

CABINET – 14 JANUARY 2014**COMMENTS FROM THE KING'S LYNN AREA CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
9 JANUARY 2014****4. Urgent Business under Standing Order 7**

The Chairman reported that there was one item of business which he proposed to accept as urgent, under Section 100(b)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, which was the Cabinet Report – Proposed Access Road between Edward Benefer Way and Lynnsport, which was due to be considered by Cabinet on 14 January 2014.

The Chairman also explained that he intended to present the Committee's comments to the Cabinet Meeting.

The Corporate Project Officer presented the Cabinet report which considered the options available to develop the proposal for the proposed access road between Edward Benefer Way and Lynnsport.

The proposals would enable the Council to be in a position whereby detailed costings could be put in place, a full business case could be completed and planning permission sought. This could then form the basis of applications for funding.

The Committee was reminded that the Council had previously submitted a bid for Pinch Point Funding to build a new road between Edward Benefer Way and Lynnsport, opening up access to the Councils housing land at Marsh Lane and Lynnsport. The bid was unsuccessful.

The Corporate Project Officer explained that the purpose of the report was to ensure that, when future funding opportunities arose, the project was 'shovel ready' which meant that the land needed to be within ownership or control of the applicant, the scheme was fully worked up and that Planning permission had been granted.

The Corporate Project Officer explained that three options had been considered for the new road, as detailed in the report. Option 3 was considered the preferred option as it had the ability to reduce the Environmental Impact of the scheme although it was the most expensive.

The Chairman thanked the Corporate Project Officer for his report and invited questions and comments from the Panel, some of which are summarised below.

In response to a query from Councillor Gourlay who made comparisons to the marina, the Corporate Project Officer explained that £361,170 was being asked for at this stage to ensure that the scheme was 'shovel ready'.

Councillor McGuinness raised concern that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would not cover the works proposed and asked whether any other sites had been looked at. In response the Corporate Project Officer explained that the CIL was not adopted Council policy yet. However early work had indicated that if the cost of the road was to be borne by the developer, then the scheme would not be viable and it would be unlikely that the Council would be able to procure a developer partner. On this basis, officers had consulted with Norfolk County Council and the two LEPs to discuss how these works might be financed. It was accepted that King's Lynn required more housing and it was considered that these two sites would not create such significant impact on the infrastructure.

The Corporate Project Officer explained that if housing was to be developed on the site the Internal Drainage Board had agreed to carry out the necessary drainage works to the culvert and build a pumping station which would divert water away from King's Lynn by pumping it into the culvert drain and then over pumped to the Ouse and Wash which would mitigate flooding and protect the centre of King's Lynn. The scheme would also bring significant benefits to King's Lynn as a whole.

Councillor Langwade stated that he sincerely hoped that option 3 would be supported by this Committee and Cabinet as it had greater advantages longer term. He added that the biggest problem was traffic congestion in that area. If option 3 went ahead, then it would not only help to alleviate the traffic congestion but would also receive additional benefits from the Drainage Board and protection for the town centre. He hoped that the Council would look at the longer term investment.

Councillor Langwade also asked that when the Borough sold the land to developers then it should ensure that the infrastructure was insitu before houses were built.

The Corporate Project Officer explained that because it was a major housing scheme the developer would have to build it all out within 5 years. He explained the proposed mix of tenures for the scheme.

Councillor Mrs Wilkinson asked that when the scheme reached the planning stage, could maintenance of the site be made clear in any planning consent granted, for example if fly-tipping occurred on private land.

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the Council could not guarantee that a company would not go bankrupt, and if a developer had held onto a piece of land and went into bankruptcy there was nothing that authority could do.

Councillor Gourlay made reference to parking bays and the fact that flytipping often took place on private land. He added that consideration needed to be given to these issues.

Councillor Loveless stated that he considered some of the issues raised were valid but needed to be considered at a later stage. He considered that option 3 was the better option.

Councillor Shorting also expressed support for option 3.

Councillor J Collop added that the opportunity existed to give consideration to these issues at the earliest opportunity and to get things right from the start.

The Deputy Chief Executive explained that the sites were Council owned and would remain so until the development was completed.

Councillor Mrs Wilkinson stated that as it was Council land, then she wished it to be recorded that the Council would be responsible for any activity left on the land that was cleared.

The Executive Director for Commercial Services added that he was confident that the Council would work together to arrive at a design which would alleviate the concerns expressed.

Councillor Joyce stated that under Section 33 of the 1990 Environmental Health Act, flytipping was the responsibility of the land/house owner.

Councillor Loveless asked that the plans displayed at the meeting, be available for public access.

AGREED: That the Committee supports the recommendation to Cabinet as follows:

1. That the Capital programme is amended to include the £361,170 split between 2013/2014 (£80,000) and 2014/2015 (£281,170) to enable the scheme to be made 'shovel ready'.
2. Instruct Officers to work up scheme Option 3 and submit the scheme for planning approval.