

Results of LDF Survey

A survey was sent to each household on the electoral register. In total 570 surveys were delivered of which 203 were returned. This is a response rate of 35.6%

Each household was asked:

- A) Whether they felt [098]007 is the most appropriate site for development of 50 houses
- B) Whether another site would be more appropriate

Each household was also invited to submit comments

Action	Number of Responses*	Percentage of Responses	Representing Number of people**
In agreement with the Parish Council's decision of [098]007 being the most appropriate site	159	78.3%	238
Against [098]007 being the most appropriate site	44	21.7%	63

* Number of paper responses (used in all calculations)

** This figure has been made up by the names of people who responded. Those who specified two people on the response have been classed as the response of two people; those who did not specify any name have been classed as the response of one person. This method has not been used in calculations but is interesting all the same.

A summary of comments given is below:

Comments for 'In agreement to [098]007'

- I agree with the Parish Council's choice of site. It is close enough to all facilities and should have reasonable access to roads. Some sites would not offer this latter point. Our roads already have increase volume of traffic
- Comment: A safe access onto the road must be provided. There should also be provision of a footpath to the school to encourage walking/cycling. Currently this section of Hoe Road North is dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. This area seems very small for 50 houses.
- We strongly feel that sites [098]006 and [098]004 are not suitable for housing development.
- I would never like the development of 006 as it would spoil the view of the church and the lovely open space in the approach to the heart of the village. Also totally against moving the village boundary at the top end of the village (003,009, 010)
- In my opinion 50 houses extra in the village would be acceptable. The local infrastructure could not accept any more.
- Re: [098]007- access to the village is suitable ie: main road/school. Least disruption to surrounding residents.
- Yes please, let's bring in more homes which young families can move into and increase the village's younger populations. Any other sites should be considered too. If younger families don't have the chance to move her (in affordable homes) then this village will die.

- The homes should be built at the other end of [098]007. Residents on the new site will be close to the school and village hall. At the proposed site there would be a requirement for a new footpath whereas if situated at my proposed site the plot would already have adequate roads and footpaths and would be ready for any further site extensions.
- Excellent choice allowing for further development if required without involving other sites. Road infrastructure may require careful review as existing 'Milnes' engineering access is poor given proximity to the bend/road junction B1147 at church/Papermakers corner.
- I agree that housing should be kept to a minimum otherwise it will be another extension of Dereham.
- I strongly oppose planning permission on site [098]004. It has very poor access onto a very busy main road and it's right by the children's playing field.
- The suggested site [098]007 is well placed to all amenities (school, church, shops, garage etc) without crowding existing villagers. And no way being isolated so will integrate well.
- We would also like to see some single units so that the youngsters don't have to leave the village to find accommodation.
- Can the current sewerage and water mains cope with the extra housing? There is already extra housing being built at Lincoln House.
- Although site [098]007 represents a suitable location for a single site for development a range of small sites pepper potted across the village is often a way of achieving a more varied, cohesive and visually interesting development mix. However, maintaining a broken street scene is an important visual characteristic of the village so sites which create a ribbon of development should be avoided. Extending the village envelope both north and south should be avoided.
- With extra buildings have you thought about extra sewerage and drainage pipes.
- Or site [098]009. I would assume that the main direction of travel for occupants of the new housing would be towards Dereham. This site would save traffic flow through the village.
- The development of site [098]007, which we think is appropriate, will however result in increased traffic from the church through Mill Street to the two bridges over the River Wensum. Could a 30mph limit be imposed as the road is too narrow and, given today's traffic, dangerous.
- No housing at Gooseberry Hill please.
- There are not many shops in the village. Could the local council recommend more?
- The traffic situation in Manns Lane needs to be resolved. Has the additional housing been considered in terms of drains and sewerage? Traffic calming measures in the village need to be addressed as the existing speed signs on the main road are ineffective. The B1147 into Dereham via the A11 needs improving.
- We agree with the Parish Council's preferred site for development as the other end of the village seems to be bearing the brunt of all the development lately.
- I worry about the extra traffic in the blind corner near the shop.
- Provided that the footpath to the school is upgraded.
- Please do not let Breckland Council turn our village into a small town by overbuilding and populating. We must not lose the 'village' feel.
- I agree with the proposed site for development.
- The outlined site will keep the development near to the village centre & not spread out the development into more precious Greenfield land.
- Do we need 50 houses? We do feel that the site proposed by the Parish Council is the most appropriate location if development is necessary.
- Site [098]007 would work for an extra 50 homes but to extend this would compromise the capacity of the road system.
- It should be affordable housing for couples trying to buy for the first time. We have enough large houses in the village which come onto the market and just sit there.

There is also development going on for the higher end of the market. Let's see some housing under £100,000.

- We strongly disagree with [098]004 for building. Also [098]008 and [098]006. Let's have some countryside left in Swanton Morley.
- There were problems with services such as electricity, water and sewerage for new residents when the Bedingfield estate was built.
- Whilst we agree with the extra houses being built, as long as there is availability is the local school and transport. Houses should be allocated to local people.
- I hope that expanding the village will not prove detrimental to essential services such as the surgery/school etc.
- [098]010 should not be developed then this will extend the village beyond the existing boundaries.
- Will some of these houses be made available to current village residents ie: young adults wanting to stay in the village and getting their feet onto the housing ladder.
- Our feelings are that there is the potential for access issues for a larger development, and that if they are for families developers must take into account not just the toddler age bracket but provide facilities for ages 10+
- The Parish Council option seems the more sensible area considering for water and sewage problems. Has any great thought been examined as to the possible use of the marriage quarters on the east side of the Barracks? It could easily be segregated from the military and give at least 30 affordable houses. There would be very little security risk in view of the open air field.
- We need our open spaces. Please don't 'overbuild' houses.
- Re: [098]004. Since the children's play area has been improved, we have seen an enormous increase in families & children using the apparatus in safety. Would building on this land be a threat to this due to access of the site. If anything, how about parking offroad for park users.

Comments for 'Disagreement' Responses

- More appropriate: Land in Greengate opposite Bedingfield Road which has planning permission granted in 1992. It would have less impact on residents for roads, more suitable for heavy traffic. Also [098]006 (part of) in Manns Lane would also be suitable. The most appropriate would be the field adjacent to the village hall and school (both sides). Low cost housing attracts young families which would give easy access to schools/play groups and join middle camp with the main part of the village.
- By way of this note I strongly opposed any further build anywhere in Swanton Morley.
- [098]006 – a much better fill in for the village
- [098]006 straight, safer road, [098]007 not suitable due to excess traffic.
- [098]006 is more suitable as this is more central to the village and would fit in well. It is close to all amenities & in particular the school and village hall.
- [098]009 is more appropriate
- [098]009 and [098]003 are more appropriate. It is best to keep the old village clear of new development and it would keep traffic out of the village as most people would work in Dereham or Norwich.
- We don't believe quotas should be enforced and planning should be appropriate
- [098]006 is more appropriate, especially the area nearest the Manns Lane junction with Gooseberry Hill and following the building line. Access and egress will provide good vision either way. [098]007 is not inclusive within the village in fact it is somewhat isolated. The area highlighted is too close to a busy turning (heading towards the camp) and will add additional traffic to a busy junction opposite the church with poor visibility.
- More appropriate [098]010, [098]009 and [098]003. [098]007 is a wide open area with open countryside and a wealth of wildlife to the west and the beauty of the Wensum

valley view to the east. This should remain unchanged. We don't see the benefit of joining the ex RAF houses to the old village brings to the area.

- [098]006 I believe to be a more suitable site due to better access and more central to the village.
- [098]006 will be more appropriate to build on as it will be inline with the main part of the village and it would be an easier position for buses to stop.
- No site. Ample space within present settlement boundary to provide homes needed by parish. Furthermore it is unfair and unjust to favour any one landowner in view of the financial advantage that would accrue.
- [098]010 and [098]009 more appropriate. I understand that the present sewerage infrastructure will not cope with further high density development. There should be no large development in the village, only infill sites.
- [098]008 and [098]010 are not near as many houses and the impact of traffic would not disrupt existing home owners. There would be are too many new cars (at least 60) coming past at site [098]007.
- 50 houses is too many.
- [098]006 more central location, close to village hall and existing play area.
- Smaller pockets of houses should be developed in several areas on the map & through the village so that new families can be integrated & welcomed into village life.
- I think that sites [098]006, [098]007 and [098]008 all have merit for building development with a maximum of 50 houses on part of the site chosen. Site to be reduced to area required to accommodate agreed number of houses plus the possibility of allotments. Building guideline to be re-drawn accordingly, to prevent indiscriminate development in the future.
- In the interests of ensuring adequate infrastructure, perhaps only one site should be chosen for the development of 50 houses. In that case I would opt for the south western part if site [098]006.
 - It is rough pasture, not good arable land. Some grazing land could still be retained in the north eastern section.
 - Assuming this is to be an area of housing for families, it would be conveniently situated, within easy walking distance to the school, Under 5's group, other facilities at the village hall, Gooseberry Hill playing field and also not too far to walk to Swanton Morley surgery.
 - It has the advantage of 2 possible exits – mainly onto Manns Lane but also egress onto Gooseberry Hill from the few houses which could be built opposite those already existing on the other side of the road.
 - I endorse the proposal that an updated boundary line should be drawn.

Further comments on correspondence

- We would like the village left as it is.
- We do not need any more building in this village, there is quite enough with the houses being built in gardens and at Lincoln House. Also we are told that the Army will be leaving then there will be houses at the camp. To build on the land suggested would, once started, just go on. The houses for sale now in the village are not selling. Imagine how much more traffic would come through the village and the sewers would not take it and more electricity would be needed.
- [098]006 has better access and is near to the school, not near a junction. The pathway is already in place and it is near to village amenities (ie:post office, school, shop and new play area). We think it would be a lot better to build 50 houses on this site as the proposed area is too near an already dangerous junction & to add more traffic we think would make the junction worse. There are no paths linking the proposed site to the school.
- Sites [098]007 and [098]008 are not appropriate for development. The small lanes surrounding are not suitable for potentially 50 extra cars, possibly 100 cars since most households have two cars if not more. 50 houses are far too many in what is still a village/rural location. Swanton Morley does not have the street lighting ability and public transport to cope with this number of new properties. If any new

development has to take place, the number should be drastically reduced and site [098]006 would be more appropriate since access would be via the main road as opposed to a country lane and would be in line with the current village build line. If each household has 4 persons could the GP surgery and the school cope. [098]008 and [098]007 could be hazardous for pedestrians walking the country lanes with the additional traffic these proposals would bring.

- I feel that the road and footpath structure of Rectory Road and Town Street are inadequate for this type of development. Possibly the field opposite to Bedingfield Road which I am led to believe already has planning permission.
- [098]006 is the best option as it is close to the school, playgroup and also shops. [098]007 is a bad choice because it would put too much traffic on to an already bad junction opposite the church.
- [098]006 is more appropriate as this site is far more central to the village and bring together two distinct sections of the village, and it neighbours the village hall.
- The south is already overcrowded. Suggest the Parish Council does nothing to support central Government on this issue. In any case given current circumstances housing policy is very unlikely to change over the next few years.
- We believe that site [098]006 to be the more appropriate because it gives good access to shops, school, village hall, playing fields and is closer to the doctors. The entrance to this site would be onto a straight road. The occupants would feel part of the village and not tacked onto the end.
- Re sites [098]002/004/005/006/008 and 008 – it would be a shame to build new houses on the older more picturesque part of the village. New houses would have an adverse visual impact. Re site [098]007 – if vehicular access is onto Rectory Road this would be extremely dangerous.
- The field behind the Bedingfield estate would be more appropriate (map provided) and accessed from the Bedingfield estate. The access road and services are already there and it will not be visible from the main road and will be easily incorporated into the existing main developments in the village.
- No sites are acceptable alternatives and I believe that Swanton Morley should never have been offered as a LDC(?). I will request it removed in Nov 08 when the Core Strategy Consultation is released.
- [098]006 – better roads for access, near village hall and children's play park. More central to village and nearer school for children.
- [098]006 is closer and more easily and safely accessible to school, village hall, playground and shops. Also vehicles less on exit to main road near church. 006 could have 2 exits (main road and Manns Lane)
- [098]006 – we feel that this would be a more suitable site as it would join the village and is alongside the main road, bus route, school and playing field. The proposed site is very near the army base houses and could cause conflict with established neighbours (research shows conflict can happen between opposing estates). We also query the need for any more housing in the village. Has the Parish Council sought the intentions of the MoD regarding the future of Robertson Barracks as there are already empty houses there.
- I think [098]009 would be more suitable for development. This is a natural extension of the village. 007 would cause more traffic driving through a very narrow Town Street, culminating in a dangerous bend near the shops. Young families would need safe access to the local school. 006 is a much more convenient site for the families who will live there. It fronts a reasonable road and backs onto park and village hall. It is also near the village school.
- No building on [098]010, [098]009 and [098]003 as drainage is dreadful
- Would like to see [098]006 developed for average type homes with gardens.
- Strongly disagree with [098]007. [098]002, [098]005 and [098]001 more appropriate. Plot 002 is clearly infill, there being two properties to the right of the proposed area and also this land has lapsed PP on it. Also smaller developments are in keeping with this village. Building on [098]007 will lead to a larger development later.

- Sites [098]001, 002 and 005 are much smaller and more appropriate to our village. 002 did have planning consent on it.
- Sites [098]006.[098]007 and [098]008 are all acceptable