

# King's Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan Review 2016-36

## Holme-next-the-Sea Parish Council Position Statement

### MATTER 1 CONSULTATION

#### 1 Introduction

1.1.1 The Parish Council (PC) has made representations at previous stages in the development of the Plan. At Regulation 19 we expressed concern about the complexity of the process and requested the right to participate in the hearing in the event that any (proposed) future changes carried implications for our Neighbourhood Plan.

1.1.2 The publication of the Examination Library Index has confirmed that a number of (possible/proposed) changes do carry such implications and so we would like to participate in discussion of the relevant topics.

1.1.3 We are also submitting position statements to address three topics that are now of particular concern as follows:

- Consultation (MIQ 7)
- Development Boundaries (Part 1, MIQ 45 et seq which is closely related to Part 2, MIQ 354 Residential Development Reasonably Related to Existing Settlements)
- Touring & Permanent Holiday Sites (MIQ 66 et Seq)

*This document deals with Consultation Issues.*

#### 2 Consultation Issues

2.1.1 Whilst we agree that the BC has carried out detailed consultations on the Plan, it is not clear that in all cases where the BC accepted our comments they have been acted on or implemented in a way that corrects the issue raised.

2.1.2 Examples include but are not restricted to:

- The BC response to our Reg 19 consultation comments (missing development boundary map; proposed text changes relating to our NDP; development boundaries under Policies LP04/LP31) correctly states that changes had previously been agreed. However, the proposed changes to Chapter 15 (15.01-7) are not summarised in the BC's response (Ref 366, Table [8-2]) and nor is there any evidence they have been acted on in terms of making changes to the Draft Plan.
- The same response states that the modifications were covered in the Additional Modifications table at AM38 but this refers to Tilney All Saints...
- Noting that there is an MM proposing that development boundary maps for SVAH's are omitted from the plan, the inclusion of a link to the plan documents on the BC website may be part of the intended solution. However, this link appears to be broken or incomplete. There is an entry for Holme in the MM spreadsheet [F21] but no map or information.

- It is clearly important that users of and consultees on the Local Plan can easily access its constituent NDPs and a secure/effective mechanism needs to be identified for doing this – not least so that the implications for NDPs of proposed policy changes are clear. Experience of working with the NDP indicates that applicants for planning permission are not always aware of its existence.