. In any case to spend funding on a single lane, shorter length one when there would be further problems in just a few ( I stress a few) years time would be ludicrous as it would not be best value for all the people of Norfolk who have already had so much of their money used with nothing to see for it!

We all know that in the worst monetary situation ever and that wise use of money has to be made and surely a proper bypass would be the best value at the end of the day.

It has, of course to be remembered that £1.5m has already been used relating to an A140 bypass – money wasted unless one is provided soon as every day of delay means that the cost will get greater!! It was understood that the reason for not re-applying for planning permission was that there was little chance of a bypass being possible – the cost to have re applied would have been less than the additional cost of delay to date I believe – if you take the rate of increase of costs at around 4.5% , the extra cost of a bypass as costed at £35m would already be much more than the cost of the renewing of the planning application would have been - should not such facts have been taken into account!! To now be faced with the costs of planning and modelling for a ‘different bypass’ is absolutely appalling.

I consider that all these points need to be brought to the attention of the Government and quickly so with the request for something to be done about finding any balance of funding that would be necessary after allowing for all that it is known could be possible - there are two possibilities whereby funding might be possible.- these I have already pointed out to the Minister of Transport in a letter sent to him in December which has been acknowledged.

An item recently appeared in the press which informed that the construction of a bypass was again a ‘realistic prospect’ and there was reference to ‘the new Government initiatives’ – However, the item did not explain that a bypass the bypass referred to was not the bypass for which planning permission had been granted and was allowed to lapse in June 2010.

**There was no information that a line for such bypass had ever been agreed, and it has since been found out that it has not been.**

**It has since been learnt that the works/provision of a bypass and improvement to the Hempnall crossroads could be carried out from funding of £20m.!!**

**One wonders how can be stated when the line of such bypass has not even been agreed.**

It was also in the press item that South Norfolk Council was to consult with residents as to how it would want to see Long Stratton develop following the removal of traffic and the construction of new homes.

*Long Stratton Parish Council carried prepared a Parish Plan in 2003 in which there was clear indication from the people of Long Stratton as to the need for additional homes in Long Stratton – the District Council was made aware of the contents of the Parish Plan, but it seems has chosen to ignore this – this when the number of*

*responses from the community was obviously higher than that in respect of the consultation carried out by South Norfolk Council ( the consultation where the responses from the community of Long Stratton could not be separated from the those from the residents of Long Stratton and those from the Long Stratton area which included surrounding villages!!!*

*I believe that the figures in the Parish Plan prove that the residents of Long Stratton were not in favour of the number of houses that the GNDP put into the JCS.*

It is considered that the need for 1800 houses for at Long Stratton was because when South Norfolk Council carried out a consultation as to the views of the public as to how many houses there should be the consultation went out to surrounding villages as well as Long Stratton - was **unsound**, as it was never possible to extract the information as to how many responses, and as to what the responses were from the residents of Long Stratton Therefore it is considered that the number of houses taken forward to the JCS was **unsound** It is now understood that in the consultation that South Norfolk Council is proposing to carry out there will be request for respondents to enter their post codes on the Questionnaire form, hence it should then be able to be determined as to the actual number of responses from the people of Long Stratton and to be able to know exactly what the responses were.

It is considered that this information must be known and that any decision by the Inspectors in relation to an A140 bypass should take into account that the views of the residents of Long Stratton were not clearly known when there was inclusion of 1800 houses, and indeed they are not known now!! It is considered that the views of the residents of Long Stratton is most important and must be correctly established before there can be any decision in respect of a bypass which would be less than that planning permission was obtained for, and has since been lapsed. As it stands at the moment the proposal is for a single lane, shorter distance bypass, and it needs to be established as to how the residents of Long Stratton view this possibility.

The views of the people and of the authority closest to the people, the Long Stratton Parish Council should be known before just 'Completion of a bypass is a pre-requisite for the scale of growth identified in Long Stratton ' is put in - I would suggest that the wording - 'this to be a duelled bypass such as planning permission was granted for and was later lapsed' would be the appropriate wording to include as it was such a bypass that the public has been looking to.

Long Stratton Community is the community that will be most affected by any decision made

I would also point out that in the new Localism Bill there is the requirement for cooperation - to ensure that local authorities and public bodies cooperate, and that developers will be required to consult local authorities before submitting planning applications for very large developments - that is for people to have a real chance to have their say - it is just hoped that this will happen, and the people who know their communities will be taken notice of!!

[Redacted signature]

A very concerned resident