

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**

Welney Update

November 2015

Document reference no.	FW21
------------------------------	-------------

1. Issue

1.1 In relation to Policy G113.1 clause 2. Could part of the site be developed without relocation of the village, as per representation 285 (JR Maxey)?

2. Response: Modification to the Site Description and Justification for Policy G113.1 Welney, Former Three Tuns/Village Hall

2.1 The second clause of Policy G113.1 states:

‘2. Development is subject to the relocation and replacement of the village hall;’

The Site description and Justification, at paragraph G.113.6 states:

‘G113.6 The site is brownfield in nature and development is linked to the relocation and replacement of the existing village hall. There was previous planning permission for seven houses on the site, but this has now expired. The Council considers the site is capable of accommodating the 7 residential units required in the settlement at a density reflecting that of the surrounding area. The local highways authority has no objection to this site providing safe access is achieved from Main Street’

2.2 Site G113.1 comprises land in two ownerships, part is owned by Elgood & Sons Ltd and the other part is owned by the Environment Agency (EA). The EA owned element at present is leased to the Parish Council and currently hosts Welney Village Hall.

2.3 As mentioned within SADMP Pre-Submission representation 285 (J R Maxey) the agent representing the Elgood & Sons Ltd part of the site, states that as their part of the site had previous planning permission, and as part of an allocation it could still be capable of coming forward without the part of the site owned by the EA. Therefore the Elgood & Sons Ltd portion of the site should not be hindered by the remaining portion of the allocation, not being able to come forward at the same time.

2.4 The site as envisaged by the SADMP would provide at least 7 dwellings, in a frontage style development, therefore the above suggestion made within representation 285, could be possible.

2.5 This point is acknowledged by the BCKLWN within our Statement 'Issue 41 Welney' Examination November 2015, (CD 49). This should also be acknowledged within the SADMP. Below is the proposed revised wording for paragraph G113.6:

'The site is brownfield in nature and development of all of the site is linked to the relocation and replacement of the existing village hall. The Council would not want to see a community facility, the village hall, being lost without replacement. Ideally the site would come forward as one comprehensive scheme. There was previous planning permission for seven houses on the site, this excluded the village hall, but this permission has now expired. If the portion of the site that doesn't currently host the village hall came forward for development independently, this could be acceptable providing the development of this portion of the site does not inhibit the remainder of the allocated site coming forward and being developed.'

2.6 The remainder of the original paragraph will form a new paragraph, as below:

'The Council considers the site is capable of accommodating the 7 residential units required in the settlement at a density reflecting that of the surrounding area. The local highways authority has no objection to this site providing safe access is achieved from Main Street.'