

# Kings Lynn & West Norfolk Local Plan Hearing Position Statement (Further Questions for Week 3) on behalf of Elm Park Developments Ltd

## Hearing Position Statement (Further Questions for Week 3) to Kings Lynn Local Plan – March 2024

Job No: 21/L/004

Version: 1

Prepared by: Stuart Booth MRTPI

# Hearing Position Statement

1.1. The comments below are made on behalf of our client, Elm Park Developments Ltd, who have interest in a residential development site at Clenchwarton that is under construction at Fosters Sports Ground. It follows our Part 1 and Part 2 Statements from the suspended examination and provides our clients response to the Additional Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) for Week 3 of the reopened Examination in 2024. It also follows our written representations submission in October 2023 to the consultation on Additional Evidence Base Documents.

1.2. Our comments in this Statement focus on questions for **Matter 2 – Spatial Strategy**.

## **Question AQ10.**

*Is the proposed New Policy for Neighbourhood Plans consistent with national policy in setting out housing requirements for neighbourhood areas that reflect the overall strategy for the pattern and scale of development in King’s Lynn & West Norfolk and any relevant allocations?*

## **Response**

1.3. Whilst the proposed policy may be consistent with national policy, we would question whether the Local Plan has assessed these settlements to consider if they can actually accommodate such levels of development, and if not, what implications there are on housing delivery should a Neighbourhood Plan become adopted that does not meet the requirement through site allocations. Statements in the draft policy and supporting text provides some concern that this may become the case. For example, “It is acknowledged that not all Neighbourhood Plan groups will wish to address housing” and “It is recognised that there may be constraints in a neighbourhood area that would mean that meeting the Housing Requirement would not be achievable. Where this is the case, it is expected that this is explained in the Neighbourhood Plan.” This must therefore raise a further question of what

happens to those housing numbers if a Neighbourhood Plan does not meet the minimum housing requirement defined for the area in policy?

**Question AQ11.**

*Is the proposed New Policy on Residential Development on Windfall sites within and adjacent to Rural Settlements positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in promoting sustainable development in rural areas and maintaining the vitality of rural communities as part of the spatial strategy for the Borough? In particular:*

*Is part 2 of the policy justified in only supporting residential development outside of rural settlements ‘in exceptional circumstances’? Is it clear what ‘exceptional circumstances’ means in the context of the policy and would it be evident how a decision maker should react to such development proposals?*

*Is part 2 of the policy justified in applying strict limits of 10, 5 and 2 dwellings to developments outside the boundaries of KRSCs, RVs and SVHs, respectively? What is the proportionate evidence to justify these dwelling numbers?*

*Should the policy or its supporting text specify that development boundaries to settlements are defined on the Policies Map?*

**Response**

- 1.4. The proposed policy is not clear what exceptional circumstances means, and we would argue that the need for the policy is due to the lack of proper reassessment of the settlement boundaries and an over reliance on windfall that comes about from not having sufficient allocations within the plan in these settlement areas. Exceptional circumstances could include poor housing delivery across the district, within the settlement tier or within the specific settlement, but we would anticipate that the policy as drafted and lack of sufficient allocations in these area will result in poor delivery rates. We have set out why in our submission response to the consultation.

- 1.5. The housing number limits in the policy are too restrictive and not justified. In addition they would not allow for any affordable housing on such small sites in arguably the areas that may need it most. Given the need for 628 new windfall dwellings in the Key Rural Service Centres (see our previous consultation response), such restrictions on development size would be highly unlikely to meet this windfall need, which is a minimum.
- 1.6. The policy should require a more accurate assessment of settlement boundaries, in particular we make reference to Clenchwarton and what we consider the incorrect nature of the current boundary that ignore large areas of existing built development.
- 1.7. It is unclear how the proposed new policy will delivery on the growth needed in the Local Plan. Either more allocations are required, to reduce a reliance on windfall, or a less restrictive windfall policy is required than that proposed. What is key to both is accurate settlement boundaries that clearly defines existing dwellings within a settlements and includes both committed extant sites and proposed allocations. We maintain our objection that the settlement boundary at Clenchwarton requires review and the extant consent of our clients site should be included as a committed site, with land adjacent considered as a potential allocation.

### **Addendum Question**

#### **AQ117.**

*In the light of the extended timetable for the Examination and the potential timescale for the adoption of the KL&WN LPR following its conclusion, is there a need for the Plan period to be extended beyond 2039 to ensure consistency with paragraph 22 of the NPPF, which expects strategic policies to look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption? If so, what would the implications be for the Plan's housing requirement and supply?*

## ***Response***

- 1.8. It would appear that additional years need to be added to the plan period and extending the housing numbers proportionally would seem to be the simplest approach at this late stage.*



---

JWPC Ltd

1B Waterview, White Cross  
Lancaster, Lancashire, LA1 4XS

Tel: 01524 599980

[enquiries@jwpc.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@jwpc.co.uk)    [www.jwpc.co.uk](http://www.jwpc.co.uk)

---

