Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

<u>The fields traditionally flood-</u> it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) <u>**that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.**</u>
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 18 9 17.

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: JOAN E PURPLE	
Organisation: THEATRE ROYAL SURGERY WALKING GROUP	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 20·9·17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MRS PAULINE PEARSON	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

<u>The fields traditionally flood-</u> it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) <u>that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.</u> Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 19. 9. 2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: DAVID BLUNDELL	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 21/9/2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Rob Pudsey	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	✓
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither!!!!!!!

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 19/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: DANIEL WILSON	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither!!!!!!!

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

<u>The fields traditionally flood-</u> it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) <u>that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.</u> Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 19 – 9 – 2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make**.

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: M. Harper	
Organisation:	
Address: 23 Beach Court, Dereham	
Post code: NR19 1DQ	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither!!!!!!!

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:**

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Mr C C Claxton	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither!!!!!!!

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

<u>The fields traditionally flood-</u> it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) <u>that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.</u> Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 19.9.2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: GARY WEST	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither!!!!!!!

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 04-9-17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: NATHAN PEARSON	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:**

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Jake Flood	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 29/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: DARREN GREENWOOD	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 29.9.2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MRS L BARKER	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MISS D LEE	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	X
Is the plan justified?	X
Is the plan effective?	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MRS D J SANDFORD	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30.07.17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MARK OGILVY	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: STEVE DORRINGTON	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither!!!!!!!

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

<u>The fields traditionally flood-</u> it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) <u>that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.</u>
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 19/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Robin Bartlett	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/9/2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Ross Kinding	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: LUKE PATEY	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:**

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Kyle Pease	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: D J ORGAN.	
Organisation: —	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30.9.17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: CALUM BARKER	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MRS VANESSA HOUGHTON	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

RECEIVED
03 OCT 2017
POST ROOM
FINANCE

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30.10.17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: X SALLY HENMAN.	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

RECEIVED
03 OCT 2017
POST ROOM, FINANCE

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/17.

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: SHAUN HOUGHTON.	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

RECEIVED
03 OCT 2017
POST ROOM
FINANCE

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/8/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Mrs Helen Forster.	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	**x**
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	**x**

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 28/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MRS M. A. THURLOW + MISS N. K. THURLOW	
Organisation: HOUSEHOLDER	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

X

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	**x**
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	**x**

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 28-9-2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MR. M. RICHER	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither!!!!!!!

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

<u>The fields traditionally flood-</u> it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) <u>**that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.**</u>
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 19.9.17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: JAMIE GADSDEN	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/09/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Les Dobson	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30-09-17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: MARION DALSTON	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 21 / 09 / 2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: LOUISE HARRIS	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post cod	
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	**x**
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	**x**

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available e tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 23 Sept 17.

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Jennifer Thomson	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	**x**
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	**x**

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 23/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Andy Rwett	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date** 30-9-17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: JOHN PARSONS.	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30.09.2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Jon Goodbody	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30-9-17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: Cheyanne Jones	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30-9-17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: WAYNE JONES	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF stresses a proactive and strategic approach to planning for the natural environment. The ambition of the NPPF is not just to retain protection for existing designations, but to plan ahead for re-creation of habitat where possible. **The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.**

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '.
Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 30/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: CAROLYN COLEMAN	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	**X**

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- ~~It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.~~

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x ✓
Signature:	**Date:** 25/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make**.

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: I Mayes	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.
Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.
The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.
Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.
The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.
It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	**x**
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x
Signature:	**Date:** 20/9/2017

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.

Breckland
in partnership with...
CAPITA

Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication Representation Form

This form should be used to make representations on the soundness of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication only.

An interactive version of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is available on the Council's consultation website: http://consult.breckland.gov.uk. Instructions on how to enter representations are provided on the website. This is the Council's preferred method of receiving representations as it will help us to handle your representation quickly and efficiently.

If you are unable to use the online system you may submit representations using this form. Further copies can be downloaded from the Council's website: www.breckland.gov.uk/pre-submission-publication or the form can be photocopied.

This form is in two parts and has four pages. Part 1 covers your contact details and Part 2 covers your representation. **Please use a separate form for each representation you make.**

Please return by 4pm on Monday 2nd October 2017. Late representations cannot be considered. Return by e-mail to planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Part 1: Your Contact Details

Name: ROBERT CAMPBELL	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and contact details.	
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

Part 2: Your Representation (please use a separate form for each representation)

1. Do you consider the Pre-submission Publication to be: (Please tick the appropriate box)

Sound (You support the document)	
Unsound (You think the document needs changing)	X

2. On which part of the document do you wish to make a representation?

Policy	
Paragraph	
Site	**Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007**
Proposals Map	
Settlement Boundary	
Other	

If you consider the document to be SOUND, please go to question 7.

3. If you consider the document to be UNSOUND, to which test of soundness does your representation apply to: (Please mark the appropriate box).

Legal Tests	
Is the plan legally compliant?	
Soundness Tests	
Is the plan positively prepared?	x
Is the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

4. Have you raised this issue before during previous consultations? (Please tick the appropriate box)

Yes at Preferred Site Options and Settlement Boundaries Stage (September to October 2016)	
Yes at Preferred Directions Stage (January - February 2016)	
Yes at Issues and Options Stage (November 2014 - January 2015)	

5. If you have not raised this issue before please use the following box to explain why.

I had understood that Breckland Capita would be taking account of both the unprecedented number of written objections already made (400+) for a current proposal on this site and the numerous technical challenges presented by this site- ~~It is clear that in recommending it they have done neither.~~

6. If you feel the plan is unsound, please use the following box to summarise why you feel the plan is unsound and explain any changes you believe are needed to make the plan sound. (Please attach extra sheets if necessary)

Land to the west of EtlingView (LP[025]007

The proposed site consists of 2 separate hedged fields - one which has been used as an Arable field and a much smaller field which has for 50 years been an enclosed paddock /grazing land. On the edge of a settlement these fields contribute to the rural setting and compliment the adjoining County Wildlife site and surrounding lightly wooded amenity land into which they penetrate.

Many of the 400+ local objectors to the current scheme proposed for the land have outlined the visual, landscape and amenity importance of the land together with numerous issues around flooding, degradation of hedgerows loss of wildlife area and concerns from the Police regarding crime.

The area is a cherished local asset due to its openness -the small field in particular due to its visual exposure from two popular footpaths including the medieval lane – Shillings Lane. The openness of the land is important in separating the built environment from the wildlife corridor and County Wildlife Site, such areas forming a "physical breathing" space away from the hustle and bustle of both the existing and proposed residential areas nearby.

Moreover, the indicative layout illustrates a relatively high density, physically distinct development. wholly incongruous with the single existing dwelling adjoining the paddock field Rose Farm a comparatively low level dwelling with single storey appendages.

The dwellings are likely to result in an unduly urbanised built form, introducing harmful change which would be incompatible with the quality of the landscape and setting of the settlement.

It is clear that most harm will be caused by developing the smaller paddock field In order for the plan to even approach being sound this field should not be developed in any way.

The 2 fields are located in a highly sensitive, historic and valued landscape; bordered by common land and historic rights of way. The level and density of development proposed (60 dwellings) is not reflective of its context and would not enhance the character and appearance of the area, but would have a significant and harmful impact on the setting. A development of 60 dwellings cannot be accommodated successfully on the site without harming the landscape character and appearance of the area- **The application is contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CP11/DC16. See also paragraphs 17 & 58 of the NPPF-**

Proposed dwellings on the southern boundary of the site would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking and harm to the amenities of Rose Farm on Field 2 and neighbouring dwellings on Field 1 as well as to users of the surrounding common land and public rights of way. **Contrary to Core Strategy Policy DC01.**

The fields traditionally flood- it can be seen from the development on adjoining fields that the propensity of the area to flood has increased dramatically and that because the adjoining Shillings Lane is lower that flooding of the lane once a rare occurance now occurs frequently- Development as proposed will further increase this flooding.The likely impact on the risk of flooding elsewhere as a result of an increase in the volume of run off post development. **Contrary to NPPF paragraphs 103 and 109**

The NPPF makes it clear in Paragraph 8 that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependant. For the above reasons the benefits of the housing provision proposed, taking into account the development plan and the policies of the NPPF as a whole, are clearly outweighed by the significant harmful impacts of the development. **This proposal does not meet the criteria to be regarded as sustainable development and should be refused.**

The NPPF identifies (in paras 6 and 17) sustainable development as the purpose of the planning system and conserving and enhancing the natural environment as a 'core planning principle'. While specific policies on conserving and enhancing the natural environment are addressed in Section 11 of the NPPF, these should not be considered in isolation, as other natural environment related policies, and their consideration in plan- and decision-making, can be found throughout the document.

The NPPF states (in para. 114) that local planning authorities should 'plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure '.

The NPPF makes it clear (in para. 110) that 'Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value '. Planning policies and decision-making should seek to protect and enhance natural and heritage assets appropriate to their significance. Policies and decisions should also encourage multiple benefits from development.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.

8. Can your representation be considered by this written representation or do you consider it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)

Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public	

9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)

Notified of the Submission	
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x
Notified of the Adoption	

Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	x ✓
Signature:	**Date:** 25/9/17

Breckland District Council is registered with the Data Protection Act 1998 for the purpose of processing personal data in the performance of its legitimate business. Any information held by the Council will be processed in compliance with the principles set out in the Act. The preparation of the Breckland Local Plan Pre-Submission Publication is a public process and your full representation and address details will be made public for this purpose.