

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

**Examination  
November 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

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?

## 1. Introduction

1.1 The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (SA01) demonstrates that of all proposed options for growth the following sites are considered the most sustainable options for development in Methwold and Northwold, out of all the sites submitted for consideration:

- G59.1 Methwold - Land at Crown Street
- G59.2 Methwold – Land at Herbert Drive
- G59.3 Methwold – Land at Hythe Road
- G59.4 Methwold – Land off Globe Street/St George's Court

This is further explained in the supporting text / justification accompanying each of the proposed policies. SA01 also demonstrates that no sites are suitable for allocation within Northwold due to highways constraints.

1.2 Deliverability Forms have been prepared by the landowners / agents of each of the sites as follows (CIV13):

- G59.1 – 16/03/2014, deliverable 2014/15 – 2018/19
- G59.2 – 17/03/2014, deliverable 2014/15 – 2018/19
- G59.3 – 17/03/2014, deliverable 2014/15 – 2018/19
- G59.4 – 08/08/2014, deliverable 2014/15 – 2018/19

1.3 The Council considers that issues raised regarding heritage and highways made during the pre-submission consultation, need careful consideration. These will be considered in turn.

## 2. Heritage Issues

2.1 The representation made by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge of Historic England (631) relating to Site G59.4, highlights two errors in the policy. One with regard to the site being within the conservation area and the second relating to no listed building being in close proximity to the site. Two modifications are proposed to address these points.

2.2 On a similar note the representation made by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge of Historic England (630) relating to Site G59.1 highlights that the site is within the conservation area and the policy does not name the listed buildings referred to. Two modifications are proposed to address this. This representation also suggests the deletion of the site from the SADMP. The site is sensitively located at the heart of the settlement. The policy contains a clause relating to this historic sensitivity. Following correspondence with the land owners, they understand the heritage concerns and the process for addressing this through professional advice at the detailed planning application stage (Appendix 1).

## 3. Highways Issues

3.1 The representation made by Claire Sullivan of Norfolk County Council as Highway Authority (1173) in relation to Site G59.4, seeks that reference is made within the policy for the access to be of adoptable standard. A modification is proposed to take account of this.

3.2 Highway concerns were raised at the Preferred Options Consultation (July 2013) to Sites G59.1 (METH1 / 316), G59.2 (METH2 / 588) and G59.3 (METH3 / 972) raised by Methwold Parish Council and members of the public. As part of the SA Norfolk County Council as Highways Authority were consulted, at stages of emerging policy formulation, their response to the sites are provided below and are contained with the following document: *'Consultation Response to Local Development Framework Preferred Highway Response'* (October 2013):

METH1 (site 316)	<b>Acceptable for inclusion in the plan.</b>  Subject to a safe access and safe visibility being achieved the Highway Authority would not object if this site were included in the plan. This allocation would be a preferred site for this settlement.
METH2 (part of site 588)	<b>Acceptable for inclusion in the plan.</b>  Access could be made onto Herbert Drive. Subject to a safe access being made the Highway Authority would not object if this site were included in the plan.
METH3 (part of site 972)	<b>Acceptable for inclusion in the plan.</b>  This allocation is slightly remote but an access could be made onto Hythe Road. Subject to a safe access being made the Highway Authority would not object if this site were included in the plan.

3.3 The specifics of access and visibility splays of sites will be considered at the detailed planning stage.

#### 4. Northwold

4.1 There are no allocations made in Northwold as detailed within the SADMP and SA01 on highways grounds. Below are the comments from Norfolk county Council Highway Authority:

283	3. It would be difficult to achieve a safe access from this allocation. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.
538	3. This allocation is remote from the settlement. The Highway Authority would object if this site were included in the plan.
1197	3. There is no clear means of access to A134. Access to the side road inadequate. This site should not be considered for housing.

Source: 'Consultation Response to Local Development Framework Preferred Highway Response' (October 2013).

Site 1278	3. The Highway Authority would object to this allocation. The access is inadequate.
-----------	---

Source: *'Consultation Response to Local Development Framework  
Additional Sites Sustainability Appraisal (January 2014).*

4.2 Whilst, as highlighted by the representation made by Jonathan Storey & Rachel Marrs (474), The Highway Authority provided a later response (25/11/2014) in relation to Site 1197 that is consistent with their earlier comments.

## 5. Comparison of Alternative Options

5.1 The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (SA01) details the consideration of all alternative options and the reasons why these were not considered the most sustainable options for development. All sites in Methwold and Northwold have identified constraints due to the nature of the settlements (landscape, heritage sensitivity, highway issues, etc.) and in the interest of delivering development in a Key Rural Service Centre; the Council have chosen the least constrained and most sustainable option for development.

## 6. Proposed Modifications

6.1 Amend item 3 of Policy G59.4 Methwold – Land off Globe Street/St George's Court, to:

- Submission of a Heritage Asset Statement that establishes that development will enhance and preserve the Conservation Area and safeguard archaeology within the adjoining site.

6.2 Add an additional item to Policy G59.4 Methwold – Land off Globe Street/St George's Court, as follows:

- Provision of highway improvements including access of adoptable standard to the satisfaction of the local highways authority.

This would also result in an amendment to paragraph G.59.30, as below:

- Access would be achieved to the site from Globe Street via the St George's Court development. Norfolk County Council as the local highway authority consider this as acceptable access providing it is of adoptable standard.

#### 6.3 Amend item 3 of Policy G59.1 Methwold – land at Crown Street, to:

- Submission of a Heritage Asset Statement that establishes that development will enhance and preserve the conservation area and the setting of the Grade I listed Church of St George and the Grade I listed Old Vicarage.

## 7. Conclusion

7.1 The Council considers that the proposed residential development sites in Methwold are justified, sustainable, viable, available and deliverable. It is considered that policy modifications, as outlined earlier in this statement, could address identified highways and heritage issues.

The King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council's response to the Issues and Questions paper from  
Inspector David Hogger

## Appendix 1. Site G59.1 Land Owner Heritage Response

From: Annette Storey <annette.stephen@live.co.uk> Sent: Thu 01/05/2014 13:01  
To: Alex Fradley  
Cc:  
Subject: RE:Site METH 1 (Part of Site 316) Land on Crown Street, Methwold, Thetford, Norfolk IP26 4AD

Dear Mr Fradley

I am writing to you with regard to the above site, as you have indicated this is a sensitive site within the heart of Methwold. Therefore we understand that any future development on this site must be of a very high standard both in design and form also character to blend in with the surrounding area, and we intend to seek professional advice when considering any development on this site.

Yours sincerely

S.J.Storey