

Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies.

Issue 20: Gayton, Grimston and Pott Row (G41).

Representation on behalf of Mrs L Barber (ID: 784629) concerning the development boundary of Gayton (comment ID 933).

### RESPONSE TO THE INSPECTOR'S QUESTION 20.1

The purpose of this statement is to respond to the Inspector's question 20.1 which is:

"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?"

#### Response

Mrs Barber's representation is that the development boundary of Gayton should be altered to include within it the site of three houses that have yet to be built under an implemented planning permission for four houses.

As there is already planning permission for houses on the site, it is not part of Mrs Barber's representation that any allocation proposed in the plan is unsound. Accordingly, this issue has not been examined on Mrs Barber's behalf. The assessment of the housing allocations needed for the borough and the calculation that 46 dwellings are needed in Gayton, Grimston and Pott Row did not take account of this existing permission but no submission is made as to whether the draft allocations should be modified in consequence.

Concluding section requested in paragraph 33 of the Inspector's guidance note

Placing the development boundary along the eastern side of the site identified in the representation is not the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternative of placing it along the western side. This is unsound as it is not justified. Moving the development boundary to the western side would bring within it the site of three houses that remain to be built under a planning permission for four houses. The permission was implemented by the construction of one of the four houses and is therefore live. There has been a long delay in construction but the owners of the land intend to develop now whether as originally permitted or, if further permission should be forthcoming, under an updated scheme. Without this change in the development boundary the land would inappropriately remain subject to countryside planning policies.

19<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

Graham Wright,  
La Ronde Wright Ltd.