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# Summary of key points

## Who was consulted?

Belton with Browston; Burgh Castle; & Fritton with St Olavesare undertaking a joint neighbourhood plan between the three parishes. Residents, local landowners, and people who work in the three parishes were consulted via a survey on key issues for the neighbourhood plan for just over five weeks from 19th January to 28th February 2023. This analysis paper has been produced by [Collective Community Planning Ltd](https://collectivecommunityplanning.co.uk/) who are helping support the development of this joint neighbourhood plan.

## How were people consulted?

The consultation included a survey with 46 questions.

The survey could be completed online or via a paper copy if preferred by residents. Different methods were taken to engage with the community and advertise the survey taking place, this included:

* Advertising it on each of the parish council websites (**Example- Appendix 1**)
* A poster was placed in the different parishes’ village halls, churches and on notice boards.
* A hard copy of the survey and article raising awareness of the neighbourhood plan was included and Advertised in the Village Voice which is delivered to every household in the plan area
* Members of the steering group helped with distribution

**Overall, 347 responses were received.**

## Main issues and concerns raised

* Generally, although residents are not supportive of large scale residential development, they would welcome more affordable or small-scale housing to help meet community needs, such as for younger people wanting to get on the housing ladder or to meet needs such as downsizing.
* Concern was raised about future housing development taking place on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. There were also concerns that new development would mean a loss of countryside, natural habitats, village identity or will impact on landscape and increase traffic / road safety issues.
* Should there be future development smaller 2 or 3 bed homes were most supported. Small sites of 10-25 homes on brownfield land was preferable.
* Residents currently or likely to be looking for housing in the next 5-10 years were predominantly interested in smaller unit housing, either alone or as a couple. The cost of purchasing a property, finding the money to acquire a deposit for housing or the costs of private rent are key concerns for those looking. Some individuals on the waiting list for social housing reported long waiting times.
* The design of any new housing is important, there’s support for ensuring new housing is in-keeping with existing development and for it to incorporate low carbon design/energy efficient measures.
* There were mixed views on allocating land for renewable energy generation. Solar energy generation was the preferred choice, subject to it not being intrusive within the landscape, and incorporating boundary treatments such as trees and hedgerows.
* A number of residents who are currently in employment and living in the NPA either work from home or travel outside of the NPA doing various miles (between 0-200 miles) to travel to their employment. The most popular option for getting to work was via private vehicle.
* Retaining the current rural character of the parishes is important to residents including the need to retain a gap between the villages so they do not lose their individual identities.
* There is strong support for protecting the rural environment, its tranquillity, important woodlands/wetlands, and views of the Broads, marshlands and other beauty spots. Many areas were suggested for identification as local green spaces and important local views.
* Access into the countryside is important, people would like to see more footpaths and routes into the countryside.
* Most respondents raised concerns that they did not want to see the area over developed or lose its rural identity. Concerns were raised about the strain development places on community infrastructure/services, the poor quality of new housing and traffic issues.
* In the next 10 years residents said they would like the area as safe, rural, tranquil, friendly, attractive and unchanged.
* If any employment land comes forward residents would like to see this used for a medical centre, rural enterprises, shop or retail.
* Most respondents did not want to see further mineral extraction in the NPA and reported issues on noise, vibration, and the maintenance of the roads.
* Most respondents were in favour of Lothingland having a recycling centre to alleviate the current traffic congestion issues.
* Most respondents were not keen to see further expansion of tourism areas and reported concerns relating to traffic.
* Most respondents said they would like to see a bus service to Millwood Surgery.
* Traffic and speeding is a common concern. Many respondents suggested the need for additional speed cameras and traffic calming measures, street lighting and safer footpaths/cycle paths.
* Concerns were raised around parking, particularly outside schools at pick up / drop off times which results in parking on pavements, junctions, and outside residential dwellings.
* Retaining existing local services and facilities is important and there is some support for new amenities. This includes a GP surgery, dentist, open spaces, post office and general shop. Some of the lowest options were secondary school, sports facilities, community centre and public house. Encouragement of more facilities and activities to be introduced in the villages for all age groups was also noted including clubs for children.
* Residents stated that they were satisfied with the current public transport but would like to see an improvement to frequency, better links to schools and other areas.
* Many comments were received about strategic planning issues or non-planning matters. The non-planning matters would be worthwhile discussing as community action points.

# Analysis of individual questions

## Demographics

**Q1- Within which Parish do you reside?**

Residents from all of the three parishes answered this survey. The largest response rate came from Belton with Browston, which is the largest of the three.

|  |
| --- |
| **Within which Parish do you reside?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Belton with Browston | 72.5% | 248 |
| 2 | Burgh Castle | 19.3% | 66 |
| 3 | Fritton with St Olaves | 8.2% | 28 |
| ***answered*** | **342** |
| ***skipped*** | **5** |

**Q2- How old are the household residents? e.g. if you have two children 0-9, enter the number of children in the age boxes and the number in the relevant boxes for you and your partner.**

A good mix of age groups responded, including children and younger people, who often fail to respond to surveys such as these.

|  |
| --- |
| **How old are the household residents? e.g. if you have two children 0-9, enter the number of children in the age boxes and the number in the relevant boxes for you and your partner.** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | 0-9 | 12.3% | 42 |
| 2 | 10-19 | 16.4% | 56 |
| 3 | 20-29 | 13.2% | 45 |
| 4 | 30-39 | 14.6% | 50 |
| 5 | 40-49 | 18.4% | 63 |
| 6 | 50-59 | 28.1% | 96 |
| 7 | 60-69 | 33.6% | 115 |
| 8 | 70-79 | 28.4% | 97 |
| 9 | 80+ | 10.5% | 36 |
| ***answered*** | **342** |
| ***skipped*** | **5** |

**Q3- How long have you lived in the Neighbourhood Plan Area?**

There was a split of responses to this question. The most common response was from people who have lived in the area between 6 and 20 years. The proportion of responses from people who have lived in the area less than five years indicates that there remains a desire for people to move into the area. People also choose to stay once living here – as demonstrated by the number of respondents indicating they’ve lived in the area more than 40 years.

|  |
| --- |
| **How long have you lived in the Neighbourhood Plan Area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Up to 5 years | 18.4% | 63 |
| 2 | 6-20 years | 33.8% | 116 |
| 3 | 21-40 years | 25.4% | 87 |
| 4 | More than 40 years | 22.4% | 77 |
| ***answered*** | **343** |
| ***skipped*** | **4** |

## Employment and Housing

**Q4- Employment Status**

|  |
| --- |
| **Are you:** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Employed | 27.0% | 93 |
| 2 | Full time | 11.3% | 39 |
| 3 | Part time | 8.7% | 30 |
| 4 | Self-employed | 9.6% | 33 |
| 5 | Employer | 0.6% | 2 |
| 6 | Unemployed | 0.9% | 3 |
| 7 | Student | 2.9% | 10 |
| 8 | Retired | 36.6% | 126 |
| 9 | Other | 2.3% | 8 |
| ***answered*** | **344** |
| ***skipped*** | **3** |

**Q5- Working from home**

This question asked if people worked from home. A large response rate (82.3%) said they do not predominantly work from home so travel elsewhere to their employment. However, 54 responses do work from home. This is something worth considering if homes will likely need to adapt for work purposes moving forward.

|  |
| --- |
| **Do you predominantly work from home?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 17.7% | 54 |
| 2 | No | 82.3% | 251 |
| ***answered*** | **305** |
| ***skipped*** | **42** |

**Q6- Is your place of work within the Neighbourhood Plan Area?**

Just over a quarter of respondents indicated that they work within the area. This could be in local employment opportunities, for example linked with the school or tourist industry. However, it’s worth noting that there could be some overlap between this and the previous question – so if people predominantly work from home they may have answered yes to this question also.

|  |
| --- |
| **Is your place of work within the Neighbourhood Plan Area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 25.8% | 75 |
| 2 | No | 74.2% | 216 |
| ***answered*** | **291** |
| ***skipped*** | **56** |

**Q7- Will anyone in your family be seeking employment in the next 5 years?**

The most common response for this question was no. This could be because individuals are already employed or may be retired. However, 74 respondents did say yes, and this could relate to the younger age groups who may be looking for opportunities whilst in education or entering the employment sector.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 22.7% | 73 |
| 2 | No | 77.3% | 249 |
| ***answered*** | **322** |
| ***skipped*** | **25** |

**Q8- How do you travel to work?**

Unsurprisingly, the most common response to Q8 was that people travelled to work by their own private vehicle (car or a van) which made up 79.2% of the 240 responses. The most common response after this was people worked from home (13.8%). A few residents took public transport, cycled, or walked to work. However, depending on the distance they need to travel, this may not be a suitable option for many.

Many people provided information on the distance they travel to work. This ranged from 1 to over 200 miles a day – most commonly less than 20 miles. Some indicated that when they are not working from home, they travel to locations like London, or their work mileage would depend on meeting clients or the job’s workload. Some stated they have to travel to Beccles, Diss Train Station, Gorleston or Norwich to get to their destination and some said they work overseas or are retired.

|  |
| --- |
| **How do you travel to work?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Bus | 6.3% | 15 |
| 2 | Train | 1.3% | 3 |
| 3 | Own car | 71.3% | 171 |
| 4 | Works car/van | 7.9% | 19 |
| 5 | Walk | 4.6% | 11 |
| 6 | Motor cycle/scooter | 0.4% | 1 |
| 7 | Cycle | 6.3% | 15 |
| 8 | Work from home | 13.8% | 33 |
| 9 | Other | 9.2% | 22 |
|  Distance travelled to and from work in miles | 191 |
| ***answered*** | **240** |
| ***skipped*** | **107** |

**Q9- Does any members of your household want or need to move out of the property?**

The most common response was no. However, quite a large number of respondents said they want to move out or will do in the next 5 years meaning they will be trying to find suitable housing in the area or further afield.

|  |
| --- |
| **Does any member/s of your household want or need to move out of the property?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes, a member/s of the household currently wants or needs to move out | 6.5% | 22 |
| 2 | A member/s of the household may want or need to move out in the next 5 years | 19.5% | 66 |
| 3 | No, it is unlikely that any member/s of the household may want or need to move out in the next 5 years | 74.0% | 250 |
| ***answered*** | **338** |
| ***skipped*** | **9** |

**Q10- If you answered yes or possibly in the future; what type of home will the household member/s require? i.e. for**

Most commonly respondents are looking for housing for a single adult or for an adult couple. A few people left comments including needing a house, a bungalow or housing for a single parent with a child or an older couple.

|  |
| --- |
| **If you answered yes or possibly in the future; what type of home will the household member/s require? i.e. for** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | A single adult | 41.7% | 43 |
| 2 | An adult couple | 25.2% | 26 |
| 3 | A family with children | 12.6% | 13 |
| 4 | An older couple | 6.8% | 7 |
| 5 | A single older person | 4.9% | 5 |
| 6 | Other (please specify): | 8.7% | 9 |
| ***answered*** | **103** |
| ***skipped*** | **244** |

**Q11- Why is the current property unsuitable for the household member(s) needing or wanting to move?**

For Q11, most commonly people cited wanting independence as a reason for wanting to move. A summary of the 80 comments received (relating to ‘other’) includes:

* House is currently too big or too small for their needs
* Children are getting to an age where they will move out so will consider downsizing
* Need more outdoor space for themselves or the children
* Getting married or wishing to start a family with a partner
* Wish to be nearer to family elsewhere
* Neighbour disputes/anti-social behaviour/noise
* Wishing to get on the property ladder and move out
* As people are ageing wishing to find a suitable property (bungalow) meet needs
* Wish to move closer to work
* Adaptable home for personal needs
* Feels the area is becoming too overcrowded and hard to get appointments for services like the dentist and doctors.

|  |
| --- |
| **Answer ONLY if you answered YES to question 9- Why is the current property unsuitable for the household member(s) needing or wanting to move? Please select all that apply:** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Overcrowded | 7.5% | 6 |
| 2 | Want/need to live independently | 68.8% | 55 |
| 3 | Other (please specify): | 35.0% | 28 |
| ***answered*** | **80** |
| ***skipped*** | **267** |

**Q12- Has anyone in your household had to move away or stay living with you because**:

For Q12 it seems the issue is particularly around suitability and expense. The most common response was ‘other’, and a number of comments were left. These comments included:

* Children have left to go to university and haven’t returned because there is no suitable employment.
* Poor public transport links
* Personal/medical reasons
* No affordable housing in the area for my children or grandchildren to move too. No council accommodation on offer, private rent is expensive and one person needing a home doesn’t have much of a chance.
* A number of people said none/not applicable/ no to the question.

|  |
| --- |
| **Has anyone in your household had to move away or stay living with you because?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | No housing available in the area | 14.9% | 13 |
| 2 | Available housing too expensive | 33.3% | 29 |
| 3 | Available housing too small/large | 1.1% | 1 |
| 4 | Non driver/poor public transport | 3.4% | 3 |
| 5 | Other (please specify): | 47.1% | 41 |
| ***answered*** | **87** |
| ***skipped*** | **260** |

**Q13- What type of property would be most suitable for the household member/s planning or needing to move?**

For Q13, the most common response was a house followed by bungalow and flat. A number of comments were left including needing a starter home or smaller home of 1-2 beds.

|  |
| --- |
| **What type of property would be most suitable for the household member/s planning or needing to move?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | House | 39.5% | 51 |
| 2 | Bungalow | 22.5% | 29 |
| 3 | Flat/apartment | 17.8% | 23 |
| 4 | Sheltered/retirement housing | 3.9% | 5 |
| 5 | Extra care housing | 3.1% | 4 |
| 6 | Other (please specify): | 13.2% | 17 |
| ***answered*** | **129** |
| ***skipped*** | **218** |

**Q14- Do you think we need more affordable housing within the parishes for example first homes, affordable, shared equity or rented?**

The respondents who answered this question was nearly an even split. It seems a large number of people felt there isn’t a need for more affordable housing within the parishes (52%) but also people thinks there should be (48%).

|  |
| --- |
| **Do you think we need more affordable housing within the parishes for example first homes, affordable, shared equity or rented?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 47.7% | 159 |
| 2 | No | 52.3% | 174 |
| ***answered*** | **333** |
| ***skipped*** | **14** |

**Q15- Is any member of your household currently on the housing register i.e waiting list for socially rented housing?**

Mostly people answered no to Q15. However, some of the 6 respondents who answered yes stated that they have been on a waiting list between 1-5 years.

|  |
| --- |
| **Is any member/s of your household currently on the housing register, i.e. the waiting list for socially-rented housing?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 1.8% | 6 |
| 2 | No | 98.2% | 326 |
|  If yes, please state how many years? | 7 |
| ***answered*** | **332** |
| ***skipped*** | **15** |

**Q16- What do you consider to be the barrier for you of buying your first home?**

The respondents who answered Q16 had different reasons for the difficulties on buying their first home. The most popular option was acquiring the deposit followed by affording the cost of payments and the affordability of homes on the market.

|  |
| --- |
| **What do you consider to be the barrier for you of buying your first home?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Acquiring the deposit | 60.1% | 83 |
| 2 | Affording the mortgage payments | 28.3% | 39 |
| 3 | Affording the costs of owning a home | 32.6% | 45 |
| 4 | Homes available in the area are too expensive | 31.2% | 43 |
| ***answered*** | **138** |
| ***skipped*** | **209** |

**Q17- What type of housing is required in the area?**

There is a perceived need for additional affordable housing in the area. Forty-five percent of respondents identified this, followed by 32% who identified housing for first-time buyers, which of course could fall into the category of affordable housing. There was also support for more bungalows (25.7%) and sheltered housing for the elderly (25.4%).

Seventy-one respondents skipped this question and quite a few comments were received from people not wishing to see further new housing. A summary of the comments left includes:

* Affordable eco homes and energy efficient
* Homes with government schemes to support people getting on the ladder.
* Smaller housing so people can downsize and let families move into larger properties.
* Bungalows and supportive living for older people
* Places for the homeless
* Decent sized homes with fair sized gardens
* Not wanting anymore housing because of reasons like not having the road infrastructure to cope with more cars, do not want to expand the current boundaries, there are enough or too many houses, but we need more community infrastructure (GPS etc), already too crowded, inadequate facilities in the parish to cope, the area is supposed to be a quiet village, need to have countryside to enjoy.

|  |
| --- |
| **What type of housing is required in the area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Social housing | 15.9% | 44 |
| 2 | Flats/Apartments | 7.2% | 20 |
| 3 | Affordable homes | 44.6% | 123 |
| 4 | First time buyers | 31.5% | 87 |
| 5 | Sheltered housing for the elderly | 25.4% | 70 |
| 6 | Bungalows | 25.7% | 71 |
| 7 | Semi-detached homes | 15.2% | 42 |
| 8 | Detached homes | 15.9% | 44 |
| 9 | Terraced homes | 6.9% | 19 |
| 10 | Other (please specify): | 23.9% | 66 |
| ***answered*** | **276** |
| ***skipped*** | **71** |

**Q18- What size of new houses do you want to see built in the area?**

There is greatest support for smaller unit housing, of two or three bedrooms. There is least support for the larger 5 bed or bigger homes.

|  |
| --- |
| **What size of new houses do you want to see built in the area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | 1 bed | 24.9% | 54 |
| 2 | 2 bed | 54.8% | 119 |
| 3 | 3 bed | 68.7% | 149 |
| 4 | 4 bed | 18.9% | 41 |
| 5 | 5 bed or larger | 7.4% | 16 |
| ***answered*** | **217** |
| ***skipped*** | **130** |

**Q19- Would you be supportive of the neighbourhood plan identifying a site for development?**

Fifty-nine percent of respondents were not in support of allocating a site for development. Comments were left relating to people’s reasons for not supporting an allocation and potential areas for development, a summary includes:

* Opposing development as want the area to remain rural and to protect fertile agricultural land.
* Only infill sites & back fill plots should be developed
* Small-scale sites rather than major sites
* Already plenty of sites in GYBC Local Plan
* Shouldn’t develop more housing because the roads such as A143 not suitable for any more traffic and the area needs better public transport and community facilities/infrastructure first.
* Wildlife, walking areas and flooding would need to be considered.
* Concern about the village identity.

Site suggestions included:

* Hobland Road Area, Browston
* Burgh Castle Centre
* Area off Church Lane, Belton
* Field opposite Sports Centre on New Road, Belton
* Green meadow on St Johns Road opposite Minsmere Road
* Land off Beccles Road
* Sandy Lane, Church Lane or High Land
* New Road, Fritton (such as Tinks Wood area)

|  |
| --- |
| **Would you be supportive of the neighbourhood plan identifying a site for development?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 40.6% | 126 |
| 2 | No | 59.4% | 184 |
|  Please enter suggested locations below. | 87 |
| ***answered*** | **310** |
| ***skipped*** | **37** |

**Q20- What do you consider important for any new builds?**

The results indicate that energy efficiency is of critical importance, with this the most common response. The availability of infrastructure/services and parking are also important factors for most. Note that respondents could select more than one answer, and this is reflected in the percentages.

|  |
| --- |
| **What do you consider important for any new builds?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Energy efficiency | 73.0% | 224 |
| 2 | Gardens | 52.4% | 161 |
| 3 | Parking | 68.4% | 210 |
| 4 | Design and layout | 32.2% | 99 |
| 5 | Public transport | 43.6% | 134 |
| 6 | Infrastructure/Services | 69.4% | 213 |
| ***answered*** | **307** |
| ***skipped*** | **40** |

**Q21- What size of housing development would be appropriate for the area?**

Almost 40% of respondents feel there should be no further housing development in the area. Overall, a fifth of respondents to the survey felt there should be an additional 10-25 homes. Note that people could select more than one response to this question, so the percentages reflect that.

|  |
| --- |
| **What size of housing development would be appropriate for the area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Less than 10 homes | 16.6% | 54 |
| 2 | 10 – 25 homes | 21.2% | 69 |
| 3 | 25 – 100 homes | 14.8% | 48 |
| 4 | More than 100 homes | 2.2% | 7 |
| 5 | Infilling or individual homes | 15.7% | 51 |
| 6 | Brownfield site development | 15.1% | 49 |
| 7 | None | 39.1% | 127 |
| ***answered*** | **325** |
| ***skipped*** | **22** |

**Q22- Should all new developments have sustainable energy provision?**

Responses to this question confirm earlier findings that the energy efficiency of new development is important to residents.

|  |
| --- |
| **Should all new developments have sustainable energy provision?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 92.9% | 286 |
| 2 | No | 7.1% | 22 |
| ***answered*** | **308** |
| ***skipped*** | **39** |

## Environment

**Q23- Should we have a solar farm or wind farm in the neighbourhood plan area?**

57% of respondents were in favour of sustainable energy generation taking place in the neighbourhood area. A range of comments were left, including:

* Should not spoil the landscape or place solar/wind on Grade 1 or 2 Agricultural Land
* Windfarms should stay offshore/ out at sea
* All new houses should have solar panels and heat pumps, air sourcing or wind turbines
* Solar sites should be in keeping with the location and have boundary treatments such as trees/hedges so they are hidden from peoples view/not too intrusive
* Small solar farms are an option for the area, should be on low grade land, brownfield sites and would not affect local nature reserves
* Can get government funding and units based on community and land ownership
* Dependent on suitable sites
* Accept the need for more sustainable energy and if it will help the NPA community energy costs
* Would rather see the construction of sustainable energy sources than new built housing development.
* Rather solar over wind due to noise
* Energy needs to be more affordable/available

|  |
| --- |
| **Should there be a solar farm or wind farm in the Neighbourhood Plan Area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 56.5% | 177 |
| 2 | No | 43.5% | 136 |
|  Please add any comments you have in respect to this section: | 75 |
| ***answered*** | **313** |
| ***skipped*** | **34** |

**Q24- As tourism is a major employer within the NPA do you consider that:**

The majority of respondents were not in favour of expanding or establishing new tourism sites within the area.

|  |
| --- |
| **As tourism is a major employer within the Neighbourhood Plan Area do you consider that:** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Yes** | **No** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Further expansion of existing tourism sites should be permitted? | 77 | 256 | 333 |
| 2 | New tourism sites should be created? | 54 | 269 | 323 |
| ***answered*** | **333** |
| ***skipped*** | **14** |

**Q25- Do you think that the area has improved or got worse over the last ten years?**

Just under half of respondents to the survey felt that the area had got worse over the last ten years. A proportion of comments related to new development and its impact on local character, or the impact that increased population has had, such as on local service availability or increasing levels of traffic. Other comments related to the environment, including a loss of trees, green spaces or other green infrastructure. A summary of comments includes:

* Increase in population but there is a lack of local service infrastructure to support them, lack of public transport services, GP, dentists
* Too much over development/ housing being built such as estates and worry of the effect on the environment and prices of housing
* Poorly built homes such as Persimmons, not enough parking spaces in new development
* Too much traffic and problems with parking (blocking in driveways such as near Berry Close, Orwell Crescent) and need more EV charging points (option Tesco or the Sports Centre)
* Seems more like a town, area feels overcrowded
* More anti-social behaviour (crime, speed, litter, noise pollution effects humans/wildlife, less friendly neighbours/losing community spirit)
* Poorly maintained roads, potholes and reduced rights of way
* Country lanes have no footpaths, street lights, amenities or bus services
* More tourism in the area increases busy roads in holiday season
* Marina has expanded too much and taken vital wildlife habitat
* Upkeep of the area is lacking/ looking run down and untidy and concern of money cuts (lack hedge trimming etc)
* Shops/services are shutting and not much for young people to do, nothing in Burgh Castle except pubs.
* Loss of green spaces and trees, lack of access to Fritton Woods, undercover seating at Belton play area has been removed
* Poor rain drainage preventing access to village at times
* Holiday homes expanding from the north, do not want to see any more caravans
* Not feeling like their views are taking into consideration in planning decisions

|  |
| --- |
| **Do you think that the area has improved or got worse over the last ten years?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | The area has got better | 5.1% | 17 |
| 2 | The area has got worse | 49.2% | 163 |
| 3 | The area has not changed much | 45.6% | 151 |
|  In what way has it got better or worse? | 159 |
| ***answered*** | **331** |
| ***skipped*** | **16** |

**Q26- Although travelling to Caister recycling centre is not far in distance, due to traffic congestion it can take 2 hours. Would you like to see a recycling centre in Lothingland i.e. covering Belton, Browston, Burgh Castle, Fritton, St Olaves, Hopton and Gorleston-on-Sea?**

This was supported by 64% of respondents.

|  |
| --- |
| **Although travelling to Caister recycling centre is not far in distance, due to traffic congestion it can take 2 hours. Would you like to see a recycling centre in Lothingland i.e. covering Belton, Browston, Burgh Castle, Fritton, St Olaves, Hopton and Gorleston-on-Sea?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 64.0% | 215 |
| 2 | No | 36.0% | 121 |
| ***answered*** | **336** |
| ***skipped*** | **11** |

**Q27- What do you cherish the most within the area?**

It is clear that respondents value the area’s rural nature, including its landscape setting, views of and access into the countryside it enables, and natural features such as woodland and green open spaces.

|  |
| --- |
| **What do you cherish the most within this area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | The very mixed landscape character of the area i.e., farmland, marshland, woodland, reed beds and carr (waterlogged wooded terrain) | 84.7% | 288 |
| 2 | Public rural footpaths (Public Rights of Way) | 65.0% | 221 |
| 3 | Open / Green Spaces | 72.1% | 245 |
| 4 | Play areas | 25.0% | 85 |
| 5 | Allotments | 22.9% | 78 |
| 6 | The Parish churches and natural habitats of the graveyards | 46.8% | 159 |
| 7 | Views from Church Lane, Belton, over Caldecott and Fritton Lake | 45.3% | 154 |
| 8 | Views from the Fort, Angles Way and Market Road, Burgh Castle over the flat topography of the Broads | 63.8% | 217 |
| 9 | Views of the countryside | 76.5% | 260 |
| 10 | The Roman Fort Garianonum at Burgh Castle | 60.6% | 206 |
| 11 | Waveney Forest Fritton | 52.4% | 178 |
| 12 | The ‘Hanger’ woodland Burgh Castle (adjacent to the Roman Fort) | 38.5% | 131 |
| 13 | The 33 Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments within the Neighbourhood Plan Area | 35.3% | 120 |
| ***answered*** | **340** |
| ***skipped*** | **7** |

**Q28- Is there any local green space that you think should be protected within the neighbourhood plan?**

Q28 received 196 comments. The most common response was to protect all green areas so they are not lost to development, to protect wildlife areas, help mental health and wellbeing, to protect Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land and to keep access via footpaths for recreational reasons.

A range of specific green spaces were suggested, including:

* Fields around Belton park?
* Playing fields including near the school (such as Bell Lane Playing Field, Belton park/play area) (Parish owned)
* Fields on Beccles Road and New Road, Belton
* Field in front of Church Lane, Belton
* \*Bluebell Woods
* The Roman Fort and surrounding grounds, Burgh Castle
* Burgh Castle community centre (Trust)
* Bland Corner (Parish owned)
* \*Lound Lakes
* Fishing lakes (privately owned)
* \*Herringfleet Hills
* Waveney Forest, Fritton (privately owned)
* Belton Common (privately owned)
* Bell Lane, Church Lane and Sandy Lane
* Angles Way
* \*Hobland Area
* Browston Hall grounds and golf course (privately owned)
* \*Somerleyton fields

\* Not in NPA

**Q29- The neighbourhood plan could include a policy that protects really special views, for example those over the broads or of the church. What views would you want to see protecting?**

There were 180 suggestions of views to be protected. Many respondents said they want to protect all views of open space, because they add to the rural and peaceful living of the area and aids mental health and wellbeing. Specific comments included:

* Views over the Broads and marsh
* Views across the Broads from Waveney forest and views of Waveney Forest
* Along the river to the boat yards
* Burgh Castle and beyond over Breydon Water
* Field views alongside Church Lane, Belton
* Views over Caldecott
* Views of Fritton Lake
* Views from the fort
* Angles way
* Market Road via the Broads
* Over Fritton Woods
* New Road, Belton view
* Church lane
* Woodland and wetlands (views over the marsh from Fisherman’s Inn)
* All perimeter areas of the villages
* Views of the Churches

**Q30- Why did you move to the village you live in today, what do you think is special about it?**

For Q30, 282 people answered. Numerous comments were left including many regarding moving here for the rural and quiet aspect the area offered. These have been summarised below:

* Rural village character and be away from busy towns/be amongst the countryside
* The people/community spirit, nice place to bring up a family, safe area, close to other family members
* Rural and historic views, peace/quiet and tranquillity, unspoilt countryside, no light pollution, quiet roads and not over populated
* There was affordable housing at the time/not too expensive compared to other areas, and it was not too built up at the time/ convenient, had open spaces
* Area still has facilities need to access
* Easy access to larger services and reasonable proximity to Norwich, Great Yarmouth, Gorleston on Sea and Lowestoft
* Lots of history
* Nice walks and cycle paths
* It was low on traffic (not the case now)
* Proximity to marsh/wetland, woodlands, and diverse wildlife
* Retire to the countryside or many were born here and stayed
* Moved here for work purposes

## Looking forward

**Q31- Looking forward 10 years, how would you like Belton with Browston / Burgh Castle / Fritton with St Olaves to be described?**

Safe and rural are key aspects of how residents would like the area to be described. Almost three quarters of respondents identified these two characteristics. This tallies with responses to other questions, that indicate residents value the landscape/countryside.

A summary of people’s comments/suggestions in relation to this includes:

* Concern the village will change, wish for it to stay separate and small.
* Do not want a big housing estate joining up the villages (need a strategic gap)
* To build on the advantages of the village and not let this go downhill
* Become a vibrant rural community with thriving pubs and village assets or a new local shop
* Plant new woodland, trees and protect the countryside
* Stay safe and have low crime rates including less anti-social behaviour
* Access to rural pathways
* No further marina development or industrial buildings except on sites such as Edwards Loke, Belton & St Olaves Riverside

|  |
| --- |
| **Looking forward 10 years, how would you like Belton with Browston / Burgh Castle / Fritton with St Olaves to be described?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Accessible | 24.0% | 82 |
| 2 | Affordable | 27.8% | 95 |
| 3 | Attractive | 52.3% | 179 |
| 4 | Friendly | 62.3% | 213 |
| 5 | Prosperous | 14.9% | 51 |
| 6 | Safe | 74.0% | 253 |
| 7 | Rural | 72.2% | 247 |
| 8 | Urban | 1.8% | 6 |
| 9 | Tranquil | 57.3% | 196 |
| 10 | Vibrant | 3.8% | 13 |
| 11 | Unchanged | 37.1% | 127 |
| 12 | Other (please specify): | 6.7% | 23 |
| ***answered*** | **342** |
| ***skipped*** | **5** |

**Q32- What do you see as the biggest threats to your village today?**

This was a free text question and there were 288 responses. Many people identified development pressure or the impact of new homes **(here or nearby)** on infrastructure, traffic or the environment. A summary of comments includes:

* Increase in new development/over development which may not be in-keeping with the village and will cause a further strain on local services
* Building on greenfield sites and brownfield sites (leads to expansion)
* Flood risk (Surface and River) and pollution of waterways
* Over population (including tourism)
* No longer a village and will become connected to Bradwell and lose its rural identity.
* Expansion of the Marina and tourism and 11-month occupancy on holiday accommodation
* Becoming a village with little way of village life
* Loss of services/shops
* Losing green space, trees and the impact on wildlife
* Increase in traffic, speeding, potential crime and anti-social behaviour
* Threat of new quarries or gravel extraction
* Government concerns
* People needing to move out of the area due to costs
* Restrictions on sensible development
* Climate change

**Q33- Should the Neighbourhood Plan allocate land for any of the following business / employment creation uses? Tick all that are applicable.**

For Q33, this was multiple choice. There is strong support for a new medical/health centre with two thirds of respondents supporting allocation of land for this use. There was also lesser support for rural enterprises (36%), shops and retail (25%).

A summary of comments includes:

* Shops should be considered if they are viable/sustainable and rural enterprises might suit the area
* Make more use of the River Waveney and the sailing club area
* Opportunities for small local businesses is a good idea
* Small housing sites not large-scale sites, small starter homes, retirement housing
* Allotments
* Ideas = Board games café, post office, village store, education, local businesses, dentist, pharmacy, volunteer fire station, light industrial/craft units, secure field for dog to use, farming.
* St Olaves is too small an area for this.

|  |
| --- |
| **Should the Neighbourhood Plan allocate land for any of the following business / employment creation uses? Tick all that are applicable.** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Rural enterprises | 36.2% | 119 |
| 2 | Manufacturing units | 3.6% | 12 |
| 3 | Shops and retail | 24.6% | 81 |
| 4 | Food and restaurants | 20.1% | 66 |
| 5 | Starter units | 7.3% | 24 |
| 6 | Light industrial / workshop units | 10.3% | 34 |
| 7 | Tourism businesses (hotels, camping etc.) | 8.8% | 29 |
| 8 | Offices | 1.8% | 6 |
| 9 | Medical/Health Centre | 66.0% | 217 |
| 10 | Housing | 20.1% | 66 |
| 11 | None of the above | 18.5% | 61 |
| 12 | Other (please specify): | 10.9% | 36 |
| ***answered*** | **329** |
| ***skipped*** | **18** |

**Q34- Sand and gravel extraction in all three parishes occurs/has occurred/may occur. Would you be for or against further expansion of mineral extraction?**

Three quarters of respondents were against further expansion of mineral extraction.

|  |
| --- |
| **Sand and gravel extraction in all three parishes occurs/has occurred/may occur. Would you be for or against further expansion of mineral extraction?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | For | 23.2% | 75 |
| 2 | Against | 76.8% | 248 |
| ***answered*** | **323** |
| ***skipped*** | **24** |

**Q35- Do you experience any issues with the HGVs used in the process of sand and gravel extraction?**

This question was multiple choice. Most of the respondents indicated that the issues they have experienced from HGVS used for mineral extraction have been from the damage in the roads. A large number of respondents also said they have issues from noise and vibrations too.

|  |
| --- |
| **Do you experience any issues with the HGVs used in the process of sand and gravel extraction?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Noise/vibration | 42.7% | 93 |
| 2 | Damage to roads | 95.4% | 208 |
| ***answered*** | **218** |
| ***skipped*** | **129** |

**Q36- What concerns you most about further development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area?**

Key concerns include the loss of countryside, natural habitats, loss of village identity, impact on landscape setting, infrastructure availability and increased traffic and road safety.

A number of comments were left these covered similar issues which had been raised previously including increase crime rate, being against new development, services are unsustainable and loss of village groups socialising, development of holiday parks, turning from a village into a town, parking issues such as on verges. Other concerns were people felt that there are too many barriers in place which means nothing gets developed and that we need more housing so must compromise and consider costs and benefits. One comment said the need to use empty industrial land and need to make sure housing has character.

|  |
| --- |
| **What concerns you most about further development within the Neighbourhood Plan Area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Loss of village identity | 69.9% | 235 |
| 2 | Scale of development | 67.6% | 227 |
| 3 | Loss of natural habitats | 76.2% | 256 |
| 4 | Impact on Landscape | 68.8% | 231 |
| 5 | Inadequate parking | 45.2% | 152 |
| 6 | Loss of countryside | 78.6% | 264 |
| 7 | Increased traffic and road safety | 68.5% | 230 |
| 8 | Insufficient infrastructure | 67.6% | 227 |
| 9 | Impact on local medical and care facilities | 68.2% | 229 |
| 10 | Lack of school/childcare places | 47.9% | 161 |
| 11 | Unsafe pedestrian and cycle routes | 45.2% | 152 |
| 12 | Development incompatible with the area | 60.4% | 203 |
| 13 | Homes higher than two storeys | 36.0% | 121 |
| 14 | Other (please specify): | 7.4% | 25 |
| ***answered*** | **336** |
| ***skipped*** | **11** |

**Q37- Do you feel safe in the Neighbourhood Plan Area?**

For Q37, most of the respondents said they felt safe or fairly safe. A number of comments were left to explain people’s response, a summary of these includes:

* Worry about too many vehicles on the narrow roads, speeding which can be dangerous for cyclists and children.
* Little or no public transport can isolate all ages.
* Infrastructure issues and lack of police, ambulance response time, difficulty seeing a GP.
* Fairly quiet with a low crime rate and friendly neighbours who look out for one another.
* Occasional groups who are anti-social.
* Some are frightened to go out in the dark and would like more street lighting or to not have these turned off at night-time.
* Has been issues of theft and vandalism reported in the areas.

|  |
| --- |
| **Do you feel safe in the Neighbourhood Plan Area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 50.1% | 171 |
| 2 | No | 6.5% | 22 |
| 3 | Fairly safe | 39.3% | 134 |
| 4 | Don’t know | 4.1% | 14 |
|  Please explain the reason for your chosen answer: | 118 |
| ***answered*** | **341** |
| ***skipped*** | **6** |

**Q38- Are you satisfied with the Public Transport within the area?**

For Q38, most respondents felt satisfied with the public transport within the area. A number of comments were left on the improvements people would like to see including:

* More frequent bus services including ones running in the early mornings and evenings to Bradwell, Beccles and Great Yarmouth (such as the X11).
* Small buses running to local services/facilities such as the medical centre and supermarkets.
* Options for non-drivers to access education and health care without requiring bus changes at Gorleston.
* Bus service starting at St Olaves and more transport in Burgh Castle.
* Bus route to Lynn Grove High School, Millwood Surgery and Gapton Hall.
* Extra bus stop needed at Blue Bell Meadow and Capt Manbys.
* Need more buses into the smaller hamlets.
* Cannot rely on the bus and services currently don’t fit in with some employment schedules.

|  |
| --- |
| **Are you satisfied with the Public Transport within the area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 66.4% | 213 |
| 2 | No | 33.6% | 108 |
|  If No, what improvements would you like to see? | 101 |
| ***answered*** | **321** |
| ***skipped*** | **26** |

**Q39- Would you like a bus that serves Millwood Surgery?**

Over three quarters of respondents indicated they would like a bus service that runs to Millwood Surgery.

|  |
| --- |
| **Would you like a bus that serves Millwood Surgery?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Yes | 76.6% | 236 |
| 2 | No | 23.4% | 72 |
| ***answered*** | **308** |
| ***skipped*** | **39** |

**Q40- At what locations are you concerned with Road Safety issues?**

223 people responded and numerous locations were given - some residents indicated that road safety was an issue everywhere. Key comments were received about safety and parking issues at school times, the narrowness of rural lanes not being suitable for larger vehicles, limited number footways/pavements for pedestrians, issues around speeding and pavement parking. Some comments said how parking on Station Rd North in Belton is difficult for buses. New Road, Belton was most commonly mentioned, with people suggesting this is becoming a racetrack, and therefore should be subject to traffic calming measures. Some people mentioned the need to reduce speed limits in areas such as Burgh Castle, Bracon Road and New Road, Belton. There were many comments on the Beccles Road A143 crossroads/mini roundabout being dangerous. Some respondents said there needs to be better footpaths and cycle ways because of dangerous driving and better street lighting.

Specific area / streets named in people’s responses included:

Station Road, Heather Road, Belton Crossroads, New Road, Belton, Beccles Road, Belton, Bracon Road, Moorlands Way, Browston Lane, Cherry Lane, Lound Road, Browston Hall entrance, Junction at Browston Green, Hobland Hill, Station Rd North in Belton, Station Road South, main road A143 from Fritton to Bradwell, Church Lane, Herringfleet Road, Haddiscoe Dam, Quarry and Kingfisher caravan park, Waveney Drive, Butt Lane, Road to Great Yarmouth via Step Short, Mill Road, blind corner of A143 between Decoy Pub and Fritton village hall, Wild Duck entrance, bend of the road adjacent to Cement cottages, Cherry Lane garden centre (also issue walking here), St Johns Road, Moorland School, High Road.

**Q41- What should be done to help improve road safety at these locations?**

For Q41, 208 respondents answered. The most common response was to install speed cameras and reduce the speed limit. Other suggestions included:

* Speed cameras, speed checks, speed signs (flashing), speed bumps/traffic calming measures, reduce speed limits to 20-30mph, mirrors to see oncoming traffic, regular hedge trimming, fix potholes, larger road signs, community speed watch.
* Highlight the effects of poor parking on pavements, add yellow lines outside areas like the Fort and opposite junctions.
* Stop further development and encouraging more vehicles.
* Defined public footpaths which are safe.
* Create parking restrictions.
* Create wider roads, add a mini roundabout, pedestrian crossing, have a one way system, traffic island.
* Encourage people to use the cycle path.
* More streetlights.

**Q42- How much of a problem are the following issues?**

Of the three issues identified, traffic speed is of most concern to respondents.

|  |
| --- |
| **How much of a problem are the following issues?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Major problem** | **Minor problem** | **No problem** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Traffic speed | 153 | 139 | 44 | 336 |
| 2 | Traffic volume | 91 | 146 | 90 | 327 |
| 3 | Traffic noise | 50 | 147 | 121 | 318 |
| ***answered*** | **338** |
| ***skipped*** | **9** |

**Q43- To what extent do you think parking is a problem in:**

For Q43, the largest response rates for all of the parishes were that parking is a minor problem. However, there was mixed views after this on the areas regarding if there was not a problem or a major problem.

|  |
| --- |
| **To what extent do you think parking is a problem in** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Major problem** | **Minor problem** | **Not a problem** |  |  | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Belton with Browston | 74 | 122 | 98 | 3 | 2 | 299 |
| 2 | Burgh Castle | 76 | 99 | 67 | 7 | 3 | 252 |
| 3 | Fritton with St Olaves | 41 | 96 | 80 | 10 | 3 | 230 |
| ***answered*** | **338** |
| ***skipped*** | **9** |

**Q44- How important to you are the following features in the landscape?**

People were able to select more than one answer for this question, and most features were considered important by everyone.

|  |
| --- |
| **How important to you are the following features in the landscape? (please tick all that apply)** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Hedgerows | 86.7% | 294 |
| 2 | Woodland | 89.1% | 302 |
| 3 | Trees in the landscape | 88.2% | 299 |
| 4 | Water courses | 70.2% | 238 |
| 5 | Footpaths / Public Right of Ways | 87.3% | 296 |
| 6 | Green / Open Spaces | 82.9% | 281 |
| 7 | Open farmland | 72.9% | 247 |
| 8 | Wildlife and natural habitats | 92.0% | 312 |
| ***answered*** | **339** |
| ***skipped*** | **8** |

**Q45- Would you like to see more money spent on maintenance and/or creation of:**

Improving access into the countryside and walking routes is important to residents. There is also strong support for spending on the creation of wildlife areas.

|  |
| --- |
| **Would you like to see more money spent on the maintenance and/or creation of:** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Footpaths | 70.3% | 234 |
| 2 | Countryside walking routes | 70.3% | 234 |
| 3 | Open spaces | 47.7% | 159 |
| 4 | Green spaces | 58.9% | 196 |
| 5 | The creation of wildlife preservation areas | 69.4% | 231 |
| ***answered*** | **333** |
| ***skipped*** | **14** |

**Q46- What, if any, Social, Leisure and Recreational services, facilities, amenities would you like to see in the Neighbourhood Plan Area?**

As indicated by the responses to other questions, there is strong support for new medical facilities – GP surgery and dentist, which were selected by 76% and 64% of respondents respectively. Around a third of respondents also selected a post office, open spaces, grocery shop, and more frequent public transport.

Other suggestions included:

* Upgrade the local park
* Petrol station
* Reliable chemist
* Keeping the existing services
* Replace the allotments at Belton
* Aldi/Lidl or Restaurants
* Variety of small business units such as locally grown produce
* Safe place for dogs to go off lead
* Weekend/After school kids club/ more for children
* Refreshed look on some of the buildings (paint job)
* Golf driving range
* Swimming pool
* Social club, sport clubs, sailing club in Burgh Castle
* Benches along the riverside walks and footpath from New Road Fritton to Sandy Lane, Bridle Paths

|  |
| --- |
| **What, if any, Social, Leisure and Recreational services, facilities, amenities would you like to see in the Neighbourhood Plan Area?** |
| **Answer Choice** | **Response Percent** | **Response Total** |
| 1 | Community centre | 17.7% | 55 |
| 2 | Post Office | 34.7% | 108 |
| 3 | Sports facilities | 16.1% | 50 |
| 4 | GP Surgery /Health Centre | 75.9% | 236 |
| 5 | Dentist | 63.7% | 198 |
| 6 | Primary school | 19.0% | 59 |
| 7 | Secondary school | 14.1% | 44 |
| 8 | Open spaces | 37.6% | 117 |
| 9 | General/grocery shop | 33.1% | 103 |
| 10 | Public House | 17.7% | 55 |
| 11 | Public Park | 19.3% | 60 |
| 12 | Butchers shop | 21.2% | 66 |
| 13 | Bakers shop | 28.3% | 88 |
| 14 | Fruit n Veg shop | 22.8% | 71 |
| 15 | Florist shop | 5.5% | 17 |
| 16 | Car repair / service facility | 11.3% | 35 |
| 17 | A library | 10.9% | 34 |
| 18 | A youth club/centre/facility | 25.1% | 78 |
| 19 | Chemist | 27.0% | 84 |
| 20 | More frequent Public transport | 32.8% | 102 |
| 21 | Allotments | 18.3% | 57 |
| 22 | Other (please specify): | 15.1% | 47 |
| ***answered*** | **311** |
| ***skipped*** | **36** |

# Appendix 1- Example of the survey being advertised - on Belton with Browston Parish Council website[[1]](#footnote-1)



1. [Neighbourhood Plan - Belton with Browston Parish Council (norfolkparishes.gov.uk)](https://beltonwithbrowston.norfolkparishes.gov.uk/village-news/) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)