

By email

Response of Snettisham Parish Council to the Norfolk Strategic Framework consultation.

Council has several concerns about the policies and other documentation provided.

Agreement 16 – Council has long had issues with the overall amount of development given problems with infrastructure etc. which it has repeatedly expressed in planning consultations. Hence it is puzzled, indeed shocked, to see that the numbers will be increased to speed up delivery, and that this is “additional” housing. Surely the number should be restricted to what is needed.

Agreement 17 – 5G coverage is irrelevant to most, as it will inevitably be focused in Norwich. This will merely exacerbate the problems with digital inequality within the County, where there are swathes of West Norfolk where even getting a mobile call through is problematical. Please can we have some consistency and balance?

This focus on the County Town is also reflected in comments about roads. The prosperity of the region depends on getting goods and services into the County, yet, again, all road spending is focused in the East. Kings Lynn is now a bottleneck all year round, not just during the holiday season. Tourism is one of Norfolk’s biggest sources of income, yet we are now hearing people saying they will not come again due to the delays on the roads – not the ones in the immediate environs of resorts, which may be expected, but those *en route*.



Snettisham Parish Council

This is before 1,000 houses, which have been given planning permission in just the last three years, are added on the A149 alone.

Council also notes a prediction of a 43% increase in the number of over-65s in the Borough of KL&WN. We know from our own research (during our Neighbourhood Plan preparation) that the single most pressing concern of residents is the provision of GPs, and the difficulty obtaining treatment and appointments. There does not seem to be anything about the number of doctors to cope with that increase, however, but much about the consultation of CCGs on house-building. As ever, we will not get the service sorted to cope with present levels before the additional housing is introduced, but will muddle through; it is simply not acceptable to say that the provision is a commercial decision for health providers. Something on attracting medical professionals to Norfolk, a well-documented problem, would be more useful.

Given our locality, Council is also very concerned about the risk of coastal flooding, and the funding of sea defences. There seems to be no overall view on this, other than to repeat the problems and leave it to the local authorities. We continue to express our view that NCC should be more involved in the flood defences, as part of a wider shared responsibility.

Overall, the document disappoints, as so much of it seems to be the customary box-ticking exercise, rather than being a document of real value and utility to those whom it affects. Secondly, we see once again the West of the County being disadvantaged in every important respect, and would have hoped for some signs of an understanding of this, with the situation being addressed, given the supposed County-wide nature of a “strategic” document.

With kind regards,

Simon Bower
Parish Clerk
15/9/2017

