

Draft Policy – South Wootton & E3.1 South Wootton Hall Lane Policy

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

<https://west-norfolk.objective.co.uk/portal/lpr2019/lpr2019?pointId=s1542882759454#section-s1542882759454>

&

<https://west-norfolk.objective.co.uk/portal/lpr2019/lpr2019?pointId=s1545126690436#section-s1545126690436>

Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Mrs T Cornwall South Wootton Parish Council	Mixed	South Wootton Parish Council wishes to question issues raised in the Local Plan Review to 2036. With regard to The Woottons, 1) The review states that the Local Plan does not seek to make a further allocation at South Wootton. 2) A map in the 2011 Core Strategy document shows a red arrow pointing from the west of Hall Lane/ Nursery Lane developments to indicate potential future development towards North Wootton. We have been informed that the red arrow has been removed, which suggests that there are no plans for future development. 3) The LP review states that North Wootton was included as one of the areas to accommodate the major housing growth around King' Lynn but no suitable sites were identified, instead within the North Wootton boundary there may be some scope for infilling. However, the above statements appear to be contradicted in the LP review, in section 9.5.1E 3.1, item 2b, which proposes "a road link to the site's (Larkfleet/Bowbridge) northern boundary to avoid prejudicing the potential for further development beyond at some point in the future." Note, the Bowbridge layout shows an area of open space with surface water drainage ponds on its northern boundary		The details of the Link Road will be provided by both the policy and future planning applications, noting that the majority of the site has outline planning permission. Whilst no land is proposed for allocation at North Wootton, we didn't want to preclude development potentially occurring at some time in the future so ensuing that the current policy and planning applications do not sterilise land should it ever be required in the future. Those sites on the

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>Clarification is needed on the location of this proposed road link and what it really means for any development towards North Wootton. It is unfortunate that the three major locations for new development in South Wootton have been on green field sites. In future, priority should be given to available brown field sites. The Borough Council's Brownfield Register shows there are 51 sites totalling 87 hectares with the potential for 2,085 homes, which is more than the 1376 needing to be allocated during the Local Plan Review process. These sites must be made use of first. In addition, there is a need for truly affordable housing, which should be given priority on the brown field sites especially those close to town centres. We note that the words ""at least"" for the number of houses allocated to preferred sites is retained in the Local Plan Review. This should be removed as it transfers control from the Borough Council into the hands of the developers allowing them free rein on the number of properties at each allocated site, regardless of sustainability. A way around this is for developers to be required to build in phases and only be allowed to move to a new phase when the previous phase has been completed and the properties sold. In the meantime, the non-developed parts could remain on a reserve list, thus protecting valuable countryside. Despite the Borough Council rejection of the Camland development (subject to possible review), the already approved developments for 660 new houses in South Wootton will contribute to significantly increased traffic congestion along the main route from Knight's Hill into the Docks and the centre of King' Lynn. Discounting the Camland development, there will be an additional new junction (for Clayland) and a new roundabout (for Larkfleet), both of which will have a negative impact on traffic flows. In 2012, Bidwells traffic report indicated that the junctions on to Grimston Road/ Low Road/ Edward Benefer Way were either</p>		<p>brownfield register currently are allocated or already have planning permissions, so in effect development can take place. The 'at least' wording is retained as the majority (80%) of sites already have some form of planning permission, this was felt by the SADMP Inspector a very important inclusion within the Plan to ensure the BC meets its housing requirements, and therefore is retained within the review. The Knights Hill development will likely be removed from the review having had an application refused by the BC Planning Committee. The traffic and associated issues raised will be covered by the relevant section within the Plan review. We are pleased to learn that the Parish Council intends to review their Neighbourhood Plans and look forward to</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>over capacity (Langley Road) or close to capacity. They concluded that a sustainable level of development would be no more than 425 properties at Knight's Hill and no more than 225 properties west of Hall lane/Nursery Lane. The combined total has already been exceeded with the approval of the Larkfleet, Bowbridge, Clayland and Hopkins & Moore developments. This endorses the conclusion that the Camland development should be completely rejected and no further development be planned for South Wootton. Indeed, Camland's own traffic report stated that Grimston Road would be over capacity by 2026 without any additional new housing.</p>		<p>supporting this process and working collaboratively to achieve this.</p>
<p>Mrs T Cornwall South Wootton Parish Council</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>CPRE Pledge.</p>	<p>All further allocations removed</p>	<p>Targets are prescribed by Government if they are unrealistic or unfounded than CPRE should take this up with Government. We need to be shown to meeting the housing need and delivery tests</p>
<p>Mrs & Mrs D Price</p>		<p>My wife and I wish to make the following comments on the LPR to 2036 document with regard to the impact on South Wootton. We are pleased to note the review states that there are no plans for future development in South Wootton. However, we also note in section 9.5 1E 3.1, item 2b a reference to 'a link road on the Larkfleet/Bowbridge site's northern boundary to avoid prejudicing the potential for further development beyond at some point in the future'. This suggests that there could be future development in South Wootton, contrary to the earlier statement of no plans for future development. Clarification is required! With planning approvals already given to the Larkfleet, Bowbridge, Clayland and Hopkins & Moore developments, these amount to 660 new</p>		<p>The 'at least' wording is retained as the majority (80%) of sites already have some form of planning permission, this was felt by the SADMP Inspector a very important inclusion within the Plan to ensure the BC meets its housing requirements, and therefore is retained within the review. The Knights</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>properties (a 40% increase in size of the village). We were pleased to see that the Camland development (a further 600 properties) has be rejected by the Borough Council. Should the developer appeal, we would trust the Borough Council will continue to oppose and seek withdrawal of this excessive development. Sadly, all off the developments for South Wootton are on green field sites. Priority should be given to brown field sites in future. In the Borough there are apparently, 51 brown field sites with the potential for over 2000 homes, which is more than required allocation in the LPR. Affordable housing should be given priority on the brown field sites, especially those close to town centres. In the LPR document, we note that the words “at least” is retained for the number of houses allocated to preferred sites. Surely. this should be removed as it effectively passes control to developers, regardless of sustainability. The developers should be required to build in phases and only move to a new phase when the initial phase has been completed and the properties sold. Non-developed parts could be held in reserve, thus protecting valuable countryside. The already approved developments in South Wootton will contribute significantly to the traffic congestion along the main route from Knight’s Hill into the Docks and the centre of King’s Lynn. Much evidence on the traffic problems was presented at BC’s Planning meeting discussing the Camland development and probably was a major factor in rejecting the application. Camland have stated in its own Traffic Report that Grimston Road would be overcapacity by 2026. The proposed Camland development must be stopped to avoid additional traffic congestion problems in the future. Traffic congestion raises other issues and consideration to the effect of a) car parking availability in King’s Lynn and at the railway station and b) on Air Quality, both in the local AQMA zones and at other relevant locations. We think that South Wootton must</p>		<p>Hill development will likely be removed from the review having had an application refused by the BC Planning Committee. The traffic and associated issues raised will be covered by the relevant section within the Plan review.</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		be protected from any further land allocations for housing in the future. Enough is enough!		
Mr John Marrow		<p>1) the Larkfleet Bowbridge developments are already almost double the original agreed 300 homes over the whole area. this is not in keeping with the surrounding area .Also to increase it further as a certain vested interest has virtual insisted .THIS IS NOT SUSTAINABLE. Consideration must be given to the infrastructure and environmental impact. No minor tinkering with the road system is going to ease the virtual gridlocked situation, the developers must be made to make a major large and useful contribution. The impact on Air Quality will also be serious and must not be overlooked by the borough planners. 2) the words "at least" must be removed from the the whole document otherwise this will open the floodgates to the developers and land agents GREED. It is time for the planners to listen and act accordingly to the local residents There is plenty of room at the major Walsoken site to compensate for the required number of homes 3) The current rate of build is twice what is required especially since the Nation Context has reduced since the core strategy and ldf therefore the number required is not nearly so many a large number of which can be covered by the use of current brownfield sites and areas above shops and offices that are empty in the borough 4) It is very unlikely that the borough would be deemed not suitable to remain a planning authority in the light of the Nation Context. this is based on reliable information from Westminster and Parish Councils organisation 5) In the event of nature reserves and ponds ,lakes ;Which should be included in all developments;are involved these must be properly constructed so that they work and are of benefit to the the environment and WILDLIFE in particular Not just a hole left in the ground which</p>		<p>Site is allocated by the SADMP and the majority benefits from outline planning permission. The 'at least' wording is retained as the majority (80%) of sites already have some form of planning permission, this was felt by the SADMP Inspector a very important inclusion within the Plan to ensure the BC meets its housing requirements, and therefore is retained within the review. Housing numbers will be reviewed. The Knights Hill allocation will most likely be removed from the plan given its refusal at planning committee.</p>

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
		<p>floods when it rains and dries out when weather is fine. This will be at the developers expense and Overseen by Parish councils with guidance from organisations such WWT, RSPB,(Wildlife trusts) NWT. This should be done by a parish subcommittee including local people with local knowledge as happened with the Neighbourhood Plans. 6) the additional 15% to provide flexibility is not required. as over supply is already meeting requirements. 7) To return to the South Wootton developments the Knights Hill development is no longer required and must be stricken from the LDF also the Number of homes allowed at the Larkfleet and Bowbridge sites must be reduced to a sustainable level: NO MORE THAN a density to match the surrounding area approx 250 homes over the whole area; This is because there are the two additional sites in South Wootton producing an additional almost 80 dwellings which are not yet built or as in the case of Nursery Lane are not selling 8) Overdevelopment is not acceptable and if this continues it will bring the borough into disrepute and the planning dept of the borough and the planning inspectorate must pay more attention to local situations such as Infrastructure impact, air quality impact environmental impact and the catastrophic impact on wildlife and the countryside. In conclusion please let common sense prevail not lunatic crazed overdevelopment At least the review shows some sense which it should have done in the first place was to build in and therefore enhance villages so saving local post offices shops and amenities This is why the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework were FLAWED from day one unless the large estate sites such as South Wootton West Winch and others are reduced to reasonable size, the numbers that were put forward by the Parish Councils, which match local surrounding densities.</p>		
Debbie Mack	Object	Object - Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site	Make reference to the	The site already benefits

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Historic England		boundary, the Grade II* Church of St Mary lies within centre of village to the east of the site, with potential for some impact on its setting and views towards the church. We note the requirement for a heritage assets assessment in criterion f which is welcomed. It would be helpful if specific reference could also be made to the church and views of the church from the site within the policy.	church and views of the church within the policy	from outline planning permission. It is likely that reserved matters will be considered before the Local Plan review is adopted. However for completeness this modification should be made
Mrs Elizabeth Mugova Environment Agency	Support	1.e. ...To include public open space for recreation and visual amenity on the western side of the site in an area not suitable for housing by virtue of flood risk. It is good to see that a sequential approach regarding site layout has been adopted for this site.		Noted and agreed
Richard Smith NPS Group	Support	NPS support the proposed allocation. NPS Property Consultants, as agent for Norfolk County Council who own part of the land will continue to work with other landowners and stakeholders to deliver development on this site		Noted

Consideration of Issues:

- In the policy make specific reference to Grade II* Church of St Mary, its setting and views of the asset, as recommend by Historic England. This could be covered within the heritage assets statement which is already required by the policy. However, it would be appropriate to mention this upfront through the relevant policy item
- South Wootton Parish Council are seeking to review their Neighbourhood Plan in the near future
- Local community resistant to Knights Hill SADMP Allocation. This will be covered in some detail within the Knights Hill section of the Plan
- Local community not keen on any major future development in South Wootton or North Wootton. The Local Plan review is not seeking to propose/make any further allocations within the Woottons
- Norfolk Property Services (NPS) are looking to bring forward the Norfolk County Council (NCC) portion of the Hall Lane allocation. This is welcomed.
- Support is offered from the Environment Agency for existing policy in terms of the flood risk approach.

Policy Recommendation:

Policy E3.1 – Hall Lane, South Wootton

7.....

f. a heritage assets assessment (to include archaeology), with review of the submitted information, and relevant on-site investigations. The Grade II* Church of St Mary lies within centre of village to the east of the site, with potential for some impact on its setting and views towards the church, this should be fully considered in the design scheme of the development.

Sustainability Appraisal:

Site Ref	Site Sustainability Factor										
	Access to Services	Community & Social	Economy A Business	Economy B Food Production	Flood Risk	Heritage	Highways & Transport	Landscape & Amenity	Natural Environment	Infrastructure, Pollution & Waste	Climate Change
LPr E3.1	+	+/x	+	x	+/x	#	++	+/x	#	O	+/#
SADMP E3.1	+	+/x	+	x	+/x	?	++	+/x	?	O	N/A

KEY: ++ very positive; + positive; x negative; xx very negative; ~ negligible; o none; # depending on implementation; ? uncertain

The additional information added to the policy item provides detail and clarity upfront and this along with the works already carried by the site’s agents/developers in ascertaining outline planning permission result in the score for ‘Heritage’ changing from a ‘?’ to a ‘#’. Likewise because of this work more is known about the impact upon the ‘Natural Environment’ and the score is amending accordingly. In terms of the new indicator ‘Climate Change’ a score of ‘+/#’ is awarded as South Wootton is classed as a sustainable location which is reasonably related to King’s Lynn and therefore offers many of the service and facilities required for daily life. There are is also the opportunity for future residents to use public transport in the form of buses or the train station. The policy itself requires the development to provide, landscaping, open space, enhanced recreational provision, a package of habitat protection measures, a network of pedestrian routes which link to the wider network, possible alternative green space, the layout should facilities cycling and walking,

including linking to the national cycle route close by and the future coastal path, and SuD's. However the design scheme and design of the individual dwellings will clearly have an impact.