



# YARE VALLEY SOCIETY

Chairman  
Dr Andrew J Salisbury

Chairman  
Secretary  
Treasurer  
Website

Andrew Salisbury 42 Bluebell Road Norwich NR4 7LG  
Mrs Alison Ward 20 Brettingham Avenue Cringleford NR4 6XG  
Mrs Jean Ray 9b Poplar Avenue Norwich NR4 7LB  
[www.yarevalleysociety.org](http://www.yarevalleysociety.org)

01603 455237  
01603 452330  
01603 457271

[ajsalisbury@talktalk.net](mailto:ajsalisbury@talktalk.net)

## Application number 2009/1276/O Colney Hall, Watton Road, Colney

A new Independent Living Centre to house the Norwich Branch of the Multiple Sclerosis Society and the Norfolk Sclerosis Therapy Centre and a centre for the Guideposts Trust to give direct services and information to a number of user groups

Perpetual Legacy, Ardsley house, 18 Braidley Road, Bournemouth, BH2 6JX

Paul Whitham  
Planning, Housing and Built Environment  
South Norfolk Council  
Swan Lane  
Long Stratton  
Norwich NR15 2XE

18 September 2009

Dear Mr Whitham,

We oppose this application.

### Piecemeal Application

Referring to your document NRP Development Framework October 2008 page 33 we see "Development proposals should be generated in accordance with a previously agreed master plan rather than piecemeal." This application has all the hallmarks of a piecemeal application. In the Environmental Statement chapter 3.0, Demarcation of plots g, Item 23, the piecemeal nature of the application is made clear.

Referring to the Plantation we see "The Plantation has low...landscape...value...." We do not agree with this statement. Principal view points 1, 2, 3 and 6 are set back a long way from the river but even here an unspoilt rural open and wooded site is apparent. This does not have low visual and landscape value. It would not be enhanced by buildings visible from the riverside.

### Application spreads over the Plantation

Your document NRP Development Framework October 2008 page 26 shows a Colney Hall Illustrative Masterplan. Although it is only illustrative it shows the need for any development to be well contained within the boundary of the site and only in one place does it go anywhere near the river. In the applicants' document 3.0 figure 3.7 the proposed buildings are far more scattered towards the edge of the Plantation quite contrary to the intent of the South Norfolk Masterplan. In particular the first page of the development goes right to the edge of the plantation, presumably to allow for spread over the whole site for the remainder of the development stages 2 through to 6 and beyond.

The application document 6.2 Landscape character Yare Valley F1 and C1 both argue for preserving the visual aspects by not allowing any buildings to intrude on the site which may be visible from the river. Thus any buildings should fall within the SNC Illustrative Masterplan except where it comes, mistakenly in our opinion, close to the edge of the Plantation.

The document "3.3 Numbers of people employed and where they may live" has an estimated 30 people working on the site. It is the piecemeal nature of this application which does not give figures for an estimate for the total number of people working on the site. There are additionally a 60 bed respite care unit, a 90 bed dementia unit, a 30 bed forensic learning disability unit, an accidental brain injury clinic, a 24 bed hospital, a residential SEN school and sports facilities, and some business space and a hotel. The number of people working there must run into several hundreds.

### Traffic concerns

Although the traffic concerns are mostly outside our terms of reference, there are potential problems with the flow of traffic across the river valley at Earlham. The transportation implications are great. It is suggested that most staff will come from Norwich and Cringleford. At present at busy times the traffic entering the city tails back to the A47 and beyond. A good number of people working at Colney Hall are likely to come from outside Norwich and Cringleford. Merely modifying (improving?) the road into the city will make little difference to the Earlham Road, UEA and Earlham Five Ways roundabout bottlenecks.

### Conclusion

In conclusion this application is very unsatisfactory in that it does not address the important issues. The visual impact, the encroachment onto the boundaries of the Plantation, the traffic density and other traffic implications have not been specified or ignored.

Yours sincerely

Andrew J Salisbury