

Borough Council of  
**King's Lynn &  
West Norfolk**



**Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk's  
Response to  
the Issues and Questions raised by Inspector David  
Hogger  
in relation to the  
King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan:  
Site Allocations and Development Management  
Policies**

**Issue 24: Syderstone (G.91.1)**

**Examination  
June 2015**

## Table of abbreviations used with the Council's Statements

Abbreviation	Full Wording
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BCKLWN	Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
BDC	Breckland District Council
CLG	Communities and Local Government
CITB	Construction Industry Training Board
CS	Core Strategy
DM	Development Management
DPD	Development Plan Document
EA	Environment Agency
FDC	Fenland District Council
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
GI	Green Infrastructure
GTANA	Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment
ha	Hectare
HELAA	Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment
HLF	Heritage Lottery Fund
HRA	Habitats Regulation Assessment
HSEHA	Health and Safety Executive Hazard Areas
IDB	Internal Drainage Board
KRSC	Key Rural Service Centres
KLATS	King's Lynn Area Transportation Strategy
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LLFA	Lead Local Flood Authority
LPSO	Local Plan Sustainability Objectives
NCC	Norfolk County Council
NE	Natural England
NP	Neighbourhood Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NORA	The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area
NWT	Norfolk Wildlife Trust
OAN	Objectively Assessed Need
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PPTS	Planning Policy for Traveller Sites
RV	Rural Village
RAF	Royal Air Force
RLA	Residential Land Assessment
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SADMP	Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SMP	Shoreline Management Plan
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSF	Site Sustainability Factors
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SuD	Sustainable Drainage systems
SVAH	Smaller Villages and Hamlets
SWMP	Surface Water Management Plan
THI	Townscape Heritage Initiative
UPC	Un-attributable Population Change

**24.1:**

**Is there evidence that the Council's approach to development at Syderstone 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?**

1. Introduction

1.1. The Council's SA demonstrates that of all proposed options site G.91.1- Land west of no. 26 The Street is considered the most sustainable option for development in Syderstone out of all the sites submitted for consideration in this Rural Village. This is further explained in the supporting text accompanying the proposed policy G.91.1.

1.2. The Deliverability Form prepared by the landowner, dated 29/07/1 (Appendix 1), states the land is vacant, available now and deliverable within the first 5 years of the plan period to 2026.

2. Issues

2.1. Representation received by the Diocese of Norwich (ID: 138602) argues for additional development in the village of Syderstone (promoting alternative site SY1 (1026) and presents a case that their site is the more sustainable option. They state that development of site G91.1 development will constitute a form of ribbon development, further extending the village into the open countryside and that site G91 is in close proximity to Syderstone Common SSSI, which provides habitat for protected species. The council maintains that site G91.1 is not in isolated position. The site is well separated from Syderstone Common by The Street, the main route through the village and by existing residential development to the south of the site. A small scale, linear development fronting The Street immediately adjoining the existing row of houses to the east of the site and opposite housing to the south of the site would appear as a minor extension to the eastern extent of the settlement and would therefore not appear as a significant intrusion into the countryside.

3. Comparison of Alternative Options

3.1. At the Preferred Options stage of this document, there was a different site, SY1 (1026), chosen as the allocated site. The SA notes that previously preferred site SY1 (1026) and site G91.1 (753) score identically in all categories apart from heritage, as site 1026 is in close proximity to the Listed church and therefore the impact is dependent upon implementation.

Response to the preferred options consultation indicated site 1026 (SY1) was not favoured by Syderstone Parish Council.

3.2. In considering an allocation of 5 dwellings in Syderstone the SA identifies either site 1026 or site 753 as the most sustainable of the options for development. One response to the consultation from the public objects to development of 1026 and the response from Syderstone Parish Council indicate opposition to allocation of site 1026. In view of this the allocation of site G91.1 (753) for 5 dwellings is seen as appropriate.

#### 4. Conclusions

4.1. The Council have considered the representation against site G91.1 and have concluded that there is no evidence that the proposed residential development site in Syderstone is not justified, sustainable, viable, available and deliverable. In the interest of delivering development in a Rural Village the Council have chosen the least constrained and therefore most sustainable option for development.