

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

**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

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?

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Council's Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that of all proposed allocations site G.41.1, Land North of Back Street in Gayton and site G.41.2, Land adjacent Stave Farm, west of Ashwicken Road in Grimston and Pott Row are considered the most sustainable options available for development in both Gayton and Grimston and Pott Row. This is detailed further in the supporting text accompanying the proposed policy G.41.1 and G.41.2.
- 1.2. The Deliverability Form prepared by the agent of the landowner for proposed policy G.41.1 dated 25/07/14 (Appendix 1) states that the land is available based on an arrangement to terminate a tenancy agreement with a current agricultural tenant. As a result of this agreement, the agent states the site will be available, vacant and deliverable within the first 5 years of the plan period to 2026. The Deliverability Form prepared by the agent of the landowner for proposed policy G.41.2 dated 24/02/14 (Appendix 2) states that the land is vacant, available and deliverable within the first 5 years of the plan period to 2026.

2. Site Specific Issues

2.1. Level of Housing/ Development Boundaries

- 2.1.1.1. A number of representations dispute the development boundary in Gayton (Jonathon Green (ID: 786509) Norfolk Property Services, Mrs. Louise Barber (ID: 784629)). This matter is principally addressed by policy DM2- Development Boundaries which outlines the proposed policy approach to development boundaries.
- 2.1.1.2. Representation by Mr D. Morrell (ID: 604160) presents a case for further development in Gayton and argues the SA process lacks in forward thinking and adequate housing supply. Further representations by Mr and Mrs. Rudd (ID: 786235) also disagrees with the level of housing allocated for sites G.41.1 and G.41.2. Both representations present a case for an increased number of housing on smaller sites but the Council considers the distribution of houses is best done by allocating growth to settlements proportional to the existing populations. On a population pro-rata basis (as is set out in the Distribution of Development section of the SADMP document), Gayton, Grimston & Pott Row are allocated 46 dwellings, to be split 23 dwellings each between Gayton and Grimston & Pott Row. The Council considers the 46 dwellings to be an appropriate level of growth in this designated KRSC.

3. Grimston

3.1. Distribution of Development

- 3.1.1.1. Grimston Parish Council (Mr. John Missing (ID: 285226)) expresses a preference for smaller infill sites that would conform to the existing patterns of linear development in the village and oppose the allocated site. The Council considers the site G.41.2, land adjacent to Stave Farm; to be the most sustainable site for development. Although a linear development pattern cannot be achieved

on the site it will infill a gap between development to the north and the south and therefore will complement the form and character of the area.

4. Gayton

- 4.1. It is noted that in the KRSC of Gayton, Grimston & Pott Row, there are a number of submitted sites which provide similar opportunities and constraints and the selection of any of the submitted sites was based on the best information at hand to the Council at that time. Ultimately the Council has to make a decision on which site to allocate and this can be based on marginal factors.
- 4.2. A number of representations were submitted during the pre-submission consultation which promoted alternative sites for development in Gayton and disputed the findings of the SA in respect of their sites and proposed allocation G.41.1, land north of Back Street.
 - Representation by Mr Scott Brown (ID: 875085) of Holt Architectural Ltd. Argue that the allocated site is not justified on the grounds that the information used to assess site 66 and suggests reassessing the allocated site. However, this selected site of G.41.1 is justified as the best site as during the plan process there was an emphasis placed on retaining employment land as is set out in policy CS10 and as a result of the scoring in the SA site 66 was judged to not be the highest scoring site.
 - Representations by Mr. Nick Fairman (ID: 598217) New Hall Properties Ltd. and Mrs. Kate Senter (ID: 503026) Gayton Parish Council both argue that the site is not justified on the grounds regarding the suitability of site G.41.1 due to the specific area of access necessary from Back Street. The Council consider the site to be accessible and there were no objections raised by NCC Highways Authority.
 - Representation by Greg Garland (ID: 603150) argue that the site is not justified on the grounds that the site selection process has failed on the importance of utilising brownfield land. The SA justifies the non-allocation of site GAY09 as it performs averagely in terms of proximity to local services in comparison to some other site options. The site is not as integrated with existing development as it is situated at the edge of the settlement and development would encroach into the countryside in the easterly direction.

5. Comparison of alternative options

- 5.1. Representations made by Mr. Nick Fairman (ID: 598217) New Hall Properties Ltd. and Mrs. Kate Senter (ID: 503026) Gayton Parish Council seek the reinstatement of formerly preferred site 557/GAY01. The site was replaced with proposed site G.41.1; land north of Back Street at the Pre-Submission stage because the Council did not have evidence that safe access could be delivered due to a disputed ransom strip forming the proposed access off Back Lane.
- 5.2. In addition, Historic England (Mr Tom Gilbert-Woolridge (ID: 56252)) objected to the allocation of site 557/GAY01 arguing that the site would have a negative impact on the significance of Grade 1 Church of St. Nicholas.
- 5.3. The now proposed allocation was therefore deemed the most sustainable option.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1. The Council considers that the proposed allocations in Gayton, Grimston & Pott Row are justified, sustainable, viable, available and deliverable. The Council have considered representations made during the pre-submission consultation which highlight issues with the

selected sites as well as with the proposed development boundary, access issues and level of housing. The Council does not consider that there is any evidence that any alternative options present more sustainable opportunities for development than the proposed allocations.

Appendices Table of Contents

Appendix 1 7
Appendix 2 12

Appendix 1

Amended form signed 28/7/14.

Site Reference	1271 GAYTON
Are you the correct person/company to contact about the site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If no, please explain why you are no longer the contact person/company for the site and please provide the correct contact details, if known, on the form below

Contact details	
Name	
Relation to the site	<input type="checkbox"/> Landowner <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agent <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please provide details
Company	CANPRO SERVICES LTD
Address	4 ST MARY'S HOUSE DUKE STREET NORWICH
Postcode	NR3 1QA
Telephone	01603 631319
Email	philip@canproservices.co.uk
Ownership	

Is the land under single ownership?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'no' who are the other landowners?	Please list other owners:
Is the access to the site under separate land ownership/s	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please provide details
<p>In the case that the site, or access to the site is owned by more than one landowner, the Council may contact you to establish which part of the site is under your control. If it is possible to indicate this on the attached map, or you have previously detailed this in documentation to the Council, please confirm this by providing details below.</p>	

Availability

<p>Is the site occupied?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Occupied <input type="checkbox"/> Part occupied <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant</p> <p>If occupied, please provide details</p> <p><i>Agricultural tenancy. Arrangements ease to terminate tenancy.</i></p>
<p>When is the site available?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Available now <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not immediately available but could be developed within the plan period (before 2026) <i>As above.</i> <input type="checkbox"/> not within the plan period (2027+)</p>
<p>If the site were allocated for development, when would you intend to develop the site?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2014/15-2018/19 <input type="checkbox"/> 2019/20-2032/24 <input type="checkbox"/> 2024/25-2025/26</p> <p>Please provide any comments you may have on how firm the indicated dates are, and what would cause this to change.</p>

Constraints	
<p>Are there any financial considerations that you are aware of that may influence whether or when the site would be developed?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please provide details</p>

<p>Are you aware of any abnormal costs associated with bringing forward this site for development, e.g. contaminated land?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No </p> <p>If yes, please provide details</p>
<p>Are there any other constraints that may prevent or delay development of the site? (see examples)</p>	<p>e.g. access issues, land contamination, ecology issues, land covenants, heritage issues, flood risk, legal issues, infrastructure requirements, hazards, land use, occupation of land, market demand, other?</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No </p> <p>If yes, please provide further details or state 'see submission for full details'</p>

Further Information	
If the site was identified by the Council as a preferred option, have you read the draft policy relating to it?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Do you have any comments on the requirements and consideration set out in that draft policy?
Other	
Please provide details of any other viability issues in relation to the site that the Borough Council should be aware of that has not been covered in your submission or this form (use separate sheets if necessary)	
None.	

Signature
Print name
Date

Appendix 2

Site Deliverability Form

- Please complete this form to the best of your knowledge and return to the Council by post by **1st April 2014**. If you would prefer to complete these electronically please contact the LDF team on LDF@west-norfolk.gov.uk or 01553 616443 to receive an electronic version.
- If you have previously sent more detailed information to the Council, for example, in response to the preferred options consultation (29/07/13 – 04/10/13) please indicate this on the form.
- Where more detailed information has been submitted previously, there is no requirement to repeat this information. The Council appreciates you taking the time to complete basic questions on the form and indicating that more detail is available elsewhere.
- The form provides the Council with an overview of the deliverability of any site, and will be collated as evidence to support the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan.

Return Address

Please return completed forms to:

Planning Policy Team (Deliverability Form)
Environment and Planning
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk
King's Court, Chapel Street
King's Lynn, Norfolk
PE30 1EX

Data Protection and Freedom of Information

The information collected in this response form will be used by the Borough Council to inform the Detailed Policies and Site Plan and subsequent components of the Local Plan.

By responding you are accepting that your response and the information within it will be in the public domain, and that it may be disclosed if requested under the Freedom of Information Act.

Site Reference	GRM 1
Are you the correct person/company to contact about the site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <p>If no, please explain why you are no longer the contact person/company for the site and please provide the correct contact details, if known, on the form below</p>

Contact details	
Name	Adrian Parker
Relation to the site	<input type="checkbox"/> Landowner <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agent <input type="checkbox"/> Other, please provide details
Company	ADRIAN PARKER PLANNING LTD
Address	33 GRIMSTON ROAD SOUTH WOOTTON KING'S LYNN
Postcode	PE30 3NR
Telephone	01553 675574
Email	adrian@parkerplanning.co.uk.
Ownership	Landowner A.A.MASSEN BUILDERS Sylvan House 29 HALL CLOSE HEACHAM PE31 7JT 01485 570642 roger.massen@virgin.net

<p>Is the land under single ownership?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>If 'no' who are the other landowners?</p>	<p>Please list other owners:</p>
<p>Is the access to the site under separate land ownership/s</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>direct highway frontage</i></p> <p>If yes, please provide details</p>
<p>In the case that the site, or access to the site is owned by more than one landowner, the Council may contact you to establish which part of the site is under your control. If it is possible to indicate this on the attached map, or you have previously detailed this in documentation to the Council, please confirm this by providing details below.</p>	

Availability

<p>Is the site occupied?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Occupied <input type="checkbox"/> Part occupied <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vacant If occupied, please provide details <i>Note - the site boundaries should exclude the northern part, which is existing infill development at Stave Farm.</i> </p>
<p>When is the site available?</p>	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Available now <input type="checkbox"/> Not immediately available but could be developed within the plan period (before 2026) <input type="checkbox"/> not within the plan period (2027+) </p>
<p>If the site were allocated for development, when would you intend to develop the site?</p>	<p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2014/15-2018/19 <input type="checkbox"/> 2019/20-2023²³/24 <input type="checkbox"/> 2024/25-2025/26 Please provide any comments you may have on how firm the indicated dates are, and what would cause this to change. </p>

Constraints	
<p>Are there any financial considerations that you are aware of that may influence whether or when the site would be developed?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, please provide details </p>

<p>Are you aware of any abnormal costs associated with bringing forward this site for development, e.g. contaminated land?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please provide details</p>
<p>Are there any other constraints that may prevent or delay development of the site? (see examples)</p>	<p>e.g. access issues, land contamination, ecology issues, land covenants, heritage issues, flood risk, legal issues, infrastructure requirements, hazards, land use, occupation of land, market demand, other?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, please provide further details or state 'see submission for full details'</p> <p><i>See details submitted Oct. 2013 reference ID 1199 and attached review paper</i></p> <p><i>Archaeology and 11kV electricity line undergrounding costs anticipated.</i></p>

Further Information	
If the site was identified by the Council as a preferred option, have you read the draft policy relating to it?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
	Do you have any comments on the requirements and consideration set out in that draft policy? <i>See Oct 2013 comments on DP&S reference ID 1199 and attached review paper</i>
Other	
Please provide details of any other viability issues in relation to the site that the Borough Council should be aware of that has not been covered in your submission or this form (use separate sheets if necessary)	

Signature	<i>Adrian Parker</i>
Print name	<i>ADRIAN PARKER</i>
Date	<i>24 Feb 2014</i>