

Site Specific Allocations – Further Issues and Options

# Bungay Area

## Further Issues and Options Representations

February 2009 (Consultation Period 30<sup>th</sup> July to 24<sup>th</sup> September 2007)



Waveney District Council  
Serving the Community

**Contents**

166 - Joyces Meadow, Bungay ..... 1  
167 - Land at Beccles Road, Bungay ..... 4  
Bungay - Further Issues and Options - Miscellaneous ..... 6

## **166 - Joyces Meadow, Bungay**

**Respondent.: ANGLIAN WATER - ANG/1056/3793 §**

**Representation.:** As previous.

**Respondent.: BIDWELLS - BID/919/3172 C**

**Representation.:** Site 166 would be very prominent and intrusive in the landscape, being in a valley bottom with wide views across the adjoining landscape. Site 166 site does not appear to have a means of access to an adoptable standard road. If access is to be via Meadow Road, this would entail access through a housing estate, which would impact on the amenity of residents, have highway safety implications and restrict opportunities for access by emergency vehicles. Site 166 is partially within an area at risk of flooding, as identified on the Environment Agency's flood risk map. 166 & 167: We do not agree with your assessments in the Site Appraisal Summary table. Neither of these sites would have a positive effect on maintaining and improving levels of education and skills. Neither site would have a positive effect on reducing the effects of traffic on the environment. Neither would encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth.

**Respondent.: BUNGAY TOWN COUNCIL - BUN/074/3661 )**

**Representation.:** The Council are against development of this site. This site is prone to flooding and is a greenfield area used for public recreation and should be retained.

**Respondent.: PHILIP M CARLINI - CAR/063/3149 ,**

**Representation.:** In a nutshell, land at Joyces Meadow area 166 would be more suitable for siting any industrial businesses rather than mixing it with housing in any other suggested development area. I have commented on a previous occasion that it is most inappropriate to mix industrial sites with that of housing. Industrial sites will always deteriorate into slum like areas and I cannot think of anyone who would like to live like that. We need progress not pre war conditions.

**Respondent.: RAYMOND & MAUREEN DAVISON - DAV/520/3789 £**

**Representation.:** I thought it important enough to point out that the area of Joyces Meadow and Dukes Farm are on a flood plain, please see the Environment Agency map (attached to letter).

**Respondent.: ENGLISH HERITAGE - ENG/1034/3667 /**

**Representation.:** Site 166 should be discussed with the County Archaeologist as previous development close to this site identified evidence of an Anglo-Saxon burial ground.

**Respondent.: ESSEX & SUFFOLK WATER - ESS/1030/3626 □**

**Representation.:** Offsite reinforcement mains may be required to supply this development further study will be required to establish the exact amount. Otherwise no foreseeable problem with supply to the stated estimated number of dwellings.

**Respondent.: ROBIN A HOLMES - HOL/990/3419 8**

**Representation.:** Have you considered the present housing in the immediate area? The access from Hillside Road isn't good and more traffic will make it worse and more of a danger to children. Will the proposed site be liable to flooding as it has done in the past? Have brownfield sites in Bungay been considered before more green belt being concreted over? Can current services support more housing? Will the increase in population benefit the livelihood of Bungay? What type of housing is proposed and will any of it be affordable? We would ask that a traffic census be carried out on Hillside Road East prior to a final decision being taken, particularly in view of the extra load already existing, due to the Rainbow superstore and the vet's surgery.

**Respondent.: HOPKINS HOMES LTD - HOP/339/3722 `**

**Representation.:** Site 166 (Joyces Meadow) relates poorly to the built up area of Bungay. If developed, the site would incur significantly to the surrounding open countryside. To this end, we disagree with the Council's consideration of the site in terms of its impact of the site in conserving and enhancing the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes (Sustainability Appraisal Objective 18) would be uncertain. It is our view that development of Site 166 would have a major negative impact upon this objective. We therefore consider that the site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Option within the Council's Site Specific Allocations Document.

**Respondent.: HELENE JACKMAN - JAC/959/3300 Á**

**Representation.:** As a tenant of Joyce Road Bungay, I feel it would be a very big mistake for the Council and for the people who would have to live there. The flooding during heavy rain is the first real big issue. I have lived here for twenty years and I know how full the river gets as we have been flooded. The meadow is even lower than our house. The sewers when it rains a lot get full very quickly and smell awful, sometimes raising the water level in the toilet. The increase in traffic would be very unsafe for Joyce Road (a) because it is not big enough and (b) the amount of small children that play on and around here. Even if there were another road put in for other access, people would still take short cuts through Joyce Road to go to the Rainbow supermarket and into Bungay town. If in doubt, come and view the meadow when we have had heavy rain as we did a few weeks ago. Respondent phoned 18-10-2007 15:25 to point out the ponds in Joyces Meadow contain newts but believed the environmental groups were aware of this.

**Respondent.: MR & MRS P & S NORFOLK - NOR/720/3456 ]**

**Representation.:** Greenfield land liable to flooding from tributary of Waveney. Well outside edge of town except NE corner - too big here.

**Respondent.: MR & MRS J PALIN - PAL/097/3282 ¯**

**Representation.:** Joyces Meadow has always been regarded as a green area for local people for fresh air and exercise. We are true Bungay residents and have always enjoyed it as much, especially the Bigod Way footpath goes through the centre of it and many walkers and rambblers have enjoyed it. The access to this site would be horrendous as it would have to go through existing housing development that traffic-wise leaves a lot to be desired as these houses were built before there was a large car ownership by residents. We would like to point out that part of this site is in a flood risk area and ought to be avoided. To summarise - leave well alone!

**Respondent.: RESIDENTS AGAINST SITE 166 - RES/965/3313 Î**

**Representation.:** Petition signed by 69 residents. We have numerous concerns relating to the suitability of the building option at Joyce's Meadow, Bungay which are listed below. Area Floods. Contains natural pond area with newts, frogs, dragonflies etc. Heavy rainfall results in water flooding down Meadow Road onto Joyce Road increased housing and less ground for soakaway would make this worse. Access via Meadow Road, Joyce Road unsuitable for anything other than light traffic and no room for improvement. Estate / road used by many small children and extra traffic of 80-160+ vehicles posing great danger to life. Access onto Hillside Road East dangerous enough with 6 access roads from businesses and homes without increased traffic new development would bring. Playground access for children would become dangerous with increased traffic. Land is used by many Bungay residents for dog walking, enjoying countryside. Any building would detract from this.

**Respondent.:** SHIRLEY RUSSELL - RUS/091/3147 \*

**Representation.:** I think it is madness to consider large scale building projects in Bungay until it has a North/South bypass. This development is on the south side of the town, beyond walking distance to the shops etc, which will mean yet more cars choking the town, doing school run/shopping/travelling to work in Norwich etc. I also question the need for all these new houses. Much of the 'housing shortage' is caused by privately owned 'Buy to let' properties of which there are many standing empty in Bungay. If built many of these new homes will no doubt be sold to private landlords. I realise that this is a political issue rather than a planning one, but feel that Waveney council should think very hard before increasing the size of these small towns to appease Westminster.

**Respondent.:** PETER SCOTT - SCO/169/3392 □

**Representation.:** This area is unsuitable for development. It is liable to flood and has poor drainage. It would cause traffic problems for residents of Joyces Road and Meadow Road. Even if areas of land were development around it as for the initial consultation, this land should be kept for recreation use - as per its current use. It is a scenic area and development would be visually intrusive. Better to develop by the swimming pool and beyond.

**Respondent.:** MR & MRS D E SMITH - SMI/1048/3745 w

**Representation.:** Site 166 (Joyces Meadow) relates poorly to the built up area of Bungay. If developed, the site would incur significantly to the surrounding open countryside. To this end, we disagree with the Council's consideration of the site in terms of its impact of the site in conserving and enhancing the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes (Sustainability Appraisal Objective 18) would be uncertain. It is our view that development of Site 166 would have a major negative impact upon this objective. We therefore consider that the site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Option within the Council's Site Specific Allocations Document.

**Respondent.:** MR & MRS J SMITH - SMI/907/3599 ë

**Representation.:** Site 166 (Joyces Meadow) relates poorly to the built up area of Bungay. If developed, the site would incur significantly to the surrounding open countryside. To this end, we disagree with the Council's consideration of the site in terms of its impact of the site in conserving and enhancing the quality and local distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes (Sustainability Appraisal Objective 18) would be uncertain. It is our view that development of Site 166 would have a major negative impact upon this objective. We therefore consider that the site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Option within the Council's Site Specific Allocations Document.

**Respondent.: THE BUNGAY SOCIETY - THE/349/3383 □**

**Representation.:** we do not believe this narrow corridor of land is suitable for housing. It is in the bottom of the valley through which a stream flows and it has been known to flood. It straddles the Bigod Way footpath. It has no access to the Halesworth Road and all traffic would have to come out via the restricted Joyce Road estate. If developed in isolation, it would form an awkward finger of southernly building beyond the natural boundary of the town. We feel extension of the Kings Road estate to the west of the Halesworth Road is infinitely more appropriate.

**Respondent.: JULIAN WALKER - WAL/914/3153 0**

**Representation.:** In EA defined flood risk area.

**Respondent.: BETTY WARNES - WAR/1022/3523 Ÿ**

**Representation.:** I am the owner of Site 166 (land at Beccles Road) which is a late option for development in the Bungay area and I understand that at a meeting of Bungay Town Council this week they voted against the possibility of housing on this area on grounds of possible flooding and access onto a bad corner. Before this vote influences your judgement of this site, I would like to emphasise that it is only a tiny area of this greenfield site to be developed - in fact it was surplus garden for the bungalow at 60 Beccles Road, before use as a paddock. Both bungalows at 60 and 60a are on the same level, don't flood, and since the planning permission for 60a was given only a few years ago, the site must have been approved at that time. As to the access onto the B 1062, there is a driveway to site 166 in existence, which if widened, would allow a wide splay with visibility round both sides of the bend. The residences at 60 and 60a share a drive next to this and appear to have no difficulty with traffic, although I believe Suffolk Roads would have the final say on this matter.

**Respondent.: DIDY WARD - WAR/971/3362 ŷ**

**Representation.:** Any housing development on Joyce's meadow would be an unwelcome intrusion into the countryside.

**Respondent.: WAVENEY GREEN PARTY - WAV/418/3693 I**

**Representation.:** Inappropriate greenfield development.

## **167 - Land at Beccles Road, Bungay**

**Respondent.: ANGLIAN WATER - ANG/1056/3794 "**

**Representation.:** As previous.

**Respondent.: BIDWELLS - BID/919/3173 D**

**Representation.:** Site 167 is covered by policy ENV 5 of the Interim Local Plan, which protects this area as a Strategic Gap and Open Break. Development of the site would intrude upon this open gap. Site 167 is on the edge of the flood risk area as identified by the Environment Agency on its flood risk map. 166 & 167: We do not agree with your assessments in the Site Appraisal Summary table. Neither of these sites

would have a positive effect on maintaining and improving levels of education and skills. Neither site would have a positive effect on reducing the effects of traffic on the environment. Neither would encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth.

**Respondent.: BUNGAY TOWN COUNCIL - BUN/074/3662 \***

**Representation.:** The Council are against development of this site. The land is in the flood plain close to Tin River and road access is poor.

**Respondent.: BUNGAY JOINT TOURISM COMMITTEE - BUN/1028/3560 Ä**

**Representation.:** This is a greenfield site that has long been enjoyed by the people of Bungay as a walking, recreational or dog-walking area. Being on the south side of the town, it is used by the residents of the neighbouring estates, where many new houses have small gardens and this green space acts as a lung for adults and an unofficial playing field for their children. In addition to its use by the townsfolk, it is also part of the Bigod Way, a series of footpaths in and around Bungay which are publicised in a leaflet produced by our organization. We believe that the Bigod Way brings tourists to the town and also encourages green use of the area, and to reroute it from the much-loved Joyce Meadows would be a retrograde step. We hope you will consider these matters when considering future development needs in Waveney.

**Respondent.: ESSEX & SUFFOLK WATER - ESS/1030/3627 □**

**Representation.:** No foreseeable problem with supply to the stated estimated number of Dwellings.

**Respondent.: MR & MRS P & S NORFOLK - NOR/720/3455 \**

**Representation.:** Greenfield land liable to flooding.

**Respondent.: MR & MRS J PALIN - PAL/097/3283 °**

**Representation.:** A relatively small amount of housing though access could be difficult as there is quite a bend in the road, but if this can be overcome - no objection.

**Respondent.: THE BUNGAY SOCIETY - THE/349/3382 □**

**Representation.:** The Bungay Society does not think that house building is appropriate at this site. It forms an open view to the green space behind, breaking up the continuous line of houses along Beccles Road. It sits on a particularly marked blind bend in the road and added car access points would not help.

**Respondent.: JULIAN WALKER - WAL/914/3154 1**

**Representation.:** In EA defined flood risk area.

**Respondent.: DIDY WARD - WAR/971/3361 p**

**Representation.:** I would not recommend further housing on this bend. There are better sites for any future housing developments in Bungay which would have less impact on our existing street scenes.

## **Bungay - Further Issues and Options - Miscellaneous**

**Respondent.: RESIDENTS AGAINST SITE 166 - RES/965/3314 Ì**

**Representation.:** Alternative suggestion: with one of the local schools closing soon, there will be land available when one stands empty.

**Respondent.: MRS M TIPLER - TIP/496/3187 R**

**Representation.:** I have been a resident of Bungay for 24 years plus. My husband and I decided to move to Bungay on his retirement because it was such a delightful market town with almost every facility provided for a happy retirement. Alas during these 24years Bungay is but a shadow of its former self and many people such as myself are very upset by its decline. The most retrograde step was the removal of a large food store (which Bungay centre badly needs) from the town to a site on the outskirts of Bungay. There are many such people as myself - immobile and elderly who benefited greatly from that store and are now presented with having to shop at smaller stores which do not provide a selection at competitive prices and with the demise of the Co-op store in town other shops have found it hard to survive. I feel that to resite the community centre out of the town and to build more houses in Upper Olland Street would be a very retrograde step. There will be even more dissatisfied residents with no adequate food store immediately accessible, also the new proposed Oasis centre will be too far away for many residents to access. May I make a suggestion that if planning permission is given for a larger food store to operate in Bungay it would generate much more shopper participation and encourage people from the outside villages to once more come into our town to shop and consequently rejuvenate Bungay. I realise that more houses are needed but please give it careful consideration before removing every facility to out of town.

**Respondent.: PAUL WATKIN - WAT/1064/3830 Ì**

**Representation.:** I see that the land surrounding the swimming pool in Bungay has not been included. I think the land there and the land opposite would be suitable for development. There is a need, particularly for industry in Bungay. The land to the South of the swimming pool was once allocated on the 1996 plan, now is the time to encourage light engineering and like industry to Bungay. The Joyce meadows allocation for housing is not good as these meadows are liable to flood. The land West of those meadows and opposite the Swimming pool is a better choice.