

King Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies EIP
Representor : J R Maxey MA, FRICS, FAAV, Maxey Grounds &
on behalf of
Representation reference : 276
Hearing Matter Number: Issue 2.11

1. Core Strategy Policy CS 11 requires development to promote forms of sustainable transport.
2. Policy DM 13 requires the safeguarding of listed former track beds for future use for footpaths / cycle ways
3. One of these track-beds borders the western side of the allocation west of South Wootton. The indicative master-plan documentation submitted as part of the emergence of the allocation of that area includes the provision of the main access road for this development , and proposed to link through to Nursery Lane, along part of this track bed, allied with the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes running alongside but not on the track bed.
4. It would appear to be illogical when the comprehensive development of an area includes provision for cycle, pedestrian and vehicular access routes that will link with other circulation corridors including national cycle ways, to require the safeguarding of the track bed as well.
5. There is no suggestion of seeking to reinstate a rail line between Kings Lynn and Hunstanton, given that the vast majority of the former route is now utilised for village bypasses or is part of the developed Kings Lynn. The purpose of the draft policy appears primarily to be to safeguard local access and circulation routes.
6. It is submitted that the policy as drafted is an unnecessary burden and as such the plan is unsound for this reason.
7. This burden could be reduced to an appropriate level by the variation of wording to remove the requirement where suitable alternative access provision including for pedestrians and cycles is made.
8. This could be achieved by adding to the policy at the end of the first paragraph after “etc” the following
“unless the proposals for trackway use are accompanied by appropriate alternative cycleway/ footpath provision that makes the safeguarding un-necessary”