



Examination of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan

Part 3

Matter 6, Issue 6

Questions Q 425, 447, 448, 452 and 455

Historic England, Hearing Statement

August 2024

Historic England is the principal Government adviser on the historic environment, advising it on planning and listed building consent applications, appeals and other matters generally affecting the historic environment. Historic England is consulted on Local Development Plans under the provisions of the duty to co-operate and provides advice to ensure that legislation and national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework are thereby reflected in local planning policy and practice.

The tests of soundness require that Local Development Plans should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Historic England's representations on the Publication Draft Local Plan are made in the context of the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") in relation to the historic environment as a component of sustainable development.

Historic England Hearing Statement

Introduction

- 1.1 This statement addresses the Inspector's questions with regards Matter 6 of the Local Plan.
- 1.2 This hearing statement should be read alongside Historic England's comments submitted at previous consultation stages of the Local Plan on 29th April 2019 and 27th September 2021, our hearing Statement dated November 2022, Statement of Common Ground dated November 2022 and response to additional evidence dated 18th October 2023 and consultation responses relating the Gypsy and Traveller sites submitted on 7th March 2024 and 23rd May 2024.

Matters and Issues for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Review

MATTER 6 – HOUSING

Issue 6: Has the Plan been positively prepared and is it justified, effective and consistent with national policy in meeting the housing needs of all groups in the Borough over the plan period?

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation (Policy LP28)

425. Are the changes proposed to amended Criterion 2.f) necessary for effectiveness in respect of biodiversity and heritage assets? If so, how?

- 2.1 If heritage assets are referenced in this criterion, Historic England considers that it would be helpful to reference their settings, given the NPPF para 206 makes it clear that the significance of heritage assets may be harmed by development within their settings.
- 2.2 Alternatively, it would be reasonable to consider that heritage protection is covered elsewhere in the Plan through the main historic environment policy LP20 and that this criterion is therefore not necessary.

GT21 – Land at Four Acres, Upwell/Outwell

447. Would the provision of an additional 5 pitches, as an extension to the existing site at Four Acres, be detrimental to the significance of nearby heritage assets, including their settings? Does the site assessment for GT21, in the Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment report [F94], accurately reflect the potential heritage impacts?

- 2.3 The Priory, listed at grade II, and Upwell Conservation Area lie approximately 350m east of the site. However dense woodland and the distance between means that any impact on designated heritage assets is likely to be minimal. In our view, the provision of an additional 5 pitches is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby heritage assets.
- 2.4 The [Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment report \[F94\]](#) makes no reference to these heritage assets. It would be more helpful if the assessment could reflect the presence of nearby heritage assets, even if the assessment ultimately concludes that the proposed allocation is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby assets.

GT09 – Land at the Stables, Walpole St Andrews

448. Would the provision of an additional pitch on land at the Stables be detrimental to the significance of nearby heritage assets, including their settings? Does the site assessment for GT09, in document F94, accurately reflect the potential heritage impacts?

- 2.5 Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the Marshland Smeeth and Fen War Memorial, listed at grade II lies approximately 150m to the south east of the site. However due to the intervening development and scale of the asset and proposed development, this is not considered to be a constraint. In our view, the provision of an additional pitch is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby heritage assets.
- 2.6 The [Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment report \[F94\]](#) makes no reference to these heritage assets. It would be more helpful if the assessment could reflect the presence of nearby heritage assets, even if the assessment ultimately concludes that the proposed allocation is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby assets.

GT20 – Land at Botany Bay, Upwell

452. Would the provision of an additional pitch on land at Botany Bay be detrimental to nearby heritage assets and their settings? Does the site assessment for GT20, in document F94, accurately reflect the potential heritage impacts?

- 2.7 The nearest designated heritage assets are approximately 250m away (the Upwell Conservation Area and grade II listed War Memorial). Given the distance and intervening development and vegetation, any impact on designated heritage assets is likely to be minimal. In our view, the provision of an additional pitch is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby heritage assets.
- 2.8 The [Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment report \[F94\]](#) makes no reference to these heritage assets. It would be more helpful if the assessment could reflect the presence of nearby heritage assets, even if the assessment ultimately concludes that the proposed allocation is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby assets.

GT55 – Land at Victoria Barns, Basin Road, Outwell

455. Would the provision of an additional pitch on land at Victoria Barns be detrimental to nearby heritage assets and their settings? Does the site assessment for GT55, in document F94, accurately reflect the potential heritage impacts?

- 2.9 The grade II listed Birdbeck lies approximately 300 m from the site. Given the distance, and intervening development the impact on designated heritage assets is likely to be minimal. In our view, the provision of an additional pitch is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby heritage assets.
- 2.10 The [Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment report \[F94\]](#) makes no reference to these heritage assets. It would be more helpful if the assessment

could reflect the presence of nearby heritage assets, even if the assessment ultimately concludes that the proposed allocation is unlikely to be detrimental to the significance of nearby assets.