

## **Draft Housing Policies**

Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:

Social & Community, and Housing:

LP25 Housing: and

LP31 – Delivering Affordable Housing on Phased Development:

[Local Plan Review 2019 - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](https://www.objective.co.uk)

**Consideration of Issues & Concussions:** (Appendix 1 provides a summary of comments, suggested modifications and an officer response/ proposed action)

- Evidence which supports the affordable housing policies is to be updated. The BC has commissioned a new Housing Need Assessment (HNA), this will replace the existing Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). A Local Plan review Viability Assessment will be commissioned.
- The BC through the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework along with the other Norfolk LPA's have commissioned an assessment of the need of older person and specialist accommodation. A new policy which considers this and the need for 'adaptable and accessible' homes will be sought through the Local Plan review.
- LP25 and LP31 are proposed for amalgamation for reasons of clarity
- The policies will up be updated accordingly taking account the latest available evidence, the NPPF and associated guidance

Suggested Policy:

Sustainability Appraisal

LP25: Housing																							
Policy	SA Objective:																						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	+	-	Overall Effect
<b>LPr LP25</b>																							
<b>Draft LP25</b>																							
<b>Draft LP31</b>																							
<b>No Policy</b>																							

LPXX: Housing for the Elderly and Specialist Care																						
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		+
LPr LPXX																						
No Policy																						

LPXX: Adaptable & Accessible Homes																						
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		+
LPr LPXX																						
No Policy																						

**Appendix 1: Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
<a href="#">Social &amp; Community</a>	Holkham Estate	Suggests	Considering the evidence provided and the NPPF they consider a response in relation to build to rent is required	Would be supportive of a policy which considers/covers build to rent	<b>Agreed. The BC has commissioned a new Housing Needs Assessment this will replace the existing Strategic Housing Market update. Regardless of this Build to Rent forms part of the NPPF and therefore such developments could come forward now</b>
	Rent Plus UK Ltd	Suggests	Suggest that the policies and evidence base is updated to reflect the requirements of the NPPF	See summary	See above
<a href="#">Housing</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Maxey</li> <li>• Thornham PC</li> <li>• Hunstanton TC</li> </ul>	Suggest	Considers the evidence base which supports the affordable housing	See summary	<b>Agreed. The BC has commissioned a new HNA and will commission a new</b>

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
			thresholds and policies requires updating		<b>Local Plan Viability Study and update policies accordingly</b>
<a href="#">LP25 Housing</a>	Heyford Developments	Support	Support in principle the approach including the flexible approach	Consider point 3 C should be removed as it is covered by 3 A & 3B and the wording to 3	<b>Agreed remove 3 C</b>
	Gladmans	Support	Support in principle the approach including the flexible approach	Consider that the need should referred to so it is clear that the policy is attempting to meet this	<b>Agreed a clear link to the need is required either as part of the policy or supporting text</b>
	Elmside Ltd	Suggest	That the policy needs to consider the special requirements for the elderly and other requiring specialist accommodation	See summary	<b>Agreed. The BC through the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework with the other Norfolk LPA's has commissioned Three Dragons to prepare a need study for older people and those requiring specialist care – a policy response in</b>

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					<b>the Local Plan review will be required</b>
	Pigeon & Pegasus	Suggest	Question the need for housing proposal to consider the latest needs evidence i.e. SHMA/HNA	Policy should be amended so that housing proposals do not have taken account of the latest evidence i.e. SHMA/HNA	Strongly Disagree – The evidence base and policies are to be updated and housing proposals should take account of this
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ian Cable</li> <li>• Mr/s Blackmore</li> <li>• Mr Good</li> <li>• Mr Golding</li> <li>• Mr/s Johnson</li> <li>• Mrs Cox</li> <li>• Mr Miller</li> <li>• Mr/s Clarke</li> <li>• Mrs Garner</li> <li>• Mr Russell</li> <li>• The Wootton Bros.</li> <li>• Mr Aldren</li> <li>• Dr Jones</li> <li>• Mr Cousins</li> </ul>	Suggest	<p>Affordable housing is not always best allocated on site, whereby there is limited demand for</p> <p>affordable in the locality and/or there is greater demand within other areas (particularly more</p> <p>urban areas). As such, greater flexibility in providing affordable housing contributions should</p> <p>be provided, such that commuted sums or provision of off site affordable is considered where</p>	<p>Amend: 5. Affordable housing should be delivered on site. Where evidence is provided that</p> <p>the site is not the most appropriate location and would give greater overall benefit off site or</p> <p>where not viable, through an open book viability assessment, if provision is made on site in</p> <p>line with the requirements set out in this policy, a commuted sum will be sought at £50,000 per</p>	

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
			it would make a more appropriate/valid contribution to the housing stock.	equivalent whole dwelling as recommended by the Council's Local Plan CIL Viability  Assessment, or the figure set out in any successor evidence endorsed by the Council	
	Norfolk County Council	Supports	Supports the affordable housing policy percentage sought		Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Milo Mason</li> <li>Charlie de Bono</li> </ul>	Suggests	Considers a threshold of 10 more reasonable than the policy	See summary	Noted. The policy will be based upon the latest evidence at the time of formulation including the NPPF and associated guidance
	CPRE – Michael Rayner (2 comments)	Suggests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BC adopt a Brownfield first approach</li> <li>Site could be phased but these options should form part of the allocation</li> </ul>		Not related directly to this policy.
	John Maxey	Suggest	Considers the evidence base which supports the affordable housing thresholds and policies requires updating	See summary	<b>Agreed. The BC has commissioned a new HNA and will commission a new Local Plan Viability</b>

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					<b>Study and update policies accordingly</b>
	STP Estates Group	Suggests	Would like to see more affordable housing in rural areas with vastly improved transport links to allow for more integrated delivery of health and social care services. Affordable housing should be available on all sites, regardless of size. The group would also like to see mention to key worker housing, particularly in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital King's Lynn. Key worker housing may allow for improved recruitment and retention rates of staff.	See summary	Noted. Affordable Housing Policies will be based upon the latest evidence available and the NPPF and associated guidance.
	Rent Plus UK Ltd	Suggests	Policy would benefit from referring to the latest evidence available including updated SHMA/HNA	See summary	<b>Agreed. The BC has commissioned a new HNA and will commission a new Local Plan Viability Study and update policies accordingly.</b>



Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Mark Behrendt (Home Builders Federation)		As outlined above the evidence on affordable housing needs will need to be updated to ensure both the overall housing requirement and policy LP25 are justified. It will also be necessary to update the Council’s evidence with regard to viability as paragraph 7.1.5 outlines that this evidence was last revised in 2009. It will be essential for this evidence to consider all the policy costs being placed on development as required by paragraph 34 of the NPPF in order to ensure that the cumulative burden of the policies in the plan do not undermine its deliverability. In particular it will be important to ensure that any affordable housing requirements are not aspirational and lead to site by site negotiation on such contributions which would be contrary to paragraph 57. The Government has established in both the NPPF and PPG that negotiation on a site by site basis should be limited and that decision makers must be able to assume that policy compliant development is		Noted. Affordable Housing Policies will be based upon the latest evidence available and the NPPF and associated guidance.

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
			<p>viable. It is therefore vital that the viability evidence is sound and that the policy in the local plan reflects this evidence. As such it will be important for the Council to engage closely with developers in their areas in the development of their viability evidence to accurately reflect the costs of developing within the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk area. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the preparation of the viability evidence and the engagement with the house building industry which paragraph 10-002-20180724 of PPG establishes as is a key requirement in the preparation of the local plan.</p>		
<a href="#">LP31 - Delivering Affordable Housing on Phased</a>	Home Builders Federation	Observation	<p>With regard to part 1 it is not clear what the policy is seeking to achieve with regard to</p>		Noted.

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
<a href="#">Development Policy</a>			<p>the delivering of affordable housing on a phased development. It would appear that the</p> <p>Council is seeking to ensure that the affordable housing contribution applies to the</p> <p>whole of the site and prevent incremental phasing below the policy threshold in LP25.</p> <p>However, there may be circumstances where sub division of a site could lead to the</p> <p>affordable housing requirement being delivered prior to market housing leaving</p> <p>remining phases to deliver solely market housing. There could be the unintended</p> <p>consequence of decision makers seeking contributions for affordable housing on later</p>		

Section	Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
			<p>phases of development as a consequence of this policy. We do not believe this is the intention of the policy, but we do recommend that the policy be rewritten to provide clarity</p>		

## Policy LP26 – Residential Development ~~Adjacent~~ Reasonably Related to Existing Settlements

Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:

<https://west-norfolk.objective.co.uk/portal/lpr2019/lpr2019?pointId=s1542883815232#section-s1542883815232>

Please note:

- Text highlighted in yellow differs from the draft consultation and has been agreed by Members
- The C&SB clause is now a separate one
- The AONB and Neighbourhood Plan clauses have been split for clarity
- Text Highlighted in green is new

Policy Recommendation:

## Policy LP26 – Residential Development ~~Adjacent~~ Reasonably Related to Existing Settlements

1. Residential development will be permitted ~~adjacent to existing~~ in areas reasonably related to existing settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy Policy (LP02) and their development boundaries where it involves:
  - a. the sensitive infilling of small gaps either wholly or in part, or rounding off the existing development boundary; and
  - b. the development is appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement and its surroundings; and
  - c. it will not fill a gap which provides a positive contribution to the street scene or views in/out of the locality; and
  - d. recognition that the development must conserve or enhance the natural environment and conserve and where appropriate enhance any heritage assets in the locality; and
  - e. sitting sympathetically within the wider landscape, preserves or enhances the setting of the nearest settlement; and
  - f. where possible the development is located to maximise the use of walking, cycling, and public transport to access services.

2. In exceptional circumstances the development of small groups of dwellings may be considered appropriate where the development is of a particularly high quality and would provide significant benefits to the local community.

3. Meaningful consultation with the Town/Parish Council, local community and other local stakeholders will be encouraged prior to submitting a planning application

4. Additional weight will be given to proposals for Custom and Self-Build development.

5. This Policy does not apply within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

6. This Policy does not apply to settlements covered by a Made Neighbourhood Plan. Unless the relevant Neighbourhood Plan allows this.

#### **Supporting text:**

#### **Introduction**

This policy is designed to provide a flexible framework for more modest levels of growth of an appropriate character by identifying the key types of development likely to be suitable, and enabling appropriate, small-scale development reasonably related to existing settlements in a sensitive manner. The policy should support housing developments which reflect local needs and promotes sustainable development in rural areas, with a view to enhancing and maintaining the vitality of such communities, including supporting local services, allowing communities to grow and thrive. This reflects the aims of the NPPF and in particular paragraph 78.

#### **Relevant Local and National Policies**

- National Planning Policy Framework - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes:
  - Core planning principles (roles and characters of different areas)
  - para 59: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
  - para 77 - 79: Rural Housing

- para 172: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
  
- Strategic Policies:
  - LP01: Spatial Strategy
  - LP02: Settlement Hierarchy
  - LP03 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
  - LP04 - Development Boundaries
  - LP06: The Economy
  - LP16 - Design and Sustainable Development
  - LP17 - Environmental Assets - Green Infrastructure, Historic Environment, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity
  - LP18 - Environment, Design and Amenity Policy
  - LP25: Housing Distribution
  - LP32: Community and Culture
  - LP37: Development in Rural Areas
  - LPXX Norfolk Coast AONB

## Policy Approach

It is recognised that windfall development makes an important contribution towards housing supply and delivery throughout the Borough. It enables people to live in desirable Sustainable locations. This policy creates the opportunity for further windfall development to come forward, however it appreciates that such development needs to be appropriately located and of an appropriate nature. This policy clarifies the form of development which could be permitted.

The policy recognises that areas which sit outside of defined development boundaries, for settlements listed in the settlement hierarchy, which are close to the settlement **and their defined development boundaries** may be sustainable locations for housing development, i.e. close to services and facilities. This is why the policy states 'reasonably related to' the settlement and development boundary as these areas could be considered part of the settlement although they sit outside of the settlement's development boundary. The policy also caters for the rounding off existing development boundaries. The policy makes it clear that the proposed development does not have to be immediately next to the development boundary.

Infill development can make an improvement to the street scene where a gap has been left, for example due to demolished buildings or where it replaces lower quality development. It also provides the opportunity for growth without spoiling the form and character of the settlement.

The Borough Council recognises the importance that custom and self-build housing can play in contributing not only to housing supply but also to completions. Given this, and that it allows people to create a home which they ultimately want, the Borough Council is supportive of this type of housing. Further details on this can be found within the introductory text to Policy LP01 – Spatial Strategy Policy, under the heading 'Custom and Self-Build' and the Borough Council's Custom & Self-Build Action Plan.

The Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) covers a significant portion of the Borough. The statutory purpose of designating an area of land as an AONB is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. This comprises the area's distinctive landscape character, biodiversity and geodiversity, historic and cultural environment. With this in mind and in line with the NPPF, Policy LPXX Norfolk Coast AONB, and taking into consideration the Norfolk Coast Partnership's management strategy '*Norfolk Coast Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty Strategy*' this policy does not apply to areas which are within the AONB.

Careful Consideration will be required for areas which could impact upon natural environment designations and their setting, for example the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA). And for areas which could have an impact upon historic environment designations and their settings such as conservation areas.



The Borough Council is very supportive of those communities who wish to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for their Area. As such the Borough Council believes it should be up to the Qualifying Body (town/parish council or forum) and the local community to decide if this policy should apply within their Area. Please see Policy LP01 – Spatial Strategy Policy for further information in relation to Neighbourhood Plans.

**Sustainability Appraisal:**

LP26: Residential Development adjacent to Settlement Boundaries																							
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		+	-
<b>LP26</b>	-	0	0	0	0	+/-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+6	-2	Likely Positive Effect +4
<b>Draft LP26</b>	-	0	0	0	0	+/-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+6	-2	Likely Positive Effect +4
<b>No Policy</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Likely Neutral Effect

This policy has evolved since the SADMP; previously it was concerned with infill development at Smaller Village and Hamlets only. It is now proposed that these settlements are to be given a development boundary. The policy now focuses on development outside, but reasonably related to the development boundaries of all the settlements listed within the settlement hierarchy (excluding areas with a made neighbourhood plan, and excluding areas within the AONB).

The provision of the policy for infilling development in the ‘Smaller Villages and Hamlets’, which generally have few services and are highly dependent on travel by car, scored poorly in the SADMP SA, however the Borough Council gave particular weight to the popular perception in these settlements that there is a need for a continuing modicum of development to sustain them and their communities. This is now to be provided through a combination of LP04 and LP26. The new policy approach results in a positive impact overall. Clearly more land could be taken up but there is a pressing need to significantly boost the supply of housing (as outlined by revised NPPF) across the Borough, and this approach is considered one way of contributing towards this, ensuing flexibility in meeting the Local Housing Need through the Local Plan review, 5 year housing land supply and of course the Housing Delivery Test.

The proposed policy has been amended since the draft version in order to clarify the position with regards to the AONB and relationship with Neighbourhood Plans and other operational aspects. The supporting text has been expanded upon to provide further detail to the approach of the policy and explain the rationale for the points within the policy.

These proposed amendments whilst add clarity to the policy do not alter the Sustainability Scoring between the daft version and that now proposed  
However, the proposed policy and supporting text is preferred for the reasons stated.

### Consideration of Issues:

- Balance of people who Support and Object.
- Many want the policy opened up to be more flexible i.e. can take place in the AONB, Neighbourhood Plan areas, for larger sites, and for wider geographic scope.
- Many want it delated altogether.
- There is support for custom and self-build element of the policy
- Further explanation to 'adjacent to existing settlement' – This should perhaps read 'reasonably related to' and mention both the settlement and the development boundary to provide clarity.
- Explain C&SB element and link to relevant section
- Explain AONB protection and link to new policy – which will include a map of the AONB
- Explain Neighbourhood Plan protection element
- Not raised but probably need to add reference to special consideration for areas which could impact upon the Environmental and Historic designations
- Not raised but if a Neighbourhood Plan covers an area in the AONB make it clear that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot override the protection afforded to the AONB.

**Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Mr Michael Rayner  CPRE	Object	<p>CPRE Norfolk is concerned by the phrases "the sensitive infilling of small gaps" and "rounding off" in this policy, as these are far too subjective. They could be used to justify unsustainable, unplanned and inappropriate development which did not recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. By potentially allowing development adjacent to existing settlements there is a danger that this policy would be used to justify development adjacent to a development boundary where it would not be infill but expanding the settlement. It is also likely that such development would not be providing often much needed affordable housing, but would instead be used to provide market housing. Many of the smaller rural settlements now have development/settlement boundaries allowing for some development within them. It is therefore important not to allow further growth outside of these boundaries, as this would lead to the possibility of exaggerated, unplanned and unsustainable growth in these smaller settlements in particular. Point 2 saying "In exceptional circumstances the development of small groups of dwellings may be considered appropriate where the development is of a particularly high quality and would provide significant benefits to the local community", is too vague with several phrases which could prove to be loopholes for unneeded development. These phrases are: "in exceptional circumstances"; "may be</p>	Delete the policy	The policy is designed to provide a flexible framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. In order to meet our housing need in terms of supply and deliver a wide range of measures will be required

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		considered appropriate"; "particularly high quality"; "would provide significant benefits.		
Mr T Richardson	Support	Support is expressed for the wording of bullet point 1(a) within LP26 in that it will enable sensible rounding off of villages. Concern is expressed in respect to bullet point (3) in respect to neighbourhood plans, as it is for the neighbourhood plan to accord with the local plan and not vice versa.	Delete bullet point 3	Want to support local communities through their Neighbourhood Plans
Mr J Maxey Maxey Grounds & Co	Support	Strongly support the principle of infill and / or rounding of development in or adjoining settlements. My comment would be that in defining the settlement boundaries there are often concentrations of development that are not marked as part of the settlement, and so to which a policy targeted as being applicable to areas adjacent to settlement would apply. Suggested this is amended to also include concentrations of development outside and not necessarily adjacent to a settlement, but where the development would clearly be infill, not extending the linearity of a frontage, or extending further into open countryside	Expand to include concentrations of development outside settlements	Noted. This perhaps would be too flexible and lead undesirable development
Mr & Mrs Gerald Gott	Object	We object to policy LP26 as it predicated on development boundaries around settlements which are contrary paragraphs 77 and 78 of the NPPF 2019 (see our representation about Policy LP04)	Delete the policy	Don't believe this to be the case. On the contrary the policy is consistent with NPPF para. 77/78
Mr Nathan Rose	Mixed	This policy reads as if it will much too easily provide a loophole against Policy LP04 Development Boundaries, especially when read	e) it is clear that it is not attempting to	Draft Policy isn't saying the site has to be next to the

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>with point 4.4.1 in that policy. This LP26 policy seems to be in direct contradiction of LP04. Moreover, it makes no reference to LP04 and therefore can be read and interpreted standalone. Point 1a could imply that once the development boundary has been extended by rounding off, that new boundary could be further extended by rounding off, and so on, enabling creep and sprawl. It should be made clear that the principles of Policy LP04 will always carry greater weight than LP26. Also my comments against LP04 regarding additional efforts to raise awareness for residents and the public of such applications, and giving their views additional weighting, are applicable here.</p>	<p>circumvent the principles of development boundaries (LP04)</p> <p>f) additional weight given to the views of local residents</p>	<p>development boundary hence the link to the settlement not the boundary.</p> <p>Local / public views will be taken into account at the planning application /determination stage</p>
<p>Mrs Erica Whettingsteel EJW Planning Limited</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Policy needs to be expanded to include smaller villages and settlements, not just those identified in the settlement hierarchy. As currently drafted the policy does not accord with National Guidance. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF acknowledges that it is not just villages containing local services that can provide for housing growth, and states that where there are groups of smaller settlements development in one village may support services in a village nearby. This is further reiterated in the Planning Practice Guidance that states that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas and that blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided. The bullet points in part 1 of the policy require refinement to</p>	<p>Expand and delete d)</p>	<p>Believe point d) is important. Policy is consistent with NPPF 78 as includes places considered to be settlement</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		ensure that they are sound, consistent with national policy and positively prepared		
Mrs Sarah Bristow-Gayton Parish	Object	<p>Policy LP26: 1. Residential development will be permitted adjacent to existing settlements identified in the Settlement Cont..... Hierarchy Policy LP02 where it involves: a. the sensitive infilling of small gaps either wholly or in part or rounding off the existing development boundary; and b the development is appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement and its surroundings; and c. additional weight will be given to proposals for Custom and Self-Build development; and d. it will not fill a gap which provides a positive contribution to the street scene or views in/out of the locality. 2. In exceptional circumstances the development of small groups of dwellings may be considered appropriate where the development is of a particularly high quality and would provide significant benefits to the local community. 3. This Policy does not apply within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty nor for settlements with a made Neighbourhood Plan (unless the relevant Neighbourhood Plan allows this). Comment: We would suggest that LP26 is actually redundant in terms of what, on the surface, it seems to be trying to achieve. Exceptions for development outside the development boundary are covered in LP04 clause 2. We suggest that all reference to LP26 is removed from clause 3 in LP04, 15.0.3 and Clause 7 in LP37, and LP26 is deleted completely. Rationale: We are responding on behalf of Gayton Parish Council. Gayton is currently developing a Neighbourhood Plan, a process</p>	Broadly delete the policy	The policy is designed to provide a flexible framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. In order to meet our housing need in terms of supply and deliver a wide range of measures will be required



Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>which should be complete before the introduction of the Local Plan in which case LP26 would not apply. However, the Neighbourhood Plan is currently not 'made' and therefore we feel it is appropriate that we do comment on LP26. The introduction of LP26 appears to be aimed at allowing small, sensitive developments of gaps to support the needs of small communities. What it seems to do (in Clause 2) is introduce a hitherto disallowed mechanism for developers to build 'small' developments of market housing with a smattering of affordable homes in small villages and hamlets. This clause seems particularly open to abuse/challenges by developers: imagine the situation where there is a recognised need for affordable housing in a community. Under LP26, a developer could offer to build affordable housing but (see LP25), this might mean that a 'small group of dwellings' of 10 houses could consist of 2 affordable houses and 8 market houses. We do not think this is what is intended by LP26. More generally, if affordable housing is required (or custom and self-build etc.), this is generally covered by the exceptions in LP04. However, these policies have the effect of diluting the provision of affordable homes as they are allowed to be provided as a percentage within a development of market housing. If the planning system is serious about promoting affordable housing, then policies such as LP26 need to be explicitly restricted to allowing Cont..... exceptional development only for 100% affordable, or custom, or self-build (etc) housing. Mixed schemes are well covered elsewhere and introducing possible loopholes which culminate in the disregarding</p>		

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Nature of Response</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Consultee Suggested Modification</b>	<b>Officer Response / Proposed Action</b>
		of development boundaries is inevitably going to destroy public confidence in the efficacy and usefulness of development boundaries and ultimately brings the planning system into disrepute.		
Richard Smith NPS	Support	provides opportunities for infilling of land adjacent to settlement boundaries		Agreed
Ian Cable	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr A Garner	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr D Russell	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr D Miller	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr R Cousins	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Nature of Response</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Consultee Suggested Modification</b>	<b>Officer Response / Proposed Action</b>
Mr A Golding	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr & Mrs J Lambert	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mrs A Cox	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Dr A Jones	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr & Mrs Clarke	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr L Aldren	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Wotton Brothers- Wotton Brothers Farm	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Mrs B Johnson	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr R Garner	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed
Mr N Good	Support	The introduction of development boundaries is supported. Proposed development boundaries are inconsistent. In some villages the proposed boundaries include areas which have recently completed development, current development and sites with extant permission yet to be built. Whilst other proposed development boundaries exclude such areas. It is considered that proposed development boundaries should be consistent to include existing built up areas, those under development and those with extant permissions yet to be built out. This will provide the most up to date development boundaries by the time the proposed development boundaries are adopted.		The approach to development boundaries is to include sites once they are built out. In order to retain an element of control
Ms Debbie Mack Historic England	Support	Historic England welcome reference for development to be appropriate to the character of the settlement and its surroundings and the reference to the importance of some gaps which make a positive contribution to the street scene or views		Agreed
FK Coe & Son Landowners (clients)	Support	Policy LP26 states that: 'Residential development will be permitted adjacent to existing settlements identified in the Settlement		Agree with the comments made about encouraging

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Lois Partridge Senior Associate Sworders		<p>Hierarchy Policy LP02 where it involves: a. the sensitive infilling of small gaps either wholly or in part or rounding off the existing development boundary; and b. the development is appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement and its surroundings; and c. additional weight will be given to proposals for Custom and Self-Build development; and d. it will not fill a gap which provides a positive contribution to the street scene or views in/out of the locality. 2. In exceptional circumstances the development of small groups of dwellings may be considered appropriate where the development is of a particularly high quality and would provide significant benefits to the local community. 3. This Policy does not apply within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty nor for settlements with a made Neighbourhood Plan (unless the relevant Neighbourhood Plan allows this). Paragraph 81 of the NPPF notes that planning policies should: d) be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan, allow for new and flexible working practices (such as live-work accommodation), and to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.’ Paragraph 117 also notes that: ‘Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses.’ Our client welcomes the introduction of Policy LP26, which would enable more windfall sites to come forward, and increases the flexibility of the Plan to accommodate new housing. Policy LP26 also complies with national policy and reflects the Government’s agenda to proactively plan to meet future housing needs. Amendments to the development</p>		windfall sites & flexibility of meeting housing needs

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>boundaries in Neighbourhood Plans, as proposed in Policy LP04, may also provide new opportunities for sites to come forward under Policy LP26 of the Plan, further increasing the flexibility of the Development Plan as a whole. One of our client's sites in Grimston, Land east of Church Close, would comply with the criteria set out in Policy LP26, by infilling the gap between the two parts of the settlement boundary along Vong Lane. A small, high quality group of dwellings on this site would fill a gap which does not provide a positive contribution to the street scene or views in/out of the locality. It would round off the existing development boundary and could be appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement and its surroundings.</p>		
Holkham Estate	Support	<p>Whilst support is given to the general principle of Draft Policy LP26, suggested modifications to the wording are set out below to better reflect the provisions of the NPPF. It is considered that draft criterion 2 restricts the potential for the delivery of affordable housing and it should be deleted. In order to enable affordable housing to be delivered at sites coming forward as part of Policy LP26, sites would need to reach the thresholds set out at Draft Policy LP25: ☐ King's Lynn, Downham Market and Hunstanton - Sites of 0.33 ha or 10 or more dwellings ☐ Rural areas - Sites of 0.165 of ha or 5 or more dwellings Draft criterion 3 is also restrictive. ☐ It is questioned what the justification is for all windfall development to be restricted throughout the AONB. Providing that development complies with the requirements of Draft Policy LP26</p>	<p>Suggest that b) is removed to allow affordable housing.</p> <p>Should apply to the AONB, see NPPF 59.</p> <p>Should apply to Neighbourhood Plan areas. Suggests additional weight for build-to-rent</p>	<p>Affordable housing can come forward as this may be appropriate. BC seeking protection of the AONB. BC supporting local communities through Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Is an important sector, BC will update SHMA. BC focusing on Custom &amp; Self Build in line with BC Action Plan. Of course BTR could</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>and other relevant Development Plan policies, particularly, Draft Policy LP17 'Environmental Assets', windfall development should be allowed to come forward in order to boost the supply of homes throughout the Borough reflecting the objective set out at paragraph 59 of the NPPF. As such it is suggested this part of the criterion is deleted. ☐ Neighbourhood Plans should reflect the adopted Development Plan. It is questioned why settlements with a made Neighbourhood Plan should be exempt from future windfall development, particularly where there is no requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to allocate sites for development. As such it is suggested this part of the criterion is deleted. In respect of criterion 1c, it is suggested by the Council that additional weight should be afforded to Custom and Self-Build development. Similarly, it is requested that the Council considers affording additional weight to 'Build to Rent' development having regard to up to date evidence. The Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk 'Strategic Housing Market Assessment – Update' (June 2014) considers recent trends in the private rented sector (paragraphs 4.14 and 4.27). The SHMA Update refers to a national report 'Who Lives in the Private Rented Sector' published in January 2013 by the British and Social Housing Foundation (BSHF). Additional input was sought from household surveys and the view of local letting agents. Paragraph 4.16 of the SHMA Update notes an increase in demand in rental property in King's Lynn and West Norfolk "due to the growth in household groups that typically look to reside in the tenure – young adults and migrant households."</p>		<p>come forward under this policy</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		This indicates there could be a need to support build to rent development across the Borough.		
Gemma Clark- AONB Norfolk Coast Partnership	Support	AONB Norfolk Coast Partnership support the policy		Noted and appreciated
Richard Brown Koto Ltd	N/A	Comments relate to Downham Market and not this policy		Consider in Downham Market Section
Richard Brown Elm Park Holdings	Support	Policy LP26 is supported, but with the deletion of paragraph 2. Policy LP26 (1.a.) there is no need for the provision of “small” gaps which [small] should be deleted.	there is no need for the provision of “small” gaps which [small] should be delete	The policy is designed to provide a flexible framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. In order to meet our housing need in terms of supply and deliver a wide range of measures will be required
Richard Brown Elmside Ltd	N/A	Comments relate to Wisbech Fringe/Emneth and not this policy		Consider in relevant Section
Mr Robert Alston	Support	We support the sentiment of policy LP26 which permits development in rural villages where previously this has been	Delete ref. to development boundary.	The policy is designed to provide a flexible



Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		restricted but consider that the need for sites having to be located adjacent to development boundaries is not in line with paragraph 78 of the NPPF. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF states that sustainable housing development in rural areas can help to support services in another village. This is not predicated on development boundaries	Delete ref. to Neighbourhood Plans	framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. BC wishes to support Neighbourhood Plans
Murdo Durrant Parish Clerk Burnham Thorpe Parish Council	Object	5. Policy 26 5.1. In tandem with the policy change to settlement development boundaries for Smaller Villages and Hamlets, and further increasing the likely random and unsuitable development which may be likely to be allowed by this Local Plan is the provision of Policy 26. This appears to give the opportunity for development outside the development boundaries of settlements - including smaller villages and hamlets. There does not appear to be any justification for this policy and its wording and intent would seem likely to give rise to significant speculative development applications. I would suggest that this policy is deleted and that no revision or alteration of it is necessary as it does not perform a useful or needful function. Where exception sites may come forward for social housing, they would not require this policy - or one like it - to support them.	Delete Policy	The policy is designed to provide a flexible framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. In order to meet our housing need in terms of supply and deliver a wide range of measures will be required
Mr & Mrs D Blakemore	Support	Support. Small scale development in smaller settlements prevents stagnation and contributes to organic growth of the settlements, with the ability to provide added character and vitality.		Agreed

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Ken Hill Estate	Support	<p>The policy is generally pragmatic and helpful to ensuring windfall housing sites can be brought forward outside of but adjacent to development limits. However, the in-principle restriction which prevents such development in AONBs is not considered valid and has the potential to disadvantage the future sustainability of some settlements, and lead to an in-balance in the delivery of windfall housing across the plan area. Settlements within the AONB have no lesser need for housing to support local services and the vitality of local communities and there is nothing to suggest that small scale development of this nature would be unacceptable in such settlements, if appropriately designed to reflect the AONB's special qualities. It is considered that the restriction on this form of development in AONBs should be removed and an additional criterion added stating: For settlements within the AONB, it must be demonstrated that development will not have an adverse impact on the qualities of the designated area.</p>	See box to left	BC affording weight and protection to AONB
Ms Sarah Greenall	Object	<p>Policy 26. This seems to allow for development outside the development boundaries of settlements. Why? It will only encourage random and unsuitable development. What is the justification for this when there has been much talk of the more sensible brownfield sites?</p>	Delete Policy	<p>The policy is designed to provide a flexible framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. In order to meet our housing need in terms of supply and deliver a wide range of measures will be required.</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
				BC has a BF register and BF sites can come forward.
Pigeon Investment Management Ltd	Support	<p>Policy LP26 – Residential Development Adjacent to Existing Settlements 1.36 The inclusion of Policy LP26 is welcomed in that it gives greater flexibility to the interpretation of Policy LP04. Where this would also result in the best use of a site through increased densities then Policy LP26 should not limit development only to ‘small groups of dwellings’ or ‘the sensitive infilling of small gaps either wholly or in part or rounding off the existing development boundary’. In the case of Pigeon’s site at Ingoldisthorpe, whilst it falls outside the settlement boundary it is well contained by existing development and could easily accommodate more than a small group of dwellings. Moreover, it does not form part of an existing small gap that would round off the existing development boundary. 1.37 Notwithstanding the above, Pigeon’s site at Ingoldisthorpe is clearly in a sustainable location, as part of a functional cluster with other higher order 13   P a g e settlements. Therefore, Policy LP26 should allow greater flexibility for sites like this to come forward where new homes would be near to services and would support villages to thrive.</p>	See box to left	The policy is designed to provide a flexible framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. In order to meet our housing need in terms of supply and deliver.
Mr Adrian Lott-Parkers of Leicester Ltd	Support	<p>Policy LP 26 Residential Development Adjacent to Existing Settlements This policy is described in the Plan as being ‘designed to provide more modest levels of growth of an appropriate character, within all settlements, by identifying the key types of development likely to be suitable, and enabling appropriate, small-</p>	Remove AONB restriction	BC protecting AONB In line NPPF 172.

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>scale development adjacent to existing development'. This is appropriate as it allows well-considered development beyond the Development Boundary consistent with the existing settlement's needs and where development would contribute to the sustainability of the settlement. The criteria listed within the policy provide the necessary safeguards to ensure that development is appropriate and high quality (criteria 1) and would be modest in amount (criteria 2). We object however, to the exclusion of settlements within the AONB under criteria 3 of the policy. While the AONB is of national significance, this designation does not necessarily preclude appropriate development. AONBs are living and working landscapes and they too must be allowed to develop and adjust to remain viable and sustainable with appropriate and limited amounts of new development. The AONB includes several settlements and the policy would restrict the ability of those settlements to change and adapt as envisaged by the policy for all other settlements. The NPPF (paragraph 172) and policies in the Plan provide the necessary safeguards to ensure that development is well considered and appropriate, such as LP16 Design and Sustainable Development, LP 17 Environmental Assets, LP18 Environment, Design and Amenity. We therefore object and request that criteria 3 as it relates to the AONB be removed.</p>		
Amber REI Ltd	Support	<p>2.14 Policy LP26 states that residential development will be permitted adjacent to existing settlements identified in the Settlement Hierarchy where it involves: ➤ The sensitive infilling of</p>	Not convinced that Custom & Self Build	Agree with summary but not suggested modification. Government

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>small gaps either wholly or in part or rounding off the existing development boundary; and ➤ The development is appropriate to the scale and character of the settlement and its surroundings; and ➤ Additional weight should be given to proposals for Custom and Self-Build development; and ➤ It will not fill a gap which provides a positive contribution to the street scene or views in/out of the locality. It goes on to state that in exceptional circumstances the development of a small group of dwellings may be considered appropriate where the development is of a particularly high quality and would provide significant benefits to the local community.</p> <p>2.15 The rationale behind this policy is supported and it is considered that residential development adjacent to existing buildings would assist in providing sufficient flexibility to support housing delivery across the plan period in sustainable locations on the edge of existing settlements.</p>	should be given additional weight	through NPPF and various legislation place focus upon Custom and Self Build Housing. BC is keen to adhere to this. Please see Action plan
Charlie de Bono	Support	We broadly support this policy As this more flexible approach to policy will encourage sustainable development in appropriate locations. Edge of settlement development is very much a traditional approach to settlement evolution. We are particularly supportive of ref 1c. where "additional weight will be given to proposals for Custom and Self-Build development", as this naturally leads more local-needs based solutions.	Could be Stronger on Custom and Self Build and perhaps provide further information	Noted. Supporting text should reference the Custom and Self Build Section of the Local Plan review
Mr Craig Barnes	Mixed	Policy LP26 relates to the development of housing within the open countryside. The policy enables development of small infill sites	Delete Policy	BC believe this to be a measured approach.

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Gladman		but excludes locations with Neighbourhood Plans. Gladman queries the differentiation made in the policy between areas with Neighbourhood Plans and those without. The application of this policy may result in Neighbourhood Plans which promote/permit a lower amount of development than the Local Plan which runs counter the National Planning Policy. No differentiation should therefore be made.		Unlikely that given the basic conditions and NPPF that Neighbourhood Plans will provide less growth than sort. Explain in supporting text the protection for Neighbourhood Plans which are Made

## **Draft Policy LP27- Houses in Multiple Occupation Policy**

**Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:**

[Local Plan Review 2019 - Details - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](#)

### **Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

No comments were made in relation to this policy so therefore we proposed no change to take place. The Local Plan Task Group asked if further investigation could be made in reference to licensing requirements for a HMO could be added to the policy or supporting text and detail regarding higher quality standards. These points were taken on board and where was appropriate text has been amended and highlighted in yellow below.

**Consideration of issues: N/A**

### **Policy Recommendation:**

- 7.4.1 HMO definition has been expanded upon in detail with footnotes
- 7.4.3 has reference to standards requirements and a link to the borough council's website
- 7.4.4 details the license requirement of large HMOS with a link
- LP27 Policy added a new clause 'd' emphasising need to be of a high-quality standard

## **LP27 Houses in Multiple Occupation Policy (previously DM4)**

### **Introduction**

**7.4.1** Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) were introduced under Class C4 in the Town and County Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment)(England) Order 2010 and is the use of a dwelling house by not more than six residents. Under Article 2 (4) of the order, purpose of Class C4 HMOs does not

include a converted block of flats to which S.257 of the Housing Act 2004 applies<sup>1</sup>. However, HMOs have the same meaning as S.254 of the Housing Act 2004 which defines them as: a building or part of a building that consists of one or more units of living accommodation, which is occupied by persons who do not form a single household and two or more of the households share one or more basic amenities such as a bathroom or kitchen<sup>2</sup>.

**7.4.2** The number of HMOs in the Borough has increased markedly in recent years. HMOs make an important contribution to the mix and range of housing to meet the needs of a diverse community and workforce. In the Borough there is a particular concentration of HMOs within certain areas of King's Lynn, Hunstanton and Downham Market. This type of accommodation is associated with a number of issues and problems, particularly in areas of high concentration, including acceptable room size and living conditions, noise and anti-social behaviour, parking provision and waste storage and removal.

**7.4.3** Planning permission may not always be needed, depending on circumstances, for a change of use to certain types of smaller HMOs. However, the Council considers it useful to have a clear policy in place for those situations, including larger HMOs, where planning applications are required. The standards expected to be provided among all HMOS are high and must comply with legislation as set out under the weblink: [https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20114/houses\\_in\\_multiple\\_occupation/413/what\\_is\\_an\\_hmo](https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20114/houses_in_multiple_occupation/413/what_is_an_hmo)

7.4.4 Large HMOS as defined by the central government are required to have a mandatory license, if the household is occupied by five or more people, forming two or more households, with shared basic amenities. As defined on our website<sup>3</sup>, for the situation of purpose-built flats (those that were originally built as flats – not converted into flats):

- a) If a purpose built flat is occupied by five or more people, and it's in a block comprising of up to two flats, it **will** be licensable;
- b) and if a purpose built flat is occupied by five or more people, and it's in a block comprising three or more flats, it **will not** be licensable.
- c) Mandatory licensing applies to flats such as those above shops on traditional high street type locations, but not large purpose-built blocks of flats.

Further information on HMOS is provided within this weblink: [https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20114/houses\\_in\\_multiple\\_occupation](https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20114/houses_in_multiple_occupation)

#### **Relevant Local and National Policies**

- National Planning Policy Framework: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- Strategic Policy LP16 Sustainable Development

---

<sup>1</sup> Town and County Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment)(England) Order 2010 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/653/article/2/made>

<sup>2</sup> Housing Act 2004 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/34/contents>

<sup>3</sup> BCKLWN (2020) HMOS [https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20114/houses\\_in\\_multiple\\_occupation/675/apply\\_for\\_an\\_hmo](https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20114/houses_in_multiple_occupation/675/apply_for_an_hmo)



- Strategic Policy LP32 Community and Culture

### Policy Approach

**7.4.4** A policy is proposed in order to regulate and manage this type of accommodation because of the pressures and problems mentioned above. In deciding applications for the conversion of existing dwellings and new developments of properties for multiple occupation, the views of Housing Services, Community Safety and Neighbourhood Nuisance, Building Control, Licensing and any other relevant sections within the Borough Council will be sought and taken into account (insofar as they are planning matters).

### Policy LP27- Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)

1. The conversion of existing dwellings to and new development of properties for multiple occupation may be permitted where:
  - a. there is no adverse impact on the amenity of existing and new residents and the historic and natural environment; **and**
  - b. the development and associated facilities, including bin storage, car and cycle parking, can be provided without detriment to the occupiers of adjoining or neighbouring properties; **and**
  - c. the site is within reasonable distances to facilities, public open space, supporting services and local employment.
  - d. **the proposed scheme is of a high quality and meets the necessary standards set out in legal national requirements**

## **Draft Policy LP28- Enlargement or Replacement of Dwellings in the Countryside Policy**

**Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:**

[Local Plan Review 2019 - Details - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](#)

**Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Nature of Response</b>	<b>Summary</b>	<b>Consultee Suggested Modification</b>	<b>Officer Response/ Proposed Action</b>
<b>Mr Kelvin Loveday</b>	<b>Object</b>	Mechanisms are already in place to prevent developments deemed inappropriate. Housing is required. This policy favours of large developers (without local connections) around major towns above small local landowners in rural areas to meet the housing needs. Smaller developers use local traders and this helps the local economy.	<b>N/A</b>	Do not think this comment is related to the LP28 intentions
<b>Gemma Clark- Norfolk Coast Partnership (AONB)</b>	<b>Support</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We support LP28</li> </ul>	<b>N/A</b>	Agreed
<b>Ms Maxine Hayes- Parish Clerk Holme- Next- The- Sea Parish Council</b>	<b>Object</b>	Please consider revising this policy. Now that the SVAH's have development boundaries this policy could helpfully be extended to cover all settlement. The comparable SADMP policy has encouraged the acquisition of small dwellings in the countryside for speculative development of grand designer houses, taking them out of the local market and often impacting negatively on the countryside setting. This is depriving local people of small homes that they could afford. The associated issues could be controlled by limiting the size of the replacement to a proportion of the original.	<b>N/A</b>	Policy is here to protect the impacts settlements can make on the countryside - it is not intended to deprive locals of small houses.

**Consideration of issues:**

- **Concern that replacement dwellings may become unaffordable for local people due to depriving them of local homes**
- **Worry that the policy favours large developers over smaller and more local trades/developers**
- **Supportive comment relates to high quality and appropriate design for the local environment I would say (AONB)**
- **The comments made are not necessarily appropriate to this specific policy**

**Policy Recommendation: As it stands.**

1. Proposals for replacement dwellings or extensions to existing dwellings will be approved where the design is of a high quality and will preserve the character or appearance of the street scene or area in which it sits.
2. Schemes which fail to reflect the scale and character of their surroundings or which would be oppressive or adversely affect the amenity of the area or neighbouring properties will be refused

**Supporting text:**

**Introduction**

The character and beauty of West Norfolk’s countryside needs to be protected in accordance with Strategic Policy LP37.

The National Planning Policy Framework promotes sustainable rural development. There is no national guidance regarding replacement dwellings and residential extensions, but these can equally have a negative impact on the countryside if not carefully managed. Therefore there is a need for a local policy to control such potential impacts.

**Relevant Local and National Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Strategic Policies:

LP01 Spatial Strategy

LP37 Development in Rural Areas

LP16 Sustainable Development

**Policy Approach**

For the purposes of this policy, the countryside is defined as any area outside of the settlements listed in Strategic Policy LP02 -The Settlement Hierarchy.

Where dwellings are replaced, in order to control further extensions that may impact on the landscape and rural character of an area, a condition may be necessary to remove or reduce permitted development rights to extend the resulting dwelling. In line with the presumption against new dwellings in the countryside, proposals to replace a property should not increase the number of units.

This policy should be applied in accordance with Policy LP18: Environment, Design and Amenity.

**Sustainability Appraisal:**

LP28: Enlargement or Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside																							
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		+	-
LP28	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/x	0	0	0	+6	-1	Likely Positive Effect +5
Draft LP28	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/x	0	0	0	+6	-1	Likely Positive Effect +5
DM5	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/x	0	0	0	+6	-1	Likely Positive Effect +5
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Likely Neutral Effect 0

## **Draft Policy LP29- Housing Needs of Rural Workers Policy**

**Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:**

[Local Plan Review 2019 - Details - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](#)

### **Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

No comments were made in reference to LP29; therefore no further change will be made.

**Consideration of issues: N/A**

**Policy: As it stands**

### **Permanent occupational dwellings**

1. New permanent dwellings should only be allowed to support existing rural based activities on well-established rural based enterprises, providing:
  - a) there is a clearly established existing functional need, requiring occupants to be adjacent to their enterprises in the day and at night,
  - b) the need could not be met by existing dwellings within the locality,
  - c) the application meets the requirements of a financial test demonstrating that:
    - i. the enterprise(s) and the rural based activity concerned have been established for at least three years, have been profitable for at least one of them **and**;
    - ii. are currently financially sound, and have a clear prospect of remaining so **and**;
    - iii. the rural based enterprise can sustain the size of the proposed dwelling;
    - iv. acceptable in all other respects

### **Temporary occupational dwellings**

2. If a new dwelling is essential to support a new rural based activity, it should normally, for the first three years, be provided by a caravan, or other temporary accommodation.
3. New temporary dwellings should only be allowed to support rural based activities providing:
  - a) the proposal satisfies criteria 1a and b above;

- b) the application is supported by clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise concerned (for example significant investment in new farm buildings is often a good indication of intentions)
- c) the application is supported by clear evidence that the proposed enterprise has been planned on a sound financial basis.

### **Existing Occupational Dwellings**

- 4. Preference will be given to retaining agricultural or other rural based occupancy dwellings where there is a local identified need.
- 5. Proposals for the relaxation or removal of agricultural occupancy conditions will only be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate that:
  - a) the dwelling has been occupied in accordance with the terms of the occupancy condition for a minimum of 5 years; and
  - b) there is no longer a need for the dwelling by those working, or last working, in the locality in agricultural, forestry or a rural enterprise, established by evidence of marketing (including the provision of details of an independent market valuation reflecting the occupancy condition, as well as all viewings and offers made) for a 12 month period at a price that reflects the occupancy condition.

### **Supporting text:**

#### **Introduction**

King's Lynn & West Norfolk is a large rural Borough, and in order to promote sustainable patterns of development to ensure strong, diverse, economic activity in line with Strategic Policy LP37 it is important to address the housing needs of rural workers such as farm and forestry workers.

The National Planning Policy Framework sets guidance to steer new development to the most sustainable locations, avoiding new isolated homes in the countryside. However, national policy does identify special circumstances including the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside.

At the local level, it is important to have a policy that ensures housing is provided and protected for rural workers. This will ensure the housing needs of rural workers are met and avoid unnecessary new development in the countryside.

#### **Relevant Local and National Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Strategic Policies

LP01 Spatial Strategy

LP37 Development in rural areas

LP16 Design and Sustainable Development

### **Policy Approach**

To ensure that new development in the countryside is carefully controlled, the proposed approach is to ensure that new rural occupational dwellings are only permitted where it relates to a proven need for a worker to live near their place of occupation.

Agricultural occupancy conditions are imposed when a dwelling is given planning permission because it is necessary to the running of an agricultural enterprise but would not otherwise have been permitted. In accordance with national and local policy, this policy seeks to ensure the housing needs of farm, forestry and other rural workers are protected. Therefore, applications for the removal of restrictive occupancy conditions will require robust justification and will be assessed against the fact that the permission was originally granted as an exception to meet an essential rural need.

For the purposes of this policy a 'rural worker' is defined as someone who is needed to live permanently in the countryside or a Smaller Village and Hamlet (outside other designated settlements) and:

- to provide vital support to, an agricultural, forestry or other enterprise which supports the rural economy and environment;
- and on or in close proximity to that enterprise;
- and where neither the worker nor the enterprise can be located in a designated settlement (excepting Smaller Villages and Hamlets).



Sustainability appraisal:

LP29 Housing Needs of Rural Workers																							
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		+	-
LP29	++	+	0	0	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	++	0	++	++	+18	0	Likely Positive Effect +18
Draft LP29	++	+	0	0	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	++	0	++	++	+18	0	Likely Positive Effect +18
DM6	++	+	0	0	0	+	+	++	++	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	++	0	++	++	+18	0	Likely Positive Effect +18
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	0	x	0	0	-2	Likely Negative Effect '-2

## Draft Policy LP30- Residential Annexes Policy

Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:

[Local Plan Review 2019 - Details - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](#)

### Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/ Proposed Action
Ms Maxine Hayes Parish Clerk Holme- Next-The- Sea	Support	This policy should make clear that residential annexes cannot be used or let as holiday accommodation – helpful to define the term “used in conjunction with”.		Interesting point, any specific issues relating to Holme can be raised in Holme's neighbourhood plan.

### Consideration of issues:

- **The comment believes that rewording should take place so that clarification is made so annexes cannot be used for letting as holiday accommodation, in relation to Holme this can be raised in Holme-next-to-Sea’s Neighbourhood Plan which is in draft stage.**

#### **Policy: will stay as it stands**

1. Development of residential annexes will be approved only subject to the following being secured by condition or planning agreement:
  - a) it remains in the same ownership as, and is occupied in conjunction with the principal dwelling;
  - b) it is ancillary and subordinate in scale to the principal dwelling;

- c) its occupant(s) share(s) the existing access, garden and parking of the main dwelling;

**Supporting text:**

**Introduction**

Residential annexes have grown in popularity in recent years and are commonly developed to provide additional semi-independent accommodation for members of the same family, particularly older family members who may need additional support. A residential annex can be defined as accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling within the residential curtilage, and is a form of extra accommodation in the same way an extension to the dwelling would be. Annexes should be well related to the main dwelling. To be considered as an annexe as opposed to a separate dwelling, it must share the same garden, parking and access as the main dwelling. It should also be ancillary and subordinate to the main dwelling, as close as possible to the main dwelling, and it should not be designed as being capable of sold or let as a separate unit. Annexes can be formed by extensions to the main dwelling, conversion of a building ancillary to the dwelling such as a garage, or the development of a new separate unit.

Within defined settlements, annexes are generally an acceptable form of additional accommodation for residents. The design, layout and scale of annexes are crucial factors in determining the impact on the amenity of existing or new residents and on the visual form and character of the local area. Ensuring that there remains safe and adequate parking and access is also a key factor in assessing applications. Problems arise when developing annexes separate from the main dwelling, because they may appear to be used as separate dwellings and are intrusive in the landscape in countryside locations.

There is currently no national guidance specifically relating to residential annexes so proposals are currently assessed against more general policies in the Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. This policy will provide clarity on the planning criteria used to define and assess applications for residential annexes.

**Relevant Local and National Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

National Planning Policy Framework: Achieving well-designed places

Strategic Policies:

LP37: Development in Rural Areas

LP16: Sustainable Development

**Policy Approach**

In principle, annexes will be permitted in the defined settlements as listed in Strategic Policy LP02 Settlement Hierarchy providing they comply with other relevant planning policies relating to design, amenity and access in the Local Plan. Stricter criteria will apply to applications for annexes in the wider countryside to ensure that the countryside is protected from adverse development

**Sustainability Appraisal:**

LP30: Residential Annexes																								
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		+	-	
LP30	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+6	0	Likely Positive Effect +6
Draft LP30	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+6	0	Likely Positive Effect +6
DM7	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+6	0	Likely Positive Effect +6
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Likely Neutral Effect

## **Draft Policy LP32- Community and Culture Policy**

Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:

[Local Plan Review 2019 - Details - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](#)

### **Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

#### **Consideration of issues:**

- **Most comments are in support of the policy**
- **A majority of comments suggest rewording and adding detail/ robust evidence to examples of local distinctiveness, key facilities being protected and how cultural facilities will be assessed in relation to proposals**
- **Welcome the protection of recreational facilities, rich cultural heritage and enhancing existing cultural assets**

#### **Policy Recommendation:**

- **7.9.3- Updated information on the IMDs and footnotes**
- **7.9.4 Updated information on health**
- **7.9.5 Updated information on deprivation and crime**
- **7.9.6 Updated information on population estimates**
- **Added relevant guidance**
- **New clause '3f' in LP32 in reference to climate change and health and wellbeing**

## LP32 Community and Culture Policy

### Introduction

7.9.1 Planning is about more than just physical land use. It is essential that planning policy aims to improve the wellbeing of local communities by tackling social issues and creating the right conditions for people to have a good quality of life. The first part of this chapter examines the key social issues which are affecting communities in the borough, while the second part identifies the significance of culture to the community.

7.9.2 A socially and culturally sustainable community means that it is active, inclusive and safe – fair, tolerant and cohesive with a strong local culture and other shared community activities. In order to achieve this goal, policies in the Local Plan must address the following key issues:

- **Inequality** - the difference between the most and least deprived wards in the borough.
- **Health** - encouraging more healthy and active lifestyles.
- **Crime** - reducing the fear of crime as well as actual incidents of crime to ensure people feel safe.
- **Community Cohesion** - community cohesion is achieved when:
  - a. there is a common vision and a sense of belonging for all communities;
  - b. the diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances are appreciated and positively valued;
  - c. those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities;
  - d. strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods.

7.9.3 There are typically seven domains of deprivation which combine the official measure for the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) these are: income, employment, health, crime, barriers to housing and services and living environment<sup>4</sup>. 'Pockets' of deprivation are a key issue for the borough, both in urban areas including King's Lynn and Hunstanton, as well as some of the more rural parts of the district<sup>5</sup>.

The national statistics of English indices of deprivation (2019) relatively ranks each small area (Lower Super Output Area) in England from most deprived (1) to least deprived (32,844). The data for local authorities (2019), highlights that King's Lynn & West Norfolk IMD average score was 94 out of 317 for

---

<sup>4</sup> MHCLG (2019) The English Indices of Deprivation (2019) (IoD2019)

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/835115/IoD2019\\_Statistical\\_Release.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/835115/IoD2019_Statistical_Release.pdf)

<sup>5</sup> MHCLG (2019) Local Authority Maps- Indices of Deprivation (2019) Available at: <https://imd2019.group.shef.ac.uk/>

local authority districts in its average rank for deprivation<sup>6</sup>; making this fall in the top 25% most deprived districts in England. The most deprived domains for the borough was education with an average score of 33 (top 10%) and health scored at 67 alongside housing (top 20%)<sup>7</sup>.

7.9.4 A health profile of the area between 2013-2015 highlighted that the average life expectancy varies by 3 years (for men) and 2 years (for women) between the most deprived wards and the most affluent areas of the borough<sup>8</sup>. Individuals who have good access to public open space including, parks, greens, leisure and sports facilities and other recreation facilities have a better opportunity to have an active and healthy lifestyle.

7.9.5 West Norfolk is fortunate to have one of the lowest crime levels in England ranking at 268 out of 317 making the borough fall within the top 20% least deprived areas in England. Recent statistics (2020) show that the crime rate was 4.8 per 1000 population compared to 6.2 in England. The highest crime rates were anti-social behaviour and violence and sex offences. Anti-social behaviour has stayed at a consistent rate from 2018-2020 of around 1.4 per 1000.<sup>9</sup> One of the main ways in which the planning process can help to reduce the likelihood of crime is to ensure it is a key consideration in the design process, particularly for access routes and public spaces. As highlighted, in the national design guide (2019) well designed places and careful planning can help users feel safe and secure within shared amenity spaces without the need for security measures. This will complement policy on design outlined in Sustainable Development Policy LP16.

7.9.6 West Norfolk is experiencing an increasing mix of people of different nationalities and cultures. Over the past decade parts of King's Lynn and the wider borough have welcomed a significant number of economic migrants, mainly from the A8 accession countries that joined the EU in 2004, particularly from Poland, Lithuania and Latvia. Population estimates by nationality shows in 2018 EU nationals were higher in King's Lynn and West Norfolk (6%) compared to Norfolk (5.1%) and England (5.9%). Broad ethnic groups within the borough show that 97.3% of the population is White, followed by Asian at 1.3% and Black, Mixed and Other falling below 0.9%. This highlights how little diversity is present within the borough overall<sup>10</sup>.

7.9.7 Providing opportunities for the community to work together, either by involving the community early in the design of new development, creating shared community facilities or by supporting different kinds of community groups, sports and activities will help to improve community cohesiveness.

---

<sup>6</sup> MHCLG (2019) Local Authority District Summaries Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>

<sup>7</sup> Norfolk County Council (2018) Norfolk JSNA Briefing Document [https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Briefing\\_paper\\_-\\_Deprivation.pdf](https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Briefing_paper_-_Deprivation.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> Health and Wellbeing Profile June 2017 King's Lynn & West Norfolk [https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Kings\\_Lynn\\_and\\_West\\_Norfolk\\_HWB\\_profile\\_2017.pdf](https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Kings_Lynn_and_West_Norfolk_HWB_profile_2017.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> King's Lynn & West Norfolk Crime & Community Safety Area Report (2020) <https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/crime-and-community-safety/report/view/c4759afd921045e68237e611043725c2/E07000146>

<sup>10</sup> Norfolk Insight (2020) Population Estimates <https://www.norfolkinsight.org.uk/population/report/view/b15822d80ec54439bb12134b7c857bb9/E07000146/>

7.9.8 The policy for Community & Culture aims to work alongside wider strategies undertaken by the West Norfolk Partnership and other agencies such as the Norfolk Constabulary as well as charities and community groups to address the social and community issues outlined above. The policy aims to ensure West Norfolk is a great place for people to live and work by creating opportunities for the community to interact, supporting the provision of community facilities and infrastructure and ensuring that future development is designed in a way which helps to avoid the creation of, or increase the amount of social problems experienced by residents in the borough.

### **Relevant Local and National Policies and Guidance**

- LP33 Community Facilities
- LP19 Open Space + 'FIT' Standards
- National Planning Policy Framework: Promoting healthy and safe communities
- National Design Guide (2019)- Public Spaces and Uses

### **The Cultural Context**

7.9.9 Culture is a collective term for a diversity of different activities and attractions. The cultural assets of West Norfolk are considered to include the arts, the natural and built heritage, libraries, museums, archives, galleries, sports and leisure, churches and other places of worship as well as events, concerts and festivals. As culture is so wide ranging, it is strongly linked to policies on the economy and environmental assets.

7.9.10 A Vision of Norfolk 2021 produces in partnership with Norfolk County Council identifies the importance of culture to people in Norfolk:

- building communities, we can be proud of;
- nurturing our growing digital economy;
- making the most of our heritage, culture and environment;



- developing the skills of our people through training and apprenticeships;
- building new homes to help young people get on the housing ladder;
- installing infrastructure first.

7.9.11 West Norfolk is rich in cultural assets and hosts a variety of different events and festivals across the borough each year. Whilst more strategic cultural facilities are focused in the larger settlements such as King's Lynn, Hunstanton and Downham Market, there are many smaller but important tourist and/or cultural facilities throughout the rest of the borough as well as many traditional local events and festivals. The borough is fortunate to be rich in cultural heritage in the built and natural environment. Environmental Assets Policy LP17 and X AONB Policy focuses on protecting and enhancing the rich heritage of the borough such as the many historic Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty as well as the distinctive inland waterways which support tourism and recreation.

7.9.12 The Borough Council has already made improvements to significant cultural venues in King's Lynn in recent years and it is essential that cultural facilities are improved and continue to grow in King's Lynn to serve an expanded population.

7.9.13 Cultural facilities can contribute to improving quality of life, reinforcing local distinctiveness, driving regeneration, providing jobs and promoting tourism. For this reason, it is vital that the Community and Culture Policy LP32 aims to protect and promote West Norfolk's existing cultural assets, as well as facilitating new cultural facilities where appropriate. Policy LP32 will prioritise locating cultural facilities sequentially in accessible locations in the larger settlements, in line with the Settlement Hierarchy Policy LP02 and national planning policy on sustainable development.

## **Strategic Policy**

### **Policy LP32 Community and Culture**

1. Delivering community well-being and enhancing quality of life through good design.
2. Where possible, developers should examine best practice on design in new development and should aim to involve the community early in the design process of new development.
3. The form, design, location and layout of development should enhance community wellbeing, by:
  - a. being accessible and inclusive - ensuring that people of any age, gender, ethnicity and ability can use and access the development;
  - b. being adaptable - creating high quality development which is capable of being modified either for different uses or to suit people with different needs;

- c. being locally distinctive - contributing to a sense of place and identity;
- d. reducing the opportunity for crime - considering factors such as natural surveillance, boundaries and security features, lighting and the management of public space to promote safe living environments;
- e. being within walking distance of open space - to increase people's quality of life and enable active and healthy lifestyles.
- f. creating places that promote social interaction and health and wellbeing, to allow people who are isolated and more vulnerable to cope with the impacts of climate change

**Creating sustainable communities through the provision of community infrastructure.**

- 3. The Borough Council will:
  - a. support proposals that protect, retain or enhance sports, leisure and recreation facilities including children's playgrounds or create new facilities in accessible locations;
  - b. work with NHS Norfolk to ensure that new health facilities are provided to serve an expanded population, particularly in growth areas in King's Lynn.
- 4. The Borough Council recognises the importance of community facilities and services (also referred to as community infrastructure) to improving people's quality of life, reducing inequality and improving community cohesion. The Council will, working with partners, seek opportunities to gain funding for the development of community infrastructure, particularly in deprived parts of the borough (see Policy LP05).

**Protecting, enhancing and promoting cultural facilities**

- 5. The Borough Council will seek to protect and enhance existing cultural assets. If a cultural facility is no longer viable and the Council cannot secure funding, the Council will seek to explore alternative options such as co-locating multiple facilities on a single site to prevent the loss of cultural facilities and to increase the economic viability of such facilities.
  - 6. Development will not be permitted in cases where it would result in a loss of existing cultural facilities, unless equivalent new or improved facilities, where need justifies, can be provided within the same settlement boundary or in close proximity of the existing facility.
  - 7. New cultural facilities will actively be encouraged by the Borough Council, providing they are compatible with their location and setting and do not conflict with Economy Policy LP06. New cultural facilities will be located sequentially, in accessible sites in King's Lynn and the Main Towns of Hunstanton and Downham Market. Cultural facilities proposed in accessible locations in Key Rural Service Centres or the more rural settlements and areas will be considered based on localised impacts.
-

Policy LP32 contributes to Strategic Objectives 1, 2, 5 Economy; 6, 7, 8, 10; Society; 12, 14, 15 Environment.

**Table of comments**

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
STP Estates Group (inc. West Norfolk NHS Clinical Commissioning	<b>Support</b>	The STP estates group welcomes statement 3b in the policy to work with NHS Norfolk to ensure that new health facilities are provided to serve an		Will take on board the comments made and will

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Group, Queen Elizabeth Hospital King's Lynn NHS Foundation Trust, Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust, Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust)		expanded population. The group would like to point out that NHS Norfolk no longer exists and that health partners in King's Lynn and West Norfolk that would need to work with the Borough Council include West Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group, Queen Elizabeth Hospital King's Lynn, Norfolk Community Health and Care NHS Trust and Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust. The STP estates group would like to refer to our previous comment under LP05 that where development triggers the need for additional capacity in health facilities (be that through new build, an extension to existing or reconfiguration) it would be expected that a financial contribution is made by the developers towards the cost of increasing capacity.		amend wording where is deemed necessary
Ms Jan Roomes- Town Clerk Hunstanton Town Council	<b>Support</b>	Waveney Road, Jubilee Crescent and Elizabeth Close are in King's Lynn and West Norfolk Lower Super Output Area 001A which has deprivation indices that are on a par with an area in Gaywood and only exceeded by an area in North Lynn. Downham Market may also contain an area of deprivation.		The policy introduction does state that deprivation is a key issue in King's Lynn and other parts of the borough.
Mr Tom Clarke- National Planning Adviser Theatres Trust	<b>Support</b>	We welcome that the Council's opening position is to protect and enhance existing cultural assets. This would include the district's theatres which play an important role in bringing people together,	Amendment to part 5. and guidance as to how proposals seeking loss of facilities will be assessed.	Consider rewording to strengthen and provide evidence for the policy to protect cultural facilities

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>providing opportunities to participate in and engage with the arts, reducing isolation (which is particularly important within more rural areas such as West Norfolk), and which support the vibrancy and viability of town centres. Where the policy could be further improved and strengthened is in part 5, where as currently drafted it leaves scope for highly valued and potentially viable facilities to be undermined if the Council is unable to secure a solution. For some facilities there might be alternative options available such as ownership by the community, charities, trusts or other such groups and the policy would benefit from this being made explicitly clear. We do however support the strength of part 6 in not permitting development which would result in the loss of cultural facilities. We would suggest that this policy is reinforced through guidance setting out criteria by which cultural facilities (as well as other social and community uses including pubs) will be assessed should proposals seeking loss be received. This would include robust evidence of marketing through appropriate channels, at a suitable rent/sale price for the building or land's existing use and condition, and that there is no longer a need for the facility amongst the local community or its users.</p>		

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Ms Debbie Mack- Historic Environment Planning Adviser, East of England Historic England	<b>Support</b>	The Cultural Context Support - We welcome the reference to the rich cultural heritage of the area in this section of the Plan		Agreed
Ms Debbie Mack- Historic Environment Planning Adviser, East of England Historic England	<b>Object</b>	Object - We particularly welcome criterion 3c. We suggest that you give some examples of local distinctiveness. Eg building materials flint cobbles and brick, car stone etc. in different parts of the borough as well as building styles? This could be in the supporting text, either in association with this policy and/or the design policy.	Give examples of local vernacular and distinctiveness in different parts of the Borough either in association with this policy or the design policy.	Consider rewording and adding to 3c
Mrs Sarah Watts- Parish Clerk West Winch Parish Council	<b>Support</b>	West Winch Parish Council comments - It is essential that health facilities are provided for the major development currently planned and any additional development in the future. Residents need the GP Surgeries, Health Centre and other associated facilities.		Will be considered in 9.4
Planning Admin Team Sport England	<b>Support</b>	Sport England supports this policy in principle, as it seeks to protect, retain or enhance existing sport, leisure and recreational facilities. However the policy should be underpinned by a robust and up to date evidence base which identifies the key facilities to be protected (see comments on Policy LP19).		Look into the data noted about not having up to date evidence on key facilities and change wording where it may be necessary – which should be looked at in LP19

## **Draft Policy LP33- Community Facilities Policy**

**Link to draft policy and comments in full received from the draft consultation stage:**

[Local Plan Review 2019 - Details - Keystone \(objective.co.uk\)](#)

### **Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:**

No comments were under LP33; therefore no further changes will be made.

**Consideration of issues: N/A**

### **Policy Recommendation: Policy will stay as it stands**

1. The Council will encourage the retention of existing community facilities and the provision of new facilities, particularly in areas with poor levels of provision and in areas of major growth.
2. Development leading to the loss of an existing community facility will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that either:
  - a) the area currently served by it would remain suitably provided following the loss, or, if not;
  - b) it is no longer viable or feasible to retain the premises in a community facility use.

### **Supporting text:**

#### **Introduction**

Community facilities such as village halls, pubs, shops, allotments and churches play an important role in bringing the community together and provide valuable services particularly in more rural settlements. In line with Strategic Policies LP06 Economy and LP32 Community and Culture the priority is to protect community facilities where possible, particularly where there is no alternative provision within the settlement. Strategic Policy LP05 identifies that community facilities will be sought within, or through, contributions from, new development.

With over 11,000 new homes planned for the Borough over the plan period to 2036 it is important that new community facilities are provided to meet the needs of an expanding population. Strategic Policy LP05 identifies that community facilities will be sought within, or through contributions from, new development.

### **Relevant Local and National Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework: Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities

Strategic Policy LP05 Infrastructure Provision

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Green Infrastructure Strategy

### **Policy Approach**

The policy seeks to protect existing community facilities where there is a proven demand and to encourage replacement facilities in the immediate locality if it is not viable to retain the facility on site. The application of criteria to protect community facilities aims to build upon strategic policies by setting a clear and consistent approach to assessing applications for development.

Evidence to meet the policy requirements may include, for example, one or more of the following:

- for (a), information on alternative provision in the area, typical provision in equivalent areas, the geography and social make up of users and potential users; changes in the demand or need for the type of facilities; and
- for (b), in the case of market provided facilities (e.g. shops, pubs, restaurants, etc.), evidence of marketing the business or premises for a sustained period (usually a minimum of 12 months), at a price reflecting the authorised use, details of income/profit achieved in recent years, evidence of significant long term changes in the relevant market.
- in the case of non-market provide facilities, the withdrawal or absence of the funding, personnel or other resources necessary to provide the facility.

The adequacy and persuasiveness of the evidence will be judged in the particular circumstances of the case, and against the objectives set out in the first paragraph of the policy



Sustainability Appraisal:

LP33: Community Facilities																							
Policy	SA Objective:																				Overall Effect		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20			+
LP33	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	++	0	0	+	+	++	++	+	0	++	+	0	+17	0	Likely Positive Effect +17
Draft LP33	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	++	0	0	+	+	++	++	+	0	++	+	0	+17	0	Likely Positive Effect +17
DM9	0	0	0	0	0	+	++	++	++	0	0	+	+	++	++	+	0	++	+	0	+17	0	Likely Positive Effect +17
No Policy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Likely Neutral Effect 0