

I write to object to the proposals for the WWHAR as noted below.

I note that we have only now been made aware of the consultation being carried out, late in the day, and by word of mouth as Norfolk County Council failed to provide adequate notice of consultation by the usual letters to those effected by the proposals and living within the area affected by the proposals. Further there have been problems with getting the planning portal to accept these comments.

These comments need to be taken into account as part of your consultation process:

1. We support all the reasons to the objections made to the scheme already so will not repeat these, especially those expressed so clearly by North Runcton Parish Council, West Winch Parish Council, the cyclist groups and others stating the incoherence of the proposals.
2. The proposal is not linked to any specific housing scheme that will be put forward. This has not been issued in recent times in any case so it is not possible to comment on whether the locations of roundabouts, traffic provisions etc. are at all optimised or suitable. This proposal cannot progress without full integration and commitment that any agreed housing scheme layout is also optimised and suited to this proposal.
3. There are no details shown on how the houses in the triangle between the existing A10, new A10 and Chequers Lane are accessed. This will not be from Chequers Lane and the new A10, so will this be from the existing A10? This must be integrated with this proposal as no housing schemes are included in the proposals.
4. The Rectory Lane overbridge with its attendant overbearing presence should be simply replaced by a roundabout, omitting the roundabouts proposed to the north and south, thus removing one roundabout and removing the need for an intrusive and costly bridge.
5. The roundabout proposed just before the new roundabout between the new A10 and existing A47 should be omitted as it is so close to its junction with the A47, removing a second roundabout.
6. The proposal by a respondent to move the WWHAR some 200m West makes sense to avoid woodland. Alternatively the WWHAR could take a shorter route to join the A47 further to the East which will also avoid woodland. Either is preferable to that proposed.
7. All of the above are predicated on ensuring NCC commit to a 20mph limit from Gravelhill Lane to Chapel Lane and suitable traffic calming measures at minimum. Such a speed limit should have been contained within this proposal as extensive 20mph limits through housing areas have become standard and the short length that is proposed is inadequate in any case.
8. The siting of area marked for "temporary works" on Chequers Lane close to housing is unacceptable and should be moved to areas remote from any housing. If this is partially or only driven by making provision to relocate the gas main, this comment is still applicable and the work site should be moved on these plans away to any existing housing to prevent avoidable nuisance and noise on housing.
9. Report 2.12.00 - Gas Main Diversion Drawings shows the land take for the proposal for pedestrian bridge over the WWHAR which is not shown on other drawings so either out of date and in error or is a toucan crossing an error?
10. 2.12.00 - Gas Main Diversion Drawings shows the expected diversion of gas main. This work can surely be designed out in agreement with National Grid as this is just an engineering problem causing excessive disruption and cost. And entailing need for work sites, mentioned in 8. Above.

11. This scheme is, as noted by responders nothing more than an access road to housing estates, which is as stated in "WWHAR". Yet the proposal is also trying to state and justify itself that it will divert traffic from the existing A10, yet without describing how any traffic calming measures will be implemented to make this happen.

12. In all it is ill-considered, ill thought through, uncoordinated with the housing it is aimed to serve and not optimised to minimise disturbance and impact as noted in the comments above.

13. No attempt is made to take account of non housing requirements in the road design which must be designed in for shops, medical facilities, buses, deliveries and the like. No public transport is built into the proposal. Like the rest of West Winch to which areas have been allowed to develop without any town planning or consideration of community, we will have just another set of developments to the formless and centreless place that is called West Winch. Norfolk County Council and its leaders should be ashamed of themselves for allowing this without any consideration of proper town planning.

14. More radically, the by pass should go to the east of West Winch, starting just south of Setchey, then run alongside the railway and join the A47 to the west of Hardwick Roundabout. This is the same A47 road as currently proposed, just at a different place, but with no different in impact. If anything a better route into Kings Lynn could be worked into this route. A new station can be built along this route, much as the successful addition of the station at Cambridge North. The surrounding land which is farmland is as to the east side of West Winch. The industrial land to the north end can also be developed without the harm caused by the proposal NCC are pursuing. With some thoughtful town planning, West Winch can have a proper centre and a true community form, the operative word being planning.