

ELM PARK DEVELOPMENTS – LIST OF REPRESENTATIONS IN PLAN ORDER

Rep ID	Respondent	Section ref	Para/ Policy/ Figure/ Table rep	Support/ object	Summary representation	Changes to Plan sought	Duty to Cooperate/ legal compliance/ soundness text NOT met	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan	Representation link
LPO4 DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES POLICIES											
529	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	4	4.4 LPO4	Object	Development boundary of Clenchwarton is clearly incorrectly drawn and should be amended to reflect what housing areas exist in the village and include the commitment for 40 new dwellings being added to the village. Policy LP04 defines these development boundaries and supporting text states that “the development boundaries are used to indicate the distinction between largely built up areas of settlements where development is generally acceptable, and areas of the countryside and areas of more sporadic buildings considered generally less suitable for new development, and where a more restrictive approach will be applied”.	Areas outside these boundaries are considered countryside, clearly an inappropriate designation for such areas. We consider there are almost 200 houses (including the committed site) excluded from the development boundary of Clenchwarton.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757700?consultation=s1625822757700
530	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	4	4.4 LPO4	Object	Areas we believe should be included as part of the settlement boundary of Clenchwarton. These areas should be included as part of the settlement, either connected to the existing boundary or as a separate defined area of the village.	Other rural areas across the district have more than one defined settlement shown on the proposals map unconnected to one another: for example Congham, Roydon which has three settlement boundaries, and also Stowbridge and Terrington St Clement to name a few. There is no clear reason why these houses that are part of the village should be excluded from the defined boundary.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757700?consultation=s1625822757700

531	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	4	4.4 LP04	Object	Existing houses and the area of those with extant consent are in some instances closer to the facilities in the village such as the convenience store and Clenchwarton Community Primary School on Main Road than the proposed site allocations at the extreme edge of the existing settlement boundary.	The Development Boundary Changes document that forms part of the Evidence Base for the Local Plan clearly shows that in most instances where existing development connects houses and their curtilage to one another they are defined within the development boundary of that village.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757700?consultation=s1625822757700
532	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	4	4.4 LP04	Object	Clenchwarton is a key rural service centre within the settlement hierarchy. These villages are identified within the hierarchy as suitable for accommodating a high level of development which will help to sustain the wider community, selected on the basis of the presence of a primary 5 school, healthcare facilities, a range of services that can meet basic day-to-day needs and a level of public transport that can enable access to and from the settlement. The hierarchy qualifies that a key rural service centre settlement must first link with a school, as village schools are core facilities. Additionally a convenience store should be present, and preferably a doctors' surgery.	The above is taken from the Consideration of the Settlement Hierarchy document. The Further Consideration of the Settlement Hierarchy document shows Clenchwarton having a primary school, a convenience store and public transport, and a population of 2,171.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757700?consultation=s1625822757700
CLENCHWARTON											
533	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	12	12.4	Object	Comments relate to settlement of Clenchwarton on the Proposals Map, which we consider has been incorrectly defined.	This error should be corrected to make the plan sound and that any direct assessments made on the basis of the incorrectly drawn settlement boundary should be undertaken again to ensure the evidence used to inform the plan is correct and therefore policies in the plan are justified.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757793?consultation=s1625822757793

534	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	12	12.4	Object	The Development Boundary of the village of Clenchwarton is shown as a single irregular shaped area drawn around areas of existing housing and their curtilages, principally where these include houses adjacent to Main Road in a continuous form or around cul-de-sac estate and connecting roads. There are some additional houses to the west of the defined settlement area that are somewhat sporadic in nature, being separated by large gaps, and more ribbon-type development on one side of the road such as along Station Road, that are not defined as part of the settlement boundary. These areas being excluded is perhaps understandable.	Significantly, there are large areas of housing to the east of the Clenchwarton defined settlement that are clearly part of the village, but that have somehow been excluded from the settlement boundary of the village. We see no plausible reason why these areas are not defined as part of the village of Clenchwarton on the Proposals Map.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757793?consultation=s1625822757793
535	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	12	12.4	Object	Committed housing site within this part of Clenchwarton, one that our client is in the process of constructing and which itself should also be included within the settlement boundary. This is standard practice for Local Plan proposals maps that are positively prepared. Application 17/01632/RMM is an extant planning permission for 40 new residential dwellings off Main Road, Clenchwarton.	Evidence of the extant permission is provided. The site is located outside what the Council have deemed the settlement boundary of Clenchwarton, adjacent existing areas of housing between Main Road and Coronation Road that are also excluded.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757793?consultation=s1625822757793
536	Elm Park Holdings (Developments)	12	12.4.1	Object	Figure was derived from the Parish Area Boundary of Clenchwarton, the boundary of which includes all of the properties we are presenting in this statement as forming part of Clenchwarton.	It is clear therefore from the evidence of the village that the Council have used to justify the settlement hierarchy, and how other villages boundaries are defined, that the properties and the area of the extant permission should all be included within the village of Clenchwarton and defined as such on the Proposals Map.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Detailed changes to individual settlement boundaries were considered during the plan making process (E8). Setting linear boundaries is always a matter of judgement and in many cases this may vary between mapping, Google and/ or site visits.	No change	https://west-norfolk-consult.objective.co.uk/kse/event/36371/people/submissions/section/s1625822757793?consultation=s1625822757793

