

Borough Council of
**King's Lynn &
West Norfolk**



**Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk's
Response to
the Issues and Questions raised by Inspector David
Hogger
in relation to the
King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan:
Site Allocations and Development Management
Policies**

Issue 32: Snettisham (G.83)

**Examination
November 2015**

Table of abbreviations used with the Council's Statements

Abbreviation	Full Wording
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BCKLWN	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
BDC	Breckland District Council
CLG	Communities and Local Government
CITB	Construction Industry Training Board
CS	Core Strategy
DM	Development Management
DPD	Development Plan Document
EA	Environment Agency
FDC	Fenland District Council
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GI	Green Infrastructure
GTANA	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment
ha	Hectare
HELAA	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
HLF	Heritage Lottery Fund
HRA	Habitats Regulation Assessment
HSEHA	Health and Safety Executive Hazard Areas
IDB	Internal Drainage Board
KRSC	Key Rural Service Centres
KLATS	King's Lynn Area Transportation Strategy
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
LPSO	Local Plan Sustainability Objectives
NCC	Norfolk County Council
NE	Natural England
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NORA	The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area
NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust
OAN	Objectively Assessed Need
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PPTS	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
RV	Rural Village
RAF	Royal Air Force
RLA	Residential Land Assessment
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SADMP	Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSF	Site Sustainability Factors
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuD	Sustainable Drainage systems
SVAH	Smaller Villages and Hamlets
SWMP	Surface Water Management Plan
THI	Townscape Heritage Initiative
UPC	Un-attributable Population Change

32.1:

Would the proposed development at Snettisham (G83.1) have any impacts on the highway network or drainage infrastructure that could not be satisfactorily addressed?

1. Introduction

1.1. The Council's SA demonstrates that of all proposed options site G.83.1- Land south of Common Road and behind Teal Close (sites 189/549 & 1284) is considered the most sustainable option for development in Snettisham. This is further explained in the supporting text accompanying the proposed policy G.83.1.

2. Site Specific Issues

2.1. Site G.83.1- Land south of Common Road and behind Teal Close is to the north-west of the settlement and offers an opportunity to accommodate a residential development of up to 34 dwellings, which are close to services, with good access routes surrounding the site.

2.2. The representation made by Simon Bower (ID: 504753), Snettisham Parish Council delivers their concerns including the cumulative impact of development on the highway network, traffic issues and local drainage.

2.3. There have previously been two proposals for development to the northern part of site G83.1. The first, 13/01736/FM, was for 24 dwellings, was refused permission but granted permission on appeal, appeal reference: APP/V/2635/A/14/2220845. The BCKLWN had applied to judicially review this decision but are likely to withdraw the challenge following negotiations with Hopkins Homes. A second application, 14/00944/FM, which is a revised scheme of application 13/01736/FM, was submitted and has been permitted for a residential development of 23 dwellings. As part of the application, drainage issues have been addressed to an acceptable degree for permission to be granted by the BCKLWN.

2.4. A Flood Risk Assessment was undertaken by JMS Consulting Engineers Ltd before the permission was granted and it made reference to Surface Water Drainage, specifically in section 6.1.6 which states, 'The retention basin proposed has an area of around 240m² with a depth of only 300mm and volume of approximately 55m³. Combined with the swales it has been shown that there is sufficient storage on the site to contain the maximum storm event without flooding outside these features. The retention basin will also act as an infiltration basin and to provide tertiary treatment of the surface water

through sedimentation and filtration, combining with the permeable pavements and swales to provide a complete train of water quality treatment.'

- 2.5. The Council has worked in conjunction with Anglian Water throughout the plan process and policy G.83.9 of the SADMP proposed document acknowledges how the IDB for King's Lynn states that there is a need for careful surface water drainage design to avoid increasing the risk of flooding on drains south of Snettisham.
 - 2.6. The Highways Authority has commented that the proposed site is acceptable for inclusion in the plan back at the Preferred Options stage. The Highway Authority notes that subject to a safe access and safe visibility being achieved onto Common Road the Highway Authority would not object if this site were included in the plan. These issues have been addressed in the proposals listed above. This allocation is the preferred site for this settlement. Following consultation with Norfolk County Council, acting as the Highways Authority, there is no objection to the development subject to the conditions listed in the planning permission decision being adhered to.
 - 2.7. The SA identifies that no one option would result in a highly positive effect overall in all of the categories. As is stated in the SA, the proposed site is located within Flood Zone 1, hence the positive score for 'flood risk'. The score for 'highways & transport' reflects the fact that the Highway Authority identifies this location as their preferred site in Snettisham. The selection of an allocated site for development is dependent on a combination of the SA, site specific factors and consultation responses received to date.
 - 2.8. Response to the Preferred Options consultation indicated that the Parish Council and the Highway Authority favoured the preferred options site 189/549.
 - 2.9. The SA concludes that G83.1 is reasonably close to services and the location between existing housing means that development would take the form of an infill development. Allocation of site G83.1 provides an opportunity to meet the desired growth numbers for Snettisham.
3. Conclusion
 - 3.1. Overall the Council considers the impacts on the highway network and drainage infrastructure to be satisfactorily addressed in the SA and is a sound choice based on all options put towards the site allocations process.