

15 Smaller Villages and Hamlets

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

<https://west-norfolk.objective.co.uk/portal/lpr2019/lpr2019?pointId=s1542882759523#section-s1542882759523>

Consideration of issues:

- Most of the comments referred to development boundaries for a variety of areas including: Barroway Drove, Congham, Gayton Thorpe and Runcton Holme.
- All DB queries have been dealt with in a separate paper.
- A selection of comments referred to CPRE Pledge

Officer Recommendation:

Amend the text accordingly with reference to adopted neighbourhood plans and changed wording to LP26. Development boundaries have been dealt with in a separate paper. However, new map required for Congham DB in reference to Parish Council comments.

Supporting text:

Introduction

15.0.1 The following settlements are classed as Smaller Village and Hamlets (SVAH's) within the Settlement Hierarchy.

15.0.2 These settlements do not have any specific site allocations. However, modest levels of development can still take place as each of the Smaller Villages and Hamlets has a development boundary.

15.0.3 Overall development proposals would be judged against the range of policies within the Local **Plan and any adopted neighbourhood plans**. In particular development will need to be consistent with Local Plan Policy LP04 Development Boundaries. Development outside of these Boundaries could potentially take place, providing it is consistent with **Local Plan Policy LP26- Residential Development Reasonably Related to Existing Settlements**.

Smaller Villages and Hamlets (37)			
Barroway Drove	Crimplesham	Pentney	Tottenhill
Barton Bendish	Gayton Thorpe	Ringstead	West Acre
Bawsey	Hay Green	Roydon	West Dereham
Blackborough End	Holme next the Sea	Saddlebow	West Rudham
Boughton	Lakesend	Salters Lode	Whittington
Brookville	Leziate	Shouldham Thorpe	Wiggenhall St Mary the Virgin
Burnham Norton	Methwold Hythe	South Creake	Wretton
Burnham Overy Town	Nordelph	Stanhoe	
Burnham Thorpe	North Creake	Tilney c/w Islington	
Congham	North Runcton	Titchwell	

Summary of Comments & Suggested Response:

Consultee	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response/ Proposed Action
Mr Michael Rayner, CPRE Norfolk	Object	<p>15.0.3- Having given settlement boundaries to these smaller villages within which modest levels of development may take place, it is unreasonable to also allow for the potential of additional development outside the settlement boundaries under Policy LP26. These smaller settlements may be able to sustain modest infill development within the settlement boundaries, but development outside is likely to be unsustainable as well-being against the strategy to conserve and enhance the countryside recognising its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, and its natural resources to be enjoyed by all</p>	Delete: Development outside of these Boundaries could potentially take place, providing it is consistent with Local Plan Policy LP26- Residential Development adjacent to existing settlement Policy.	<p>Noted. The response given in LP26 relates to this point. LP26 is designed to provide a flexible framework for sustainable development to take place in a sensitive manner. Modest levels of development are supported as long as they are consistent with a range of policies within the local plan including sustainability and conserving the countryside</p>
Mr T Richardson	object	<p>15.0.2- Runcton Holme</p> <p>It is considered that the development boundary as applied to North Runcton does not reflect the extent to the village development- as opposed to the agricultural and common land that lies beyond.</p> <p>The site at Common Lane forms part of a former garden and has no functional relationship to the Common to the west or the fields to the south; it is therefore considered to be part of the village and consideration of aerial photos going back 20</p>	That the land edged red on the attached plan (45 Common Lane, North Runcton) be included within the development boundary for the village of North Runcton.	<p>Noted. Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.</p>

		<p>years confirm that it has been garden for a significant period.</p> <p>The site has no alternative use - having been separated from the main house following its redevelopment and it would represent a sensible rounding off of the village form in this instance.</p> <p>The proposed inclusion of the site within the development boundary for North Runcton would not create a precedent as the circumstances of the site and its relationship to the open countryside beyond are very particular.</p>		
Mr Andrew Page	Object	<p>The Congham map indicates the development boundary extending to the west of the property Deerwood up to Broadgate Lane but this land was considered to be in open countryside reference planning refusal 17/00812/F which was upheld at appeal.</p> <p>Any further linear development along St Andrews Lane will further destroy the original spatial development pattern which pre-existed prior to the damage policy DM3 has inflicted on this rural hamlet. Policy DM3 is unsuitable for most small villages and rural hamlets.</p>	<p>The boundary should be amended to the stop on the western boundary of Deerwood with 33 & 34 St Andrews Lane being in open countryside consistent with 12,13 and Bramble Cottage on St Andrews Lane</p>	<p>Noted. Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.</p>
Mr & Mrs B Johnson (2 comments)	mixed	<p>1. The introduction of development boundaries is supported.</p> <p>Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. In some villages the proposed boundaries include areas which have recently</p>		<p>Noted. Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.</p>

		<p>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.</p> <p>2. Barroway Drove- The development boundary should be extended to include developed areas of The Drove/Cuckoo Road, which form an intrinsic part of the village, which comprises of and is characterised by ribbon development. As shown below. This would be consistent with other proposed village boundaries such as Boughton, where recent and approved development have been included within the proposed development boundary.</p>		
Holkham Estate	Mixed	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Feb 2019) sets out at paragraph 35 the tests for Local Plans to be found sound. It is necessary for Local Plans to be: positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with		<p>Noted. Support appreciated for 15.0.2 & 3. In reference to point LP01 this is covered in another section.</p>

national policy. These representations are made in this context.

New Residential Development at Smaller Villages. The NPPF acknowledges that “Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly” (para 68).

Paragraph 78 of the NPPF advises that “Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.” In addition paragraph 77 advises in respect of rural housing that “Local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet identified local needs, and consider whether allowing some market housing on these sites would help to facilitate this.”

Paragraph 15.0.2 of the Draft Borough of King’s Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan states that these settlements do not have any specific site allocation. However “...modest levels of development can still take place...”. Support is given to this acknowledgement within the Local Plan.

Paragraph 15.0.3 reiterates that “Development outside of these Boundaries could potentially take place, providing it is consistent with Local

		<p>Plan Policy LP26 - Residential Development adjacent to existing settlement Policy.” Support is also given to this acknowledgement within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Despite the above acknowledgments at paragraph 15.0.2 and 15.0.3 of the Draft Local Plan, Policy LP01 ‘Spatial Strategy’ suggests that 5 dwellings will come forward in total across the plan period. This figure appears to be relatively low. It is suggested that the Council produces evidence about the potential for windfall sites to inform the figure quoted at Policy LP01.</p>		
Mrs Rachel Curtis, North Runcton Parish Council	Object	<p>Smaller Villages and Hamlets.</p> <p>We note the reintroduction of a village development boundary. We are not quite clear about the significance of this in respect of it replacing the current SADMP policy DM3. We note that the Hardwick ward is not illustrated in the description of North Runcton – although you may consider it is covered under West Winch Policy E2.1/E2.2.</p>		Noted.
Mrs Kate Sayer, Congham Parish Council	object	<p>Congham-</p> <p>The Local Plan review identifies a number of changes to the Congham development boundary which has been extended on the west of St Andrews Lane to the junction with Broadgate Lane, in contradiction of a planning</p>	<p>Summary</p> <p>* Reduce the development boundary to the west of St Andrews</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper. This change has been analysed and the change will be made.</p>

application which was refused in 17/00812/F. west of Deerwood. The boundary has also been modified in the Little Congham settlement complex adjacent to the B1153.

There has already been significant development in this small rural village in the last three years which further exacerbates transport movements along this very narrow St Andrews Lane.

Vehicles can only move in single file, using gateways and 3 passing places; agricultural machinery movements along this very narrow lane have already caused damage to property as it passes through the centre of the village near the Anvil and has cut away the banks along the side of the lane bringing soil onto the lane.

This village has been designated open countryside and previous planning applications have been built in open countryside rather than in infill locations. The Parish Council therefore expects the boundary to be taken back to the edge of the bungalow Deerwood.

The map of the Congham settlement does not include the development boundary along Low Rd and it therefore appears to be in the Key centre of Grimston; this is not the case, as the north side of Low rd is in the parish of Congham and all residents in Low Rd Congham wish to remain on the edge of open countryside. The Parish Council would respect the residents of view on Low Rd and object to any development at HO63, currently designated as greenfield, and as it is in Congham village - open countryside.

Lane.

* Cricket Field (HO62), to be protected as open space under the LP23 policy.

* Reject the site allocation HO63 to the north of Low Rd Congham.

* Provide a suitable Transport solution for access to the town centre via the A148 / Grimston Rd.

		<p>Contrary to the comments on Open Space/ Green Infrastructure in the HELAA document, the open space (Congham Cricket Field) between Congham Hall and the residential development along Low Rd is a vital recreational space which has previously had a planning application for a row of 3/4 houses along its edge, which was refused. This open space requires protection under the LP23 policy as it is regularly used for a range of recreational uses for both Congham and Grimston residents. Congham Parish would strongly object to the HELAA site HO62.</p> <p>Access into Kings Lynn along the A148 Grimston Rd. Congham has previously supported South Wootton in their concerns re traffic along this route, which is already congested at specific times in the day. This is the main route into the the town centre for residents from the north and the east. It is also an essential business route to the North Lynn industrial estate as well as providing access for heavy lorries to access the docks. The transport policy, in relation to the 600 housing development on top of other developments along this route, will need more serious consideration and assessment.</p>		
Ms Sarah Bristow, Gayton Parish Council	object	Gayton Thorpe- We recognise that, as part of the Neighbourhood Plan, the community has the		It is the grant of the qualifying body who are doing a neighbourhood plan to decide

<p>(2 comments submitted same text)</p>		<p>opportunity to (re)define the development boundary of Gayton Thorpe. Nevertheless, the NP is currently not ‘made’ and so the following comments apply until it is. The idea of development boundaries in Gayton Thorpe is a new one. Previously, the policy has been along the lines of ‘modest levels of development to support the needs of the community’.</p> <p>Introducing development boundaries along with policy LP25 and LP26 (although we suggest elsewhere that LP26 is deleted) means that a development boundary is a bit like a magnet – the development boundary is expected to grow. I.e. new development is expected to start against an existing development boundary.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why aren’t all the groupings of buildings in GT surrounded by a development boundary? for example, Great Barn Farm and its cottages which doesn’t have a development boundary? - Development Boundaries seem to be a contradiction in terms if they can be (re)moved to suit borough requirements without consideration of a consultation with village residents. 		<p>what they deem suitable for the development boundary for their area.</p>
<p>Mrs Sarah Bristow, Gayton Parish Council</p>	<p>mixed</p>	<p>General comments on Policy G41.1 Why, with the current planning permission of ‘at least 23 houses’ which has now turned into 40</p>		<p>Noted. This comment refers to section ‘KRSC’- Gayton G41.1.</p>

(2 comments submitted same text)		houses has Gayton been allocated an additional 10 houses? With windfall sites outside of your calculations, figures are already inaccurate and this goes against the Borough's Local Plan.		
Mr & Mrs D Blakemore	Mixed	<p>The introduction of development boundaries is supported.</p> <p>Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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.</p>		Support acknowledged. Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.
Mr Ian Cable	mixed	<p>Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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</p>		Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.

		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.		
Mr N Good	object	Barroway Drove- The development boundary should be extended to include developed areas of The Drove/Cuckoo Road, which form an intrinsic part of the village, which comprises of and is characterised by ribbon development. As shown below. This would be consistent with other proposed village boundaries such as Boughton, where recent and approved development have been included within the proposed development boundary.		Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.
Mr R Garner (2 comments)	mixed	1. Barroway Drove- The development boundary should be extended to include developed areas of The Drove/Cuckoo Road, which form an intrinsic part of the village, which comprises of and is characterised by ribbon development. As shown below. This would be consistent with other proposed village boundaries such as Boughton, where recent and approved development have been included within the proposed development boundary.		Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.

		<p>2. The introduction of development boundaries is supported. Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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 eb 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.</p>		
<p>Mr A Golding (2 comments)</p>	<p>mixed</p>	<p>1. Barroway Drove- The development boundary should be extended to include developed areas of The Drove/Cuckoo Road, which form an intrinsic part of the village, which comprises of and is characterised by ribbon development. As shown below. This would be consistent with other proposed village boundaries such as Boughton, where recent and approved development have been included within the proposed development boundary.</p>		<p>Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.</p>

		<p>2. The introduction of development boundaries is supported. Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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.</p>		
Mr David Miller	mixed	<p>The introduction of development boundaries is supported. Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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,</p>		Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.

		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		
Mr & Mrs J Clarke (2 comments)	mixed	<p>1. Barroway Drove- The development boundary should be extended to include developed areas of The Drove/Cuckoo Road, which form an intrinsic part of the village, which comprises of and is characterised by ribbon development. As shown below. This would be consistent with other proposed village boundaries such as Boughton, where recent and approved development have been included within the proposed development boundary.</p> <p>2. Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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</p>		Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.

		boundaries by the time the proposed development boundaries are adopted.		
Mrs A Garner (2 comments)	mixed	<p>Barroway Drove-</p> <p>1. The development boundary should be extended to include developed areas of The Drove/Cuckoo Road, which form an intrinsic part of the village, which comprises of and is characterised by ribbon development. As shown below. This would be consistent with other proposed village boundaries such as Boughton, where recent and approved development have been included within the proposed development boundary.</p> <p>2. The introduction of development boundaries is supported. Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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.</p>		Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.

<p>Wotton Brothers Farms (2 comments)</p>	<p>mixed</p>	<p>Barroway Drove-</p> <p>1.The development boundary should be extended to include developed areas of The Drove/Cuckoo Road, which form an intrinsic part of the village, which comprises of and is characterised by ribbon development. As shown below. This would be consistent with other proposed village boundaries such as Boughton, where recent and approved development have been included within the proposed development boundary.</p> <p>2. The introduction of development boundaries is supported. Proposed development boundaries are in consistent. 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.</p>		<p>Development boundary queries will be dealt with in a separate paper.</p>
<p>Mr L Aldren</p>	<p>mixed</p>	<p>Proposed development boundaries are in</p>		<p>Development boundary queries</p>

		<p>consistent. 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.</p>		<p>will be dealt with in a separate paper.</p>
<p>Mr Andrew Carr, West Rudham Parish Council</p>	<p>object</p>	<p>CPRE Pledge</p>		<p>Noted. Housing Need is now prescribed by Government if they are unrealistic or unfounded than CPRE should take this up with Government. We need to be shown to meeting our Local Housing Need, ensure the Local Plan is up-to-date and 'sound' and that at least 5 years' worth of housing land supply is in place and attempt to meet the Housing Delivery Test.</p>
<p>Mr R G Pannell, Pentney Parish Council</p>	<p>object</p>	<p>CPRE Pledge</p>		<p>Noted. Housing Need is now prescribed by Government if</p>

				they are unrealistic or unfounded than CPRE should take this up with Government. We need to be shown to meeting our Local Housing Need, ensure the Local Plan is up-to-date and 'sound' and that at least 5 years' worth of housing land supply is in place and attempt to meet the Housing Delivery Test.
Ms Christina Jones, Holme Next The Sea Parish Council	object	CPRE Pledge		Noted. Housing Need is now prescribed by Government if they are unrealistic or unfounded than CPRE should take this up with Government. We need to be shown to meeting our Local Housing Need, ensure the Local Plan is up-to-date and 'sound' and that at least 5 years' worth of housing land supply is in place and attempt to meet the Housing Delivery Test.
Mrs J Bland, Fring Parish Meeting	object	CPRE Pledge		Noted. Housing Need is now prescribed by Government if they are unrealistic or unfounded than CPRE should

			take this up with Government. We need to be shown to meeting our Local Housing Need, ensure the Local Plan is up-to-date and 'sound' and that at least 5 years' worth of housing land supply is in place and attempt to meet the Housing Delivery Test.
--	--	--	--