

# MAJOR HOUSING CONSULTATIVE GROUP

**Minutes of the 2nd meeting held on  
Monday 6<sup>th</sup> July 2015, 2pm - 4pm  
in the committee suite, BCKLWN Council Offices  
King's Court, Chapel Street, King's Lynn**

**Present:** Cllr Nick Daubney, Leader of the Council - Chairman  
Cllr Alistair Beales, Deputy Leader and Regeneration Portfolio Holder  
Cllr Sandra Buck, North Lynn Ward, BCKLWN  
Cllr Andy Tyler, North Lynn Ward, BCKLWN  
Cllr Patrick Rochford, Gaywood North Bank Ward, BCKLWN  
Ray Harding (RH) – Chief Executive, BCKLWN  
Dale Gagen (DG) – Corporate Projects Officer, BCKLWN  
Justin Coote (JC) – Lovell Partnerships Ltd  
Fergus Bootman (FB) – LanRonde Wright, Planning Consultants  
John Hiskett (JH) – Norfolk Wildlife Trust  
Quentin Brogdale (QB) – Resident Engineer, Norfolk County Council  
Michael Coote (MC) – Marsh Lane Residents' Association  
Paul Foster (PF) – Representing LARA (Lynnsport Area Residents' Association)  
Joy Franklin (JF) – Sedges Residents' representative  
Les Thurlow (LT) – North End/North Lynn Neighbourhood Partnership  
Charles Lankfer (CL) – Pelicans Hockey Club  
  
Sue Dickinson – Project Support Officer and minute taker, BCKLWN

**Apologies:** Cllr David Collis, Norfolk County Council  
Roger Partridge (RP) – Sports Development Manager, Alive Leisure  
Simon McKenna – Alive Leisure  
George Dann - IDB  
Nicole La Ronde (NLR) – LaRonde Wright, Planning Consultant

## 1. Welcome

Cllr Daubney welcomed everyone to the meeting.

As some representatives and councillors had changed since the last meeting, everyone introduced themselves and the organisation they represented.

The Chairman commented that he considered it extremely discourteous that LARA had not informed the group in advance who their representative would be. He added that the purpose of the group was for people and organisations in the immediate vicinity of Lynnsport, who would be directly affected by the development proposals, to air and discuss their concerns and it was therefore inappropriate that the LARA representative attending was not a local resident.

## **2. Minutes of the last meeting**

The minutes of the last meeting, held on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2015, were agreed as a correct record.

## **3. Matters arising**

There were no matters arising.

## **4. Update on the new road from Edward Benefer Way to Lynnsport**

### Current state of Planning

DG updated the meeting. Planning permission for the new road was granted on 10 April and work was in progress to discharge the pre-start conditions. Condition 3, relating to the water vole mitigation plan, had already been discharged. An application to discharge conditions 4, 5 and 6 relating to the detailed plans for the access roads, off-site highway works and construction management had been submitted and was currently pending a decision by the planners.

Condition 8 relating to drainage was awaiting completion of the design, while Condition 9 regarding the archaeological written scheme of investigation (WSI) was being prepared and was expected to be submitted by 20 July.

### Highway Design and Construction

QB reported that the county's highway engineers were working on the detailed design of the drainage and the structural design of the culverts. Specialist designers were involved and the structural design of the long culvert was almost complete. All the proposals would require the approval of the Internal Drainage Board (IDB).

MC asked if the road proposals had the support of Norfolk Police and if they had been safety checked. QB confirmed that all road proposals were reviewed by the police and safety audited 4 times, at feasibility, detailed design, implementation and 1 year following completion. He confirmed that amendments could be made if problems were identified.

JF asked about the status of the drainage designs, as the IDB were stating on 30<sup>th</sup> June that they had not seen them. DG and QB explained that a recent meeting had taken place with the IDB when many issues had been discussed in detail. Following this, a lot of information had been sent to the IDB within the last week.

JF noted that with effect from 15<sup>th</sup> April, NCC were now the Lead Local Flood Authority and a statutory consultee for planning applications. She asked if they would be consulted on the emerging drainage proposals for the road, or whether they would be excluded because the road had been granted planning permission prior to them assuming this role. She suggested they should be invited to send a representative to these meetings in future.

DG responded that drainage design was being led by NCC, so everything would be built to their standards. QB added that a representative from the relevant section at NCC could be invited to the meetings, but due to their workload, it was unlikely they would be able to attend.

### Draining the pond

DG explained that draining the pond (which would be the site of the new car park, with drainage attenuation crates underneath) had had to be postponed due to nesting birds being present on the surface of the water as well as in the reeds. A further inspection would be made in September to determine when this work could start.

### Timetable

DG said that a start on site was anticipated in September and construction would take about 18 months. Once the surface water drainage condition had been discharged, a detailed timetable of the various phases of construction would be drawn up and shared with this group at the next meeting.

### Proposed one-way system

DG outlined the proposal for a one-way route around Reid Way and Front Way which LT had put forward at the last meeting. He explained this had been put to the county highway planners with a request for a site meeting to discuss it, but this had been refused. The highways planners had taken the view that the existing plans were suitable and a one-way system was unlikely to be required. However, issues of congestion and safety would be monitored during the first year following the construction of the road, and if there were problems, modifications could be made.

Cllr Beales expressed his disappointment that NCC had refused a meeting, as he had been keen for this to take place. He said NCC had not wished to become involved in what they perceived to be a local political matter. Whilst this perception was wrong, he acknowledged that they were not refusing to amend the plans if they proved to be problematic in practice.

LT expressed his concern that NCC had refused to meet, despite a request from the leader and deputy leader of the council, which he felt was discourteous both to them and to local residents. He said it was not a political issue, but purely a practical matter which he would take up with his local county councillor. He was sceptical that any amendments would be implemented in the short term, even if the need for them was clearly demonstrated, and it would be local residents who had to suffer the consequences.

Cllr Beales understood LT's point of view, but noted that the borough council generally had good relations with the county highways department, and reiterated their willingness to review the road layout if congestion occurred.

LT thanked Cllr Beales for his efforts to arrange a meeting.

## 5. Marsh Lane Housing

### Feedback from public consultation on 4<sup>th</sup> June

FB explained that, following the submission of the planning application on 27<sup>th</sup> May, a public consultation day had been held at Lynnsport on 4<sup>th</sup> June from 10am-8pm. Approximately 50 people had attended during the day, with the majority of the feedback being neutral or positive. Many people felt this was a reasonable location for housing. Issues raised included:

- Impact of the pile foundations on nearby properties, which would be addressed by using auger piling.
- Concerns for the wildlife in the area, particularly muntjac deer
- Concerns about the traffic
- Concern that there were no bungalows

A group of people from LARA had arrived towards the end of the day and their more detailed, individual concerns had been discussed.

### Current state of Planning

FB said that the planning decision was anticipated in September – it was hoped that the application would go before the planning committee on 7<sup>th</sup> September.

A couple of comments had been received, one regarding overshadowing and another because an out of date set of standards had been used in the air quality report. This was being addressed.

### Acoustic concerns

JF asked about the acoustic assessment as the same report which had been prepared for the road application was also being used for the housing applications. This being the case, she asked why no sensitive receptors for noise and vibration had been placed on the Sedges, as some Sedges properties were only 10m or 11m from the boundary of the Marsh Lane development – much closer than the position of any of the receptors used for the report, which were all adjacent to points along the road.

JC commented that the planners had not required a separate acoustic report for the housing as part of the planning application.

JF pointed out that there were 240 houses on the Sedges, some of which suffered from subsidence, and were therefore likely to be particularly sensitive to vibration.

DG said that everyone was aware that the Sedges were built on a concrete slab which could be affected by vibrations, and for this reason, care had been taken to find a contractor to use auger piling. He was aware that a small number of house owners had complained about cracking already during the archaeological works, as a lump of concrete had been lifted and accidentally dropped. Their claims were being investigated. Before the construction of the houses began, nearby residents would be offered surveys of their property as a benchmark against which to assess any damage, and any caused would be covered by insurance.

JF said that there was a fault line across the estate where subsidence was most prevalent and because of this, damage was likely along the fault line and not necessarily only in the properties closest to the boundary. This should be taken into account when determining which properties should be offered surveys.

JC added that Lovell's were investigating using the smallest possible rigs, to minimise impact, and any larger rigs found necessary would be used for the shortest possible time.

Cllr Daubney said that this was clearly a complex issue which he needed to understand more fully. He would study the acoustic report and find out more before contact JF to discuss further. He said she would be welcome to contact him direct about her concerns in the future.

#### Construction traffic

MC said that 2 people had written to him with related concerns about the increase in noise and vibration from increased traffic through the estate, while 2 others had spoken to him about construction traffic.

JC assured him that all construction traffic would approach the site by the agreed route through the industrial estate, not through the housing. All contractors would be made aware of this and clear signage would back this up. Cllr Daubney also offered reassurance on this point, saying that regulations on construction traffic were much stronger than in the past and he was confident this would not be an issue.

#### Sewage and Drainage

MC asked about the capacity of the sewers. He said an earlier scheme in 1995 had indicated that the sewage capacity was incapable of carrying any more.

JC said that he had assurances from Anglian Water that capacity exists for the additional housing.

DG said that all sewage from King's Lynn travels to the pumping station near Tesco's and is pumped across the river for processing. The system was being upgraded and the capacity increased to ensure it could cope with the additional amounts. He added that Anglian Water would be holding talks with the council and Lovell's to discuss the plans and legal agreements would be put in place.

A similar approach was being taken with regard to electricity, as there would be a new ring main to cope with the extra loads.

#### Crime

JF noted that Mark Stokes, a Secured By Design consultant, had responded to the planning consultation and his recommendations were on the website. She said there had been an alarming increase in crime around the Marsh Lane area, with 343 crimes and incidents of anti-social behaviour reported. She gave a breakdown of the types of crime which included 120 ASB incidents. Permeability was the biggest issue and she was concerned this would be increased with the new development as there were several through routes. She sought assurances that the housing and the development as a whole would meet Secured By Design standards and that the

Safer Neighbourhoods Team would be looking at these issues to make whatever improvements were possible.

JC confirmed that the individual dwellings would meet Secured By Design standards. Cllr Beales acknowledged that, whilst this was partly a planning issue, there were wider interests including NCC and the Police, and all interested parties would be involved as necessary.

## **6. Lynnsport 3**

### Feedback from Public Consultation on 22nd June

FB reported on the public consultation day for the Lynnsport 3 development site which had been held at Lynnsport on 22<sup>nd</sup> June from 10am-8pm. This had been held prior to the submission of the planning application. Approximately 50-70 people had attended. Only 3 feedback forms had been completed on the day. Two of these objected to the principle of the development and the third raised concerns about the design. All the information available on the day was now available to view on the LaRondeWright website (with a link to this from the BCKLWN website).

### Current State of Planning

FB explained that Lynnsport 3 would be the next of the development sites to be submitted for planning consent. It was anticipated that the planning application would be submitted later this month, for a decision in the late autumn. If approved, a start on site would be likely early in 2016.

54 houses were proposed, with 8 of them to be affordable housing, in line with policy. Indicative layout and elevations plans had been prepared and a mix of traditional materials, including red and buff bricks and cream render, was proposed. The development would be tenure blind, with the affordable properties built to the same specification as the rest. The main access into the site would be from the new road, but the existing access to the adjacent North Lynn allotments would be retained. A footpath would run through the west of the site on a roughly N-S line and 2 green open spaces were included.

Cllr Beales said that he had been keen to remove the southernmost point of the site from the development, to retain better cohesion of the open spaces around Lynnsport and this had now been achieved. He also wanted to improve the planting along the boundary of the site with the new road, to create a green screen.

JC said that the development would be screened from the road as far as the provision of utilities allowed.

## **7. Sports Pitches**

DG explained that the planning application to build 2 new all-weather hockey pitches and 4 new tennis courts had been submitted for planning consent and was due to be determined at the end of July. They were being procured through the hockey and FA framework, which meant they would be specified and built by specialists in this

field. If all went according to plan, a start on site would be made in September. It would take around 3 months to deliver one of the pitches and up to 6 months to complete both but all efforts were being made to ensure one pitch was available for the Pelicans club as early as possible.

A road crossing from the Lynnsport building would be provided and all the details were available for comment on the council website.

LT asked if the new pitches meant that the existing junior grass football pitch would be lost. DG responded that the second hockey pitch would be multi-purpose and could be used for football, whilst the artificial surface meant that it could be played on in all weathers, so overall provision would be increased.

Cllr Beales commented that the Sunday league usually used the River Lane pitches which were not affected by the developments.

Cllr Tyler asked if, overall, there were any sports which would be losing out as a result of the changes. DG said that from his discussions with all the various sporting organisations, all had acknowledged that on completion of the works, provision for all sports would be either improved or increased.

CF supported this view. He said the Pelicans run 9 clubs already and aim to be the No.1 club in Norfolk. He is regularly approached by schools to use the pitches for hockey and other sports and there is general support for the proposals.

Cllr Rochford asked about charges for use of the pitches, and sought assurance that costs would not increase on account of the developments. DG explained that charges would remain in line with current rates. Alive Leisure now ran the facilities, but they were not bearing the costs of the improvements, so they had no additional costs to cover or pass on.

Cllr Beales said that one of the key objectives was to improve and increase sporting facilities and it would make no sense to make them inaccessible due to costs. Charges would remain reasonable. He added that the costs of boots and equipment tended to be more of an issue for participants, rather than the hire of the playing areas.

JF asked if the area now proposed for Fields in Trust status would remain available for children from the estate to use free of charge as an informal play area and this was confirmed.

LT suggested an allocated area should be identified for dog walking. JH said that the area south of Lynnsport 5 was potentially suitable for this. Without being too proscriptive, dog walking routes might help manage the area for wildlife. It was agreed that DG should continue to work with JH on this issue.

DG added that he was also working with the Rivers Authority to improve the area south of Lynnsport 5 and the river to the east of the Dutton Pavilion.

## **8. Miniature Railway**

DG provided an update on the relocation plans. The miniature railway would be moving to the open area south of the Shed. Club members were currently working on making the new points, which, because of the dual track, were not available to purchase commercially. DG would be ordering other materials imminently. The move was planned for Sept/Oct and the new track would be in place before the old one was closed. The club were happy with the plans.

MC asked if there would be CCTV coverage of the new track area. This was not known but Cllr Beales suggested it might be possible for the area to be covered by roving cameras.

Cllr Tyler asked if there would be improvements as a result of the move to help attract more visitors and members. DG said it would be more visible with easy access. MC added that the rides were exceptionally good value at 50p but they would welcome greater publicity once the move had taken place. Cllr Beales said that the council could help with more publicity at the appropriate time. Cllr Rochford said that Cllr Thomas Smith would be happy to help as he was a train enthusiast.

## **9. Later Phases: Lynnsport 4 & 5 and Lynnsport 1**

JC outlined the planned later phases. A planning application for Lynnsport 4&5 was anticipated in September with a start on site expected around June/July 2016.

The Lynnsport 1 application would not be submitted until spring 2016 and would not be on site until mid- 2018.

Cllr Tyler asked how many dwellings were proposed for Lynnsport 4&5. JC responded that 92 were currently planned.

MC commented that the pavement kerbs had never been properly finished along Greenpark Avenue. DG explained that this was because Greenpark Avenue was not an adopted highway. Once the development went ahead and the utilities were installed, the pavements would be properly completed.

## **10. Any other business**

### Collapsed drain

MC commented that there appeared to be a collapsed drain between the two ponds. DG said he was aware of this and plans were in progress to repair it prior to the building of the new sports pitches.

### Bungalows

Mc asked if any further thought had been given to providing bungalows. He suggested that dormer bungalows might meet the Environment Agency's requirements, while providing elderly and disabled people with more suitable accommodation.

JC acknowledged there were no bungalows on Lynnsport 3, but said they were looking at trying to provide some on the other sites, providing they met the EA's requirements.

Cllr Daubney said that, whilst the Environment Agency's requirements clearly had to be met, the council also wanted to provide for all housing needs, so this would be further investigated.

### **11. Date of next meeting**

Cllr Daubney thanked everyone for attending and contributing to the discussion.

The next meeting would be held in September, around the time when Lynnsport 4 & 5 were due to be submitted for planning consent. Dates would be circulated nearer the time.

### **Agreed Actions:**

- A road construction programme to be shared with the consultative group at the next meeting.
- Cllr Daubney to familiarise himself with the acoustic report and related issues and contact JF about her concerns.
- Lovell's to ensure that a robust green screen of trees and hedging be planted between Lynnsport 3 and the new road, insofar as utilities provision allowed.
- DG to work with the Norfolk Wildlife Trust on improving the area for wildlife and identifying suitable areas for dog walking.
- The council to assist the miniature railway with improved publicity, following relocation.
- Lovell's to investigate the possibility of providing bungalows or dormer bungalows on the later phases of development.