

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

# **THE KING'S LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK LOCAL PLAN: SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES**

## **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

- including draft timetable

June 2015

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE KING'S LYNN AND WEST NORFOLK LOCAL  
PLAN: SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES  
2011- 2026 (SADMP)**

**Venue:** The hearing sessions will be held in the Wembley Room, Lynnsport,  
Greenpark Avenue, King's Lynn PE30 2NB, commencing on Tuesday  
7<sup>th</sup> July 2015 at **10.00am**.  
Please note earlier start time of **9.30am** for weeks 2 and 3.

**Statement deadlines:**

All Statements, for the Hearing Sessions must be sent to the Programme Officer by  
**midday on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> June**. This deadline relates to the receipt of the both **paper  
and electronic copies**.

**Statements:**

The Inspector requests written responses from the Council to all the matters raised.

Written Statements from Representors are not compulsory but if Representors feel a  
Statement is warranted they should seek only to answer the Inspector's Questions as  
far as they relate to their original representations.

**The examination starts from the assumption that the Council has submitted  
what it considers to be a sound Plan and that the Council has fulfilled its legal  
duty with regard to the Duty to Co-operate. The hearings will be concerned  
only with considerations relating to the soundness of the document and the  
legality of the process followed, and all submissions should address those  
issues as appropriate.**

The Guidance Notes provided set out the requirements for the presentation of all  
Statements. Its provisions should be thoroughly read and implemented as otherwise  
Statements could be returned. Please note the 3,000 word limit.

In the Statements from respondents it would be very helpful for the Inspector to have  
a brief concluding section stating:

what part of the SADMP is unsound;  
which soundness criterion it fails;  
why it fails (point to the key parts of your original representations);  
how the SADMP can be made sound; and  
the precise change and/or wording that you are seeking.

**The Inspector will give equal weight to views put orally or in writing.**

## **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS**

### **Preamble**

If the Inspector is satisfied that an Issue or question has been satisfactorily addressed in the submitted Statements it is possible that it may not be included in the final Agenda. Consequently the timetable and lists of participants may be subject to change, so please contact the Programme Officer or view the programme on the Examination page of the Council's web-site.

**Indeed if you have any queries – please contact the Programme Officer at [programme.officer@west-norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:programme.officer@west-norfolk.gov.uk)**

**Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> July - 10.00**

### **Introduction by the Inspector**

### **Opening Statement by the Council**

### **Issue 1 : The Duty to Co-operate, Legal Requirements and the Council's Broad Strategy**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Colin Jex (173); Sarah Evans (Lord Howard) (729); John Maxey (278); John Hiskett (Norfolk Wildlife Trust) (1278); Mike Jones (RSPB) (1221); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (497)

#### **Questions**

- 1.1 Has co-operation between the Borough Council and other nearby local planning authorities been a continuous process of engagement from initial thinking? What evidence is there of effective co-operation (NPPF paragraph 181) and of joint working on areas of common interest being diligently undertaken for the mutual benefit of neighbouring authorities (NPPF paragraph 178)? Is there a long-term commitment to co-operation?

- 1.2 Have any cross-boundary strategic priorities or issues been identified? If so are they clearly reflected in the SADMP (NPPF paragraph 179)?
- 1.3 Has the SADMP been prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement?
- 1.4 In broad terms is the SADMP based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal and testing of reasonable alternatives, and does it represent the most appropriate strategy in the circumstances? Has the site selection process been objective and based on appropriate criteria? Is there clear evidence demonstrating how and why the preferred strategy was selected? Does the Plan provide for a satisfactory mix of housing to serve the needs of different groups in the community (NPPF paragraph 50)?  
[Detailed site specific issues will be dealt with under the relevant settlement/allocation]
- 1.5 In broad terms is sufficient weight placed on the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment (NPPF section 11)? In particular have the consequences of the proposed allocations on sites of nature conservation importance been adequately assessed and are satisfactory mitigation measures proposed if they would be required?
- 1.6 Is the relationship between the Core Strategy and the SADMP sufficiently clear? Should there be confirmation that work will start next year on a review of the Local Plan (i.e. the Core Strategy and the SADMP)?
- 1.7 Is the relationship between the SADMP and any future Neighbourhood Plans sufficiently clear? Do the policies of the plan provide sufficient and appropriate 'hooks' on which to 'hang' Neighbourhood Plans?
- 1.8 Does the SADMP appropriately reflect current national advice, for example the Ministerial Statement published on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2015?
- 1.9 Why are no figures included for Emneth in Appendix 5?

**Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> July - 14.00**

## **Issue 2: The Development Management Policies (DM.1 to DM.22)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

DM1: Colin Jex (173); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (431)

DM2: Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1181); Rawdon Gascoigne (AW Dean) (847); Keith Ives (200); Ann Hills (65); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (432); Stuart Williamson (Albanwise) (819); Beccy Rejzek (Aventa) (832); Adrian Parker (128)

DM3: Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1188); Keith Ives (202); Adrian Parker (524)

DM8: John Maxey (275); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (502); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (433)

DM9: Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (435)

DM11: Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (501); Andrew Brand (The Abbey Group) (193/194)

DM12: Sarah Evans (Lord Howard) (727); Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1183); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (437); Sarah Evans (Castle Rising Parish Council) (723)

DM13: Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1184); John Maxey (276); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (500); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (438)

DM14: Keith Ives (203)

DM15: Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1185); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (440);

DM16: Mike Jones (RSPB) (1223); Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1186); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (441); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (496)

DM17: Graeme Warriner (Hopkins Homes) (1257)

DM18 and DM21: Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1188); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (494/493); Richard Brown (Elmside) (1216)

DM19: John Hiskett (Norfolk Wildlife Trust) (523); Mike Jones (RSPB) (1224); Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1187); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (443)

DM20: Paul Derry (RES) (822)

DM22: Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1182); Keith Ives (204)

## Questions

- 2.1 Will the policies in the SADMP satisfactorily contribute towards the sustainable growth of the Borough (DM 1)?
- 2.2 Is the Council's approach towards the definition of settlement boundaries justified and consistent (policy DM 2)? How has the Council taken into account the boundary of schools and their playing fields?
- 2.3 Is the Council's approach to infill development in smaller villages and hamlets justified (policy DM 3)? How will the Council determine whether or not a gap makes a positive contribution to the street scene (second bullet point)? The Council refer in DM 3 to the rural exception policy. Do the Council mean policy DM 6, which is entitled 'Housing Needs of Rural Workers'?
- 2.4 Is the Council's approach towards the replacement or enlargement of dwellings in the countryside justified (policy DM 5)?
- 2.5 Should the glossary include a definition of 'rural workers' (policy DM 6)?
- 2.6 Is the Council's approach to delivering affordable housing on phased development reasonable and sufficiently clear, with regard to both allocated and windfall sites (policy DM 8)? Does the Written Ministerial Statement on support for small-scale developers, custom and self-builders, by Brandon Lewis MP (published on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014), have any implications for the Council's approach?
- 2.7 Is the Council's approach to encouraging the retention of community facilities justified (policy DM 9)? How will the Council determine whether or not the area 'is currently well served' by the use that would be lost? Is the 12 month marketing period reasonable and how would the Council's satisfaction be measured?
- 2.8 Is the Council's approach towards retail development outside town centres justified (policy DM 10)?
- 2.9 Is the Council's approach towards the provision of touring and permanent holiday sites justified (policy DM 11), particularly with regard to protecting the AONB and its setting?
- 2.10 Is the Council's approach to protecting the function of the strategic road network justified (policy DM 12)? What are the circumstances in which a Traffic Impact Assessment would be required? NPPF paragraph 29 confirms that transport policies are important in facilitating sustainable development. Does the SADMP

sufficiently reflect this advice, for example in paragraph 97? Is the Plan based on a sufficiently robust transport evidence base?

- 2.11 Is the safeguarding of the railway trackways justified (policy DM 13)? Is the status of the King's Lynn dock branch sufficiently clear? Are there any other former rail routes that should be safeguarded, for example between Watlington and Wisbech and/or King's Lynn to Fakenham?
- 2.12 Is policy DM 14 justified (RAF Marham and CITB Bircham Newton)? Is it sufficiently clear what evidence would be required to enable the Council to take decisions on enabling development?
- 2.13 How will the Council determine whether or not a proposal would comply with the factors listed in the bullet points in policy DM 15 on Environment, Design and Amenity? Is sufficient weight attached to conserving and enhancing the historic environment (NPPF chapter 12)?
- 2.14 Are the open space standards in policy DM 16 justified? How would the Council determine the need for allotments associated with large scale residential development?
- 2.15 Are the proposed parking standards adequately justified (policy DM 17)?
- 2.16 Is the Council's approach to coastal flood risk and to other areas at risk from flooding, justified (policies DM 18 and DM 21)? What is the status of the Protocol in Appendix 4, which is referred to as a Local Plan Policy in paragraph C.18.5 but is not mentioned in the section entitled 'Sites in Areas of Flood Risk'?
- 2.17 How will new green infrastructure enhancements be identified and delivered? How will 'more detailed local solutions' be developed and implemented (policy DM 19)?
- 2.18 Has the Council attached sufficient weight to the provision of renewable energy, including in terms of the design and operation of buildings (policy DM 20)?
- 2.19 Is the Council's approach to the protection of local open space justified (policy DM 22)?

### **Wednesday 8th July - 10.00**

#### **Issue 3: The Broad Distribution of Housing (Section D.1)**

##### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (447); Richard Brown (Elmside) (1217); Richard Brown (Koto) (1219); William Lusty (Diocese of Norwich) (702 etc.); William Lusty (Jenny Levin) (904 etc.); Rawdon Gascoigne (AW Dean) (851); Sarah Evans (Lord Howard) (726); Ian Cable (J Kirchen) (260); John Maxey (279); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (490)

##### **Questions**

- 3.1 Does the SADMP accurately reflect the requirements of the adopted Core Strategy, particularly in terms of meeting identified housing need?
- 3.2 Has the Council adequately justified the proposed distribution of development across the Borough? What has been the role of Parish Councils in the distribution process?
- 3.3 How has the Council assessed the potential density of development on each of the allocated residential sites?

### **Wednesday 8th July - 14.00**

#### **Issue 4: King's Lynn and West Lynn (E.1)**

##### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (456); Adrian Parker (213); Verity Connolly (468); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (485); Paul Belton (Camland) (563); Porta Planning (Associated British Ports) (1214); William Davison (676)



## Questions

4.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in King's Lynn and West Lynn are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:

- Marsh Lane (E1.4)
- Boal Quay (E1.5)
- Lynnsport (E1.7)
- South Quay (E1.8)
- West of St Peters Road, West Lynn (E1.14)
- Land at Bankside, West Lynn (E1.15)

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

4.2 Is sufficient weight attached by the Council to matters of transport, heritage, green infrastructure provision and flood risk in King's Lynn and West Lynn?

4.3 Is the Council's approach to development in King's Lynn town centre (E1.1) and in the Gaywood Clock Area (E1.3) justified (for example in terms of retail provision) and in all other respects sound?

4.4 Is the Council's approach to the allocation of employment land in King's Lynn and West Lynn sound (E1.12)?

4.5 Reference is made in paragraph 27 (page 95) to the protection of, and support for, the King's Lynn port. Should this support be more clearly reflected in the plan?

**Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> July - 10.00**

## **Issue 5: West Winch (E.2)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

John Hiskett (Norfolk Wildlife Trust) (523); Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (483); Frances Leamon (North Runcton and West Winch Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group) (1209); Graeme Warriner (Hopkins Homes) (1258); Helen Russell-Johnson (King's Lynn Civic Society) (461); Colin Jex (172); David Maddox (Northern Trust) (465)

## Questions

- 5.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development in the West Winch Growth Area (E2.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council? Should there be a reference in the policy to public transport provision?
- 5.2 In terms of part B of policy E2.1, how and when will (a) be undertaken and expected; and when will (b) and (c) be expected?
- 5.3 What is the Council's attitude towards the potential silica sand deposits on the site? Have the implications of the Minerals Safeguarding Area been addressed by the Council?
- 5.4 Is there any evidence that the Council's approach to development within the existing built-up areas of West Winch is not sound (E2.2)?

**Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> July - 14.00**

## **Issue 6: South Wooton (E.3)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Brian Gadd (413); John Maxey (280)

## Questions

- 6.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development in South Wooton (E3.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?
- 6.2 Have the implications of the Minerals Safeguarding Area been addressed by the Council?

## **Issue 7: Knights Hill (E.4)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Sarah Evans (Lord Howard) (728); Adrian Parker (226); Sarah Evans (Castle Rising Parish Council) (724); Christopher Collett (Ashdale) (615); Paul Belton (Camland) (563)

### **Questions**

- 7.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development at Knights Hill (E4.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?
- 7.2 Has proper regard been given to the protection of sites of nature conservation importance and to the protection and enhancement of heritage assets?

## **Issue 8 : North Wootton (E.5) (Hearing Session not required)**

### **Question**

- 8.1 Paragraph E.5.3 confirms that North Wootton has a range of services and facilities and is close to King's Lynn. Is the Council's decision not to allocate land for development at North Wootton justified?

**Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> July – 9.30**

## **Issue 9 : Downham Market (F.1)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Campbell (Mr & Mrs Riches) (962); William Arkell (Bennett plc) (586); Stuart Williamson (Albanwise) (818); Richard Brown (Koto) (1220); Malcolm Starreveld (392); Kelvin Loveday (796); Jean Markwell (Downham Market Town Council) (224); Janet Carter (989)

## Questions

9.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in Downham Market are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:

- Land off St John's Way (F1.2 – employment)
- North-East – east of Lynn Road (F1.3)
- South-East – north of the southern by-pass (F1.4)

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

9.2 Is there evidence that neighbourhood shops/ community facilities would be justified at east of Lynn Road and/or north of the southern by-pass. If there is justification, should the Council's approach to the delivery of such facilities be stronger?

## **Issue 10: Hunstanton (F.2)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Murray (Hunstanton & District Civic Society) (478); Rob Snowling (Le Strange Estate) (1210); David Coleby (Mr & Mrs S Wallace) (320)

### **Question**

10.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in Hunstanton are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:

- East of Cromer Road (F2.2)
- South of Hunstanton Commercial Park (F2.3)
- North of Hunstanton Road (F2.4)

And similarly is the proposed employment site south of Hunstanton Commercial Park justified (F2.5)?

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council? Is the inclusion of the 'housing with care' element in F2.3 justified?

**Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> July – 14.00**

**Issue 11: Wisbech Fringe (F.3)**

***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Campbell (John Freeman) (939); John Maxey (282); Paul Sutton (College of West Anglia: Stephen Jones) (846)

**Questions**

- 11.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development west of Burrowgate Road (F3.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?
- 11.2 Is policy F3.1 compatible with any policy adopted by Fenland District Council for the land to the west (within Fenland District)?

**Issue 12: Brancaster/Brancaster Staithe/Burnham Deepdale (G.13, G.14 and G.16)**

***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Janet Lake (Brancaster Parish Council) (394); Jamie Bird (Warner Family) (835)

**Question**

- 12.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in Brancaster/Burnham Deepdale are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:
- East of Mill Road (G13.1)
  - Land off The Close (G13.2)

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> July - 9.30**

**Issue 13: Burnham Market (G.17)**

***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Nicole La Ronde (Townfolk Ltd) (1157); Garth Hanlon (Holkham Estate) (1248); Jamie Bird (Fleur Hill) (849)

**Questions**

- 13.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development at Foundry Field (G17.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?
- 13.2 Is the requirement for the submission of a plan for the future management and maintenance of the car park and public facilities reasonable and justified (criterion 7)?
- 13.3 Does plan G17 accurately show the site area and should there be a reference in the policy to the provision of a retail use on the site?

**Issue 14: Castle Acre (G.22)**

***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

David Russell (Greene King plc) (744); Bill Welch (46); Anita Watridge (50); Garth Hanlon (Holkham Estate) (1249)

**Question**

- 14.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development west of Massingham Road (G22.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

## **Wednesday 15<sup>th</sup> July - 14.00**

### **Issue 15: Clenchwarton (G.25)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Kevin Woods (592); Richard Fletcher (272); Hodkinson (347); Adrian Parker (129)

#### **Question**

15.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in Clenchwarton are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:

- Between Wildfields Road and Hall Road (G25.1)
- Land north of Main Road (G25.2)
- Land south of Main Road (G25.3)

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 16: Denver (G.28.4)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Campbell (Mr & Mrs Riches) (958); Richard Fletcher (272)

#### **Question**

16.1 Is there evidence that the Council's restrictive approach to development at Denver is not justified? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 17: Dersingham (G.29.1; G.29.2) and Docking (G.30.1)** **(Hearing Session not Required)**

#### **Question**

- 17.1 Is there evidence that development in either of these settlements would have unacceptable impacts on highway safety or to any heritage assets?

**Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> July - 9.30**

### **Issue 18: Emneth (G.34)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Campbell (Mr & Mrs Noone) (936); Andrew Campbell (Mr & Mrs Plumridge) (948);  
Chris Dawson (850)

#### **Question**

- 18.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development south of The Wroe (G34.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 19: Feltwell and Hockwold cum Wilton(G.35)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Edward Keymer (Miss N Fletcher (521); Ann Hills (1282)

#### **Question**

- 19.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in Feltwell are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:
- Rear of 24, Oak Street (G35.1)
  - Land north of Munson's Lane (G35.2)
  - 40 Lodge Lane/Skye Gardens (G35.3)



- Land south of South Street, Hockwold cum Wilton (G35.4)

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

## **Issue 20: Gayton, Grimston and Pott Row (G.41)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Campbell (Mr & Mrs Rudd) (925); Scott Brown (33); Greg Garland (464); Nick Fairman (New Hall Properties Ltd) (575); Graham Wright (Louise Barber) (933)

### **Question**

- 20.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed developments north of Back Street, Gayton (G41.1) and adjacent to Stave Farm, Grimston and Pott Row (G41.2) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> July - 14.00**

## **Issue 21: Great Bircham and Bircham Tofts (G.42)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

William Lusty (Diocese of Norwich) (718); Keith Ives (205); Fred Rothwell (127)

### **Question**

- 21.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development adjacent to 16 Lynn Road (G42.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

## **Issue 22: Great Massingham (G43) (Hearing Session not Required)**

### **Question**

- 22.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development south of Walcup's Lane (G43.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

## **Issue 23: Harpley (G.45) (Hearing Session not Required)**

### **Question**

- 23.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development at Nethergate Street/School Lane (G45.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

## **Issue 24: Syderstone (G.91.1) (Hearing Session not Required)**

### **Question**

- 24.1 Is there evidence that the Council's approach to development at Syderston is not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

## **One week break**

## **Tuesday 28th July - 9.30**

## **Issue 25: Heacham (G.47)**

### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Gabrielle Rowan (W.H. Kerkham (Rhoon) Ltd (350); Nicole La Ronde (Broadland Housing Group, Andrew Savage) (1277)

**Question**

- 25.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development off Cheney Hill (G47.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council? Is there evidence that would support the provision of a Care Home at Heacham?

**Issue 26: Hilgay (G.48) (Hearing Session not Required)**

**Question**

- 26.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development south of Foresters Avenue (G48.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Issue 27: Leziate (G.54.1)**

***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Sarah Evans (Sibelco UK) (732)

**Question**

- 27.1 Is there evidence that the Council's restrictive approach to development at Leziate is not justified? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Issue 28: Marshland St James (G.57) (Hearing Session not Required)**

**Question**

- 28.1 Is there evidence that the Council's approach to development at Marshland St James is not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such

evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Tuesday 28th July - 14.00**

**Issue 29: Methwold Hythe (G.58) (Hearing Session not Required)**

**Question**

- 29.1 Is there evidence that the Council's restrictive approach to development at Methwold Hythe is not justified? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Issue 30: Methwold and Northwold (G.59)**

***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Rachel Buckle (Methwold Parish Council) (775)

**Question**

- 30.1 Is there evidence that the Council's approach to development at Methwold and Northwold is not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Issue 31: North Runcton (G.64) (Hearing Session not Required)**

**Question**

- 31.1 Is there evidence that the Council's restrictive approach to development at North Runcton is not justified? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 32: Snettisham (G.83) (Hearing Session not Required)**

#### **Question**

- 32.1 Would the proposed development at Snettisham (G83.1) have any impacts on the highway network or drainage infrastructure that could not be satisfactorily addressed?

### **Issue33: Southery (G.85) (Hearing Session not Required)**

#### **Questions**

- 33.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development off Lions Close (G85.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?
- 33.2 Is the route of the development boundary in the vicinity of 9, Upgate Street, justified?

### **Issue 34: Stoke Ferry (G.88)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Ian Cable (J Kirchen) (261); William Lusty (Jenny Levin) (904)

#### **Question**

- 34.1 Is there evidence that the Council's approach to development at Stoke Ferry is not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 35: Ten Mile Bank (G.92) (Hearing Session not Required)**

#### **Question**

- 35.1 Is this settlement a sustainable location for development?

## **Wednesday 29th July - 9.30**

### **Issue 36: Terrington St Clement (G.93) and Terrington St John (G.94)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Campbell (Dene Homes) (886); Fergus Bootman (Sutton Partnership) (752); Scott Brown (Mr & Mrs Dawson) (937); Keith Hutchinson (Mr K G Brown) (561)

#### **Question**

36.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in Terrington St Clement are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:

- Church Bank, Chapel Road (G93.1)
- Adjacent to King William Close (G93.2)
- West of Benn's Lane (G93.3)
- East of School Road (G94.1)

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 37: Three Holes (G.96) (Hearing Session not Required)**

#### **Question**

37.1 Are there any drainage implications of development at Three Holes that cannot be satisfactorily addressed?

### **Issue 38: Upwell with Outwell (G.104)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Andrew Campbell (Mr & Mrs Gooch (953); Nigel Nelson (307); Julie Jacques (Edwin Broad) (427); John Maxey (283)

## **Question**

- 38.1 Is there evidence that the Council's approach to development at Upwell and Outwell is not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Wednesday 29th July - 14.00**

### **Issue 39: Walpole Crosskeys (G.105), Walpole Highway (G.106) and Walpole St Peter (G.109)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Jeff Clarke (Freshpeel Produce Ltd, Peter Lonsdale) (518); Peter Humphrey (Peter Humphrey Associates) (505) Frank Cahill (207) Andrew Campbell (Trevor Pitcher) (926); Emma Bateman (Walpole Parish Council) (292); Chris Dawson (935)

## **Question**

- 39.1 Is there evidence that the Council's approach to development at Walpole Crosskeys; Walpole Highway; and Walpole St Peter is not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Thursday 30th July - 9.30**

### **Issue 40: Watlington (G.112)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Rawdon Gascoigne (AW Dean) (848); William Arkell (Bennett plc) (584)

## **Question**

- 40.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development south of Thieves Bridge Road (G112.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 41: Welney (G.113) (Hearing Session not Required)**

#### **Question**

- 41.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development at the former Three Tuns/Village Hall (G113.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

### **Issue 42: Wereham (G.114)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council

Dr Christopher Ward (387); Mr & Mrs Paul Carter (640); Brian Howard (311); Tim Shackleford (288); William Arkell (Bennett plc) (585); Mr & Mrs Ivan Voutt (315)

#### **Question**

- 42.1 Is there evidence that any elements of the proposed development at the Springs, Flegg Green (G114.1) are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable? If such evidence exists what alternatives are available (including brownfield sites) and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

**Thursday 30th July - 14.00**

### **Issue 43: West Walton/Walton Highway (G.120)**

#### ***Participants***

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council



Gillian Kirman (1104); Andrew Campbell (Mr & Mrs Jewson) (920); Jason Gage (769); Emma Bateman (West Walton Parish Council) (271); Peter Humphrey (Peter Humphrey Associates) (504)

### **Question**

43.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in West Walton and Walton Highway are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:

- Adjacent to Common Road (G120.1)
- North of School Road (G120.2)

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

## **Issue 44: Implementation and Monitoring (Appendix 6)**

### **(Hearing Session unlikely to be Required)**

#### **Questions**

- 44.1 In order for the plan to be found sound it must be effective. In order to test its effectiveness over the course of the plan period it must be capable of appropriate monitoring. The monitoring section makes no reference to a Monitoring Report, the frequency of monitoring, any targets the Council hopes to achieve or what actions may be taken if the expected outcomes of the policies are not forthcoming. The second sentence of paragraph 6.1 refers to indicators that could be used. Should the Council's approach to monitoring be strengthened to ensure that the plan is effective and remains consistent with national policy?
- 44.2 What are the main risks to delivery; does the Council have an appropriate fall-back position; and is there sufficient flexibility to accommodate any unforeseen circumstances?

#### **CLOSING STATEMENT BY COUNCIL**

#### **CLOSING REMARKS BY INSPECTOR**