

# Adrian Folker

**Mr David Hogger** BA Msc MRPTI MCIHT  
The Local Plan Programme Office  
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk  
Kings Court  
Chapel Street  
Kings Lynn  
West Norfolk  
PE30 1EX

12Jan16

Dear Mr Hogger,

**King's Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan:  
Site Allocations and Development Policies 2011 - 2016;  
Resumed Hearings;**

**In Particular: Gayton; Site Ref Nr: 66**

**Land to the South of and adjoining the (long closed) Rampant Horse Public House**

I write further to my attendance at the proceedings at South Lynn Community Centre on 5Nov15 and to my last letter to you dated 6Nov15.

I previously wrote taking the lead from one of the participants, who presented further and additional written clarification of a previously submitted argument at the hearing. This letter is again at the request of the joint freehold owners of the above village-centre land who are Borough residents of long Norfolk descent and it is in response to The Council's Document FW20, November 2015 entitled:

*"Follow up work in relation to the Examination into the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, regarding question in Gayton and Pott Row"*

FW20 includes a list of current applications in Gayton. This list includes a permitted scheme at the former Rampant Horse site (15/01264/F) for the change of use from a former public house to four residential dwellings and associated works.

Issue 2 of FW20 contains an update of the current scenario in relation to the Sustainability Appraisal's Reasonable Alternative Sites. This analysis sets out a significant change in the sustainability score of site 66.

In the original Sustainability Appraisal submitted with the Plan, Site 66 had been scored negatively for two sustainability factors: "Community & Social" and "Economy A Business". However, as noted in Document FW20 these negative scores for site 66 are no longer appropriate. FW20 does not set out what the revised sustainability scores of the site would be and neither does the *Proposed Minor Modification to the Sustainability Appraisal Report Incorporating Strategic Environment Assessment for the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Pre-Submission Document* state what the revised sustainability scores for the site would be.