



Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan 2016 -2036 Reconvened Examination

Part 3: Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

“Matter 6” Statement – Housing

Response to the Inspectors “Additional Matters, Issues and Questions”

16 August 2024

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)

Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs

Q416. Does the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2023 (GTAA) [F44], as updated by the Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Proposed Site Allocations and Policy Consultation (May 2024) [F93] and the Technical Note: King's Lynn GTAA – Revised 2023 PPTS Need Figures for Gypsies and Travellers (May 2024), provide a robust evidence base to establish the need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the Borough to 2040? In particular:

- a) Is the overall methodology of the GTAA robust and based on industry standards and practice, and are the definitions of terms in the Glossary at Appendix B justified and consistent with national policy?**

KLWNBC Answer:

The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) was completed following a robust methodology based on industry standards as set out in a range of Legislation and Government Guidance. The study is consistent with the requirements of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) 2023, and also the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023 and the Housing and Planning Act (2016) by including an assessment of need for all Traveller households that do and do not meet the current planning definition of a Traveller set out in the PPTS 2023.

Opinion Research Services (ORS), who carried out the GTAA on behalf of the Borough Council, would note that the GTAA methodology has been repeatedly found to be sound and robust, including through Local Plan Examinations in Bedford, Blaby, Cambridge, Central Bedfordshire, Chelmsford, Cheltenham, Cotswold, Daventry, East Hertfordshire, Gloucester, Hart, Maldon, Milton Keynes, Newham, Runnymede, South Cambridgeshire, South Northamptonshire, Tendring, Tewkesbury, and Waverley.

An Appeal Decision for a Hearing in Central Bedfordshire (APP/P0240/C/18/3213822) that was issued in March 2020 concluded:

...whilst there have been some queries in previous appeal decisions over the conclusions of other GTAAs produced by ORS, the methodology has nevertheless been accepted by Inspectors in a considerable number of Local Plan Examinations.

In addition, specific elements of the ORS GTAA methodology have been supported by Planning Inspectors in various Decision Notices.

The Planning Inspector for an appeal in Chelmsford (APP/W1525/A/14/2226970) that was issued in February 2016 agreed with the approach taken by ORS when identifying concealed or doubled-up households. The Inspector concluded:

The appellant disputes the Council's approach, particularly with regard to its assessment of need. He considers that there are errors in the GTAA with regard to concealed households, doubling up, hidden need, household formation rates and unauthorised sites. He contends that these errors combine to result in need being

considerably underestimated. More realistic figures would, in his view, be 33 pitches to 2018, a further 18 from 2018 to 2023 and another 44 from 2023 to 2033.

Mr Jarman, of Opinion Research Services (ORS), explains that the methodology used by ORS takes into account relevant legislation and guidance and has been evolved over a lengthy period of preparing GTAA for over 100 authorities. It includes interviews with gypsy and traveller families and gathering of evidence from other sources including through advertisements and dialogue with a wide range of stakeholders.

The terms “doubling-up” and “concealed households” both refer to actual or potential households which are currently living on other gypsy and traveller sites. The GTAA does not count a household as needing another pitch if it is found during interviewing that there is not a wish for another pitch. I find this approach to be reasonable and consistent with that of engagement with the traveller community in assessing need.

The approach taken by ORS to new household formation and the use of a base rate of 1.50% has been supported by Planning Inspectors in a number of Decision Notices. In relation to a Decision Notice for an appeal in Doncaster that was issued in November 2016 (Ref: APP/F4410/W/15/3133490) where the agent acting on behalf of the appellant claimed that a rate closer to 3.00% should be used. The Inspector concluded:

In assessing need account also needs to be taken of likely household growth over the coming years. In determining an annual household growth rate, the Council relies on the work of Opinions Research Services (ORS), part of Swansea University. ORS’s research considers migration, population profiles, births & fertility rates, death rates, household size data and household dissolution rates to determine average household growth rates for gypsies and travellers. The findings indicate that the average annual growth rate is in the order of 1.50% but that a 2.5% figure could be used if local data suggest a relatively youthful population. As the Council has found a strong correlation between Doncaster’s gypsy and traveller population age profile and the national picture, a 1.50% annual household growth rate has been used in its 2016 GTANA. Given the rigour of ORS’s research and the Council’s application of its findings to the local area I accept that a 1.50% figure is justified in the case of Doncaster.

Another case (APP/P1615/W/16/3148326) issued in August 2017 in the Forest of Dean the Inspector concluded at paragraphs 41 and 42 that:

41. The parties also differ in terms of household growth rates. The GTAA was undertaken by Opinion Research Services (ORS), part of Swansea University. ORS’s research indicates that the average annual household growth rate is in the order of 1.50%. The GTAA adjusts this figure according to local demographics, such that within Cotswold District the rate is 1.90%, whilst in the Forest of Dean it is 1.40%. ORS prepared a technical note in 2015 to justify this rate. This note has been subject to peer review and was published in Social Research Practice in 2016/17.

42. The appellant’s position in respect of household growth rates has changed during the course of the appeal from an initial figure of 3.00% to 1.90% in the most recent submission. Many of the elements that the appellant considers contribute to the higher household formation rate have been taken into account in the ORS research. There

remains a difference between the parties as to the life expectancy of gypsies and travellers. The appellant submits that life expectancy at birth is 89 years, whilst ORS believe 72 years to be a more realistic figure. ORS rely on research from the University of Sheffield which found that life expectancy amongst gypsies and travellers was about 10-12 years less than for average. ORS found that using a life expectancy of 72 the results were consistent with the 2011 census. I therefore prefer the evidence of ORS which has been subject to greater scrutiny.

Another relevant decision was in relation to an appeal in Guildford that was issued in March 2018 (Ref: APP/W/16/3165526) where the agent acting on behalf of the appellant again claimed that a rate closer to 3.00% should be used. The Inspector concluded:

There is significant debate about household formation rates and the need to meet future growth in the district. The obvious point to make is that this issue is likely to be debated at the local-plan examination. It is of the opinion that, projecting growth rates is not an exact science and the debate demonstrates some divergence of opinion between the experts. Different methodologies could be applied producing a wide range of data. However, on the available evidence it seems to me that the figures used in the GTAA are probably appropriate given that they are derived by using local demographic evidence. In my opinion, the use of a national growth rate and its adaptation to suit local or regional variation, or the use of local base data to refine the figure, is a reasonable approach.

As such, ORS would contend that the ORS GTAA methodology has repeatedly been found to be robust and in line with national policy and guidance and has been supported by Inspectors at numerous Local Plan Examinations and Planning Appeals.

It is also the view of ORS that the definitions of terms in the Glossary at Appendix B are fully justified and consistent with national policy.

It is understood that there have been representations in relation to the definition of a Dwellinghouse in the Glossary.

A dwellinghouse consists of self-contained living accommodation when the basic elements of living (sleeping, washing, preparation of food, and so on) are located together within a defined area and are not shared by more than one household or tenant. ORS contend that this definition includes Gypsy and Traveller caravans/chalets/mobiles/statics.

- b) Has adequate allowance been made within the need figures to take account of the effects of displacement and to ensure future households are not forced to move out of the Borough due to overcrowding or an inadequate supply of pitches?**

KLWNBC Answer:

The GTAA has made more than adequate allowances for the effects of displacement to ensure that households that have been forced to move off sites due to overcrowding have been included as components of need.

Paragraph 7.22 in the GTAA deals specifically with issues relating to household displacement and the GTAA identified a total of 10 households that have been displaced from sites who have a need for permanent pitches.

- c) Is an assumption of nil net migration within the assessment of need justified and reasonable, given that the future movement of Gypsy and Traveller households into and out of the Borough over the remainder of the Plan period is unknown?**

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council consider this approach to be justified and reasonable. Paragraphs 7.23-7.25 in the GTAA address issues relating to in-Migration. It is accepted that the GTAA is a snapshot in time based on a baseline date on May 2023 (updated to take account of the changes to the PPTS definition of a Traveller in December 2023). At the time of the GTAA, other than the identified displaced in-migration, there was no evidence of any in-migration.

The New Policy will seek to deal with any new need that may arise over the plan period.

- d) On what basis has the pitch need arising from households who meet the 2015 PPTS definition been reduced from 102 to 98 pitches for the period 2023/24 to 2038/39, and the 5-year need for the period 2023/34 to 2027/28 from 76 to 74 in the Technical Note?**

KLWNBC Answer:

The reason for the reduction from 102 pitches to 98 pitches within the Technical Note [F115] was due to the dismissal of the appeal at the site at Robyn's Nest at Baldwins Drive (APP/V2635/C/21/3286363). This site generated a need for 4 pitches (3 x doubled-up and 1 x unauthorised). This was not found to be a Traveller site by the Inspector in the appeal so the need was removed from the GTAA.

- e) Is an allowance of 6 pitches sufficient to meet the needs of households whose status against the 2015 Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) definition is undetermined, given that 14 such households were identified in the GTAA, and 52% of households that were surveyed met that definition?**

KLWNBC Answer:

The GTAA identified a total of 14 undetermined households that generated a need for a total of 6 pitches (2 x unauthorised and 4 x new household formation). Therefore, the allowance for 6 pitches is seen as fully justified, and that the proposed Local Plan Criteria-Based Policy can deal with any future need that may arise.

- f) How have the pitch needs arising from households that did not meet the 2015 PPTS definition of Gypsies and Travellers, but meet the revised definition in the 2023 PPTS, been ascertained, given that 14 such households generate a need for only 2 additional pitches? Has the**

revised definition also been applied to the allowance for undetermined households?

KLWNBC Answer:

Following a review of the outcomes of the GTAA against the revised planning definition of a Traveller the ORS Technical Note (01/05/2024) concluded that a total of 14 households that did not meet to 2015 PPTS definition do now meet the 2023 PPTS definition and that these households contained a current need for 1 pitch, and a future need for 1 pitch.

It is not possible to apply the 2023 planning definition to the 14 undetermined households as there is no evidential data available to complete the evaluation against the definition.

The New policy will seek to deal with any new need that may arise over the plan period.

Proposed New Policy: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

417. Is the proposed New Policy intended to replace Criteria 17 to 20 of Policy LP28 in the submitted Plan?

KLWNBC Answer:

Yes. The proposed New Policy within [F93] is intended to replace criteria 17-20 of Policy LP28 in the submitted Plan.

418. On what basis has the Council proposed changes to the new supporting text and policies for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople set out in its 'Suggested Changes to the Proposed Gypsy and Traveller Sites Policies Document'? Is it this amended version which is to form the Council's proposed change to the provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in Policy LP28 of the submitted Plan?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council has proposed the 'Suggested Changes to the Proposed Gypsy and traveller and Traveller Sites Policies Document' [F116] in response to comments raised through the Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Proposed Site Allocations and Policy Consultation (May 2024) and the advice evidenced within the Technical Note [F115]. The Council believe that these proposed changes will help improve clarity of its position in relation to the emerging Policy framework for the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers within the Borough.

Yes, it is this amended version (document [F116] that the Council is seeking to use to form the proposed change to the provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in Policy LP28 of the submitted Plan.

419. The revised Tables following paragraph 7.3 of the supporting text to the New Policy indicates that 98 pitches are required for Gypsies and Travellers and 5 plots are required for Travelling Showpeople. However, paragraph 7.3 itself refers to 102 permanent pitches and an additional 5 plots for Travelling Showpeople. In the light of the Council's response to question 416d) above,

please could the Council confirm which figure is correct or why these numbers differ?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council note the oversight identified within paragraph 7.3 in relation to the accommodation requirement numbers. The Council can confirm that paragraph 7.3 within the Suggested Changes to the Proposed Gypsy and Traveller and Traveller Sites Policies Document should read....

“The GTAA (June 2023) identifies a need for a minimum of 102 98 additional permanent pitches by 2039, of which 726 pitches are needed by 2027/2028. There is also a required need for an additional 5 plots for Travelling show people with 4 plots to be delivered by 2028/2029. The evidence does not identify a need for any transit or temporary provision. It has been agreed through Duty to Cooperate that the Council and neighbouring authorities are able to meet their own needs in full, with no dependence on neighbouring areas”.

420. Would these New Tables be clearer if combined into a single table? If not, should the title of the second table be amended to reflect that it only relates to the requirements for Travelling Showpeople?

KLWNBC Answer:

To help improve clarity of the Policy, the Council agrees that both tables should be merged into one single table which identifies the accommodation requirements for both Gypsies and Travellers and those for Travelling Showpeople, over the plan period. The Council proposes the following change:

Accommodation Requirements for Gypsies and Travellers to 2039		
0-5	2024-2029	72
6-10	2030-2034	10
11-15	2035-2038	11
16-17	2038-2039	5
0-17		98
Accommodation Requirements for Travelling Showpeople to 2039		
0-5	2024-2029	4
6-10	2030-2034	0
11-15	2035-2038	1
16-17	2038-2039	0
0-17		5

421. Paragraph 7.4, as amended, comments on changes to Government legislation, planning decisions and the ‘proposed’ extension of the Plan period by a year to 2040, which, it states, have all been reflected in the supply. It goes on to say that the overall net remaining need identified in the GTAA has reduced. Please could the Council explain how this has been calculated, taking account of any additional requirement for the extra year of the Plan period to 2040?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council can confirm that the Technical Note [F115] did not extend the Plan period by a year, so paragraph 7.4 within document [F116] is incorrect where it states, ‘*and an extension to the Plan period by a year*’. In addition, references to 2040 within F116 have been included as an error.

However, ORS have confirmed that adding an additional year to the Plan period 2039-2040 would lead to an increase of 2 pitches at the end of the Plan period in year 2039/2040. This means that the 5-year accommodation need of 72 pitches would remain the same, but an additional 2 pitches would be added after year 5. This would result in an uplift from 26 to 28 pitches to be delivered between the years of 2028-2040 and an uplift of 98 to 100 pitches to be provided overall.

The necessary changes to the Plan period can be made if required.

422. Are the criteria in the proposed New Policy for determining proposals for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites consistent with national policy in the PPTS, in particular paragraph 13?

KLWNBC Answer:

In accordance with the PPTS it is considered that New Policy (Part 2) sets out a fair criteria-based approach against which planning applications for Gypsy and Traveller sites will be determined. The Council consider the criteria to be consistent with those in the PPTS to facilitate the traditional and nomadic life of travellers while respecting the interests of the settled community (PPTS, Policy B, para 13).

423. In respect of the amended Criterion 2.b) what is meant by the phrase ‘a well-managed site’? Is this requirement justified?

KLWNBC Answer:

This requirement was included in response to concerns raised during the consultation process that some of the existing sites have general site management issues in terms of their physical condition. On reflection however, the Council do not believe the requirement is necessary for soundness and propose the following modification to Criterion 2.b) of the Policy.

2.b) ‘in the case of an extension, be small scale, intensify the use of an existing authorised, ~~well-managed site and/or~~ make effective use of brownfield land, wherever possible’

424. Is the amended Criterion 2.c) necessary and justified given that Criterion 2.b) requires proposals to be of a scale that is appropriate to local character in line with Policy LP18? If required could it be more positively worded and reference made to Policy LP21, as follows: ‘d) safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents in line with Policy LP21’?

KLWNBC Answer:

Due to most of the existing Gypsy and Traveller sites being located within the rural area, Criterion 2.c) is proposed to reflect Policy C Part 14 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS). The Council believe that this is important given the concerns raised about the growth of existing sites in relation to the size and scale of the nearest settled community through the consultation process.

On reflection, the Council believe that Criterion 2.b) could cover this issue in a more positively worded manner and therefore, Criterion 2.c) could be revised to focus on the impact on residential amenity of those existing neighbouring residents nearby. The Council proposed the following change...

~~2.c) would not dominate or overwhelm the nearest settled community in terms of size and scale;~~

'2.c) safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents in line with Policy LP21 Environment, Design and Amenity'.

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

KLWNBC Answer:

The changes proposed to criterion 2.f) were suggested by Historic England in their response [003] to the Gypsy and Traveller consultation. It is considered necessary for effectiveness to align with paragraph 200 of National Policy.

However, the Council consider the proposed changes to criterion 2.f) are not necessary for biodiversity.

426. The New Policy lists the number of permanent pitches and plots to meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople to 2027/28 in Part 1 – is this sufficiently clear as set out in the Policy? In order for it to be clear and effective, should it say, 'The following allocated sites will meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople up to 2027/28, as follows:'?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council agree that to improve clarity and effectiveness of the New Policy, Part 1 of the current wording within Part 1 should be deleted and replaced with...

1. The following allocated sites will meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople up to 2027/28, as follows:

~~The permanent accommodation needs of the Borough's Gypsy and Traveller community will be met through the provision for 958 permanent pitches by 203940, with approximately 69 72 permanent pitches to be delivered by 2027/2028. There is also a required need for an additional 5 plots for Travelling show people with 4 plots to be delivered by 2027/2028, by:~~

427. Is it clear how the Council will 'support' the extension, intensification and formalisation of the 72 permanent pitches and 'support' the provision of 4 plots for Travelling Showpeople up to 2027/28? What evidence is there to support these pitches and plots coming forward as anticipated?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that it has provided a clear strategy within the Gypsy and Traveller Proposed Sites and Policy Consultation Document (May 2024) [F93] – via site

allocations – as the mechanism for delivering the extension, intensification and formalisation of the 72 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller provision and 4 plots for Travelling Showpeople provision.

The evidence for supporting these pitches and plots coming forward is identified within the Interview Transcripts of the GTAA and the results of the Site Assessment document [F94].

428. Is it justified to rely on the criteria-based approach in parts 2 and 3 of the New Policy to provide the remaining 26 permanent pitches and 1 plot for Travelling Showpeople over the rest of the Plan period from 2027/28? What evidence does the Council have to demonstrate that a reliance on windfall provision via this approach would be effective and positively prepared in meeting the remaining need, such as a recent track record of granting permissions for new sites?

KLWNBC Answer:

Yes. It is considered justified and appropriate to rely upon a criteria-based windfall policy to deliver the outstanding balance of permanent Gypsy and Traveller (26 pitches) and Travelling Showpeople (1 plot) for the remainder of the Local Plan period (2028/29-2039).

The overwhelming quantum of need (72 Gypsy and/ or Traveller pitches and 4 Travelling Showpeoples plots) is acute and will need to be met over a 5-year period, from 2023-2027. This is a function of the 5-year need for 72 pitches (to 2027/28) identified in the 2023 Gypsy and Traveller Technical Note [F115] and will be met through site specific allocations in the Plan. Evidence to justify the reliance upon windfall provision to meet the remaining residual need identified in the GTAA is set out below.

Calculation of need, 2028-2039

For the remainder of the Plan period (2028-2039), there is an annual need for 2.36 Gypsy and Traveller pitches, plus 0.09 Travelling Showpeoples plots per year. The table below shows how the need is distributed over the Plan period. A need for an additional two pitches is extrapolated from need identified through the GTAA to 2039, to cover the whole Plan period to 2039. This equates to a need for 28 Gypsy and Traveller pitches and 1 Travelling Showpeoples plot (2028-2039).

Monitoring period dates (from)	(to)	Gypsy and Traveller pitches (2023 GTAA)	Travelling Showpeople plots
01/04/2023	31/03/2028	72	4
Planned growth (site allocations, 2023-2028)		72	4
01/04/2028	31/03/2033	10	1
01/04/2033	31/03/2038	11	
01/04/2038	31/03/2039	5	
Total 2023-2039		98	5

Total 2028-2039 (to be delivered through windfalls)		26	1
Annual need 2028-2039 (apportioned)		2.36	0.09
TOTAL NEED 2028-2039		28	1

Historic rates of consent for Gypsy and Traveller pitches (2015-2024)

Details of recent consents, for the monitoring period 2020-2024 (4 years) are shown below.

Reference	Category	Date of Decision	Monitoring year	No of Gypsy and Traveller pitches
19/00451/F	Minor	20/08/2021	2021-22	4
21/01171/F (allowed on appeal)	Minor	06/03/2023	2022-23	5
20/01246/FM (allowed on appeal)	Major	14/01/2023	2023-24	1
21/01097/F	Minor	27/09/2023	2023-24	1
23/01082/F	Minor	14/02/2024	2023-24	1
TOTAL				12

These equate to 12 pitches approved over 4 years; a mean average rate of 3 per year.

Consideration is also given to earlier consents granted, as set out in the 2019/20 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), submitted with the Local Plan [D10], as set out in the table below.

Monitoring period	Gypsy and Traveller consents	Mean annual rate of pitches granted
Prior to Plan period [D10 - AMR 2019/20]		
2015-16	0	2.6
2016-17	0	2.6
2017-18	8	2.6
2018-19	0	2.6
2019-20	5	2.6
TOTAL (2015-2020)	13	13
2020-21	0	3
2021-22	4	3
2022-23	5	3
2023-24	3	3
TOTAL (2020-2024)	12	12

TOTAL (2015-2024)	25	25
Mean annual rate of consents		2.8

The AMR [D10] noted consents for 13 pitches during the five-year period, 2015-20. The 2016 GTAA [D4], submitted with the Local Plan, identified a need for an additional 5 pitches over the plan period to meet the traveller need and a possible need for an additional 2 plots for travelling show people to meet the need over the plan period (paragraph 7.1.15). Therefore, the number of consents granted at the time (before 2020) was more than sufficient (at the time) to cover the need for pitches identified in the 2016 GTAA.

Furthermore, the mean annual rate of consents over the previous 9 years equates to a mean of 2.8 pitches granted per year. This compares to the identified need for later part of the Plan period (2028-2039), which equates to a mean annual rate of 2.36 Gypsy and Traveller pitches and a negligible need for Travelling Showpeople (1 plot) beyond 2028.

Overall, historic rates of consent for Gypsy and Traveller pitches have, on average, been 19% higher than the identified need for the Plan period 2028-2039. Based on these historic completions rates, it is considered the Plan would be effective and positively prepared in meeting the remaining need, by relying upon a criteria-based (windfall) policy (parts 2 and 3 of the New Policy).

Proposed New Policy: Caravans, Park Homes and Houseboats

429. Would the proposed New Policy: Caravans, Park Homes and Houseboats meet the accommodation needs of Gypsy and Traveller households who do not meet the planning definition or are classified as undetermined in the GTAA. Would this be justified and consistent with national policy?

KLWNBC Answer:

The proposed New Policy: Caravans, Park Homes and Houseboats would form part of a suite of housing Policies (Policies LP28 - Affordable Housing, LP29 - Housing for the Elderly and Specialist Care, LP30 - Adaptable and Accessible Homes, LP32 - Houses in Multiple Occupation Policy, LP33 - Enlargement or Replacement of Dwellings in the Countryside Policy, LP34 - Housing Needs of Rural Workers Policy and LP35 - Residential Annexes) that would help meet the accommodation needs of Gypsy and Traveller households who do not meet the planning definition or are classified as undetermined in the GTAA.

The Council believe that this is justified and consistent with National Policy in relation to paragraph 63 of the NPPF where 'the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies'.

430. Is it clear in Criterion 1 of this New Policy what is meant by the phrase 'where they are located on sites which would be acceptable for permanent dwellings'? Should this criterion include reference to the relevant policies in the Plan, in order to be clear and effective?

KLWNBC Answer:

On reflection, the Council does not consider 'where they are located on sites which would be acceptable for permanent dwellings' to be sufficiently clear and effective. To improve clarity and effectiveness, the Council propose that '*Where they are located on sites which would be acceptable for permanent dwellings*' be removed from the policy and references be made to other relevant policies in the Local Plan.

~~Proposals for the delivery of new caravan pitches or park homes, or extensions to existing caravan or park home sites, will be supported where they are located on sites which would be acceptable for permanent dwellings and satisfy other relevant policies in the Local Plan~~

'Proposals for the delivery of new caravan pitches or park homes, or extensions to existing caravan or park home sites, will be supported where they satisfy Policies LP13 Transportation, LP18 Design and sustainable Development, LP19 Environmental Assets - Green Infrastructure, Landscape Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity, LP21 Environment, Design and Amenity'.

431. Is Criterion 2 of this New Policy clear and effective in terms of what is meant by being 'situated where local services and facilities are accessible by active travel means'?

KLWNBC Answer:

On reflection, the Council does not consider 'situated where local services and facilities are accessible by active travel means' to be clear and effective. To improve clarity and effectiveness, the Council propose the following change:

'The development maximises opportunities to reduce the need to travel and encourages sustainable and active travel modes of transport in accordance with Policy LP13 Transportation'.

Proposed Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site Assessment and Selection Process

432. Was the process for the selection of sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, as set out in the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessments report [F94], thorough and robust, and consistent with national policy? In particular, are the sites that have been selected for allocation justified as appropriate, taking into account the reasonable alternatives?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council consider the process for selecting sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation to be thorough, robust and consistent with National Policy for the following reasons:

1. It was prepared in accordance with the methodology of the Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) [Ca1]; and
2. The provisions of Paragraph 11 of the PPTS and other planning guidance.

The Council considers the site selection for allocation to be justified as appropriate, taking into account any reasonable alternatives, including those that the Council received through the “call for land” consultation in October 2023 and those received through the consultation process. These sites were all fully assessed within the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document (May 2024) [F94], Gypsy and Traveller Sustainability Assessment Addendum Report (May 2024) [B11], and the Habitats Regulations Assessment of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites [F97].

433. Where sites have been assessed as potentially suitable for additional accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, but not allocated, have the reasons for their non-selection been clearly explained and justified in the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessments report [F94]?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that further clarity can be provided in document F54 for those sites that have been assessed as ‘potentially suitable’ for additional accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, but not allocated. The Council has proposed several changes for relevant sites to document [F94]. The revised document is attached to these MIQs as Appendix 1.

Sustainability Appraisal

434. Has the selection of sites for additional accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople been based on a sound process of sustainability appraisal (SA), as set out in the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites and Policies Sustainability Appraisal Addendum, dated May 2024 [B11]? Have the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment been met, including in respect of the cumulative impacts of the Plan, with the proposed Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Addendum for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) (May 2024), has been written in support of the Local Plan Review and should be read in conjunction with the SA Scoping Report (2017), the Local Plan Review SA including Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 2020, SA Addendum and non-technical summary (2022) and SA Addendum for GTTS (January 2024). The SA 2020 with subsequent updates sets out the background and process undertaken to produce the Sustainability Appraisal including SEA and the underpinning methodology, which also relates to the GTTS SA Addendum. The SA incorporating SEA has been prepared and is compliant with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). The full set of SA documents were prepared in support of the examination of the BCKLWN Local Plan Review and have followed Stages A to D of the preparation of the SA including Strategic Environmental Assessment. The SA process is an iterative process and therefore the GTTS SA Addendum forms part of the overall assessment process.

The purpose of SA/SEA is to help guide and influence the Plan making process by identifying the likely sustainability effects of various reasonable alternative options. As

noted in the non-technical summary, the Borough Council has determined that the nature and scope of the Local Plan review means it is likely to have significant environmental effects (in the terms of Regulation 9(1) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004), and consequently SEA is required. Although the requirements for a SEA are distinct from those for SA, they can overlap substantially in terms of process and content. Therefore, the required SEA has been integrated into this SA. Whilst the SEA looks at the environmental impacts, the SA also looks at the wider economic and social impacts.

Table 2.1 from the SA 2020 outlines the ‘Stages of Sustainability Appraisal’ (A-E)¹, which sets out the main stages in preparation of the SA for the KLWN Local Plan Review. Each Addendum to the SA 2020 has followed national guidance, including key stages of sustainability appraisal process.

Stage	Summary
A Scoping	Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline, and deciding on the scope
B Option Testing	Developing and refining options
C Assessing Plan	Appraising the effects of the Plan
D Consulting	Consulting on the Plan and SA/SEA Report
E Monitoring	Monitoring the implementation of the Plan

The context and objectives have been reviewed following consultation responses and a draft GTTS SA Addendum and proposed site allocations and policies were consulted on in January 2024, with further work following on to develop and refine options. A further consultation exercise was undertaken on the latest GTTS SA Addendum, which appraised the effects of the policies and allocated sites. In undertaking the GTTS SA Addendum, national guidance on the SEA Directive and Regulations has been followed and references to the SA should be taken as incorporating the requirements of strategic environmental assessment.

An assessment of cumulative impacts builds on the assessment of individual policies and site allocations to provide a deeper understanding of the potential impacts of the policies within a local plan. The cumulative impact of policies is not solely a simple mathematical exercise, although the scores form the basis for any assessment. The cumulative assessment has also considered the wider implications of policy options and site allocations and would identify any potential amendments to policy to minimise environmental impacts. The GTTS SA Addendum 2024 considers that the cumulative

¹ https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20079/planning_policy_and_local_plan/629/sustainability_appraisal [Document B3 - Page 6]

impacts of the Plan (as assessed in the SA 2020 and SA 2022) are not materially impacted by the inclusion of GTTS site allocations and policies. The GTTS SA Addendum also recognises potential mitigation measures that have been set out in the supporting policies to help enable the delivery of sustainability objectives and reduce any negative cumulative impacts.

The policies and reasonable alternatives are measured against a range of sustainability objectives. There were two sets of objectives to allow a more nuanced approach to site specific appraisals. The objectives for the site specific policies were applied to all sites in the Plan, including the GTTS sites. The objectives against which the non-site specific policies were measured were applied to all non-site specific policies. Therefore, the approach taken was comparative and equal.

The SA Addendum is also accompanied by a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of GTTS sites to determine likely significant effect on certain European sites and whilst there are some links between the requirement and SA/SEA, these are reported separately.

The Council will also publish a Post-Adoption Statement on the successful adoption of the Local Plan Review, confirming how the SEA process was undertaken. Following adoption of the Plan, the Council will monitor the impacts of the Plan primarily through the Authority's Monitoring Report (AMR) as part of the final stage of the SA process.

Flood Risk Assessment

435. The Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocation Sequential and Exception Test Document [F95] finds that all of the proposed sites in part 1 of the New Policy pass the Sequential Test in respect of flood risk and are capable of meeting the Exception Test, even though residential caravans are classified as 'highly vulnerable' in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) and 11 out of 20 of the proposed sites are located partially or entirely within the areas at highest risk of flooding in Flood Zones 2 or 3. How is this justified as an appropriate strategy?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council considers the approach to flood risk is a justified and appropriate strategy considering the type of the flood risk across the Borough and the location of the accommodation need for Gypsy and Travellers.

The Council has liaised with the Environment Agency on this matter from an early stage of the process to agree a suitable balance be made against the risk from flooding and locating the accommodation need in those places where it is directly arising.

The Sequential Test and Exceptions Test should be read in conjunction with the methodology agreed with the Environment Agency and set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 2 [F96] document.

Although many of proposed sites are located partially or entirely within the areas at a higher risk of flooding in Flood Zones 2 or 3, the nature of the flood risk within the Borough needs to be considered. Whilst the Borough is almost entirely within Flood

Zones 2/3, this is based on undefended modelling, and there are defences in place which protect most of the borough, meaning the true risk to sites is lower than the Flood Zones might imply. As agreed with the Environment Agency, sites have been assessed for flood risk considering the nature of risk to the specific site (sources of flooding, depth, hazard, velocity, distance from defences, access/egress) to determine which sites would be able to be developed safely, and what measures would be needed to keep residents safe through the lifetime of the development (particularly focussing on emergency warnings/planning).

Given the widespread areas of FZ2/3 covering the Borough, and the need arising is predominantly within these areas, it would make it virtually impossible to meet the need for Gypsy and Traveller Sites. The evidence within document [F44] demonstrates that there is very little accommodation need arising in less vulnerable areas.

Appendix 2 of the SFRA identifies the flood risk to a site and potential ways to mitigate the risk from flooding through further development. This has been captured within criterion 2.i of the New Policy. Therefore, the Council and the Environment Agency have taken a pragmatic approach to enable allocations to be made, where the need arises, whilst ensuring the sites and their occupants will be safe for the lifetime of the development.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

436. In the light of the recommendation in paragraph 7.7 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites [F97], should the proposed New Policy: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople require bespoke HRAs to be submitted with planning applications for those Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Impact Risk Zones of designated international Habitats sites?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) Sites [F97] explains that while the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (known locally as GIRAMS²) requires all the sites to provide a project level HRA, there are however several sites identified in Table 2 of the report that require a bespoke HRA for each site. The report also identifies in paragraph 7.6, sites GT17; GT18; GT28; GT34 and GT39 as being very close to the Impact Risk Zones for protected habitats and that they should also be considered for bespoke HRAs. This is reiterated in paragraph 7.7 of the report.

Comments made by Natural England in their response to the GTTS Proposed Sites Allocations consultation (dated 15 May 2024) concurs with the assessments and recommendations made in the HRA and welcomes the precautionary approach taken

² [Habitat Mitigation \(GIRAMS\) | Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk \(west-norfolk.gov.uk\)](#)

by the report to ensure that additional recreational pressure does not impact on the European Sites.

To appropriately assess the impact of any development proposals on the European Sites it is therefore recommended that the proposed New Policy: Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople require each of the sites listed in Table 2 and paragraph 7.6 of the HRA to submit a bespoke HRA (as set out in GIRAMS) with respective planning applications. With regards to the remainder of the sites discussed in the HRA the policy should require a project level HRA to be submitted with planning applications.

The Council proposes a new criterion to Part 2 of the New Policy to state:

j) Provide a bespoke Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) in accordance with GIRAMS requirements for sites either within or just outside Impact Risk Zones (IRZ); namely, GT17; GT18; GT25; GT28; GT34; GT39; GT54; GT65; and GT66. This would also be a requirement for any windfall sites that are within or in close proximity to the boundary of an IRZ. For the remaining sites a project level HRA is required in accordance with GIRAMS.

Deliverability of Sites

437. Are the proposed sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's accommodation deliverable, as identified in part 1 of the New Policy? In particular, are they:

a) confirmed by the landowner as being available for the use proposed?

KLWNBC Answer:

Yes, all sites have been made available directly by the landowner as detailed within the Interview transcripts gathered via the household questionnaire in Appendix F of [F44].

b) supported by evidence to demonstrate that safe and appropriate access for vehicles and pedestrians can be provided?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believes that all those existing permitted sites proposed as allocations for further intensification and/ or extension have current satisfactory operational access points. Concerns regarding the suitability of access due to additional pitch/plot provision will need to be satisfactory demonstrated through Criterion 2.e) in Part 2 of the New Policy.

c) deliverable, having regard to the provision of any necessary infrastructure and services, and any environmental or other constraints?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that all sites proposed for allocation are deliverable in terms of the provision of infrastructure, services, environmental and other constraints, for the following reasons:

1. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of existing health, education or utility infrastructure provision from statutory consultees for any of the proposed sites.
2. Where infrastructure issues have been raised through the Council's evidence base (Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document (May 2024) [F94], Updated Gypsy and Traveller Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level [F96], Gypsy and Traveller Sustainability Assessment Addendum Report (May 2024) [B11] and Habitats Regulations Assessment of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites [F97], then mitigation has been identified for those sites and any future planning applications will need to demonstrate that they can satisfactorily overcome any constraints through the provisions of Part 2 of the New Policy.

Extensions to existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller Sites (Part 1.a)

GT14 – Land at Blunts Drove

438. Is the Council now proposing 12 pitches on an extension to the Blunts Drove site, as set out in the suggested changes to the New Policy?

KLWNBC Answer:

Yes, the Council is now proposing 12 additional pitches within document [F116] at Blunts Drove through an extension to the existing site.

439. Would the provision of an additional 10 or 12 pitches, as an extension to the existing site at Blunts Drove, have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity, surface water and flooding?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council do not believe the provision of an additional 12 pitches would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity, surface water and flooding for the following reasons:

1. Blunts Drove is an existing permitted public site for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. The site is currently serviced by road and utility infrastructure. During the consultation process, no concerns were raised regarding the capacity of utility infrastructure. In addition, Hastoe Housing Association who manage the site have also not raised any concerns regarding any issues with utility infrastructure on the site.
2. In terms of road capacity, the existing road (Blunts Drove) off St Paul's Road only services a small, limited number of properties and the Blunts Drove Traveller Site.

This is not a busy through road and any additional traffic will be limited to the pitches provided at Blunts Drove.

3. The SFRA identifies the type and scale of the flood risk on site. It also identifies guidance for site design and making development safe over its lifetime as required by national policy. Any future planning applications for development at this location must be detailed against the risk from flooding within a site-specific flood risk assessment and meet the provisions of Criterion 2.i) of the New Policy.

440. Is the site in a sustainable location, in respect of its access to key services and facilities?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council considers Blunts Drove (GT14) to be located close to local services and facilities such as the convenience store, garden centre and eateries at the A47 service station. These services are accessible by active travel means from the site or by a short distance by car. The site is also located close to a cluster of sustainable settlements including Walsoken, Walton Highway, Marshland St James, Emneth, and Wisbech. Where key services and facilities such as education and health provision can be accessed.

The Gypsy and Traveller Sustainability Appraisal (SA) [B11] scored the site a 'positive/negative' with regards to access to key services and facilities. This recognised that whilst the site itself is not contained within a settlement centre it is in fact within a reasonable distance to service and facilities required for daily life.

Although the location of this site is situated outside of an existing development boundary, the Council's spatial strategy enables some housing growth outside of settlement boundaries where the accommodation need cannot be met within a development boundary.

The Council has demonstrated through the Site Assessment process [F94] and the SA that there are no suitable reasonable alternatives inside or nearby development boundaries to suitably accommodate the required housing need for Gypsy and Travellers. Therefore, the Local Plan provides a policy framework which enables housing growth outside of development boundaries through Policy LP02 and through the New Policy as identified in MM6.

441. Would the scale of the resulting development be appropriate having regard to the character and appearance of the local area?

KLWNBC Answer:

Due to the sites (GT14) rural location and it being relatively contained due to it being heavily screened by high hedging, particularly at the western and northern boundaries to the site, the Council does not believe the development would have detrimental impact on the character of the local area. In addition, any future development at this site would need to comply with the Criterion in the New policy such as Criterion 2.c) and the provision of Policy LP18 Design and sustainable Development.

GT17 – Land at The Lodge, Small Lode, Upwell/Outwell

442. Would the provision of an additional 9 pitches, as an extension to the existing site at The Lodge, Small Lode, have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that the provision of an additional 9 pitches on this site would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding. For the following reasons:

1. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of other infrastructure provision from statutory consultees such as the capacity of utility infrastructure, education or health.
2. Although NCC Highways have identified that the Local highway network is not of a sufficient standard to support further development within the area, NCC highways did not raise the same concerns about cumulative highway capacity issues in relation to the proposed housing allocations for Upwell and Outwell as identified within the Local Plan or indeed the Neighbourhood Plan where a greater number of dwellings were proposed. Therefore, the Borough Council believe that impact on highway capacity will be limited and would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe as prescribed by paragraph 115 of the NPPF.
3. The accommodation needs arising from this area is largely through the expansion of existing family needs through doubling up. The Council has demonstrated that there are no deliverable reasonable alternatives within the location to accommodate the need in an alternative location.

443. Should the extension to this site be reserved for family members?

KLWNBC Answer:

GT17 is a privately owned site occupied by an established, but growing family. A recent permission in 2021(19/00451/F) has seen the site provide a further 4 pitches to the east of the original consented site. In addition, the GTAA identifies a further current need for pitches to accommodate the needs for teenage children and family members.

The Council is not aware of any non-family travellers residing on site or wishing to live on site. Therefore, the Council do not believe it is necessary to reserve the site for family members.

GT18 – Land at 2 Primrose Farm, Small Lode, Upwell/Outwell

444. Would the provision of an additional 13 or 14 pitches, as an extension to the existing site at 2 Primrose Farm, Small Lode, have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council is now proposing 14 additional pitches at Primrose Farm.

The Council believe that the provision of an additional 14 pitches on this site would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding. For the following reasons:

1. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of other infrastructure provision from statutory consultees such as the capacity of utility infrastructure, education or health.
2. Although NCC Highways have identified that the Local highway network is not of a sufficient standard to support further development within the area, NCC highways did not raise the same concerns about cumulative highway capacity issues in relation to the proposed housing allocations for Upwell and Outwell as identified within the Local Plan or indeed the Neighbourhood Plan where a greater number of dwellings were proposed. Therefore, the Borough Council believe that impact on highway capacity will be limited and would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe as prescribed by paragraph 115 of the NPPF.
3. the accommodation needs arising from this area are largely through the expansion of existing family needs through doubling up of households. The Council has demonstrated that there are no deliverable reasonable alternatives within the location to accommodate the need in an alternative location.

445. Should the extension to this site be reserved for family members?

KLWNBC Answer:

GT18 is a privately owned site occupied by an established, The GTAA identifies a further current and future need for pitches to accommodate the needs for teenage children and family members.

The Council is not aware of any non-family travellers residing on site or wishing to live on site. Therefore, the Council do not believe it is necessary to reserve the site for family members.

GT21 – Land at Four Acres, Upwell/Outwell

446. Would the provision of an additional 5 pitches, as an extension to the existing site at Four Acres, have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that the provision of an additional 5 pitches on this site would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding. For the following reasons:

1. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of other infrastructure provision from statutory consultees such as the capacity of utility infrastructure, education or health.
2. Although NCC Highways have identified that the Local highway network is not of a sufficient standard to support further development within the area, NCC highways did not raise the same concerns about cumulative highway capacity issues in

relation to the proposed housing allocations for Upwell and Outwell as identified within the Local Plan or indeed the Neighbourhood Plan where a greater number of dwellings were proposed. Therefore, the Borough Council believe that impact on highway capacity will be limited and would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe as prescribed by paragraph 115 of the NPPF.

3. the accommodation needs arising from this area is largely through the expansion of existing family needs through doubling up. The Council has demonstrated that there are no deliverable reasonable alternatives within the location to accommodate the need in an alternative location.

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?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the provision of 5 additional pitches as an extension to the existing site at Four Acres, would not be detrimental to the significance of The Priority Grade II listed or its setting. The Conservation Officer also confirmed that there would be no detrimental impact to the nearby Conservation Area at Upwell.

The Council has reassessed the site assessment for GT21 in relation to heritage and has proposed some changes which can be identified within Appendix 1 to this document.

Intensification of existing authorised Gypsy and Traveller Sites (Part 1.b)

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?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the provision of 1 additional pitch at The Stables, would not be detrimental to the significance of Marshland Smeeth and Fen War Memorial (Grade II) or its setting.

As the site is already located on the Route of the Lynn and Wisbech Railway (Non-designated Heritage Asset) and the remains of a medieval chapel (Non-designated Heritage Asset), the Council does not believe an additional pitch will lead to a detrimental impact on these Non-designated Heritage Assets.

The Council has reassessed the site assessment for GT09 in relation to heritage and has proposed some changes which can be identified within Appendix 1 to this document.

GT15 – Land SW Common Road (The Bungalow) Walton Highway

449. Site GT15 has been identified in the Full Site Assessment document F94 as unauthorised, but is included in the New Policy as both authorised with 1 pitch under 1.b), and unauthorised with 1 pitch under 1.c). Is this the same pitch, or two separate pitches, one authorised and one unauthorised. If the site allocation is duplicated in error, what are the implications of this for the delivery of a 5 year supply of deliverable pitch sites?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council recognise that this is an oversight. The single pitch at GT15 is unauthorised and this should be just for a single pitch. By removing the site from the table in Part 1 b of the New Policy would lead to a shortfall of 1 pitch in the five-year supply. The Council believe that this shortfall could be accommodated on either sites GT18 or GT14 where there is additional capacity for 1 additional pitch.

450. Would the provision of an additional pitch on this site have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding?

KLWNBC Answer:

No concerns have been raised by statutory consultees, including health, NCC highways and education in relation to the provision of 1 pitch at this site. Therefore, the Council does not believe the provision of an additional pitch on this site will have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding.

451. Is the site in a sustainable location, in respect of its access to key services and facilities?

KLWNBC Answer:

The site is in close proximity to the sustainable settlements of Walton Highway and West Walton. Here key services and facilities can be accessed.

Although the location of this site is situated outside of an existing development boundary, the Council's spatial strategy enables some housing growth outside of settlement boundaries where the accommodation need cannot be met within a development boundary.

The Council has demonstrated through the Site Assessment process [F94] and the SA that there are no suitable reasonable alternatives inside nearby development boundaries to suitably accommodate the required housing need for Gypsy and Travellers. Therefore, the Local Plan provides a mechanism to enable housing growth

outside of development boundaries through Policy LP02 and through the New Policy as identified in MM6.

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?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the provision of an additional pitch at Botany Bay, would not be detrimental to the significance of Upwell War Memorial (Grade II) or the Cold War Observer Corps Site (Non-designated Heritage Asset) or their setting. The Conservation Officer also confirmed that there would be no detrimental impact to the nearby Conservation Area at Upwell.

The Council has reassessed the site assessment for GT20 in relation to heritage and has proposed some changes which can be identified within Appendix 1 to this document.

453. Would the provision of an additional pitch on this site have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that the provision of an additional pitch on this site would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding. For the following reasons:

1. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of other infrastructure provision from statutory consultees such as the capacity of utility infrastructure, education or health.
2. Although NCC Highways have identified that the local highway network is not of a sufficient standard to support further development within the area, NCC highways did not raise the same concerns about cumulative highway capacity issues in relation to the proposed housing allocations for Upwell and Outwell as identified within the Local Plan or indeed the Neighbourhood Plan where a greater number of dwellings were proposed. Therefore, the Borough Council believe that impact on highway capacity will be limited and would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe as prescribed by paragraph 115 of the NPPF.
3. the accommodation needs arising from this area is largely through the expansion of existing family needs through doubling up. The Council has demonstrated that there are no deliverable reasonable alternatives within the location to accommodate the need in an alternative location.

1. Although there is some evidence of surface water flooding on site, the SFRA did not identify this to be of a significant concern. The SFRA also identifies guidance for site design and making development safe over its lifetime as required by national policy. Any future planning applications for development at this location must be detailed against the risk from flooding within a site specific flood risk assessment and meet the provisions of Criterion 2.i) of the New Policy.

GT28 – Many Acres (Smithy's Field), Small Lode, Upwell

454. Would the provision of 2 additional pitches on this site have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that the provision of an additional 2 pitches on this site would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding. For the following reasons:

1. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of other infrastructure provision from statutory consultees such as the capacity of utility infrastructure, education or health.
2. Although NCC Highways have identified that the Local highway network is not of a sufficient standard to support further development within the area, NCC highways did not raise the same concerns about cumulative highway capacity issues in relation to the proposed housing allocations for Upwell and Outwell as identified within the Local Plan or indeed the Neighbourhood Plan where a greater number of dwellings were proposed. Therefore, the Borough Council believe that impact on highway capacity will be limited and would not be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe as prescribed by paragraph 115 of the NPPF.
3. the accommodation needs arising from this area is largely through the expansion of existing family needs through doubling up. The Council has demonstrated that there are no deliverable reasonable alternatives within the location to accommodate the need in an alternative location.

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?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed that the provision of an additional pitch at Victoria Barns, would not be detrimental to the significance upon Birdbeck (Grade II), Wisbech Canal (Non-designated Heritage Asset), Wisbech and Upwell Tramway (Non-designated Heritage Asset), Undated Ditches (Non-designated Heritage Asset) and their setting.

The Council has reassessed the site assessment for GT55 in relation to heritage and has proposed some changes which can be identified within Appendix 1 to this document.

GT59 – Land at Spriggs Hollow, Wiggshall St Mary Magdalen

456. Should the boundary of this existing site be extended to ensure that there is sufficient space for the 4 additional pitches proposed?

KLWNBC Answer:

Yes, the Council believe the site should be extended to ensure that there is sufficient space for the 4 additional pitches at Spriggs Hollow. The Council received a representation [010] from the land agent representing the site during the consultation process. The representation identifies a proposed boundary for a possible extension to the site. The Proposed boundary is identified below.

Existing Site



Proposed Extension



Formalisation of long-term unauthorised pitches (Part 1.c)

GT15 – Land SW Common Road (The Bungalow) Walton Highway

457. Would the formalisation of the unauthorised pitch on this site, which has previously been refused planning permission and the subject of enforcement action, have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding?

KLWNBC Answer:

No concerns have been raised by statutory consultees, including health, NCC highways and education in relation to the provision of 1 pitch at this site. Therefore, the Council does not believe the provision of an additional pitch on this site will have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity or flooding.

458. Is the site in a sustainable location, in respect of its access to key services and facilities?

KLWNBC Answer:

The site is located close to the sustainable settlements of Walton Highway and West Walton and where key services and facilities can be accessed.

Although the location of this site is situated outside of an existing development boundary, the Council's spatial strategy enables some housing growth outside of settlement boundaries where the accommodation need cannot be met within a development boundary.

The Council has demonstrated through the Site Assessment process [F94] and the SA that there are no suitable reasonable alternatives inside nearby development boundaries to suitably accommodate the required housing need for Gypsy and Travellers. Therefore, the Local Plan provides a mechanism to enable some limited housing growth outside of development boundaries through Policy LP02 and through the New Policy as identified in MM6.

Additional plots for Travelling Showpeople (Part 1.d)

GT25 – Land at the Oaks, Northwold

459. Would the provision of 2 additional plots for Travelling Showpeople on land at The Oaks have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that the provision of an additional 2 pitches on this site would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding. For the following reasons:

1. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of other infrastructure provision from statutory consultees such as the capacity of utility infrastructure, education, health or highways.
2. the accommodation needs arising from this area is largely through the expansion of existing family needs through doubling up. The Council has demonstrated that there are no deliverable reasonable alternatives within the location to accommodate the need in an alternative location.

GT62 – Land at Redgate Farm, Magdelan Road, Tilney St Lawrence

460. Would the provision of 2 additional plots for Travelling Showpeople on land at Redgate Farm have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including flooding?

KLWNBC Answer:

The Council believe that the provision of an additional 2 pitches on this site would not have a detrimental impact upon local services, infrastructure and facilities, including road capacity and flooding. For the following reasons:

2. No concerns have been raised about the capacity of other infrastructure provision from statutory consultees such as the capacity of utility infrastructure, education, health or highways.
3. the accommodation needs arising from this area is largely through the expansion of existing family needs through doubling up. The Council has demonstrated that there are no deliverable reasonable alternatives within the location to accommodate the need in an alternative location.
4. The SFRA site table [F96f] identifies the type and scale of the flood risk on site. It also identifies guidance for site design and making development safe over its lifetime as required by national policy. Any future planning applications for development at this location must be detailed against the risk from flooding within a site-specific flood risk assessment and meet the provisions of Criterion 2.i) of the New Policy.

Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Supply

461. Would the overall supply of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites be sufficient to meet the identified needs over the Plan period?

KLWNBC Answer:

Yes. The overall supply of Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites would be sufficiently met through a combination of site allocations and windfall development via the proposed New Policy.

462. Would there be a 5 year supply of deliverable sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's accommodation on the adoption of the Plan?

KLWNBC Answer:

Yes, there would be a 5-year supply of deliverable sites for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople on the adoption of the Plan if all proposed sites identified for

allocation within the Gypsy and Traveller Proposed Sites and Policy Consultation Document (May 2024) [F93] and those proposed changes identified by the Council in this paper and those within the Suggested Changes to the Proposed New Policy on Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople's Accommodation (July 2024) [F116] were taken forward.