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

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

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?	х
Is the plan justified?	х
Is the plan effective?	х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	х

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
3. Can your representation be considered b				you consider
t necessary to attend the Examination in Pr	•		,	
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily d	ieait with	by written r	epresentations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably of Examination in Public	dealt with	by appearin	ng at the	
O. If you wish to appear at the Examination to be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate)				
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x			
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the details inc will be available in the public domain. (please			x	
Signature:			Date: 10	0,7



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

N1	
Name: SOAN & PUR	PLE
Organisation: THEATRE ROYA	L SURCERY WALKING GROUP
Address:	w.T.
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
9	
If you have appointed someone to act	as your agent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
•	
Post code:	Telephone:
	releptione.
E-mail:	

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

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

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

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.	7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.			
8. Can your representation be considered by this written in the transfer of th		ou consider		
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by writ	tten representations	x		
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by approximation in Public	pearing at the			
O. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, pleaso be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)	ase outline why you co	onsider this		
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Inspectors x Recommendations				
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the details included on this fo will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	orm x			
Signature:	Date: 20.9.1			



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.

Name: PRS Pauline PEARSO	
Organisation:	IV
organisation.	
Address:	
Post code:	
	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to get as your	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a Name:	gent please give their name and contact details.
Organisation:	
Address:	
, radio55,	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

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

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
	X
Is the plan justified?	
	X
Is the plan effective?	
	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
8. Can your representation be considered by this written reprit necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick	esentation or do y appropriate box)	ou consider		
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written	representations	х		
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appear Examination in Public	ing at the			
9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please to be necessary.	outline why you c	onsider this		
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)				
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations				
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: / 9 0	1.7017		



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/presubmission-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.

Name:	
Name: DAVID BUNDELL	
Organisation:	
Organisation.	
Address:	
Addiess.	
Post code:	Tolonbour
1 Ost code.	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	gent preude give their name and contact details.
Organisation:	
_	
Address:	
·	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

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

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	
ls the plan positively prepared?	х
ls the plan justified?	x
Is the plan effective?	χ ,
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	х

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
8. Can your representation be consid it necessary to attend the Examination			ou consider	
Yes, my representation can be satisfac	ctorily dealt with by writter	representations	х	
No, my representations can only be su Examination in Public	itably dealt with by appea	ring at the		
9. If you wish to appear at the Exami to be necessary.	nation in Public, please	outline why you co	onsider this	
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	propriate boxes)			
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x			
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the det will be available in the public domain. (x		
Signature:		Date: 21/9.	12017	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: Rob Pulgly	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Tolonhous
Post code.	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed company to get as your a	nont who are given the in a constant of the first
If you have appointed someone to act as your aq Name:	gent please give their name and contact details.
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You sup	port the doo	cument)		
Unsound (You changing)	think the	document	needs	Х

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?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
8. Can your representation be conside it necessary to attend the Examination			ou consider	
Yes, my representation can be satisfacted	orily dealt with by writte	en representations	х	
No, my representations can only be suit Examination in Public	ably dealt with by appe	earing at the		
9. If you wish to appear at the Examin to be necessary.	ation in Public, pleas	se outline why you c	onsider this	
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	ropriate boxes)			
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	х			
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the deta will be available in the public domain. (p		m x		
Signature:		Date: (②)	9/17	



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/presubmission-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.

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

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

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

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	V
Is the plan positively prepared?	X
	Х
Is the plan justified?	
	x
Is the plan effective?	
	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	

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)	

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'.

. If you feel that the plan is sound, ple	ease tell us why.		
. Can your representation be conside necessary to attend the Examination	ered by this written re n in Public? (Please tid	presentation or do yo k appropriate box)	ou consid
Yes, my representation can be satisfact	orily dealt with by writte	en representations	Х
No, my representations can only be suit Examination in Public	tably dealt with by appe	earing at the	
o be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app		se outline why you co	onsider u
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the dewill be available in the public domain.	tails included on this fo	rm x	
Signature:		Date: 🤊 —	a- 201



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/presubmission-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.

Name: M. Harrer	
Organisation:	
Address: Beach Court, Deschum	
Post code: WKI9 I) @ Telephone:	
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your agent please give their name and conta	ct details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code: Telephone:	
r diophone.	
E-mail:	

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)	х

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?	Х
Is the plan justified?	х
Is the plan effective?	х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	х

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.			
c. Can your representation be consider t necessary to attend the Examination	lered by this written reproon in Public? (Please tick a	esentation or do yo	ou conside
Yes, my representation can be satisfac	ctorily dealt with by written	representations	x
No, my representations can only be su Examination in Public	itably dealt with by appeari	ng at the	
0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	propriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the det will be available in the public domain. (p		x	
Signature:		Date:	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: 14. 0 0 01	
Name: Mr C C CLAXION	$\sqrt{}$
Organisation:	¥
	•
Address:	
-	
Post code:	Telephone:
	r dicpriorie.
E-mail:	-
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
0	
Organisation:	
Address	
Address:	
Post code:	
Post code;	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You support the document)					
Unsound (\changing)	ou thi	nk the	document	needs	Х

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

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, p	lease tell us why.		
8. Can your representation be considit it necessary to attend the Examination	lered by this written represon in Public? (Please tick ap	sentation or do yo opropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfac	ctorily dealt with by written re	epresentations	x
No, my representations can only be su Examination in Public	iitably dealt with by appearin	g at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Exam to be necessary.	ination in Public, please o	utline why you co	onsider this
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick ap	propriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the de will be available in the public domain.	etails included on this form (please tick box)	x	
Signature:		Date: 19 -	9.2017
	-		



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/presubmission-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.

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

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

Sound (Yo	ou sup	port the	e doc	ument)		
Unsound changing)	(You	think	the	document	needs	Х

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

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)	

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'.

Can your representation be consider necessary to attend the Examination	ed by this written representation or do yo in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)	ou consid
es, my representation can be satisfacto	rily dealt with by written representations	Х
No, my representations can only be suita Examination in Public	ably dealt with by appearing at the	
0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	ropriate boxes)	
I0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick applementation) Notified of the Submission	ropriate boxes)	
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	ropriate boxes)	
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors		
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	ails included on this 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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Name: NATHA DEALSON Organisation: Address: Post code: Telephone:
Address:
Post code: Telephone:
Post code: Telephone:
Tolophono.
E-mail:
If you have appointed company to get as your agent places give their name and soutest details
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:

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

Sound (Yo	u sup	oort the	e doc	ument)		
Unsound changing)	(You	think	the	document	needs	Х

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?	Х
Is the plan effective?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

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)	

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 long have settlined the

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'.

. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
. Can your representation be conside	red by this written representation or do yo in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)	ou consid		
	orily dealt with by written representations	х		
No, my representations can only be suit Examination in Public	ably dealt with by appearing at the			
If you wish to appear at the Evamin	ention in Public please outline why you co	onsider t		
o be necessary.	ropriate boxes)	onsider t		
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appl		onsider t		
O. If you wish to appear at the Examino be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appear to the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations		onsider t		
O be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick applementation) Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors	ropriate boxes)	onsider t		
o be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick applementation) Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	ropriate boxes) x ails included on this form	onsider t		



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/presubmission-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.

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

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

Sound (You	supp	ort the	doc	ument)			
Unsound (changing)	You	think	the	document	needs	Х	

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?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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 '.

. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
. Can your representation be considered by this written repres necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick a	sentation or do yo opropriate box)	ou conside		
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written re	epresentations	Х		
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearir Examination in Public	ng at the			
4 the Franciscotion in Rublic places	utline why you co	onsider th		
o be necessary.	outline why you co	onsider th		
I. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please of the necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)	utline why you co	onsider th		
o be necessary.	outline why you co	onsider th		
Notified of the Inspectors	outline why you co	onsider th		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x	onsider th		



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Name: OARREN GREDWOO	±D
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	o in a contract details.
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

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

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

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
s. Can your representation be consider t necessary to attend the Examination	red by this written representation or do yo in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)	ou consider		
Yes, my representation can be satisfacto	orily dealt with by written representations	х		
No, my representations can only be suita Examination in Public	ably dealt with by appearing at the			
. If you wish to appear at the Examina o be necessary.	ation in Public, please outline why you co	onsider this		
0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appr	opriate boxes)			
	opriate boxes)			
	opriate boxes)			
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors				
Recommendations	ils included on this 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/presubmission-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.

Name: 0.480	
NAME: MRS L BARKER	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
	releptione.
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
	,
E-mail:	

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

Sound (Yo	ou sup	port the	e doc	ument)		
Unsound	(You	think	the	document	needs	Х
changing)						

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?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, p	lease tell us wh	ıy.	
8. Can your representation be considit necessary to attend the Examination			
Yes, my representation can be satisfac	ctorily dealt with	by written representations	х
No, my representations can only be su Examination in Public	iitably dealt with	by appearing at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examito be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick ap			u consider thi
Notified of the Submission	,		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the de			
will be available in the public domain. ((blease lick box)	X	



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Name: n	
Name: MISS D LEE	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Tolonbono
Fost code.	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Organisation.	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
- 115th	

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

		1
document	needs	X
Ē	ocument	ocument needs

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	X
Is the plan positively prepared?	^
Is the plan justified?	X
Is the plan effective?	х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, pleaso	e tell us why.		
B. Can your representation be considered t necessary to attend the Examination in			ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily	/ dealt with by written r	epresentations	Х
No, my representations can only be suitably Examination in Public	y dealt with by appeari	ng at the	
	on in Public, please o	outline why you co	onsider this
	on in Public, please o	outline why you co	onsider this
o be necessary.		outline why you co	onsider this
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropr		outline why you co	onsider this
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropring Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors		outline why you co	onsider this
o be necessary. 0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropring Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	riate boxes)	outline why you co	onsider this
Declaration: I understand that the details it will be available in the public domain. (please in the public domain.)	riate boxes) x included on this form	x	onsider this



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/presubmission-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.

Name: MRS DJ SANDFORD	
Organisation:	
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:	agent please give their name and contact details.
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You support the document)							
Unsound changing)		think	the	document	needs	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	
4	X
Is the plan positively prepared?	
	Х
Is the plan justified?	
	х
Is the plan effective?	3
	Х
ls the plan consistent with national policy?	

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)	

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

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'.

If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.		
Can your representation be considered by this written representation be considered by this written representation in Public? (Please tick a	esentation or do yo	ou consid
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written		X
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appear Examination in Public	ng at the	
O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission		
Notified of the Inspectors x Recommendations		
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: 30.0	57.17



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Name: OCOCH OCHICLE	
Name: MARK OGILVY	
Organisation:	
Address:	·
7,111,755	
Post code:	Telephone:
. 30. 3343.	releptione.
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
	·
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You support the document)						
Unsound (Yo	u think	the	document	needs	Х	

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
	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
B. Can your representation be conside t necessary to attend the Examination	ered by this n in Public?	written re (Please ti	epresentation or do y ck appropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfact	torily dealt w	ith by writt	en representations	х
No, my representations can only be sui Examination in Public	tably dealt w	ith by app	earing at the	
o. If you wish to appear at the Examino be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app			se outline why you c	onsider this
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x			
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the det will be available in the public domain. (rm x	
Signature:			Date: 36/09	1/10



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Name: (27)				
Name: STGUG DORNINGTON,				
Organisation:				
Address:				
Post code:	Tolonhono			
l ost code.	Telephone:			
E-mail:				
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.			
Name:				
Organisation:				
Organisation.				
Address:				
Post code:	Telephone:			
E-mail:				
L-IIIaII.				

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

Sound (You support the document)							
Unsound changing)	(You	think	the	document	needs	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?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.			
3. Can your representation be conside t necessary to attend the Examinatior	red by this writte in Public? (Plea	en representation or do ase tick appropriate box)	you consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfact	orily dealt with by	written representations	x
No, my representations can only be suit Examination in Public	ably dealt with by	appearing at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examir to be necessary.	nation in Public,	please outline why you	consider this
0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	ropriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	х		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the detwill be available in the public domain. (nis form x	
Signature:			



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/presubmission-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.

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

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

Sound (Yo	ou sup	port the	e doc	ument)		
		think	the	document	needs	Х
changing)						

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?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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 have 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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.		
. Can your representation be considered by this written representation be considered by this written representation in Public? (Please tick a	esentation or do yoppropriate box)	ou conside
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written r	epresentations	х
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appeari Examination in Public	ng at the	
O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)	outline wny you co	onsider thi
Notified of the Submission		
Notified of the Inspectors		
Notified of the Inspectors x Recommendations		
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations 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	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: 7	
GOSS GINGLING	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You sup	port the doc	cument)		
Unsound (You changing)	think the	document	needs	Х

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?	Х
Is the plan justified?	х
Is the plan effective?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	х

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)	

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 areaThe 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 t	.ell us wr	ıy.		
3. Can your representation be considered b t necessary to attend the Examination in Po				ou conside
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily d	ealt with	by writter	ı representations	X
No, my representations can only be suitably d Examination in Public	lealt with	by appea	ring at the	
 If you wish to appear at the Examination to be necessary. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate) 				
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x			
Notified of the Inspectors	х			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	cluded on	this form	x	



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/presubmission-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.

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

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

Sound (You support the document)					
Unsound (Yo	u think	the	document	needs	Х

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?	Х
Is the plan effective?	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

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)	

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 orime

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 conside it necessary to attend the Examination				ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfactor	orily dealt with	by written re	epresentations	Х
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appearing at the Examination in Public				
9. If you wish to appear at the Examinato be necessary.	ation in Publ	c, please o	utline why you co	onsider this
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appr	opriate boxes) 		
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x			
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the detail will be available in the public domain. (pl			x	
Signature:		Date:		



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/presubmission-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.

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

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

Sound (You support the document)							
Unsound changing)	•	think	the	document	needs	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?	Х
Is the plan justified?	Х
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	х

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)	

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.

. If you reel that the plan is sound, please ten as	. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.		
. Can your representation be considered by this	written representation or do ye	ou consid	
necessary to attend the Examination in Public?	' (Please tick appropriate box)		
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations			
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt w Examination in Public	rith by appearing at the		
o. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Pu o be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate box			
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors x Recommendations			
Notified of the Inspectors x			
Notified of the Inspectors x Recommendations		-	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: \$ T. DRGAH.				
Organisation:				
Address:				
Post code:	Telephone:			
E-mail:				
If you have appointed someone to act as your ag Name:	gent please give their name and contact details.			
Organisation:				
Address:				
Post code:	Telephone:			
E-mail:				

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)	3 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?	Х
Is the plan effective?	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

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)	

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 reprit necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick	esentation or do y appropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written	representations	x
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appear Examination in Public	ing at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please to be necessary.	outline why you c	onsider this
0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations		
Notified of the Adoption		
Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the றய்கிic domain. (please tick box)	X	
Signature:	Date: 30.9.	17.



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Name: CALLUM BARICER	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Doctorda	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	,
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (Yo	u sup	port the	e doc	ument)		
Unsound changing)	(You	think	the	document	needs	Х

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?	х
Is the plan effective?	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	х

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)	

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.

. If you feel that the plan is sound, p	lease tell us v	vny.		
. Can your representation be considences and the Examination of the Examination is a second control of the Examination of the E				ou consid
Yes, my representation can be satisfa	ctorily dealt wit	h by writte	n representations	х
No, my representations can only be รเ Examination in Public	uitably dealt wit	h by appe	aring at the	
. If you wish to appear at the Exam o be necessary.	ination in Puk	lic, pleas	e outline why you c	onsider tl
0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick ap	propriate boxe	s)		
Notified of the Submission				
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x			
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the de will be available in the public domain.			n x	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: MRS VANESSA HOUGHTO	oN .
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	DEOCH/ED
	KECEIVEU
	D 2 OCT 2017
	0 3 OCT 2017
	POST NOOM FINANCE 1
	I FINANCE !

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

Sound (You support the do	ocument)	
Unsound (You think the changing)	document needs	Х

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?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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 rep it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick	resentation or do yo appropriate box)	ou conside
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written	representations	х
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appea Examination in Public	ring at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please o be necessary.	outline why you co	nsider this
Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors		
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations		
Notified of the Submission	x	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: X JALLY HENMAN.	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your ag	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	DO COT COLO
	POST ROOM, FINANCE
	FINANCE

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

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

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

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)	

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

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 reprit necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick	resentation or do y appropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written	representations	x
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appear Examination in Public	ing at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please to be necessary.	outline why you co	onsider this
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations		
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 00)	n



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/presubmission-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.

Name: SHAUN HOUGHT	ON.		
Organisation:			
Address:			
Post code:	Telep	ohone:	
E-mail:			
If you have appointed someone to act	as your agent p	lease give their name and	contact details.
Name:			
Name.			
Organisation:	-		
Address:			
	Tols	phone:	
Post code:	100	priorie.	
E-mail:		RECEIVED	
		03 OCT 2017 POST ROOM FINANCE	1

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

Sound (You support the document)						
Unsound (\changing)	You	think	the	document	needs	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?	х
Is the plan justified?	х
Is the plan effective?	х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

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)	

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.		
B. Can your representation be considered by this written reprit necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick	esentation or do ya appropriate box)	ou consideı
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written	representations	х
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appear Examination in Public	ing at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please to be necessary.	outline why you co	onsider this
Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission		
Notified of the Inspectors x Recommendations		
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:	9/1>



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.

Name:	Mrs	Helen	Forster.	
Organisation:				
Address:				•
Post code:		•	Telephone:	
E-mail:				
If you have appoi	nted some	one to act as y	ur agent please give their r	ame and contact details.
Name:				
Organisation:				
Address:				
Post code:			Telephone:	
E-mail:				

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

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

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?	×
Is the plan justified?	X
Is the plan effective?	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

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)	

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.			
			ı
8. Can your representation be considered it necessary to attend the Examination in	d by this written re Public? (Please t	epresentation or do you	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations			x
No, my representations can only be suitable Examination in Public	y dealt with by app	earing at the	
 If you wish to appear at the Examination to be necessary. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropring the content of the content of			
Notified of the Submission	x		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption	х		
Declaration: I understand that the details ir will be available in/the public domain. (pleas	ncluded on this forn e tick box)	n x	
Signature:	Date: 28/9	117.	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: MRS M. A. THURLOW	+ MISS N. K. THURLOW
Organisation: HOUSE HOLDER	
Address:	
	Thombon
Post code: _	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your ag	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You sup	port the	e doc	cument)		
Unsound (You changing)	think	the	document	needs	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?	Х
Is the plan effective?	х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

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)	

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'.

,	please tell us why.		
8. Can your representation be considit necessary to attend the Examination	dered by this writter on in Public? (Pleas	n representation or do y e tick appropriate box)	ou conside
Yes, my representation can be satisfac	ctorily dealt with by w	ritten representations	х
No, my representations can only be su Examination in Public	uitably dealt with by a	ppearing at the	
. If you wish to appear at the Exami o be necessary.	ination in Public, pl	ease outline why you c	onsider thi
*			
*	propriate boxes)		
ン 0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	propriate boxes)		,
O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick applementation) Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors			
 Do you wish to be: (Please tick apple) Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations 	x		
	x x x ails included on this f	orm x	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: MR. M. RICHER	
Organisation:	
-	
Address:	•
Post code:	Telephone:
Fost code.	To opinone.
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their hame and contact details.
Name:	
Organization	
Organisation:	
Address:	
7.00.000	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You	sup	oort the	e doc	ument)		
Unsound (You	think	the	document	needs	Х

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?	х
Is the plan justified?	х
Is the plan effective?	х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	x

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)	

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 '.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
8. Can your representation be considered by this written rep it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Please tick	presentation or do ye appropriate box)	ou consider		
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by writter	n representations	x		
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with by appea Examination in Public	ring at the			
9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public, please to be necessary.	outline why you co	onsider this		
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)				
Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations				
Notified of the Adoption				
Declaration: I understand that the details included on this form will be available in the public domain. (please tick box)	×			
Signature:	Date: /9.9.1			



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/presubmission-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.

Name:	JAMIC	GADSOCN	
Organisa	tion:		
Address:			,
Post cod	e:		Telephone:
E-mail:			
If you ha	ve appointed	someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:			
Organisa	ation:		
Address			
Post cod	e:		Telephone:
E-mail:			

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

Sound (You su	pport th	e dod	cument)			
Unsound (Yo	u think	the	document	needs	Х	

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?	х
Is the plan justified?	х
Is the plan effective?	х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	х

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.		
3. Can your representation be considered by thi t necessary to attend the Examination in Public	is written representation or do yo ? (Please tick appropriate box)	u conside
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt v	with by written representations	х
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt v Examination in Public	with by appearing at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Person be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate box		nsider thi
Notified of the Submission		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations		
Notified of the Adoption		
Declaration: I understand that the details included will be available in the public domain. (please tick b	d on this form x	
Signature:	Date: 20/04	1.



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/presubmission-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.

Name: LES DOSSON			
Organisation:			
organication.			
ALL			
Address:			
Post code:	Tolonhono		
rost code.	Telephone:		
E-mail:			
If you have appointed someone to act as your ag	gent please give their name and contact details.		
Name:	<u> </u>		
ivalite.			
Organisation:			
Address:	The state of the s		
7.000.			
Post code:	Telephone:		
	'		
E-mail:			
- ···•···			

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

Sound (Yo	u sup	port the	e doc	ument)			
Unsound changing)	(You	think	the	document	needs	Х	

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

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.			
8. Can your representation be considered by this writ it necessary to attend the Examination in Public? (Ple	ten representation or do you consider ease tick appropriate box)		
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by	y written representations X		
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with b Examination in Public	y appearing at the		
If you wish to annear at the Evamination in Public			
to be necessary.	please outline why you consider this		
to be necessary.	please outline why you consider this		
to be necessary.	please outline why you consider this		
to be necessary.	please outline why you consider this		
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)	please outline why you consider this		
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes) Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors	please outline why you consider this		
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes) Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations			



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/presubmission-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.

Name: MARION DALSTO	. 1
TAKTON BALSTO	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Address.	
Post code:	Tolomban
	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someons to get as your	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
If you have appointed someone to act as your a Name:	igent please give their name and contact details.
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	
	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

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

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

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)	

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 occurrance 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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.					
B. Can your representation be consident t necessary to attend the Examination				you c	onsider
Yes, my representation can be satisfact	orily dealt with by	written re	presentations		K
No, my representations can only be suit Examination in Public	ably dealt with by	appearin	g at the		
9. If you wish to appear at the Examir to be necessary.	nation in Public,	please ou	utline why you	ı consid	der this
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	ropriate boxes)				
Notified of the Submission					
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x				
Notified of the Adoption					
Declaration: I understand that the deta will be available in the public domain. (p		is form	x		
Signature:			Date: 21	09	1901



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/presubmission-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.

Name: 10/1/26 14.000'6	
LE TIMERIS	
Organisation:	
Address:	
, real eds.	
Post cod	
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	ornac, dotailo.
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Tolonhau
	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You support the document)					
Unsound (Yo	ou think	the	document	needs	Х

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?	Х
Is the plan effective?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.			
8. Can your representation be consi it necessary to attend the Examinati			ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfa	actorily dealt with by written r	epresentations	x
No, my representations can only be s Examination in Public	uitably dealt with by appearir	ng at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Exam to be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick a		utline why you co	onsider this
Notified of the Submission	x		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption	x		
Declaration: Lunderstand that the de	e tick box)	x	
Signature:		Date: 2356	A-12



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/presubmission-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.

Name:	
Jennile Thomson	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Addless.	
•	
Post code:	
	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have anneigh-d	
Name:	as your agent please give their name and contact details.
rvame,	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
∃-mail:	
···-	

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

Sound (You support the document)							
Unsound changing)	(You	think	the	document	needs	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	X
Is the plan positively prepared?	
•	X
Is the plan justified?	
	X
Is the plan effective?	
	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	·

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)	

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'.

If you feel that the plan is sound, plea	se tell us why.		
Can your representation be consider necessary to attend the Examination	ed by this written repre in Public? (Please tick a	esentation or do yo appropriate box)	ou consid
es, my representation can be satisfacto	orily dealt with by written	representations	X
No, my representations can only be suita Examination in Public	ably dealt with by appear	ing at the	
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	ropriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission	x		
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	х		
Notified of the Adoption	х		
Declaration: I understand that the det will be available in the public domain. (ails included on this form	ı x	
AAIII DO CIACUICINIO III III II II II II I	picado tidit worty	1 **	



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/presubmission-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.

Name:	
L Hndy Kwett	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Tolophono
	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gont places give their name.
Name:	gent please give their name and contact details.
Organisation:	,
Address:	
Address.	
Post code:	Telephone:
F	- Josephone.
E-mail:	

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

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

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	X
Is the plan positively prepared?	^
	X
Is the plan justified?	
	X
Is the plan effective?	
	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	

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

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

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'.

. If you feel that the plan is sound, pl	ease tell us v	why.			
B. Can your representation be consident t necessary to attend the Examination	ered by this v n in Public?	writte (Plea:	en repres se tick ap	entation or do yo propriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfact	torily dealt wif	th by '	written re	presentations	X
No, my representations can only be suit Examination in Public	tably dealt wi	th by	appearing	g at the	
o. If you wish to appear at the Examino be necessary.	nation in Pul	blic, p	olease ou	utline why you c	onsider this
I 0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	propriate boxe	 ∋s)			
Notified of the Submission					
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x				
Notified of the Adoption					
			4464		a.
Declaration: I understand that the detail will be available in the public domain. (p			s form	x	
Signature:				Date 3 - 9 -	-17



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Name:	
Name. JOHN PARSONS	•
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address	
Address:	
Post code:	Tolonhous
r ost oode.	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (Yo	ou sup	oort the	e doc	ument)		
Unsound changing)		think	the	document	needs	Х

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?	х
Is the plan effective?	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	X

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)	

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 occurrance 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'.

If you feel that the plan is sound, please t	ell us why.			
Can your representation be considered be necessary to attend the Examination in Pu	y this writte	e n represe se tick app	entation or do yo propriate box)	ou conside
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations			resentations	x
No, my representations can only be suitably c Examination in Public	lealt with by	appearing	at the	
. If you wish to appear at the Examination	in Public,	please ou	tline why you c	onsider thi
o be necessary.		please ou	tline why you co	onsider thi
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropria		please ou	tline why you co	onsider thi
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropria		please ou	tline why you co	onsider thi
O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate Notified of the Submission	ite boxes)	please ou	tline why you co	onsider thi
Recommendations	x cluded on the		tline why you co	onsider thi



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/presubmission-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.

Name:	
Name. Jan Carrison	
Organisation:	
Organisation.	
Address:	
Address.	
Post code:	
Fost code.	Telephone:
E-mail:	I
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	gont picase give their flame and contact details.
ramo.	
Organisation:	
Address:	
, man 5551	
Post code:	Tolonhous
1 001 0000.	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (You support the document)						
Unsound (You changing)	think	the	document	needs	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	X
Is the plan positively prepared?	
Is the plan justified?	х
	X
Is the plan effective?	
	X
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	

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)	

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'.

. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.			
. Can your representation be consider necessary to attend the Examination	red by this written representation or do y in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)	ou conside	
Yes, my representation can be satisfacto		Х	
No, my representations can only be suita Examination in Public	ably dealt with by appearing at the		
. If you wish to appear at the Examina	ation in Public, please outline why you c	onsider this	
o be necessary.	ation in Public, please outline why you c	onsider this	
o be necessary. 0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appro		onsider this	
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriately approp		onsider this	
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	ropriate boxes)	onsider this	
Declaration: I understand that the detawill be available in the public domain. (pl	ropriate boxes) x ills included on this form	onsider this	



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/presubmission-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.

Name: Cheyanne Jone	C
Organisation:	2
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details
Name:	
Organisation:	
_	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

Sound (Yo	u sup	oort the	e doc	ument)			
Unsound changing)	(You	think	the	document	needs	Х	

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?	Х
Is the plan effective?	Х
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	Х

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)	

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'.

If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us wh	ny.	
		····
Can your representation be considered by this winecessary to attend the Examination in Public? (P	ritten representation or do yo Please tick appropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with	by written representations	Х
No, my representations can only be suitably dealt with Examination in Public	by appearing at the	
. If you wish to appear at the Examination in Public be necessary.	ic, please outline why you co	onsider this
Do you wish to be: (Please tick appropriate boxes)	
Notified of the Submission		
Notified of the Inspectors x Recommendations		
Notified of the Adoption		
Declaration: I understand that the details included or will be available in the public domain. (please tick box		
Signature:	Date: 30 - 0	2-17



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/presubmission-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.

Name: 104	
Name: WAYNE JONES	
Organisation:	
Address:	-
Post code:	Telephone:
,	Telephone.
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	gent please give their name and contact details.
Organisation:	
Adding	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
	Tolophone.
E-mail:	

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

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

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

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)	

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'.

. If you feel that the plan is sound, ple	7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.				
. Can your representation be conside t necessary to attend the Examination	ered by this written representation or do you in Public? (Please tick appropriate box)	ou consider			
Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations					
No, my representations can only be suit Examination in Public	ably dealt with by appearing at the				
If you wish to annear at the Examin					
	nation in Public, please outline why you co	onsider this			
o be necessary.		onsider this			
o be necessary. 0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app		onsider this			
o be necessary. 0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app		onsider this			
o be necessary. O. Do you wish to be: (Please tick application) Notified of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	ropriate boxes)	onsider this			
o be necessary. 10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appleant of the Submission Notified of the Inspectors	ropriate boxes) x ails included on this form	onsider this			



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/presubmission-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 <u>planningpolicyteam@breckland.gov.uk</u> or by post to Planning Policy, Breckland Council, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk, NR19 1EE.

Mayari	
Name: CAROLYN COLEMA	4 <i>N</i>
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
	Tolopholio.
E-mail:	
· · ·	
If you have appointed someone to get as your a	mout places six their section of the least
	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
6.	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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

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

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?	ĺ
	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, please tell us why.			
3. Can your representation be consident to the consident to the transfer of the Examination to the Examinati	ered by this written repr n in Public? (Please tick	resentation or do yo appropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfac	torily dealt with by written	representations	х
No, my representations can only be sui Examination in Public	itably dealt with by appea	ring at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Exami to be necessary.	nation in Public, please	outline why you co	onsider this
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	propriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the dewill be available in the public domain.		x	
Signature:		Date: 25/	9/,7



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/presubmission-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.

Name: 1 Mays	
Organisation:	
Ofganisation.	
Address:	
Address.	
•	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
If you have appointed someone to act as your ag	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Organisation.	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	

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)	s 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).

X
X
Х
X

1
_

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, pl	ease tell us why.		
B. Can your representation be consident t necessary to attend the Examination	ered by this written repn n in Public? (Please tic	presentation or do yo k appropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfac	Yes, my representation can be satisfactorily dealt with by written representations		
No, my representations can only be sui Examination in Public	tably dealt with by appe	aring at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examino be necessary.	nation in Public, pleas	e outline why you c	onsider this
I 0. Do you wish to be: (Please tick app	propriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	x		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the det will be available in the public domain. (m x	
Signature:		Date: 20./9	2017



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/presubmission-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.

Name: ROBERT CAMPBELL	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
•	•
If you have appointed someone to act as your a	gent please give their name and contact details.
Name:	
Organisation:	
Address:	
Post code:	Telephone:
E-mail:	
	1

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

Sound (You sup	port the	e doc	ument)			
Unsound (You changing)	think	the	document	needs	Х	

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?	
	×
Is the plan effective?	
	x
Is the plan consistent with national policy?	

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)	

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'.

7. If you feel that the plan is sound, plea	se tell us why.		
3. Can your representation be consider t necessary to attend the Examination	ed by this written in Public? (Please	representation or do yo tick appropriate box)	ou consider
Yes, my representation can be satisfacto	rily dealt with by wr	itten representations	х
No, my representations can only be suita Examination in Public	bly dealt with by ap	pearing at the	
9. If you wish to appear at the Examina to be necessary.	ation in Public, ple	ease outline why you co	onsider this
10. Do you wish to be: (Please tick appro	opriate boxes)		
Notified of the Submission			
Notified of the Inspectors Recommendations	х		
Notified of the Adoption			
Declaration: I understand that the detai will be available in the public domain. (pl		x 🗸	
Signature:		Date: 25/9	117