

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 January 2016 15:23
To: Programme Officer
Subject: Re: Amended Consultation Period for Publication of follow up work

F.A.O. Julie Belding.
Further to my phone call on Friday 8th January please find below my submission to the inspector as discussed.

A major drawback to any development of the former Del Monte factory site is that at the junctions with St Peters Road dangerous bends with extremely limited vision are present and it is the only road through the village. Not even heavy engineering traffic calming measures will do much to improve the ever present hazards. In addition, St Peter's Road is a 30mph route making heavy engineering traffic calming measures dubious methods to ameliorate the dangers.

A second drawback to development of the site is its close proximity to the river and the flood defences in situ. The local planning authority claims that land at Bankside, the former Del Monte factory site which is next to the river is less prone to flooding than land half a mile inland does seem to defy the basic ethics of planning and logic. The defences for West Lynn itself were upgraded in the early 1980s and are 1/100 years defences rather than 1/200 years.

The local planning authority argues that the site is suitable for 200 homes quoting a previous planning permission with similar density close by at the former Dredging & Construction site. However, this permission was never enacted upon and to date nor has a subsequent planning permission for a care village on the same site.

The land of the former Del Monte factory is reclaimed from salt marshes therefore the work required to make it usable for high density housing would be extensive and detrimental to existing properties with the amount of piling and groundworks required. It must be doubtful if inputs from such development would provide a commercial return. The agent for the owners of the site suggests that 200 homes is not viable and that no more than 120 homes is deliverable. Even at this suggested density level the development will do little if anything to enhance the local environment. I would suggest that if this site is suitable for any housing development it should be for much lower density, high quality purpose built properties that will blend in with the surrounding environment, enhance the view from the King's Lynn side of the river and at the same time have better flood defences most especially for the living area of any built properties. Over £4million was spent on improving the view from West Lynn via a millennium project and it must be only right for the view from the King's Lynn side of the river to be improved and not disrespected by high density housing that is at risk of flooding.

The claim is made that the site is well served especially regarding transport. The ferry is noted as providing transport into King's Lynn and I agree it is a valuable service. However, the ferry does not lend itself to be used by people with mobility problems (because of all the steps and having to walk on duck boards at low tides) also it only runs until 6.30pm and not on Sundays. It is also susceptible to the severe weather as recently seen when it could not run because of the gales. There is no GP surgery in the village so residents must use their own cars or have the expense of a taxi to get to a GP's practice, hospital or any other services in the town.

The Del Monte site is reasonably close to the village school. However, high density development on the site will place undue challenges on the local school. Inevitably the school will need to expand but has very limited space to do so without encroaching on its own recreational and sports area. When children reach secondary age their secondary school is designated by the LEA as Terrington High School. This will mean either the county council must provide transport which under financial pressures they may be reluctant to do so, or parents will need to arrange their own transport.

If the local planning authority wishes to expand the village by the numbers suggested there is land that has been proposed and subsequently rejected on Clenchwarton Road, West Lynn. This has much better access to facilities including primary schools.

Children would be able to attend Whitefriars school without any access to the main highway infrastructure via the cyclepath

that runs along the site. An alternative school is the new St Michael's school which can be accessed from Clenchwarton road

via a pedestrian controlled crossing on Wisbech Road. Attendance at either school would mean King Edward VII School is the

natural secondary school . There is a far superior bus service that serves this site than the former Del Monte factory site. All

round it is a far superior site for development and it beggars belief that it has been rejected on the grounds it is more liable to

flooding than the former Del Monte site as it is much further away from the river.

There has been a considerable amount of development in the viillage recently including Poppyfields, Hare Close, Bramley Close

which have already been built with more being proposed so the village cannot take much more without affecting its character.

therefore planners need to be treating West Lynn with careful consideration.

Yours sincerely

William Davison.

-----Original Message-----

From: Programme Officer <Programme.Officer@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>

To: Programme Officer <Programme.Officer@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>

CC: 'wdavison6981031 <wdavison6981031@aol.com>'; 'adrian <adrian@parkerplanning.co.uk>'; 'enquiries <enquiries@rmassoc.co.uk>'; 'Graeme.warriner <Graeme.warriner@turley.co.uk>'; 'David <David@maddoxassociates.co.uk>'; 'caroline.jeffery <caroline.jeffery@norfolk.gov.uk>'; 'KHNLives <KHNLives@long-acre.fslife.co.uk>'; 'neil.hall <neil.hall@amecfw.com>'; 'abrand <abrand@taguk.co.uk>'; 'Mike.Jones <Mike.Jones@rspb.org.uk>'; 'chris.collett <chris.collett@bartonwillmore.co.uk>'; 'WArkell <WArkell@geraldeva.com>'; 'cllrmds <cllrmds@hotmail.co.uk>'; 'loveday.kelvin <loveday.kelvin@yahoo.co.uk>'; 'Jean <Jean@downhammarkettc.co.uk>'; 'ronandjan <ronandjan@live.co.uk>'; 'rsnowling <rsnowling@morstonassets.com>'; 'davidcoleby <davidcoleby@markliell.co.uk>'; 'paul.sutton <paul.sutton@cheffins.co.uk>'; 'jamie <jamie@blubirdland.co.uk>'; 'nicole.laronde <nicole.laronde@larondewright.co.uk>'; 'draplanning <draplanning@btinternet.com>'; 'williamwelch <williamwelch@hotmail.co.uk>'; 'anita <anita@peoplesource.co.za>'; 'clerkclenchwarton <clerkclenchwarton@btconnect.com>'; 'ian.bix <ian.bix@ianbix.co.uk>'; 'sarah.evans <sarah.evans@wyg.com>'; 'falmerroad <falmerroad@ntlworld.com>'; 'herewardservices <herewardservices@hotmail.co.uk>'; 'greg.garland <greg.garland@btinternet.com>'; 'johnjowitt <johnjowitt@pjplanning.com>'; 'graham.wright <graham.wright@larondewright.co.uk>'; 'cllr.michael.pitcher <cllr.michael.pitcher@west-norfolk.gov.uk>'; 'edward.keymer <edward.keymer@keymer-cavendish.co.uk>'; 'WLusty <WLusty@savills.com>'; 'ianr <ianr@lanproservices.co.uk>'; 'fergus.bootman <fergus.bootman@larondewright.co.uk>'; 'scott <scott@holt-architectural.co.uk>'; 'keith <keith@hutchinsons-planning.co.uk>'; 'NSNF156 <NSNF156@gmail.com>'; 'clarkejeff <clarkejeff@btinternet.com>'; 'peter.lonsdale <peter.lonsdale@freshpeel.co.uk>'; 'info <info@peterhumphrey.co.uk>'; 'cahill864 <cahill864@btinternet.com>'; 'walpoleclerk <walpoleclerk@hotmail.com>'; 'chris <chris@acaciahouse.mail1.co.uk>'; 'SOUTH WOOTTON' <swpc@hotmail.co.uk>'; 'brian.500howard <brian.500howard@btinternet.com>'; 'jasongage <jasongage@hotmail.co.uk>'; 'Cllr Roy Groom <cllr.Roy.Groom@West-Norfolk.gov.uk>'; 'swinter108 <swinter108@btinternet.com>'; 'r.snowling@pigeon.co.uk' <r.snowling@pigeon.co.uk>; 'John.Jowitt@PJPlanning.com' <John.Jowitt@PJPlanning.com>

Sent: Wed, 16 Dec 2015 9:10

Subject: Amended Consultation Period for Publication of follow up work

Dear All,

N.B: -Please note the amended / extended consultation period, to allow for Christmas.

During some of the Examination Hearing Sessions, the Inspector requested that the Council produced follow-up work ('homework') on particular issues. This included clarifying the Council's policy approach, seeking further information and in some cases suggesting amendments to the Plan.

The Council has now completed this work and has submitted it to the Inspector for information/ consideration on Friday 11 December 2015.

[Inspectors Examination page](#)

The Inspector has requested **all comments should be received by Friday 15 January 2016 at 4pm**. This consultation period of just over four weeks includes an allowance for the Christmas period. It will enable people to respond to the information/ discussion within these papers. **It is important to note that the Inspector will only consider comments made by an individual / organisation that participated in that particular Hearing Session, and that no late submissions will be accepted.** The Hearing Sessions Agenda and Attendee list can be viewed here [http://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/pdf/September%20AGENDAS%20for%20resumption%20\(venue%20change\).pdf](http://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/pdf/September%20AGENDAS%20for%20resumption%20(venue%20change).pdf)

Next steps... As a result of this follow up work there may be proposed amendments / modifications to the Plan. These are still subject to Council approval, and following this would be publicised for consultation in February 2016

Julie Belding Temporary for Clare Cobley
Programme Officer
programme.officer@west-norfolk.gov.uk
01553 616811



[This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.](#)

www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/Default.aspx?page=24794
