

Clenchwarton development boundary and housing allocations

1. This objection is that the settlement boundary of a Key Rural Service Centre (KRSC) has been altered (reduced) without any logic or stated rationale, which is in principle at odds with the designation as a KRSC village where new housing will normally be permitted. This element of the Plan is not Sound as it is not justified, or consistent with national and local 'Rural' policies.
2. The Borough-wide issues associated with the way in which development boundaries have been reviewed and amended will be discussed under Policy DM 2 earlier in the Hearings.
3. The particular site is in the west side of the centre of the village, on the south side of Main Road where the amended boundary now excludes part of the back gardens of nos 216-230, including the redundant garage of a family haulage business. The amended Development boundary does not relate to any planning factor at all, and appears to be a completely arbitrary response in a desk study, but it is an alteration that will compromise the granting of any planning permission to redevelop the garage site or to make more efficient and effective use of what is at least suburban land if a group of gardens were proposed for additional development.
4. The full depth of these properties combine to form a single landscape 'compartment' having boundary trees along the southern edge, and the altered settlement boundary relates to no physical feature at all, nor does it have any relevance for current flood risk advice or any flood hazard area arising. This appears to be the only part of the entire settlement boundary now altered from the Inset Map examined by the Plan Inspector and adopted in 1998, and which should be reinstated.
5. The LPA has proposed three allocated sites at Clenchwarton, confirming the acceptability of the village as a location for additional housing. The most recent proposal included amongst these is site G.25.3, along the south side of Main Road west of the Wildfields Close estate. As a matter of practical development practice, I wish to point out that this allocation is of *unrealistic depth*, being only about 30 metres from the road; the back boundary would be beside the house at 248 Main Road. It would be inappropriate in this locality for the new frontage housing to be so much closer to the road than the Wildfields houses adjoining, and they are not going to be as small as the older cottages on the north side. There will clearly be individual vehicle accesses to a ribbon development (and a Highways requirement for on-site parking and turning). Reasonable space must exist for houses with back gardens of better than a minimum 10 metres length which might be found in the denser urban estates in King's Lynn. Considering all these appropriate development elements, the allocation should be made deeper, and 45 to 50 metres would be reasonable in order to create a development which is not in complete contrast with the locality.