

King Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies EIP
Representor : J R Maxey MA, FRICS, FAAV, Maxey Grounds & Co LLP
on behalf of Elgood & Sons Ltd
Representation reference : 285
Hearing Matter Number: Issue 41

1. I represent Elgood & Sons Ltd owners of the site of the former Three Tuns Public House. We are happy to submit further representations to the Inspector in this written statement given that it enabled the Inspector to avoid a hearing session just involving ourselves and the Council
2. We are supportive of allocation area G113.1 which is primarily owned by my clients (apart from the small village hall section. Our objection to the policy G113.1 and the reason that we consider it unsound, particularly as my client site has previously had planning consent for 7 dwellings (the number now proposed for the enlarged site including the village hall area), is the requirement in part 2 of the policy for development to be subject to relocation and replacement of the current village hall.
3. It is understood and accepted that the village hall element of the allocation should not be redeveloped without the relocation and replacement of the facility, and it is understood that are proposals for this to be relocated to the playing field where it could serve a multiuse function. However this is subject to suitable financing of the project, part from the value of the existing site and part from grant and other funding resources. What makes no sense, particularly in the light of the past consent which the Council were happy to approve, is to constrain the development of the remainder of the site should those financial resources not be forthcoming.
4. The scale of the site, the access to it and the general arrangements which are proposed to be linear development fronting Barrier Bank and with access from Main Street over land which is in my clients ownership are such that my clients site could be developed in isolation without prejudice to the separate development of the village hall. There is no justifiable reason to require the whole area to be developed as one. If the village hall was not to obtain funding to move, development of the remainder would not be prejudiced nor would it prejudice the continued operation of the village hall.
5. It is therefore submitted that part 2 of the policy is both unnecessary and unsound and only serves to constrain the delivery of the remainder of the site by my clients, and should be amended to read

“The development of the village hall element of the allocation is subject to the relocation and replacement of the village hall”
6. My clients will cooperate with the Parish Council to try and ensure that the village hall relocation occurs, but if best efforts to achieve this by the Parish Council are not successful I

King Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies EIP
Representor : J R Maxey MA, FRICS, FAAV, Maxey Grounds & Co LLP
on behalf of Elgood & Sons Ltd
Representation reference : 285
Hearing Matter Number: Issue 41

submit it is not sound to prevent 35% of the development proposed for the village occurring when in reality the majority of that 35% is deliverable.