

## Examination of the King's Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan Review 2016 – 2036

### Hearing Statement from West Winch Parish Council (WWPC)

#### Matters Issues and questions

### Matter 5 Settlements and Sites

#### Kings Lynn and Surrounding area (Policy LP38)

79. Does The King's Lynn Transport Study and Strategy (2019) provide a robust model of traffic generation from the proposals?

Clearly not. It mainly covers King's Lynn with sketchy mention of the surrounding area and no attempt to grasp the implications of all the planned developments in the wider area. area.

#### West Winch Growth Area (policy E2.1)

126 Have the potential impacts of the proposed increase in development at the WWGA under Policy E2.1 on the highway network, air quality, ecology, heritage assets, landscape character, green infrastructure, flood risk and local amenity been adequately assessed? Is the wording of Policy E2.1 sufficiently clear and robust to ensure that any adverse impacts would be effectively mitigated?

WWPC are particularly concerned that the issue of surface water has not been adequately addressed. It is only in the last month that the developers have accepted that it is not possible to drain the surface water towards the Puny drain and they now propose to pump it North. There is concern that excess water would feed into storm overflows.

The DOE advises that "Rainwater should be treated as a resource to be valued for the benefit of people and the environment, not mixed with sewage or other contaminants.

Rainwater should be discharged back to the environment as close as possible to where it lands or channelled to a close watercourse without mixing it with sewage. "

The government is about to publish the review and decision regarding implementation of Schedule 3 to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. If implemented, this schedule would:

- Introduce standards for new sustainable drainage systems (SuDS);
- Introduce an 'approving body', and;
- Remove the automatic right to connect to the public sewer system, to prevent new developments adding more surface water to the combined sewer network when it rains.

130. The Countryside buffer referred to in Policy E2.2

WWPC welcome a strengthening of the countryside buffer and further feel that the countryside buffer should be extended south along the boundary of the village. Specifically, the area at the bottom of Gravelhill Lane should be removed from the growth area. E2.1. It was not originally included but was added at the behest of the landowner. The sustainability and environmental assessment for E2.1 is unsound.

132 Criterion 5 of part A to policy E2.1 linking traffic calming measures to development.

This policy has been a hindrance to the village since its adoption. It has meant that crossing points and calming measures which have been needed for the last 10 years cannot be implemented until some development takes place. Villagers daily take their life in their hands crossing the A10. It is a barrier to taking the bus or using the cycle path.

As there is no sign of when or if the Access Road will take the traffic and, in any case, new traffic from housing will add to the traffic, WWPC feel that these measures should be implemented in advance of the development.

133. Is Policy E2.1 justified and effective in not setting a threshold for the number of new dwellings that can be built before the proposed new road linking the A10 and A47 is completed?

At the moment the Borough and the developers are not only intending building to start before the road is complete but to recklessly start before there is even any confirmation that the road will be funded at all.

WWPC wants a commitment that the new road is built and open before any new houses are built. This has been our position from the start of the proposals. It is highly unlikely that having started to build and with infrastructure in place that the developers will stop building. Once building has started we believe they will in any case seek to remove any limits.

Opposition to commencing development before the road is in place is universal in the parish of West Winch (maybe excluding one or two land owners).

Originally the proposal was for the initial phase to access the development from the A47. While this would have impacted traffic it would have shielded the local residents from the worst effects of the road.

The proposed new roundabout was initially presented as having no impact on traffic. WWPC and North Runcton Parish Council (NRPC) found this to be frankly unbelievable so jointly commissioned their own transport consultant who found several serious "errors" in the modelling as presented by the developers.

Unfortunately, as this cost the parish councils over £1000 we are unable to afford further consultants to check the new modelling which has been carried out. It seems highly likely to be unsafe as e.g., it refers to the largest queue at the roundabout only being a few cars, whereas even now the traffic queues are back to Setchey and beyond.

It doesn't take a lot more than common sense to know that giving the traffic from a development of several hundred houses priority over traffic heading north on the A10 will increase delays considerably.

We also have the illustrative experience of the new roundabout on the A149 where most of the traffic is joining to go North but the queues cause considerable delays including back onto the Hardwick interchange.