

Andrew S Campbell Associates Ltd

Chartered Town Planners &
Development Consultants

Quay Cottage Studio
6 Bull Lane
St Ives
Cambridgeshire PE27 5AX

tel: 01480 393844

email: campbellplanning@aol.com

KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK BOROUGH COUNCIL: SITE ALLOCATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES (SADMP)

**PRE-HEARING STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MR AND MRS RUDD
LAND AT LEZIATE DROVE, POTT ROW, (ID 786235)**

ISSUE 20 : GAYTON, GRIMSTON AND POTT ROW (G.41)

REFERENCES:

**LPA REFERENCE – 925
OUR REF - ASCA/11/11
MR A S CAMPBELL (ID 401851)**

CONTENTS

1. **General Introduction**
2. **The Role of Key Rural Service Centres**
3. **The Distribution of Housing**
4. **Situation of Grimston/Pott Row**
5. **Conclusions**

1. **General Introduction** – We act for Mr and Mrs Rudd who own land on the south side of Leziate Drove, Pott Row. The land is identified on the attached red line plan and for convenience we show the two infill sites comprising 8 houses in total. The representations indicate that we consider this a much better proposal than the allocated site and in line with the Parish Council's wishes that only frontage development (not back land sites) should be considered in Grimston and Pott Row. We consider that our clients proposed houses could be added to the overall total for G.41.2 unless the Inspector felt that that allocation should be reduced to frontage development only. We consider that there is a strong case for that (see below) in terms of impact upon character of the village.
2. **The Role of Key Rural Service Centres** – The NPPF 2012 makes it clear that Local Plans “must be prepared with the objective for contributing to the achievement of sustainable development”, with a “presumption in favour of sustainable development”. (Paragraph 151. Opportunity should be sought “to achieve each of the economic, social and

environmental dimensions of sustainable development” (Paragraph 152) and should provide for the need for homes and jobs, retail leisure and other commercial development and the provision of local facilities (Paragraph 156). Plans should be drawn up over an appropriate timescale, preferably a 15 year time horizon (Paragraph 157). Whilst this applies to the approved Core Strategy, less than 10 years remains from the approval of the SADMP, and thus we will argue that flexibility should be allowed within the “guide figures” in the approved Core Strategy.

- 3. The Distribution of Housing** – The approved Core Strategy confirms (paragraph 7.2.14) that key rural service centres should support both local housing needs and local employment opportunities and Policy CSO6 indicates that key rural service centres will be the focus for most new development in the rural areas”. The Core Strategy confirms that key rural service centres will help sustain the wider rural community (Paragraph 6.1.11) by providing a range of services and having a level of public transport that can enable access to and from the settlement. Paragraph 6.1.12 confirms that “local scale development will be concentrated in identifying key rural service centres. This will include new housing, employment and retail development”. We feel it unfortunate therefore that the allocation of land in key rural service centres is constrained by the guide figures included in both the approved Core Strategy and analysed in more detail in both the Issues and Options Consultation and subsequently the pre-submission document. We note in particular in the pre-submission document that flexibility has been shown for the provision of housing in certain settlements, by allowing a greater amount of housing than that dictated

by settlement size. We see no reason why this cannot be the case in particular proposals that we are submitting on behalf of clients where circumstances dictate the need for additional housing to support the function of a key service village, particularly where there is a need to take a more comprehensive approach as required by the Core Strategy than is inherent in the Council's proposals. Indeed, we find the Council's "pro-rata" approach too simplistic whilst we will argue that a more pragmatic and comprehensive approach will not affect the overall thrust of the approved Core Strategy or the proposed SADMP in the relationship between key settlements and higher order settlements. The variations we suggest are minor but essential and in some places can be in place of other proposed housing allocations.

- 4. Situation of Grimston/Pott Row** – We note, in Paragraph G.4.14 of the pre-submission document, that Pott Row is described as a linear village, together with Grimston. There are a range of facilities that supports its designation as a key service village (paragraph G.4.15). The Council propose that the villages of Grimston and Pott Row should take half of the proposed development (23 dwellings), and our proposals, as described above, could in fact reduce that overall number. There are therefore no implications regarding the thrust of the general strategy.

- 5. Representations** – The representation indicates that, as with the Parish Council's comments, frontage development would be preferred within the villages of Grimston and Pott Row. There is therefore no reason why our client's site should not be chosen. There is no flood risk (a positive FRA having been produced) whilst, despite the comments of the

Borough Council that there is a highway reason militating against allocation, it can clearly be seen from the site layout plan attached that the requisite forward visibility in a westerly direction along Leziate Drove can be achieved as part of the development. We presume that the highway authority have not seen that proposal. Our representation concludes that our proposals can succeed either with Allocation G41.2, but preferably with that allocation amended to frontage development only, in line the Parish Council's wishes. Even with the retention of allocation G.41.2 as proposed, the addition of 4 (or 8) dwellings at Leziate Drove will make little difference to the total proposed.

6. **Conclusions** – Our client's proposals respect the character of the village and are in line with the Parish Council's wishes. It is clear that it has always been intended that our client's site be developed, the house numbering being reserved, whilst the proposal will improve the present trod footpath along the frontage linking one part of Pott Row with the other. We consider, for the reasons outlined above, that there should be alterations to make the Plan sound, justified and effective, and to be consistent with both the Core Strategy and National Policy.



Drain

LEZATE DROVE

12

11

31

36

43

49

90°

25m

50m

75m

Promap

Ordnance Survey © Crown Copyright 2011. All rights reserved. License number 100020410. Printed Scale - 1:1250





Revisions:

Notes: Subject to survey

Andrew S Campbell Assoc.
Chartered Town Planners

Quay Cottage Studio
6 Bull Lane, St Ives,
Cams. PE27 5AX

Tel. 01480 393844
Fax. 01480 381649
Email: campbellplanning@aol.com
Copyright 2011

SKETCH DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
LAND AT LEZIATE GROVE, POTT ROW
KINGS LYNN, NORFOLK.
ON BEHALF OF MR & MRS J RUDD

Scale 1:1000
Date June 2011
Drawing No. ckm/11/11/01