

Key Rural Service Centres (KRSC's)

Local Plan review link: <https://west-norfolk.objective.co.uk/portal/lpr2019/lpr2019?pointId=s1542882759466#section-s1542882759466>

Context & Consideration of Issues Raised

Given the picture with housing numbers and that there is no absolute need to allocate further sites in the Local Plan review, in order to meet the Borough Council's Local Housing Need (LHN) it is therefore proposed not to carry forward the draft allocations at KRSC's as outlined in the consultation version of the draft Local Plan review, with the possible exception of at Terrington St Clement which will be discussed in a separate paper, given this rather unique opportunity.

Many of the settlements are covered by Neighbourhood Plans at some stage of preparation or in some cases made/ adopted. Therefore, the Borough Council and the Local Plan review will support those Parish Council's and local communities through their Neighbourhood Plans.

Both statutory bodies Historic England (HE) and the Environment Agency (EA) have made a series of comments which relate specifically to allocations made by the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (2016). Clearly all of these sites have been through the rigours local plan process including examination and have been found to be sound by an independent Inspector. Nevertheless, it is important to consider the comments of the environmental statutory bodies and these will be considered in two separate papers.

The majority of the comments received either object to the newly proposed draft local plan allocations, which are no longer proposed to be taken forward. Or they relate to the promotion of other sites, most of which were assessed and either not carried forward from the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) or the draft Sustainability Appraisal did not class them as 'preferred options'.

There were a few requests to amend the development boundary, those which are not simply a request for the inclusion of a proposed site to be included, will be considered in a separate paper.

There were also several comments that opposed sites which had been submitted and appear in the HELAA/SA, even though they were not proposed for allocation.

With all of this in mind, what follows is a series of recommendations and an appendix schedule of the comments received as part of the draft Local Plan review consultation.

Recommendations:

General:

- **Consider proposed development boundary changes together, in a separate paper.**
- **Consider points raised by Historic England together, in a separate paper**
- **Consider points raised by the Environment Agency together, in a separate paper**
- **Update sections accordingly with regard to relevant Neighbourhood Plan progress**
- **Update sections with latest progress on the SADMP allocations - if any have completed remove the policy from the plan and include the site within the development boundary**
- **Update the Policy Mapping to reflect agreements**
- **There is an appendix which consider the comments made at the draft consultation stage**

Settlement Specific:

- **Brancaster with Brancaster Staithe/ Burnham Deepdale: The Parish Council are preparing a neighbourhood plan review and a draft version has been published for consultation. Continue to support this and proceed with Draft Local Plan review approach to Brancaster. Update the position with regards to the Neighbourhood Plan and any progress with the SADMP Allocations.**
- **Burnham Market: The GP's element of the proposed draft allocation is proceeding without the need for allocation, so there is no need to allocate housing to support this or allocate the GP element in the plan. Given the housing numbers it is proposed not to carry forward the draft housing allocation BM1. It should also be noted that the Parish Council have signalled their intent to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for their Area and the Borough Council should support this. Officers have already attended a series of meetings and the Area will most likely be designated in due course. It will be for the Parish Council to assess sites and decide if they wish to allocate sites for further residential housing.**
- **Castle Acre: The Parish Council are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. Their consultation on a draft plan commenced (12/03/2020). The Borough Council should continue to support this. Proceed with Draft Local Plan review approach to Castle Acre. Update the position with regards to the Neighbourhood Plan and any progress with the SADMP Allocation.**
- **Clenchwarton: Given the Housing Numbers the draft allocation CLE1 should no longer be carried forward in the Local Plan review. It should be noted that the Parish Council are exploring the option of Neighbourhood Plan and BC officers have presented to the Parish Council and Public. Amend the plan accordingly and reflect and progress within the SADMP allocations.**
- **Dersingham: Continue to support the Parish Council through their Neighbourhood Plan. Carry forward the approach in the draft Local Plan review.**

- **Docking:** Given the Housing Numbers the draft allocation DOC1 should no longer be carried forward in the Local Plan review.
- **East Rudham:** Given the Housing Numbers the draft allocation RUD1 should no longer be carried forward in the Local Plan review.
- **Emneth:** Given the Housing Numbers the allocation draft EMN1 should no longer be carried forward in the Local Plan review
- **Feltwell with Hockwold cum Wilton:** As proposed in the draft version remove allocation G35.2 Land north of Munson's Lane – site agent confirms the landowner has no interest in making any effort to develop the site, now, in the foreseeable future or ever. Carry forward the approach for Feltwell as outlined in the draft Local Plan review. It should be noted that the Parish Council of Feltwell are exploring the option of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.
- **Great Massingham:** Given the Housing Numbers the draft allocation GM1 should no longer be carried forward in the Local Plan review. It should be noted the Parish Council are exploring the option of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.
- **Grimston/Pott Row with Gayton:** Carry forward the approach outlined by the draft Local Plan review. Continue to support the Gayton Parish Council with their Neighbourhood Plan and the Parishes of Grimston (included Pott Row), Roydon & Congham who are jointly preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. It will be for these Qualifying Bodies through their Neighbourhood Plans to consider the policies for their Areas.
- **Heacham:** The Parish Council are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for their Area. They have held their consultation and are moving forwards towards submission of the plan. The Borough Council should continue too support this. Carry forward the approach for Heacham as proposed by the draft Local Plan review
- **Marshland St James/ St John's Fen End with Tilney Fen End:** The Borough Council should support Marshland St James Parish Council through the preparations of their Neighbourhood Plan (Area Designated 24/01/2020). And Terrington St. John Parish Council who's designated area includes St John's Fen End. Given this development and the housing numbers it is proposed to no longer carry forward the draft allocation MSJ1.
- **Methwold with Northwold:** Both Parish Councils are exploring the option of preaging Neighbourhood Plans. Given the housing numbers no allocations should currently be proposed at this KRSC. None were at the draft stage as those sites which had been submitted for consideration we assessed as being not suitable.
- **Middleton:** As proposed by the draft Local Plan review remove SADMP allocation G60.1 Land south of Walter Howes Crescent. Given the housing numbers no longer take forward draft allocation MID1.
- **Snettisham:** The Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan has been made and came into force 03/12/2018. The Parish Council have indicated their wish to explore an early review of this and the Borough Council should support this. Continue forward with the approach outlined by the draft Local Plan review
- **Southery:** Given the Housing Numbers the draft allocation SOU1 should no longer be carried forward in the Local Plan review.
- **Stoke Ferry:** The Parish Council are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for their Area. Given this and the housing numbers it proposed to no longer carry forward STF1 in the Local Plan review. The Bourgh Council should support the Stoker Ferry Neighbourhood Plan. Carry forward the approach to Stoke Ferry as outlined by the draft Local Plan review.

- **Terrington St Clement:** Consider this settlement separately given the rather unique opportunity presented.
- **Terrington St John with St John's Highway/Tilney St Lawrence:** The Borough Council should continue to support the Terrington St John Parish Council with their Neighbourhood Plan. Given the housing numbers is proposed to no longer carry forward TSL1 or TSL2 as a part of the Local Plan review going forward.
- **Upwell/Outwell:** The Borough Council should continue to support the Parish Councils as they continue to prepare their own Neighbourhood Plans. Please note the Upwell Neighbourhood Plan is at examination (March 2020). Carry forward the approach as advocated by the draft Local Plan review.
- **Walpole St Peter/Walpole St Andrew/Walpole Marsh:** Walpole Parish Council are exploring the option of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for their Area. Given the Housing Numbers it is proposed not to carry forward with draft allocation WSA1.
- **West Walton:** Given the Housing Numbers it is proposed not to carry forward with draft allocation WEW1.

Appendix – Local Plan review Comments: Key Rural Service Centres (KRSC)

The Section column contains list the section and the section title contains a link to the relevant page of the draft Local Plan review consultation document, so the comments can read in full:

- If a number of consultee’s raise the same points/topics these have been grouped together, as the response will clearly be the same.
- Comments made by Historic England (HE) and The Environment Agency (EA) are considered in separate papers
- Requests to amend the development boundary (which are not simply to include a site put forward for consideration as an allocation) are also considered within a separate paper.
- Terrington St Clement is considered in a separate paper
- If any actions are recommended as a direct result of the comments this appear in ‘**bold**’ in the ‘Proposed Action’ column.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
KRSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ian Cable • Mrs A Cox • Mr & Mrs J Lambert • Mr R Cousins • Mrs Carol Coleman 	Suggestion	Sites with planning permission should be included within the development boundary	See summary	The approach is to include allocations and windfall sites that are related to the existing development boundary within it once the site has been built out/completed
Burnham Market	Mr M Dudley	Suggestion	Inclusion of further site allocation	Allocate this site	Latest housing numbers suggest no need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review. Burnham Market Parish Council and the local community are embarking upon a neighbourhood plan. The consultee could engage with this

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					process in the future
	Sarah Wyatt	Objection	Site for new GP's may be right, considers the site (BM1) should not be used for housing, however the old/current GP's site could be	See summary	BM1 not seeking to carry forward due latest housing numbers situation. Looks like the new GP's is coming forward independently of the Local Plan process. Existing GP's surgery could be redeveloped without the need to allocate through the Local Plan review
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mrs Rachel Campbell-Gray • Steve Wood • Mrs Jane Ridley • Mr Nigel Strongitharm 	Objection	Objects to BM1		BM1 not seeking to carry forward due latest housing numbers situation. Looks like the new GP's is coming forward independently of the Local Plan process. Existing GP's surgery could be redeveloped without the need to allocate through the Local Plan review
	David de Stacpoole	Suggestion	Seeking for inclusion of his land within the development boundary or allocation	See summary	Latest housing numbers suggest no need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review. Burnham Market Parish Council and the local community are embarking upon a neighbourhood plan. The consultee could engage with this process in the future
BM1 - Burnham Market Land south of Joan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Murdo Durrant (Burnham) 	Objects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to BM1 • Number of houses • In the AONB 	Remove site	BM1 not seeking to carry forward due latest housing numbers situation.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Short's Lane and east of Creake Road Policy	Thorpe PC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greg Garland • Chris Yardley • Graham Gooch • Sarah Greenhall • Dr Paul Zuckerman 				
	Mr M Rayner (CPRE)	Suggestion	BM1 must provide the right number of affordable homes	See summary	BM1 not seeking to carry forward due latest housing numbers situation.
	Burnham Market PC	Objects	Objects to BM1	Remove site	BM1 not seeking to carry forward due latest housing numbers situation. The BC has held a number of meetings with the PC and local community regarding taking forward a neighbourhood plan for the area. It is anticipated that this will take place and the BC will fully support this. Update Local Plan review to reference neighbourhood plan potential.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Holkham Estate	Support & Suggestion	Strongly supports the proposed allocation BM1 and makes several suggestions as to the proposed policy clauses in relation to the retention of buildings, possible conversion of existing buildings	See summary and full representation	Due to the latest picture with regards to housing numbers it is no longer proposed to carry forward this draft allocation. It would appear that the new GP's can still come forward and this would be supported by the BC through existing policy relating to community facilities. Burnham Market PC and the local community are embarking upon a neighbourhood plan for the area it would be strongly advised that both parties liaise in a constructive way.
	Norfolk County Council	Suggestion	BM1 - Sections of frontage footway should be provided on Creak Road linking to the existing footway provision on the western side via a suitable pedestrian crossing. Ideally the new footway should be 1.8 m in width. Further improvements will be required to the wider footway provision linking the site to/from the main residential parts of the village both to the north and the south. Access improvements would also need to be implemented.	See summary	BM1 not seeking to carry forward due latest housing numbers situation.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Castle Acre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Martin Tate (Castle Acre PC) X2 Linda Roast (Castle Acre PC) 	Observations	Castle Acre PC's views & CPRE pledge. Please see full responses	See Summary	The BC are in continued and active discussion with Martin Tate regarding the Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan which the BC is fully supportive of. The NP is currently at the Reg. 14 Consultation Stage (April 2020). Ongoing and constructive dialogue is continuing. It will be for the NP to assess sites and make allocations
	Sally Hubbard	Objects	Objects to a site which has been put forward for consideration and has been assessed in the HELAA as site H030		The Local Plan review is not proposing any further allocations at Castle Acre. The emerging Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan may well look to
	Holkham Estate	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the continuation of the SADMP allocation Are actively engaged in the Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan Wish to support site they have proposed in the Local Plan review process (H032) if the Neighbourhood Plan isn't forthcoming 		The Support is noted and welcomed. The Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan is progressing in a timely fashion and it is encouraging that the PC and Holkham Estate are engaged in a constructive process as part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan
G22.1 - Castle Acre - Land west of Massingham Road	Debbie Mack (Historic England) X2	Support & Objection	See separate HE response paper	See separate HE response paper	See separate HE response paper

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Clenchwarton	Gavin Lane X2	Proposal	Allocate site H0531 / H0532	See summary	Due to the latest housing numbers picture, there is no need to allocate further sites at Clenchwarton at this time
	David Goddard	Proposal	Allocate his site	See summary	Due to the latest housing numbers picture, there is no need to allocate further sites at Clenchwarton at this time
	Jenny Rowe (Clenchwarton PC)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to housing numbers • No longer a Doctors at Clenchwarton • Recent flooding concerns • Why has the development boundary been changed? 		<p>Due to the latest housing numbers picture, there is no need to allocate further sites at Clenchwarton at this time</p> <p>Plan doesn't say there is a Doctors at Clenchwarton</p> <p>The latest information available at the time has been used to inform both the Local Plan review and the determination of planning applications. BCKLWN SFRA 2019. Which the EA have been fully engaged with</p> <p>There are no proposed changes to the development boundary. The Local Plan review seeks to carry forward that as adopted in</p>

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					the SADMP (2016) for Clenchwarton
	Mr D Thorpe x3	Proposal	Allocate his site	See summary	Due to the latest housing numbers picture, there is no need to allocate further sites at Clenchwarton at this time
	Jemma Curtis	Proposal	Amend development boundary as per the submitted plan	See summary	See separate paper on Development Boundaries
	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comments			
	Mr & Mrs Gay	Proposal	Allocate their site or include in development boundary	See summary	Due to the latest housing numbers picture, there is no need to allocate further sites at Clenchwarton at this time
	Peter Humphrey x2	Proposals	Allocate sites H043 & H044 or include them within the development boundary	See summary	Due to the latest housing numbers picture, there is no need to allocate further sites at Clenchwarton at this time
G25.1 - Clenchwarton - Land between Wildfields Road and Hall Road Policy	Elizabeth Mugova (Environment Agency)	Suggestion	See separate EA response paper	See separate EA response paper	See separate EA response paper
	Jenny Rowe (Clenchwarton PC)	Objects	Object to G25.1 on flooding grounds	Remove allocation form the Plan	The site benefits from both outline planning permission (15/01315/OM) and reserved matters (19/00913/RMM) for 10 dwellings (granted 08/10/2019).

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					Indeed, a number of conditions have since been discharged. As part of the planning process the Environment Agency were satisfied with the flood risk assessment submitted, subject to conditions. No further action
G25.2 - Clenchwarton - Land north of Main Road Policy	Jenny Rowe (Clenchwarton PC)	Objects	Objects to the 'at least' wording		This was an essential element of the SADMP being found sound, please see SADMP Inspectors Report . The site has come forward and benefits from outline planning permission (15/01269/OM) and reserved matters (19/00466/RMM) for 19 dwellings. No further action
CLE1 - Clenchwarton - Land to the north of Main Road Policy	The Crown Estate	Support	Support for the draft proposed site Allocation CLE1		Supported noted. However, due to the latest housing numbers picture, there is no need to allocate further sites at Clenchwarton at this time. So that the site will not be taken forward at this time
Dersingham	Sarah Bristow (Dersingham PC) x2	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Local Plan review • CPRE Pledge 		Support Noted. Dersingham are involved in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for their Area. The BC fully support this and they are back on track with this following focusing efforts on

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					a new village hall/meeting place. They are working towards a draft version for consultation
G29.1 - Dersingham - Land north of Doddshill Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Advice	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
G29.2 - Dersingham - Land at Manor Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Advice	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
Docking	John Ward (Docking PC)		CPRE pledge		CPRE should engage with the Government regarding housing numbers.
	Colin Tuck		Objects to a potential development sites		The site he mentions doesn't from part of the Local Plan review
G30.1 - Docking - Land situated off Pound Lane (Manor Pasture) Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Advice	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
DOC1 – Docking Land south of Pound Lane and west of Bradmere Lane Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Advice	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jamie Bird 	Support	Supports the proposed site allocation		Noted. If the site was to be

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erica Whettingste el 		DOC1 and also a wider site		allocated it is probably better to take a longer-term view and allocate the whole site allowing comprehensive planning for the area rather than a short-term piecemeal approach. However, due to the housing numbers picture currently no further allocations are required at this time
	Norfolk County Council	Support	Support for DOC1		Noted. Allocation no longer required to meet housing numbers
East Rudham	Nikki Bareham	proposals	The Rudham's should be combined to from a Key Rural Service Centre Proposal for 4 detached dwellings		East Rudham is a KRSC, West Rudham is a Smaller Village and Hamlet. The two could be combined but this would simply make a larger KRSC. Other Joint KRSC exist as there are shared service between the two. The proposed development is too smaller in terms of numbers to be considered through the HELAA/SA/Local Plan review, 5 is minimum number of homes considered. This could be amend to be consistent with this, but currently the housing numbers indicate there is no need to make any further allocations, although

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					policy LP26 could be of interest to this consultee as a potential way of bringing the site forward.
G31.1 - East Rudham - Land off Fakenham Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)		No Comment		
RUD1 – East Rudham Land to north of Lynn Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Suggestion	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
	Norfolk County Council	Support	Support for RUD1		Noted. Allocation no longer required to meet housing numbers
Emneth	Debbie Mack (Historic England)		No Comment		
	Richard Waite X3	Suggests	Allocate Site H108, Site H109, Site H110		No further allocations required. No further allocations needed to meet the local housing numbers at this current time
	Mrs Hilary Keightley	Suggests	Allocate Site H120		No further allocations required. No further allocations needed to meet the local housing numbers at this current time
	Peter Humphry	Suggests	Included consented site(s) within the development boundary		The development boundary is interested to have a number of functions including identifying where development is potentially suitable, protecting the

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					countryside. It is not intended to include all of what is the settlement of Emneth. Sites which have completed may be included within the development boundary if appropriate.
	Peter Humphrey x7	Suggests	Allocate Site H119, Allocate Site H118, Allocate Site H100, Allocate Site H127, Allocate Site H111. Or included them within the development boundary.		No further allocations required. No further allocations needed to meet the local housing numbers at this current time
EM1 – Emneth Land north of Church Road Policy	Mrs A Cox	Supports	Supports the allocation of EMN1		The site is no longer supported as part of the Local Plan review as it isn't required to meet the Local Housing Need at this time. It is recommended that Policy LP26 is considered by the consultee
	Norfolk County Council	advice	Support site EMN1 subject to criteria	Subject to footway improvements and a junction improvement at Bambers Lane. Footway improvements must provide a connection to the existing footway to the east of Gypsy Lane	The site is no longer supported as part of the Local Plan review as it isn't required to meet the Local Housing Need at this time.
G35.1 - Feltwell - Land to the rear of Chocolate Cottage, 24 Oak Street Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Advice	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Norfolk County Council	Amend	Update policy to reference correct NPPF para.in regard to the historic environment	See Summary	Agreed see summary
	Elizabeth Mugova (Environment Agency)	Suggests	See separate EA response paper	See separate EA response paper	See separate EA response paper
G35.2 - Feltwell - Land north of Munson's Lane Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Advice	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
	Brown & Co.	Support	As I am sure has been confirmed to your team before, my clients have no interest in making any effort to develop their land now or in the foreseeable future, if ever.	Remove site from plan	The site is proposed to be removed from the Local Plan review and will not appear in the submission version
	Norfolk County Council	Amend	Update policy to reference correct NPPF para.in regard to the historic environment	See Summary	The site is proposed to be removed from the Local Plan review and will not appear in the submission version
G35.3 - Feltwell - Land at 40 Lodge Lane / Skye Gardens Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
G35.4 - Hockwold cum Wilton - Land south of South Street Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Advice	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
	Norfolk County Council	Amend	Update policy to reference correct NPPF para.in regard to the historic	See Summary	The site has permission and has indeed completed. It is now

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
			environment		proposed to be removed from the Local Plan review and will not appear in the submission version
Great Massingham	Gary Alexander	Proposal	Allocate Site H156	See summary	No further allocations are required at this time to meet the Local Housing Need
G43.1 - Great Massingham - Land south of Walcup's Lane Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper & The site is already allocated as part of the SADMP (2016). The site has come forward and benefits from planning permission for 16 dwellings (16/01634/OM & 18/02038/RMM).
	Mr Stephen Baker	Suggests	The area for development makes no mention of what environmental measures are to be taken to protect the annual migration of toads and Great Crested Newts across that land which every March move to breed in the "Big Pit" pond. Indeed, there is no acknowledgement that there is an awareness of this	To consult with the voluntary bodies/individuals who constitute the annual Great Massingham Toadwatch, whose principal aim is to help protect and conserve all amphibian wildlife in the village of Great Massingham. To take appropriate action to conserve this protected wildlife, vital to the natural environment of the village of Great Massingham.	The site is already allocated as part of the SADMP (2016). The site has come forward and benefits from planning permission for 16 dwellings (16/01634/OM & 18/02038/RMM).
	Tim Slater	Suggest	Allocate Site H156	See summary	No further allocations are required at this time to meet the Local Housing Need

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Norfolk County Council	Amend	Update policy to reference correct NPPF para.in regard to the historic environment	See Summary	Amend Policy accordingly to NPPF (2019) para. 189
GM1 – Great Massingham Land east of Castle Acre Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	Due to housing numbers, the site is no longer sought for allocation through the Local Plan review.
	Diocese of Norwich	Suggests	Support for GM1, Allocate H160 & H158	See summary	No further allocations are required at this time to meet the Local Housing Need
	Norfolk County Council	Advice	GM1 -Subject to access as this may require land for the required visibility splay across the now unallocated section. If this site is an extension to the existing village and will provide some frontage development with a continuous footway; a visibility splay measuring 2.4 x 59m is likely to be acceptable. If this is not the case the visibility splay would probably be 2.4 or 4.5 x 90m, depending on the scale of development and speed of traffic. Highways would expect the site owner to provide evidence to show that this could be achieved.		No further allocations are required at this time to meet the Local Housing Need. So, the site will not be taken forward
	Mr Michael Wingell	Proposal	Allocate site which the PC advocate near the GP's rather than GM1	See summary	No further allocations are required at this time to meet the Local Housing Need. So, the site will not be taken forward. The PC's site could come forward

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					through a neighbourhood plan or potentially a revised version of Policy LP26
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Michael B Jackson Mr P A James 	Objection	Objects to GM1 based on highway safety. Supports the PC site	Seek an alternative site	No further allocations are required at this time to meet the Local Housing Need. So, the site will not be taken forward. The PC's site could come forward through a neighbourhood plan or potentially a revised version of Policy LP26
	Tim Tilbrook	Support & Objection	Supports the allocation of the PC site near the GP's. Objects to the allocation of GM1. Supports the PC's views	See summary	No further allocations are required at this time to meet the Local Housing Need. So, the site will not be taken forward. The PC's site could come forward through a neighbourhood plan or potentially a revised version of Policy LP26
Grimston/Pott Row with Gayton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Jill Garton Ms Brenda Cornelius 	Objects	To potential development of Grimston Cricket Pitch		This does not form part of the draft Local Plan review.
	Dr Judith Taylor	Objects	Objects to a development proposal, however it is not clear which?		Comments not clear, no action

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Mr & Mrs Rudd	Support & Proposal	Supports the KRSC status and supports site H288 for allocation	See summary	Suggest that the consultee engages in the Neighbourhood Plan process for Grimston. As it will be this process that looks at potential development sites. This is supported by the Local Plan review.
	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
	FK Coe and Son x5	Proposals	Provides supporting information for four sites and suggests these are allocation. HELAA Ref 25-11-20163001, Ref 25-11-20163779, Ref 25-11-20166188, 25-11-20165238, Ref 27-11-20169730	See summary	Suggest that the consultee engages in the Neighbourhood Plan process. As it will be this process that looks at potential development sites. This is supported by the Local Plan review
	Mrs Rosiland Larrington	Proposals	Provides information with regard to land for potential development		Suggest that the consultee engages in the Neighbourhood Plan process. As it will be this process that looks at potential development sites. This is supported by the Local Plan review
	Mr John Curry	Proposal	Support for site Ref: 28-11-20162666		Suggest that the consultee engages in the Gayton Neighbourhood Plan process. As it will be this process that looks at potential development sites. This is supported by the Local Plan review

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Ms Phillipa Sewell (Grimston PC)	CPRE Pledge			Grimston are engaged in the Neighbourhood Plan process which is fully supported by the BCKLWN and the Local Plan review.
	Mrs Sarah Bristow x3	suggests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest that Anglian Water are consulted as part of development • Talks about a site, but not clear which one? • Concerned about the number of homes given permission as part of G41.1 		Anglian Water are consulted as part of the Local Plan process and through the planning determination process. 'at least' was key to the plan being found sound, it has also assisted with 5-year housing land supply and the housing delivery test. The Gayton Neighbourhood Plan process is fully supported by the BCKLWN and the Local Plan review.
G41.1 - Gayton - Land north of Back Street Policy	Mrs Sarah Bristow x2 (Gayton & Gayton Thorpe PC)	Questions	Questions housing numbers		'at least' was key to the plan being found sound, it has also assisted with 5-year housing land supply and the housing delivery test. Also, a justifiable allowance for windfall development is factored into housing number calculations for the Local Plan and 5-year housing land supply. These positions will be updated accordingly as a new FY occurs and the Plan moves towards submission consultation. The Gayton Neighbourhood Plan

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					process is fully supported by the BCKLWN and the Local Plan review. The site has come forward and benefits from outline planning permission for 40 new homes (15/01888/OM). A reserved matters application in line with this has been submitted and is currently being considered (19/00694/RMM)
G41.2 - Grimston and Pott Row - Land adjacent Stave Farm, west of Ashwicken Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Colin Manning • Kevin Mummery • Tim Tilbrook 	Objects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to development of Grimston cricket pitch • Proposed development boundary for Congham 		This does not form part of the draft Local Plan review.
Heacham	Mrs Sue Eke (Heacham PC) x2	Advice CPRE Pledge	<p>General suggestions for the Local Plan review relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers • Greenfield/amenity land protection • Affordable housing policy • Air Quality • Developer contributions • Housing along the A149 		Heacham PC are engaged in the Neighbourhood Plan process. This fully supported by the BCKLWN and through the Local Plan review. 'At least' forms a key part of the Local Plan and was essential to the plan being found sound (please see SADMP Inspector Report). It has assisted with 5-year housing land supply and the housing delivery test. 80% + of the SAMP (2016) have already come forward and

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					<p>benefit from planning permission. Sometime the need for housing out weighs the need to build on some greenfield sites, there are not enough brownfield sites to meet the need, they are difficult to develop and often take a long time to come forward see NORA as an example. Affordable housing policy will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan review. Developer contributions are addressed elsewhere in the Local Plan review, and through planning permissions, S106 agreements and CIL. The A149 provides a transport route to a number of settlements within the north of the Borough it is not the intention to not allow any development to place which the occupants may use this route.</p>
	Mel Able Farming Ltd	Supports	Supports Site H184 for development	Allocate site H184	Suggest that the consultee engages in the Heacham Neighbourhood Plan process as this will consider sites for allocation
	Ken Hill Estate	Proposals	Supports their sites for allocation in the Local Plan review	See summary	Suggest that the consultee engages in the Heacham Neighbourhood Plan process as this will consider sites for

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					allocation. The Heacham NP is progressing well, having already undertaken the Reg.14 consultation
G47.1 - Heacham - Land off Cheney Hill Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
G47.2 - Heacham - Land to the south of St. Mary's Close Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Object	See separate HE response paper	See separate HE response paper	See separate HE response paper. This site has come forward with a planning proposal and now benefits from outline planning permission (16/00245/O) for 8 new homes. This has been progressed by a series of reserved matters permissions (17/00251/RM, 17/01114/RM, 18/01458/RM & 19/01005/RM). The first four homes are have been completed.
Marshland St James/ St John's Fen End with Tilney Fen End	Sarah Thorpe (Marsh Land St James PC)	Views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> we no longer have a pub in our village. site H223 there is a footpath Object to (S224 and H231). We prefer the site H227 & S224 (if required) 	See summary	No further allocations required to meet the Local Housing Need currently. Marshland St James are now engaged in the Neighbourhood Plan process and the BCKLWN supports this as does the Local Plan review.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
	MTC Engineering (Cambridge) Ltd	Support	Support for Site H225	Allocate site H225	No further allocations required to meet the Local Housing Need currently. Suggests the consultee engages in the neighbourhood plan process
	Peter Humphrey	Support	Support for Site H223	Allocate site H223	No further allocations required to meet the Local Housing Need currently. Suggests the consultee engages in the neighbourhood plan process
	Carol Coleman	Objects	Doesn't believe this should be a KRSC	See summary	Meets the criteria therefore is proposed as a KRSC, please see the settlement hierarchy.
MSJ1 – Marshland St James Land south of School Road Policy	Norfolk County Council	Advice	Would need to provide at least a part time 20mph speed limit		No further allocations required to meet the Local Housing Need currently. So MSJ1 will not be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review
	John Maxey	Support & Objects	Supports MSJ1, however believes it should be two allocation policies to cover the two-separate parcels of land	See summary	No further allocations required to meet the Local Housing Need currently. So MSJ1 will not be taken forward as part of the Local Plan review

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Methwold with Northwold	Northwold & Whittington PC	Objects & CPRE Pledge	Level of infrastructure not in plan to support growth advocated by the Plan		No new allocations were proposed in the draft Local Plan review. Allocations shown at Methwold & Northwold were allocated by the SAMP which was found sound at examination and subsequently adopted in 2016. Many of the sites now have planning permission and are being built.
	Rachel Buckle (Methwold PC)	CPRE Pledge	Generic letter		CPRE should engage with the Government/MHCLG re: housing numbers
G59.1 - Methwold - Land at Crown Street Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Object	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
G59.4 - Methwold - Land off Globe Street/St George's Court Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Object	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper
Middleton	Barclay Farm Estate	Support	Support for Site H220 and supporting documents for this Owner agrees to deletion of G60.1	Allocate Site H220	No further allocations required to meet the Local Housing Need currently through the Local Plan review

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
	Elaine Oliver (Middleton PC)	CPRE Pledge	Generic letter		CPRE should engage with the Government/MHCLG re: housing numbers
MID1 - Middleton Land west of School Road Policy	Norfolk County Council	Advice	Subject to footway improvements along site frontage		No further allocations required to meet the Local Housing Need currently through the Local Plan review. It is proposed not to take MID1 forward.
Snettisham	John Maxey	Suggests	All neighbourhood Plan allocations policies are shown in the Local Plan. If A neighbourhood plan isn't complete the Local Plan should allocate in that location		Neighbourhood Plan allocations will be shown on the Policy Map, the neighbourhood plans can be easily located on the BCKLWN website, repeating the policy is not necessary. As both the Local Plan and neighbourhood plans form part of the development plan. Allocating where is neighbourhood plan is being prepared would undermine the process and would not be in the spirit of localism/neighbourhood plans.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
	Simon Bower (Snettisham PC) x2	Support	Good to see the Neighbourhood referenced and no further allocations proposed beyond that contained within the neighbourhood plan. A grumble about the timing of the consultation. CPRE Pledge		The BCKLWN was supportive of the Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan preparation process and is supportive now it has been adopted. This forms part of the local development plan and there is no need to replicate everything in there within the Local Plan review. There is a clear link between the two expressed in the Snettisham chapter, however this will be updated. The PC has signalled their intentions to carry out an early review of their NP and the BCKLWN would support this. Whenever a consultation takes place, something else will no doubt be occurring, the BCKLWN did extend the consultation to 8 weeks to allow a full or further responses from anyone who wished to take part.
	The Ken Hill Estate	Supports	Support the allocation of two of their sites and requests greater information with regards to neighbourhood plans in case of non-delivery.		No further allocations are required through the Local Plan review to meet the local housing need currently. Suggest that the consultee engages in the

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					neighbourhood plan review process for Snettisham. The Snettisham Neighbourhood Plan has been Made and a planning application has been submitted for consideration for the allocation which the neighbourhood plan. Non-delivery of a neighbourhood plan itself would be picked up through future Local Plans and reviews which legally now have to take place every 5 years.
Southery	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
	Roger & Joyce Burton	Proposal	Support for Site H334 to be allocated	Allocate Site H334	If the site already has planning permission and is capable of being delivered then it should be, it doesn't need to be allocated. Once the development has completed it could be considered for inclusion within the development boundary. There is also no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). The HELAA shows that the site cannot be delivered as the required visibility

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					splays cannot be achieved, so the site is in fact undeliverable so cannot be allocated.
	Mrs Annette Osler	Advice & Proposal	Provides information as to why Site H334 cannot be delivered or allocated. Allocate all of H332 not just a small portion	Allocate all of H332	There is also no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). SOU1 will not be taken forward.
SOU1 - Southery - Land to north of Lions Close Policy	Norfolk County Council	Advice	SOU1 - If this site is accessed through the new estate road that is under construction to the south onto Lions Close it would be acceptable.		There is also no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). SOU1 will not be taken forward.
Stoke Ferry	Helen Richardson (Stoke Ferry PC)	Information	Provides information at the services and facilities currently at Stoke Ferry	Update accordingly	Agreed, thanks for the information, Plan updated accordingly. Stoke Ferry are no engaged in the Neighbourhood Plan process which is fully supported by the BCKLWN and through the Local Plan review
	Mr J Kirchen x2	Proposals	Include two sites, one at Valmers Road and another at Wretton Road within the development boundary	See summary	Generally, sites are not included within the development boundary until they have been completed. Also suggest the consultee engages in the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan process.
	Amber REI Limited	Proposal	Suggest that the Mill Storage Site on Furlong Road is included within the	See summary	Generally, sites are not included within the development

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
			development boundary		boundary until they have been completed. This site has come forward along with the mill and now benefits from planning permission. Also suggest the consultee engages in the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan process.
	Mrs J Hall	Proposal	Objects to STF1, considers H347 should allocated instead	Allocate H347	There is also no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). Suggest the consultee engages in the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan process.
	Mr Russel Swann	Support	Support for site G81.1 and progress update		Noted. Thanks for the response. Site progress will be updated based upon the latest information
	Mr & Mrs J Lambert	Proposal	Proposes that their site is allocated	See Summary	There is no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). Suggest the consultee engages in the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan process.
G88.3 - Stoke Ferry - Land at Indigo Road / Lynn Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Object	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper	See separate HE paper

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
STF1 – Stoke Ferry Land to west of Fairfield Road Policy	James Grant (BCKLWN)	Support	Support for site STF1, looking to bring this site and the adjacent allocation forward as a Custom and Self-build site		There is no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). Suggest the consultee engages in the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan process.
	Mrs J Hall	Proposal	Allocate Site H347	See Summary	There is no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). Suggest the consultee engages in the Stoke Ferry Neighbourhood Plan process.
Terrington St Clement and Associated sections					Please see separate Terrington St Clement Paper for consideration of consultation responses
Terrington St John with St Johns Highway/Tilney	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
St Lawrence					
	Peter Humphrey x2	Proposal	Allocate Site H378 Included a further parcel of land within the development boundary	See summary	There is no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). Suggest the consultee engages in the Terrington St John Neighbourhood Plan process.
G94.2 - Terrington St John, St John's Highway and Tilney St Lawrence - Land north of St. John's Road Policy	Elizabeth Mugova (Environment Agency)	See separate EA paper	See separate EA paper	See separate EA paper	See separate EA paper. Note this site is proposed for removal from the plan and will most likely not be taken forward in the Submission Version of the Plan
	John Maxey	Advice	Remove allocation completely from the plan if proposed to be removed	See summary	The site will be removed from the Submission Version of the Plan. It was left in the draft with information relating to its proposed removal to draw out any further comments with regard to the site
TSL1 – Tilney St Lawrence Land adjacent to Tinley St	Norfolk County Council	Advice	TSL1 - Tilney St Lawrence - Land adjacent to Tilney St Lawrence Primary School/West of School Road Would need to provide at least a part		There is no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). TSL1

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
Lawrence Primary School, west of School Road Policy			time 20mph speed limit		will most likely not be taken forward.
TSL2 – Tilney St Lawrence Land to the west of School Road Policy	Norfolk County Council	Advice	TSL2 - Tilney St Lawrence - Land West of School Road Would need to provide at least a part time 20mph speed limit.		There is no current need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need (LHN). TSL2 will most likely not be taken forward.
Upwell/Outwell	John Maxey X2	Views	Don't leave new allocations to the Neighbourhood Plans. Suggests a number of sites		Suggest the consultee engages in the Upwell and Outwell Neighbourhood Plan processes. There is also no absolute need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need. The neighbourhood plans however may choose to.
	Francis Thomas	Proposal	Allocate site 25-11-20163465	See summary	Suggest the consultee engages in the Upwell and Outwell Neighbourhood Plan processes. There is also no absolute need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need. The neighbourhood plans however may choose to.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
	Kate Bennett (Upwell PC)	CPRE Pledge			Upwell PC are engaged in the Neighbourhood Plan process, with at the time of writing, the plan being at the examination Stage
	Peter Humphrey x3	Promotes	Promotes sites H413, H414 & H403 for allocation	See summary	Suggest the consultee engages in the Upwell and Outwell Neighbourhood Plan processes. There is also no absolute need to allocate further sites through the Local Plan review to meet the Local Housing Need. The neighbourhood plans however may choose to.
G104.1 - Upwell - Land north west of Townley Close Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Objects	See Separate HE paper	See Separate HE paper	See Separate HE paper. Note the sites has outline planning permission granted.
	Graham Moore (Middle Level Commissioners)	Objects	Objects to G104.1 being allocated		Allocated in SADMP (2016) found sound at examination and adopted. The site now benefits from outline planning permission.
12.21.2 G104.2 - Upwell - Land south/ east of Townley Close Policy	Graham Moore (Middle Level Commissioners)	Objects	Objects to G104.2 being allocated		Allocated in SADMP (2016) found sound at examination and adopted. The site now benefits from outline and reserved matters planning permission.

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
G104.3 - Upwell - Land at Low Side Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Objects	See Separate HE paper	See Separate HE paper	See Separate HE paper. Site allocated in SADMP (2016) found sound at examination and then adopted. The site is currently subject to an enlargement via the Upwell Neighbourhood Plan. This currently at the examination stage.
	Graham Moore (Middle Level Commissioners)	Objects	Objects to G104.3 being allocated		See Separate HE paper. Site allocated in SADMP (2016) found sound at examination and then adopted. The site is currently subject to an enlargement via the Upwell Neighbourhood Plan. This currently at the examination stage.
G104.4 - Upwell - Land off St Peter's Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Objects	See Separate HE paper	See Separate HE paper	See Separate HE paper. Site allocated in SADMP (2016) found sound at examination and then adopted. The site has been granted planning permission and has been built out, is as good as complete. So, the allocation policy will be removed and site drawn into the development boundary
	Graham Moore (Middle Level Commissioners)	Objects	Objects to G104.4 being allocated		Site allocated in SADMP (2016) found sound at examination and then adopted. The site has been granted planning permission and has been built out, is as good as

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
					complete. So, the allocation policy will be removed and site drawn into the development boundary
G104.6 - Outwell - Land Surrounding Isle Bridge Policy	Graham Moore (Middle Level Commissioners)	Objects	Objects to G104.6 being allocated		Site allocated in SADMP (2016) found sound at examination and then adopted. The site currently benefits from outline planning permission
Walpole St Peter/Walpole St Andrew/Walpole Marsh	John Maxey	Suggests	Suggests extending the proposed draft allocation	See summary	The Local Housing Need can be met without the need for further allocations. Therefore, it is unlikely that draft site allocation WSP1 will be taken forward at all
	Mr R Cousins x2	Proposal	Allocate site 884 and look to amend the development boundary to take account of development with permission		The Local Housing Need can be met without the need for further allocations. The approach is generally not include sites which have planning permission until the development is completed
	Cllr Richard Blunt	Proposal	he development boundary for Walpole St. Andrew / Walpole St. Peter could logically be extended to include the relatively small portion of Chalk Road, which currently lies outside of the development boundary. Historically this area may have been	See summary and full representation	Please see separate paper on development boundaries

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
			excluded to provide a degree of separation between the two villages. Today however, the two villages are fairly well joined together and this could be acknowledged further, particularly as the Local Plan review itself considers the villages to be a Joint Key Rural Service Centre.		
	Mrs S Harris	Proposal	Suggests various changes to the development boundary, please see full representation for full details	See summary	Please see separate paper on development boundaries
G109.1 - Walpole St. Peter - Land south of Walnut Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Object	Please see separate HE Paper	Please see separate HE Paper	Please see separate HE Paper
	Elizabeth Mugova (Environment Agency)	Question	Please see separate EA Paper	Please see separate EA Paper	Please see separate EA Paper
G109.2 - Walpole St. Peter - Land south of Church Road Policy	Elizabeth Mugova (Environment Agency)	Question	Please see separate EA Paper	Please see separate EA Paper	Please see separate EA Paper

Section	Consultee(s)	Nature of Response	Summary	Consultee Suggested Modification	Officer Response / Proposed Action
WSA1 – Walpole St Andrew Land south of Wisbech Road Policy	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	Object	Please see separate HE Paper	Please see separate HE Paper	Please see separate HE Paper. Although please note the site will most likely not be taken forward as the Local Housing Numbers can be met without the need for further allocations.
	Norfolk County Council	Advice	WSA1 - Not a preferred site as there are no continuous footways back to services		The site will most likely not be taken forward as the Local Housing Numbers can be met without the need for further allocations.
West Walton	Debbie Mack (Historic England)	No Comment			
	John Maxey x2	Proposal	Amend the development boundary, please see representation for details Suggests that West Walton and Walton High Way should be re-joined as a KRSC rather than split as proposed by the draft Local Plan review	See Summary	Please see separate development boundary paper. The decision to split the two settlements is a political one, please see the settlement hierarchy.