

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



**Follow up work in relation to the Examination
into the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local
Plan: Site Allocations and Development
Management Policies**

**Terrington St. Clement/ Terrington St. John/ Tilney St. Lawrence
Response**

November 2015

Document reference no.	FW25
------------------------------	-------------

Terrington St. Clement

1. Issue:

- 1.1. Can the Borough Council include an additional clause in the policy (G93.3) for a footpath link to the west of the site?

2. Response:

- 2.1. The Borough Council does acknowledge and support the suggestion of including an additional clause in policy G93.3 for a footpath link to the west of the site but must consider the feedback from the Highways Authority when deciding if to include the suggested additional clause.
- 2.2. The Highway Authority has concerns regarding the issue of the suggested footpath across fields with it not meeting the footpath requirement that the Highways Authority requests to overcome its principle objection to the allocation. Further concerns raised are that such a link would be remote and could create issues of personal safety which in itself is likely to deter usage.

Terrington St. John

1. Issue:

- 1.1. Can the Borough Council consider the principle of allocating the whole site (KGB Transport Site (779/780)) given the appeal decision and the brownfield issues on the site?

2. Response:

- 2.1. The Borough Council acknowledges that the principle of development has been established with the permission granted on appeal (Ref: APP/V2635/A/2181075) after being refused by Planning Committee. Furthermore, the appeal decision has established a lack of conflict with CS Policy CS10 in relation to site 779/780. Following the decision to grant permission on appeal to a section of site 779/780, the Borough Council chose to allocate the site at Land east of School Road (G94.1) for an additional residential development of 35 dwellings. The proposal to further allocate the piece of land excluding the initial granted permission on site 779/780 would be considered by the Borough Council as it would result in the effective use of land but should be set at a fixed number of dwellings to meet demand.
- 2.2. The Sustainability Appraisal for Terrington St. John initially indicated that all the site options performed positively in terms of access/proximity to services due to the nature of the village and the range of services available. Site 779/780 also scored well in the scoring process but did fall down in the

scoring system compared to the proposed allocated site G94.1 in relation to its negative score in the category of Economy A Business. The site is well located and is in close proximity to services in the settlement. Subject to a safe access and footpath, the Highway Authority does not have objections to the site. Development on the rest of this site would not have an impact on food production as the site is mostly brownfield and the rest of the site is not in agricultural use. It is considered development on the site is not likely to harm the landscape character and visual amenity of the locality. The site is subject to medium flood risk (FZ2) as is the case with all sites in this settlement. A Flood Risk Assessment has been undertaken at the previous stage for planning application 11/01923/OM.

- 2.3. The representation made by Keith Hutchinson, the agent for the landowner Mr. K. G. Brown; raises concerns regarding the future of the remainder of site 779/780 which does not currently have planning permission. The Borough Council is aware that the landowners are looking to expand on land surrounding where development was permitted. The remainder of the site, although not actively forming part of the depot operation is within its overall curtilage and none of the land is Greenfield or open farmland. The agent suggests that development of this site would complete the residential development and be the most effective usage of the land. This is an unusual situation in that an area of land has been given permission on appeal, but leaves out the other land which would not be used if that permission were implemented. Logic suggests that it should be used comprehensively for residential use.
- 2.4. In view of the current situation regarding the Borough Council being judged to lack a five year housing supply, all applications which come forward are to be judged against Paragraph 14 of the NPPF which points out both plan-making and decision-taking should be undertaken with a presumption in favour for sustainable development. An application can come forward at any time in relation to the remaining land at site 779/780 and will be judged according to the current set up.
- 2.5. Overall, the Borough Council acknowledges that the site could be put forward for allocation. Potentially an allocation could provide 20 to 25 more housing dwellings, including affordable housing, to add to the housing supply in the settlement of Terrington St. John.
- 2.6. The policy team's preferred mechanism for bringing the land forward would be to designate the land as an allocation in the plan. In doing so, the Council is positively identifying the site to be allocated. This proposed allocation would have to be formally included in the plan process and put before the Council's members. Furthermore, this allocation would also have to be included in and consulted on as part of the list of Main Modifications which the Council is in the process of producing for the Inspector.