

## SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS – GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE POTENTIAL SITES AND POLICY CONSULTATION PAPER (Jan -Mar 2024)

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
<b>CONSULTATION PAPER</b>							
<b>GENERIC/ OVERALL COMMENTS</b>							
001		Whole document	<p>The general feeling in this area is enough is enough, we have more than our fair share of travellers and all that goes with them, high crime rates, fly tipping, litter.</p> <p>If we must have more sites, let's spread them throughout the Borough, not just in our area.</p>	Not specified	No	The Council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment identifies a need for a further 97 pitches over the Plan period to 2039. The Council is therefore required to make sure that it is meeting the needs for the Gypsy and Traveller community within its Local Plan.	None.
002		Site Process	<p>Paras 4.20 and 4.21 of the Site Assessment Document make the point that allocations should not dominate settlements close by. However para 2.3 acknowledges that 70% of proposed allocations are within 3 parishes all west of the river Ouse. I would suggest that the search for suitable sites should be widened across the district so that the affect on settlements is disbursed and the needs of this community are spread across a wider proportion of the district, so as not to place undue pressure on facilities and infrastructure within a small number of settlements (as stated in para 4.22). I see no logic in seeking to identify as a broad location for growth an area (Wisbech Fringe) that is an existing residential allocation. This will be unlikely to lead to any provision of additional pitches because of the potential prejudice to the adjoining residential development. If it were suitable then why not include such sites at Kings Lynn and Downham Market as locations with the biggest capacity for infrastructure and facilities close at hand. This inclusion makes no sense in both policy or practical terms</p>	Not specified	Yes	The Council are mindful of this part of national planning policy. Due to the location of the need largely coming from this part of the Borough, it is important that an appropriate balance is made between reducing the dominance to the nearby community and meeting the needs for the provision of Gypsy and Travellers.	None.
003		Consultation document	<p>I have made two consultation responses. The first relates to Methodological and Procedural Issues. There is a main response made on 18 February 2024 and an addendum provided on 20 February 2024. The second relates to numbers and was made on 25 February 2024. Associated with each response is text and a bundle of documents. There are an additional two responses being made: These will be issues with site assessments (standards, maps etc) and I will forward details of additional sites. There are currently three / four 1. Rope Walk (one pitch site), St Pauls Highway (one pitch site) 3. School Road, Marshland St James (5 pitch site) not included in the assessment documents 4. Robyns Nest Outwell (1 pitch site) to provide sleeping residential use In total 8 pitches excluded from assessment. There is also dispute with highways and your assessment in relation to the site at Cottons Head. I am providing a transport management plan (9 pitches). There has been a partial survey conducted and there were two vehicular movements on the Cottons Head over a period of time between 1500 - 1900 hrs on 23 February 2024. The Cottons Head has similar dimensions to most roads in the KWNLCB area - and there seems to be arbitrary highway standards. I have been asked to submit applications for about 20 pitches that are identified as being unauthorised / temporary. One has been granted consent another is being submitted. These need to have sight of the agreed Flood Risk Statement of Common Ground between KLNBC and EA before submission. I have firm instructions for applications for intensification of sites for 25 pitches and nearly finalised instructions for another 35. I am very time constrained = 60. I am also aware that most sites that have been identified as suitable for intensification will be submitting applications. There is great concern about position on the list by the applicants. My estimate is that applications for about 220 pitches are to be made over the next six months There is also a borough wide value for money report being prepared.</p>	Not specified	Not Specified	This document is not subject to this consultation. However, issued raised with the Council's evidence base will be discussed at the planned examination hearings on the Gypsy and Traveller part of the Local Plan scheduled for later in 2024.	Consider this location as a reserve or potential site allocation if there is a shortfall in delivering the 5-year need.
004			<p>The KLWNBC are currently consulting on changes to its Gypsy / Traveller policy and making additional provision. The consultation is based on making provision of about 104 pitches between 2023 - 2039 for Gypsy / Travellers that an organisation known as ORS identified met the definition of Gypsy / Traveller contained in Annex 1 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) in June 2023. Provision for an additional 52 accommodation units was identified as being made through the NPPF (rather than PPTS) for Gypsy / Travellers that ORS identified did not meet the definition of Gypsy / Traveller contained in Annex 1 of PPTS in June 2023. In December 2023 the Secretary of State abandoned the definition of Gypsy / Traveller contained in Annex 1 of PPTS and reverted to the definition agreed in 2012. ORS identify that they are taking legal advice on this issue, as it would lead to Gypsy / Travellers that ORS have identified as not meeting the definition within PPTS 2015 now meeting this definition. This would lead to an increase in GTAA provision of 50 pitches based on their calculations and a decrease in 50 units being required under the NPPF until 2039. This has an effect on the housing supply over the plan period. The GTAA work of the Council is till 2039 whilst the NPPF work on housing need is until 2036. It is impossible to determine if KLWNBC are accepting the revised GTAA definition of Gypsy / Traveller and wishes to make changes to its housing requirement and supply, and increase the level of GTAA provision. The GTAA provision is a subset of the NPPF provision. It is believed that until the KLWNBC identifies if the GTAA provision and NPPF provision of</p>	Not specified	Not Specified	<p>This document is not subject to this consultation. However, issued raised with the Council's evidence base will be discussed at the planned examination hearings on the Gypsy and Traveller part of the Local Plan scheduled for later in 2024.</p> <p>However, the Council will be producing a Technical Note on how the recent updates to the PPTS impact the GTAA and this will be made available to view from the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2024.</p>	Produce a Technical Note on how the impacts of the recent changes to the PPTS affect the Council's provision.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>accommodation is to be standardised (and take account of guidance) that it is impossible for the KLWNBC to comply with paragraph 22 of the NPPF. A comprehensive response identifying that the GTAA on which the KLWNBC is basing its consultation on changes to its Gypsy / Traveller policy and making additional provision identifying that this is neither sound or robust has / is being provided to the KLWNBC and its GTAA provider. These issues are not expected to be heard until September 2024. It is anticipated that common ground will be reached by the KLWNBC and myself and my clients. It is anticipated that this will lead to withdrawal of the 2023 GTAA and development of agreed assumptions, and methodologies for further work. The KLWNBC GTAA was the first in the country commissioned after the Lisa Smith court case that led to changes to the 2015 PPTS. It was identified by the court that interpretation of PPTS could lead to breaches of equalities and human rights by LPAs. This means that due regard was likely to have not occurred under s149 of the Equalities Act 2010 by commissioning authorities and providers.</p> <p>It is important that there is due regard across the whole local plan to equalities issues. The draft Local Plan needs to be changed to standardise the period over which they are expected to operate, and also modified to take account of the provision that is now to be made available through the GTAA (this will lead to a small reduction in the provision required under the NPPF until 2036). ORS has identified that it is taking legal advice on the December 2023 changes to PPTS I wish to attend the hearing into matter 2 if the KLWNBC is unable to provide justification to its failure to base its consultation on the 2015 revised Annex 1 GTAA definition of Gypsy / Traveller.</p>				
<b>SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL</b>							
005			<p>In document B10 we feel that the Site Sustainability Factors are not a true reflection of the actual character and infrastructure of the village of West Dereham. Using the official Sustainability Impact Scoring Criteria (Appendix D), we feel that in reality West Dereham Village should be scored as follows: ACCESS TO SERVICES : At the moment scored as X : Should be scored as XX.</p> <p>West Dereham is a remote village with no essential services, limited employment opportunities and restricted scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The nearest essential services are 4.5 miles away in Downham Market which provides doctor surgeries, dentists, vets, schools and shops. The nearest bus stop from the proposed site would be about 1200m away with infrequent services which do not cover the standard working day. The only practical access to the bus stop would be along Station Road which is a dangerous, unlit, single lane road with many HGV passes and no footpath. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, the unsuitability for walkers and cyclists for accessing services which are 4.5 miles away scores a Highly Negative XX</p> <p>COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL : At the moment scored as +/# : Should be scored as XX. There is a very strong objection to the proposed planning application 23/01606/F. In a small village of West Dereham with a population of about 450 people, to date (11th February 2024) on the Planning Application Portal there are 112 Objections with Zero Supporting. There are further objections within the documents. The proposed site located in the middle of green fields, hedges and trees will have an immensely negative impact on the amenities of the residents of Station Road with increased noise and light pollution. Their current views of uninterrupted open countryside will be destroyed forever. The population along Station Road could double which is totally disproportionate to the existing dwellers of Station Road and to West Dereham as a whole, with limited opportunities for employment within the village. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, the very strong community objection and that the proposed site would not deliver wider benefits to the community scores a Highly Negative XX.</p> <p>ECONOMY A : BUSINESS : At the moment scored as 0 : Agreed. The site would deliver minimal/no real benefit to the economy.</p> <p>ECONOMY B: FOOD PRODUCTION : At the moment scored as 0 : Should be scored as XX. The proposed site is a green field and lies in an area of Grade 2 Agricultural land. The loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land is contrary to National and Local Policies and should be avoided. It would have a negative impact on the food security of the UK. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, Grade 1 or Grade 2 scores a Highly Negative XX.</p> <p>FLOOD RISK : At the moment scored as 0. Should be scored as Unknown? The proposed site would be on very high clay content soils with slow water infiltration rates which easily floods even with moderate rainfall events. It is also within 50m of Flood Zone 3. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, Unknown Impact being so close to Zone 3 and on very high clay content soils.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The SA has been undertaken across all sites, applying a consistent approach to the assessment. Our response to comments is set out in the table below. We note that there may be potential issues that could arise at detailed planning stage; however, this assessment is based on known constraints at this time and each site has been considered on that basis as a fair and impartial assessment.</p> <p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal for Access to services.</p> <p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree to this change</p> <p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p>	The Sustainability Appraisal has been updated to reflect any agreed changes where appropriate.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>HERITAGE : At the moment scored as 0 : Should be scored as Negative X. The proposed site would be very close to the historically significant site of St. Mary's Abbey founded in 1188, classed as a Scheduled Monument : List Number : 1020141. The proposed site would impact on the setting and enjoyment of the Scheduled Monument and associated public right of way which runs through it. Many significant historic treasures have been found and documented around the village of West Dereham. Extensive and expensive archeological searches would inevitably be required. Otherwise, important treasures belonging to the nation could be lost. There is a blank square in the Scoring Criteria but due to the likely harm to the setting of a Scheduled Monument the score should be Negative X.</p> <p>HIGHWAYS &amp; TRANSPORT : At the moment scored as 0/# : Should be scored as Highly Negative XX. Station Road is a dangerous, unlit, single lane road with many HGV passes. There are no footpaths or other provisions for pedestrians, runners, cyclists and horse riders. The proposed development site would increase the traffic by up to 20 extra vehicles and touring caravans. There will inevitably be the need for service vehicles, waste disposal lorries, delivery companies and visitors to the site. As a result, vehicle movements would dramatically increase on this dangerous, unlit, single lane road with no footpath. It would also impact the adjoining narrower, unlit, single lane Basil Road with no footpath. These unlit single lane roads could become too dangerous for pedestrians (young and old), runners, cyclists and horse riders to use with no footpaths. The inevitable increase of vehicle movements and their associated interaction could result in a heightened risk of incidents. The access to the proposed site would not be within the 30mph speed limit zone. There is a reasonable chance that vehicles would be travelling greater than 30mph as they pass the proposed site access. This would substantially increase the dangers to all road users. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, the issue of the access within the 60 mph Zone of Station Road and the impact on Station Road with substantially increased vehicle movements on an already dangerous, unlit, single lane road means that it should score Highly Negative XX.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE &amp; AMENITY: At the moment scored as #. Should be scored as Highly Negative XX West Dereham is a small village/hamlet and is very scattered in form with a number of separate farmsteads, open spaces and three main groups of dwellings. The scattered nature produces a marked rural character throughout the village, resulting in there being no obvious focal point and a predominance of rural features such as agricultural buildings, fields, grass verges, hedges and trees. The open spaces are an integral and important part of the character of the village. The proposed development site could increase the population of West Dereham by 20% which is totally disproportionate to the group of dwellings along Station Road as well as the village of West Dereham as a whole. The proposed new development on the East side of Station Road would be in the middle of a long open stretch of agricultural land, hedges, dykes, trees and green fields. In such a context, the harm to the rural landscape from a deep, stark and permanent incursion of 10 Gypsy/Traveller Plots, each containing 1 Static Home and Touring Caravan concentrated in a long rectangular block, would be particularly pronounced. The scale, concentration, layout and style of such a proposed site would completely and adversely dominate the nearest settlement community along Station Road and be completely out of character with the rest of the village of West Dereham. For the existing permanent residents along Station Road, their quiet, unlit open space will be blighted forever.</p> <p>In summary, the inevitable outcome of the proposed development site of temporary and mobile accommodation would lead to a devastatingly negative impact on the character and landscape of the entire village of West Dereham and, in particular, Station Road. The proposal would create a precedent for similar proposals in respect to other land within the vicinity which would cumulatively further erode the markedly rural landscape and character of the village. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, sites likely to have a significant impact on the landscape/townscape which is virtually impossible to avoid scores Highly Negative XX.</p> <p>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT : At the moment scored as #. Should be scored as Negative X. The proposed site would have a negative impact on the environment as it would be in the middle of a long open stretch of agricultural land, green fields, dykes, hedges and trees, where the natural environment and biodiversity is currently thriving. The site would have a higher impact on Carbon Footprint because of increased vehicle use compared with a site nearer to a location with essential services. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, likely negative impact on species/biodiversity scores Negative X.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE, POLLUTION AND WASTE : At the moment is scored as XX : Agreed The proposed site would be on soil with a very high clay content with slow water infiltration resulting in flooding and a possible high water</p>			<p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p>	

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>table even during moderate rain events. The assessment indicates the safe and effective use of septic tanks as a concern. Regarding the planning application 23/01606/F the Environment Agency have Objected, recommending Refusal, on the basis that the application 'involves the use of a non-mains foul drainage system but no assessment of the risks of pollution to surface water has been provided'. The complexity and ramifications of treating sewage on the proposed site is a real concern in firstly, setting up the infrastructure and, not least, in how it would be managed in the future. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, significant constraints to delivery identified by infrastructure providers scores Highly Negative XX.</p> <p>CLIMATE CHANGE : At the moment is scored as ?/# : Should be Highly Negative XX. In 2018, outline planning was refused by the Borough Council for six dwellings on the same Station Road, West Dereham. Clause 2/3 cited 'The proposal is remote from local service provision conflicting with the aims of accessible development, the need to minimise travel and the ability to encourage walking, cycling, use of public transport and Reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy.' Quoting from the Highways Development Management Officer for the Executive Director for Community and Environmental Services who stated in their response to the planning application of the proposed development 23/01606/F: 'It is the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed development is likely to conflict with the aims of sustainable development and you may wish to consider this point within your overall assessment of the site.' The proposed new site with the possibility of up to 20 extra vehicles and touring caravans would inevitably increase the Carbon Footprint compared with a more suitable site located nearer to essential amenities. As stated in the Scoring Criteria, significant adverse impact on climate change, which will not contribute to adapting or mitigating GHG emissions scores Highly Negative XX.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The cumulative result of 16 Negative X's for the proposed site in the Sustainability Appraisal must render the site completely unsuitable for allocation in the Local Plan. The constraints identified confirm that the site is not suitable to accommodate any number of gypsy and traveller plots.</p>			<p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>No change to the Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</p>	
006		Site Assessment	<p>In the document F56, we feel that the Site Suitability Assessments are not a true reflection on the actual character and infrastructure of West Dereham and should be scored as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ACCESS TO SITE : Scored as Amber but in reality should be Red. Access to the site is on a section of Station Road where the speed limit is 60mph. This calls for increased visibility splays over and above those used for 30mph to ensure that safe access is provided. Traffic surveys should be undertaken to inform this process and ensure the site can indeed provide suitable access.</li> <li>2. ACCESSIBILITY TO LOCAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES : Scored as Red : Agreed Agreed as detailed in The Sustainability Appraisal (B10) under Access to Services.</li> <li>3. UTILITIES CAPACITY UTILITIES INFRASTRUCTURE : Scored as Green but in reality should be Red. The proposed site would be on soil with a very high clay content with slow water infiltration resulting in flooding and a possible high water table even during moderate rain events. The assessment indicated the safe and effective use of septic tanks as a concern. Regarding the planning application 23/01606/F the Environment Agency have Objected, recommending Refusal, on the basis that the application 'involves the use of a non-mains foul drainage system but no assessment of the risks of pollution to surface water has been provided'.</li> <li>4. CONTAMINATION AND GROUND STABILITY : Scored as Green : Agreed.</li> <li>5. FLOOD RISK : Scored as Green : but in reality should be Amber. The proposed site would be on very high clay content soil with slow water infiltration rates which easily floods even with moderate rainfall events. It is also within 50m of Flood Zone 3.</li> <li>6. NATIONALLY AND LOCALLY SIGNIFICANT LANDSCAPES : Scored as Green : Agreed.</li> <li>7. TOWNSCAPE : Scored as Amber but in reality should be Red. West Dereham is a small village/hamlet and is very scattered in form with a number of separate farmsteads, open spaces and three main groups of dwellings. The scattered nature produces a marked rural character throughout the village, resulting in there being no obvious focal point and a predominance of rural features such as agricultural fields, hedges, grass verges and trees. The historic round towered church is sited on the hill above the village. The first and largest group of dwellings is South of the church and is in two main parts. The open space South of these dwellings is an important part of the character of the village. The second group of dwellings, about 1 mile South, is linear in form and partly stretches along the West side of Station Road.</li> </ol>	Not specified	Yes	Thank you for your comments. The site assessment has been updated where appropriate.	None.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>The East side of Station Road is and has always been a completely open space comprising grass and arable fields, hedges and trees. This open space is also an important part of the character of the village. The third group of dwellings is a small cluster of buildings around College Farm. The older buildings throughout the village are two storey houses with a pitched roof and materials consisting mainly of stone with brick cornering and pantiles. The proposed development could increase the population of West Dereham by up to 20% which is totally disproportionate to the second group of dwellings along Station Road as well as the village of West Dereham as a whole. The proposed new development on the East side of Station Road would be in the middle of a long open stretch of green fields, hedges, dykes and trees. In such a context, the harm to the rural landscape from a deep, stark and permanent incursion of 10 Gypsy/Traveller Plots, each containing one Static Home and Touring Caravan concentrated in a rectangular block, would be particularly pronounced. The scale, concentration, layout and style of such a proposed site would completely and adversely dominate the nearest settled community along Station Road and be completely out of character with the rest of the village of West Dereham. For the existing permanent residents along Station Road their quiet, open and unlit space would be blighted forever. In summary, the inevitable outcome of the proposed development site of temporary and mobile accommodation would lead to a devastatingly negative impact on the character and landscape of the entire village of West Dereham and, in particular, Station Road. The proposal would create a precedent for similar proposals in respect of other land in the vicinity and would cumulatively further erode the markedly rural landscape and character of the village.</p> <p>8. BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY : Scored as Green but in reality should be Amber. The proposed site would have a negative impact on the environment as it would be in the middle of a long open stretch of green fields, hedges, dykes and trees where the natural environment and biodiversity is currently thriving.</p> <p>9. HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT : Scored as Green but in reality should be Amber. The proposed site would be very close to the historically significant St. Mary's Abbey founded in 1188, classed as a Scheduled Monument: List Number : 1020141. Many significant historic treasures have been found and documented around the village of West Dereham. Extensive and expensive archaeological searches would inevitably be required. Otherwise, important treasures belonging to the nation could be lost.</p> <p>10. OPEN SPACE/GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE : Scored as Green : Agreed.</p> <p>11. TRANSPORT AND ROADS : Scored as Amber but in reality should be Red. The proposed development site would increase the traffic by up to 20 vehicles and touring caravans, with the inevitable need for service vehicles, waste disposal lorries, delivery vehicles and visitors. The dangers to pedestrians, runners, cyclists and horse riders along the unlit, single lane roads of Station Road and Basil Road (even narrower) with no footpaths, together with the other roads within the village, would become far more dangerous because of the inevitable increase in traffic. The access to the proposed site would be positioned within a 60mph speed limit which would further escalate the danger on Station Road and increase the possibility of accidents. These unlit, single lane roads could become too dangerous for pedestrians (young and old), runners, cyclists and horse riders to use with no footpaths. The inevitable increase of vehicle movements and their associated interaction could result in a heightened risk of accidents.</p> <p>12. COASTAL CHANGE : Scored as Green : Agreed.</p> <p>13. COMPATIBILITY WITH NEIGHBOURING/ADJOINING USES : Scored as Amber but in reality should be scored Red. The intensification of vehicle movements along the unlit, single lane Station Road, associated with 10 traveller plots would lead to increased noise, odour and light pollution which cannot be effectively mitigated. For the existing permanent residents along Station Road their quiet, unlit and open view would be blighted forever. This would have a dramatic and adverse impact on the amenity of the existing residents of Station Road.</p> <p>CONCLUSION The cumulative 6 Reds from Document F56 and the 16 X's from Document D10 clearly demonstrate the unsuitability and poor sustainability of the proposed site. In addition, there is an extremely large number of objections and no support from the villagers of West Dereham. To reiterate, the inevitable outcome of the proposed development site of temporary and mobile accommodation would lead to a devastatingly negative impact on the character and landscape of the entire village of West Dereham and, in particular, Station Road. The proposal would create a precedent for similar proposals in respect to other land in the vicinity and would cumulatively further erode the markedly rural landscape and character of the village. The overwhelming evidence, along with the very strong objection and zero support from the residents of West Dereham, must mean</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			that this proposed site, and West Dereham as a whole, are not suitable or sustainable and should be removed from the Local Plan.				
007		Blackboro' End	<p>I think the part of the brownfield land that had planning permission for 10 holiday chalets, an admin building and lake would be more suitable as it is away from the other houses. It would be supported by the council's brownfield policies in the spatial strategy which says it's important to make best use of available sites in the borough and also para 122 from NPPF.</p> <p>10 traveller plots is less impactful than 10, 2 story holiday chalets isn't it?</p> <p>Your suggestion about a smaller piece around the access is a good one. It's 740m from the local school and village hall in Middleton to the access so there is access to services within 10 minutes walk. The post office, church and pub are not much further.</p> <p>Traveller plots can support the services in the Key Rural service centre of Middleton. At least that would justify the Council upgrading Middleton in the settlement hierarchy as it hasn't allocated any housing there despite the upgrade in status.</p> <p>All the land my family owns from the top of the water lane to the Alley is available to sell exclusively to travellers right now as we speak as we plan on moving soon anyway and don't want any ties to Kings Lynn. We are selling up and moving elsewhere, Peak District, Matlock or Buxton area.</p> <p>I've put your suggestion of a smaller site to the Parish Council with my suggestion of using the holiday chalets site and explained to them that due to the Council's failure to allocate enough traveller plots it now doesn't have a 5 year land supply. I'll wait and see what they say before I send my suggested sites to you.</p> <p>Do I submit extra land for you through the consultation or email it in?</p> <p>3 additional areas of land have been sent to the Council at Blackborough End for consideration.</p>	Not specified	Not Specified	<p>The Council has considered GTRA(E) and have assessed the other sites submitted as part of this consultation. These sites have also been subject to public consultation through the period to enable further information to be gathered about the sites.</p> <p>Although the sites appear to have few constraints in terms of highways and flooding, they are located in a generally undeveloped area between Blackborough End and Middleton. The character of this area is rural and there are a number of heritage assets close by. The development of these undeveloped sites is likely to negatively impact the characters of both Blackborough End and Middleton and likely cause harm to the setting of nearby heritage assets.</p> <p>No need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is arising from this particular part of the Borough and therefore the Council is not convinced that these would be considered deliverable within the first five years of the plan period.</p>	None
008		GTRA(B) SA Assessment	<p>We are objecting to the site allocation option GTRA(B) because many of the assessments set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum are fundamentally flawed in a number of ways, as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access to Services, current score: 'X' (Negative) a. The assessment of the proposed site accurately states that there are no services – shops, schools, medical/dental provision – within walking distance of the proposed site, as Downham Market is 4.5 miles away, and alternative forms of transportation are not supported. As there are no pubs in West Dereham, the nearest opportunities for socialising/entertainment are in Downham Market. The bus service in place (buses 66 and 89) is also severely limited, providing a service once daily to Downham Market (66) and twice daily to Brandon (89). See Downham Market to West Dereham (rome2rio.com) The last bus stops in West Dereham at about 17:30, so after that time, vehicle transportation is required. b. The assessment refers to a bus stop as being within '800m' of the site. In fact, the bus stop referred to is currently unbuilt. The existing stop is 1,400m from the proposed development site, along a narrow, unlit road with no footpaths, and is unsafe for pedestrians, particularly after dark. This situation would be exacerbated by the building of the proposed site and the increased in the number of cars on Station Road and Basil Road. c. Those health and educational services that do exist in Downham Market are under severe pressure, with increasingly restricted number of school places and currently no availability of NHS dentistry. Proposed revised score: XX (Highly Negative)</li> <li>2. Community and Social, current score: '+/#' (Positive, Dependent on Implementation) a. There is no support (120 letters of objection and 2 neutral) for the proposed site among the local community (see 'Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Potential Sites and Policies Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Draft Interim Report' [January 2024], p. 31; Objective B.) As the assessment acknowledges, there are potential conflicts with neighbouring uses. No mitigation – such as screening – could reasonably be effective. The development does not 'contribute to healthy lifestyles', as identified in Item B of the Interim Report, as there is no</li> </ol>	Not specified	Yes	Thank you for your comments. The site assessment has been updated where appropriate.	None.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>realistic opportunity to encourage a shift from the use of private vehicles to other means of transportation. b. The proposed site is remote from any currently established Gypsy/Traveller sites, with consequent issues of isolation from community members. Proposed revised score: XX (Highly Negative)</p> <p>3. Economy A-Business – O – Neutral This current score probably accurately reflects that the proposed development of the site will likely have neutral impact.</p> <p>4. Economy B-Food Production – O – Neutral The proposed site is Grade 2 Agricultural Land. The loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land is contrary to national and local planning policies and should be avoided. See Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) See also appendix (figure 3) Proposed revised score: XX – Highly Negative to reflect this impact.</p> <p>5. Flood Risk: current score: ‘O’ (Neutral) The proposed site is within metres of Flood Zone 3, and to ensure the safety of future residents of the site a flood risk assessment would be necessary before any development was permitted. See Appendices - Figures 1 and 2 Proposed revised score: ? (Unknown)</p> <p>6. Heritage: current score: ‘O’ (Neutral) a. The proposed site is adjacent to the site of the medieval St Mary’s Abbey (Historic England Scheduled Monument, list no. 1020141. It is probable that stonework/remains of buildings that formed part of the abbey precinct lie beneath the soil. Archaeological investigation, including a geophysical survey, should be carried out, as any such work would be impossible if the site was built on. b. The unspoiled setting of the above-ground abbey remains, which includes a public footpath, would be negatively impacted by the development of the site, which would result in a loss of amenity. Proposed revised score: X (Negative)</p> <p>7. Highways and Transportation: current score ‘O’ (Neutral) a. The proposed site is described as ‘800m’ from a bus stop. This is not accurate – this bus stop has not been built. The nearest existing bus stop is at Church Road junction, 1,400m away, and access to it is along a road with no footpaths, and so is unsafe and inaccessible to wheelchair users, the infirm and people with prams. If the proposed site was developed, the number of vehicles on Station Road and Basil Road would be increased, so the hazard to pedestrians would be commensurately raised. The Officers’ report recognises this: “It can be estimated that a development such as a Gypsy/Traveller site with 10 plots could easily increase the vehicle movements by some 24%. This is on a single-track road, with limited passing places which regularly have vehicles parked in them. There are no streetlights or footpath. The risk of collision on a road which residents and school children are required to walk will increase significantly. b. The speed limit adjacent to the site to the south is 60mph (national speed limit) and to the north is 30mph. The danger posed by cars travelling at high speeds beyond the 30mph zone, and increased number of cars envisaged if the site is developed, would exacerbate the danger to non-vehicular road users. c. The officer’s report states that “The entrance to the proposed development site is on a slight bend, itself giving impaired vision for entering or leaving the site. The ability to turn tourer caravans into and out of this limited entrance would automatically be problematic”. d. The Highways Management Officer’s letter of 1st November 2023 states that “the proposed development conflicts with the aims of sustainable development” Proposed revised score: XX (Highly Negative)</p> <p>8. Landscape and Amenity: current score: ‘#’ (Dependent on implementation) a. West Dereham is a linear village comprised predominantly of a combination of housing in stone and brick, some dating from the 17th, grouped in clusters and isolated in the agricultural landscape in a pattern characteristic of the area. The proposed development of static units and caravans would stand out in style and design, and have a negative impact on what is otherwise a harmonious rural landscape. It would potentially be visible from the public right of way passing through the site of St Mary’s Abbey. b. The increased traffic associated with 10 new dwellings on Station Road (each with at least one vehicle, and potentially more) would come with an increase in noise,</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>vehicle emissions and danger to household pets on the road, which will impact chiefly the residents of Station Road, Church Road and Basil Road. A scheme of mitigation should be submitted for approval before any development is approved. The proposed revised score reflects the probability of negative impact on the village and surrounding landscape and loss of amenity associate with development in this rural area.</p> <p>Proposed revised score: X/ XX (Negative or Highly Negative)</p> <p>9. Natural Environment: current score ‘#’ (Dependent on implementation) The landscape surrounding the proposed site is home to or within the hunting range of a number of species of birds and animals, some of them protected, including pipistrelle and brown long-eared bats, barn owls and tawny owls. It is highly probably that the proposed development, with attendant light pollution, disturbance and noise levels associated with human habitation, will have an impact on habitat and feeding habits of the species that thrive in the area. Mitigation is partial and unproven – ‘wildlife-sensitive’ lighting would be ineffective in mitigating the impact of the increased road traffic on wildlife, particularly barn owls, which fly low to hunt and are vulnerable to collision with traffic. Proposed revised score: #/X (Dependent on implementation/Negative)</p> <p>10. Infrastructure and Waste, current score: XX (Highly Negative) The current score accurately reflects the acute issues presented by the drainage conditions at the site.</p> <p>11. Climate Change: current score ‘?/#’ (Unknown/Dependent on implementation) Meeting carbon emission targets is central to UK government policy and development should only take place where sustainability is clearly demonstrable. The Sustainability Appraisal rightly states that ‘climate impacts will depend on how the site is implemented’. The location of the proposed site (effectively 4.5 miles from amenities and services (Downham Market) means there is no realistic prospect that the proposed site will be able to site of advance sustainability goals towards net zero as the occupants will be heavily reliant on private motor vehicles. Proposed revised score: XX (Highly Negative).</p> <p>Conclusion: It is recognised that there is a locally identified need for gypsy and traveller sites in the area. However, the cumulative impact of the recommended revisions to the proposed site’s assessment scores would result in the site scoring extremely badly in the sustainability appraisal, making it wholly unsuitable for allocation for development of any kind. The sheer number of constraints against the proposed site means that it is completely unsuitable to accommodate any number of gypsy and traveller plots as these cannot reasonably be mitigated.</p>				
010		GT42, GT66 and GT67	Further assessment has been advised by Natural England with regard to proximity to designated sites (SPA and SSSIs). Until the HRA or SSSI impact assessment has been conducted the SA scoring for Natural Environment should be ‘Unknown/?’	Not specified	No	Agree to change to Unknown/?	Remove GT42 from the consultation document.
011		Policy A	<p>Since 2011 there has been a policy failure of the KLWNBC to provide accommodation for Gypsy / Travellers. Policy CS09 in the Core Strategy 2011 sought to make 146 pitches available between 2006 and 2011 with an annual compound increase of 3% to for the period 2011 – 2021. This would equate to a total supply of about 202 pitches. The level of supply made by the Council is unclear, particularly as ORS identified to the KLWNBC in 2016 that it only needed to provide 5 pitches between 2016 – 2036. ORS in 2023 have identified to the KLWNBC that they need to make land available for at least 102 pitches immediately and that about 200 pitches would be required by 2039. KLWNBC following an additional Gypsy / Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) by ORS is seeking to make accommodation for Gypsy / Travellers. The provision proposed is based on a flawed GTAA provided to KLWNBC to ORS. KLWNBC appears to have proposed that part of policy LP28 in the Local Plan Review 2016 – 2033 is replaced with a new Policy A.</p> <p>Policy A proposes that: a) accommodation on existing Gypsy / Travellers sites is intensified (Policy A3); b) some pitches and sites that are tolerated are granted planning permission (Policy A4) c) new sites are granted planning</p>	Not specified	Yes	The Council’s Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment is not subject to this consultation. It has been produced independently in line with the provisions of National Planning Policy. The GTAA provides the Council with an accommodation need to deliver over the Plan period. This, like, with other evidence base documents, provides a snapshot in time and it is likely that additional accommodation needs will arise over the Plan period. To manage any additional need, the Council is proposing several criteria-based planning policies to help support any additional accommodations needs as they arise as windfall development.	None.



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>permission (Policy A5) That if Policies A3, A4 and A5 are unable to provide the required level of accommodation that this is provided in Broad Locations for Growth (Policy A6)</p> <p>It is unlikely that the provision identified in Policies A3, A4, A5 and A6 will meet the need for Gypsy / Traveller accommodation required Associated with Policy A is a site assessment document [F56], a sustainability review [B10] and a strategic flood risk assessment [F57].</p> <p>The site assessment document is not comprehensive.</p> <p>The site assessment document is already being rejected by the development control function of KLWNBC, and is claiming that sites that were screened for the site assessment document were not correctly screened. This is shown at Tab 45. Decisions already clarified by the Secretary of State in appeals are being used to recommend sites are refused planning permission (i.e. sustainability) contained in the site assessment document, and that issues that were not considered material have become material in the view of the LPA development control function. This is shown at Tab 46.</p> <p>There is dispute in relation to other sites shown at Tab 47 that assessment criteria are being used consistently. There is strong dispute that in application 23/01067/FM - Land S of 14 And SE of 18 Cottons Head Outwell Norfolk, the highways function of Norfolk County Council is assessing road traffic issues in a standard way. It is unlikely that proposed Policy A will be possible to realise at the Local Level particularly for new sites.</p> <p>The ONS in December 2022 produced a report Gypsies and Travellers lived experiences, homes, England and Wales:2022. This is shown at Tab 48. The report identifies that public site provision is mainly of a slum standard, and that there is a shortage of accommodation. There have been value for money reports produced for KLWNBC to accompany planning applications for eight sites. Two of these are shown at Tab 49.</p> <p>It had been the intention to produce a value for money report for the KLWNBC site borough. This is not feasible as it is apparent that the majority of sites that KLWNBC have identified are suitable for development shall be rejected at the development control level.</p> <p>The Inspectors for the Local Plan Review wrote to the KLWNBC on 20 June 2023 and identified work that needed to be undertaken to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsy / Travellers, and in acting in this way secure the Local Plan Review. This is shown at Tab 50.</p> <p>The 2013 GTAA undertaken by ORS for KLWNBC was deeply flawed;</p> <p>The 2023 GTAA undertaken by ORS for KLWNBC was deeply flawed;</p> <p>c. The Secretary of State changed the definition of Gypsy / Traveller contained in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) in December 2023. This has not been taken into account by KLWNBC</p> <p>d. KLWNBC have based their revised policy (Policy A) for Gypsy / Traveller Sites on flawed information, and have undertaken a considerable amount of work. It is unclear if KLWNBC are seeking revisions to Policy LP28 contained in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>e. The KLWNBC has chosen to reject its draft Policy A when considering planning applications after its publication.</p> <p>f. The KLWNBC has failed to identify clear and transparent standards for sustainability (access to services) and highways and as a result arbitrary decision making has occurred.</p> <p>g. It is unlikely that the KLWNBC is able to produce a Local Plan until it has entered into a statement of common ground with the Environment Agency, developed required standards (access to services and highways), and sought to follow its own draft policies.</p> <p>h. It is very unlikely that the KLWNBC will be able to provide a 5 year supply of specific deliverable sites until it has a robust and credible GTAA and acts consistently in both its policy and development control functions.</p>			<p>These policies have been developed in line with National Planning Policy and have been subject to consultation.</p>	

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>There is no doubt that a substantial element of the need for accommodation for Gypsy / Travellers in KLWNBC can be resolved through intensification of existing family sites and approval of unauthorised sites. This does not resolve the problem of establishing new sites that in particular meet the needs of young family's. Young family sites are normally.</p> <p>Due to policy failures dating from 2011 there has been demand for Gypsy / Traveller accommodation develop. People have been displaced, and have become similar to 'refugees'. Accommodation provided at the Saddlebow Site is in slum condition.</p> <p>It is unclear as to what compensation the KLWNBC intends to provide to those it failed to provide land that could be used for accommodation due to the flawed 2016 GTAA on which the Local Plan Review was based when submitted to the Secretary of State and/or the compensation that the Secretary of State intends to impose on the KLWNBC for breaches of equalities and human rights legislation caused through procurement of flawed GTAA's.</p> <p>It is likely that the Local Plan Review will need to be stayed whilst additional work is carried out on the KLWNBC Gypsy / Traveller studies. The alternative would be production of a Development Plan Document this is likely to increase violations of Equality and Human Rights through use of the Local Plan Review.</p>				
012		All Sites	<p>Historic England has concerns about sites GTRA (B), GT43 and F3.1. Further details in relation to each of these sites is set out in the table below. We suggest that these sites are either deleted or that a brief heritage impact assessment (HIA) is undertaken to understand the potential impacts on heritage, the suitability of the site per se and if found suitable any potential mitigation/enhancement and revised policy wording. The site profiles and Sustainability Appraisal need updating to more properly reflect potential impacts on heritage assets. We broadly welcome criterion 8f which references impacts on heritage assets. We suggest that this is slightly re-worded to read: '...have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity and/or heritage assets and their settings, and use boundary treatments and screening materials which are sympathetic to the existing urban or rural form' We have some concerns that the sites are just listed in a table in the policy. There is currently no provision for policy criteria for individual sites in relation to potential mitigation/enhancements. The NPPF (para 16d) makes it clear that Plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react development proposals. Further advice on the content of policies is given in the PPG at Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 61-002-20190315 Revision date: 15 03 2019. It states that, 'Where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interested parties about the nature and scale of development'. Historic England's Advice Note on Site Allocations HEAN3 includes a section on site allocation policies at paragraphs 3.1 – 3.2. It states, 'The level of detail required in a site allocation policy will depend on aspects such as the nature of the development proposed and the size and complexity of the site. However, it ought to be detailed enough to provide information on what is expected, where it will happen on the site and when development will come forward including phasing. Mitigation and enhancement measures identified as part of the site selection process and evidence gathering are best set out within the policy to ensure that these are implemented. We therefore suggest that either there should be a policy for each site or the table in policy A should include a column for any site specific criteria including any mitigation and enhancement measures.</p>	<p>For sites GTRA (B), GT43 and F3.1, either delete site or prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment to inform suitability of the sites and, if found suitable, any policy wording. Update site profiles and sustainability appraisal for these 3 sites. We suggest that either there should be a policy for each site or the table in policy A should include a column for any site-specific criteria.</p> <p>We suggest that this is slightly re-worded to read: '...have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity and/or heritage assets and their</p>	Yes	<p>The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.</p>	Remove sites GT43, GTRA(B) and F3.1 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
				settings, and use boundary treatments and screening materials which are sympathetic to the existing urban or rural form			
013		Not Specified	In their role as a navigation authority, the Commissioners recognise that there is a need for residential moorings/houseboats in the navigable system and that this need is likely to increase as more people instigate life changes that result in them exchanging permanent or temporary housing for residing on a boat. The Commissioners are not a Planning Authority and cannot therefore grant permission for residential moorings. Any land owned by the Commissioners tends to be the watercourse and channel profiles only and cannot, therefore, nominate sites, as part of the Call for Sites process which limits what can be delivered without the involvement of third party land owners. In our role as a navigation authority, it is requested that the Commissioners, the Well Creek Trust and respective Parish Councils are involved in the allocation and subsequent processing of planning applications made to the Borough Council for residential moorings/houseboat sites. Any "site" may potentially need the Commissioners prior written consent and any vessel needs to be suitably licensed with underpinning insurance and boat safety certification.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None.
014		GT43	Reference GT43 Homefield, Common Road, Walton Highway. This site has an enforcement order on it, the residents haven't yet left, why on earth has it been flagged up as a potential site. Included in this email are two neighbours to the site.	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.
015		GT67	I strongly object to traveller site proposal. This is a quiet, close knit community with a primary school a stones throw away. This site is in the middle of syderstone, blenheim park and wicken green and is at the only access road to blemheim Park and wicken green. Every child will have to pass this to get to school! This will significantly lower the appeal of our area, lower lower house values and increase our insurances once the crime increases. I for one will not feel safe letting my young children out alone and will certainly be re thinking my home security. I understand not all people act the same but I have seen enough bad behaviour from these groups to be extremely worried, scared and anxious or their arrival. We've all seen crime rates increase when they visit and most goes unsolved. The most recent proven example being their attacks on Cromer in late 2017. There is an abundance of crop fields here and I worry that more will follow unlawfully. Why do we need this when fakenham has 2 large sites 7miles away???!	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.  Any future planning applications for this site will be considered against relevant Policies within the Local Plan.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
016		GT67	I Strongly Object to GT67 Llamados, Sysderstone, (Reference from F55 and F56 documents), which is currently a Tolerated Travelling Showman's yard of 1 plot, becoming an authorised plot or being extended in any way. The current 1 plot on this Tolerated site (paragraph 6.1 of GTAA June 2023) is offensive to all residents of Syderstone and Wicken Green. It devalues the permanent residential housing which has undergone redevelopment in recent years. There has never been any attempt to fence off or tidy up this large corner plot at a 'T' junction with high traffic movements and high visibility for the local community. This Tolerated, derelict, single plot achieves quite the opposite of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 Chapter 12 'Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places' and fails to meet the 2015 Planning Policy for Travellers 3.13 (a) promote peaceful and integrated co-	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the	Review the planning status of the site and review the SA outcome in relation to the Townscape and the Locally

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>existence between the site and local community. J1 Summary of Representations Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (October 2023) Appendix E:Site and Yard List Figure 6 states that The Elms in South Creake (3 miles from Syderstone) is their main area of concern. It says "The Elms, South Creake – Main area of concern. Horrified to note that The Elms South Creake has apparently permission for 10 undeveloped pitches, this area of land has been under appeal numerous times and enforcement and has been deemed to be abandoned it has been a source of considerable nuisance to local residents how has this happened?' This site very near to Syderstone demonstrates the nuisance to local residents and the apparent lack of control by the Council and Planning department. I do not want a repeat of this situation in Syderstone. I note there are 10 undeveloped pitches on The Elms plot so an alternative to developing Syderstone would be to develop the 10 existing pitches at The Elms in South Creake and manage it appropriately. Documents F55 and F56 Reference GT67 Llamados Syderstone, the summary states 'the site has some identified constraints that could be overcome through mitigation' Planning status 'Authorised'. Firstly, there is no mitigation plan submitted with the assessment, secondly the assessment has no evidence base and lastly, the term Authorised is misleading because the site has neither permanent nor temporary planning permission. It is Tolerated (term provided by Planning Dept with no legal definition for that term). I disagree that the site has a neutral impact on the Townscape and the Locally Significant Landscape. As described above it is in a prominent large open corner position at a T junction, surrounded by improving and new build properties. The assessment acknowledges that the site is immediately next to residential dwellings and could have issues of compatibility with neighbouring uses. Again, no mitigation plan is provided, residents have not received letters about this proposed development and as described above, there are enormous resident nuisance issues with The Elms at South Creake, just 3 miles away. I believe that if Llamados is approved for development, under the current 5 year plan for pitches and plots, it will accelerate into more pitches and plots before 2039 as detailed in Figure 9, Page 40 of GTAA 2023.</p>			<p>GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.</p> <p>Concerns related to the Sustainability Appraisal will be reviewed as part of finalising the Sustainability Appraisal following the consultation.</p> <p>The Planning status of the site will be reviewed to make sure it is correct moving forward.</p>	<p>Significant Landscape.</p> <p>Remove GT67 from the consultation document.</p>
017		GT67	<p>I Strongly Object to GT67 Llamados, Sysderstone, (Reference from F55 and F56 documents), which is currently a Tolerated Travelling Showman's yard of 1 plot, becoming an authorised plot or being extended in any way. The current 1 plot on this Tolerated site (paragraph 6.1 of GTAA June 2023) is offensive to all residents of Syderstone and Wicken Green. It devalues the permanent residential housing which has undergone redevelopment in recent years. There has never been any attempt to fence off or tidy up this large corner plot at a 'T' junction with high traffic movements and high visibility for the local community. This Tolerated, derelict, single plot achieves quite the opposite of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 Chapter 12 'Achieving Well Designed and Beautiful Places' and fails to meet the 2015 Planning Policy for Travellers 3.13 (a) promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and local community. J1 Summary of Representations Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (October 2023) Appendix E:Site and Yard List Figure 6 states that The Elms in South Creake (3 miles from Syderstone) is their main area of concern. It says "The Elms, South Creake – Main area of concern. Horrified to note that The Elms South Creake has apparently permission for 10 undeveloped pitches, this area of land has been under appeal numerous times and enforcement and has been deemed to be abandoned it has been a source of considerable nuisance to local residents how has this happened?' This site very near to Syderstone demonstrates the nuisance to local residents and the apparent lack of control by the Council and Planning department. I do not want a repeat of this situation in Syderstone. I note there are 10 undeveloped pitches on The Elms plot so an alternative to developing Syderstone would be to develop the 10 existing pitches at The Elms in South Creake and manage it appropriately. Documents F55 and F56 Reference GT67 Llamados Syderstone, the summary states 'the site has some identified constraints that could be overcome through mitigation' Planning status 'Authorised'. Firstly there is no mitigation plan submitted with the assessment, secondly the assessment has no evidence base and lastly, the term Authorised is misleading because the site has neither permanent nor temporary planning permission. It is Tolerated (term provided by Planning Dept with no legal definition for that term). I disagree that the site has a neutral impact on the Townscape and the Locally Significant Landscape. As described above it is in a prominent large open corner position at a T junction, surrounded by improving and new build properties. The assessment acknowledges that the site is immediately next to residential dwellings and could have issues of compatibility with neighbouring uses. Again no mitigation plan is provided, residents have not received letters about this proposed development and as described above, there are enormous resident nuisance issues with The Elms at South Creake, just 3 miles away. I believe that if Llamados is approved for development, under the current 5 year plan for pitches and plots, it will accelerate into more pitches and plots before 2039 as detailed in Figure 9, Page 40 of GTAA 2023.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.</p> <p>Concerns related to the Sustainability Appraisal will be reviewed as part of finalising the Sustainability Appraisal following the consultation.</p> <p>The Planning status of the site will be reviewed to make sure it is correct moving forward.</p>	<p>Review the planning status of the site and review the SA outcome in relation to the Townscape and the Locally Significant Landscape.</p> <p>Remove GT67 from the consultation document.</p>
018		GTRA(E)	<p>I object to the proposed Gypsy and Travellers site at Blackborough End for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No public transport or other amenities such retail outlets within 800m or 10min walking from site.</li> </ol>	Not specified	No	<p>GTRA(E) did not form part of this consultation in terms of it being identified as a potential site. The size of the site would likely</p>	None.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Significant impact on the character of the area and will overwhelm existing village.</li> <li>3. Flood risk zone. Previous planning applications have identified the area waterlogged and unsuitable for building.</li> <li>4. Water lane too narrow and is only single direction for large vehicles with trailers/caravans.</li> <li>5. Sandy lane access/ egress from the site is on a rise in the road and on a bend making it dangerous to exit or enter the site. Highlighted as unsuitable in a previous planning application.</li> <li>6. There is a Roman archeological site within the site.</li> <li>7. There is insufficient supply of potable water or electricity to the site and no sewage waste disposal. The existing pumping works for the village is already close to capacity.</li> <li>8. In conclusion, the site is totally unsuitable for further development.</li> </ol>			have a negative impact on the character of this part of Blackborough End and therefore is not being considered at this stage.	
019		GTRA(E), GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I have only just seen this, and I live right in between both sites. And this would impact on my house in and life in a big way. Also have a big effect on the village and roads that surround it. So as one of the people who would be living the closest to this, I would not be happy with it going ahead. Thank you	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
020		GTRA(E)	I object to the proposed sites in Blackborough End as it is a small Hamlet and the sites are unsuitable for the area. Sandy Lane and Water Lane are totally unsuitable for heavy traffic such as caravans and lorries and there is no amenities within the village.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. The Council has consulted the Highway Authority about the capacity and safety of the road affected.	None.
021		GTRA(m), GTRA(N) GTRA(L)	I object to the proposed sites in Blackborough End due to it being a small Hamlet which cannot accommodate an increase in people and traffic and there are no facilities in the village.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document
022		GTRA(E)	I object to the proposed sites in Blackborough End as it is classified as a small Hamlet and the sites would spoil the nature of the area. Also, Water Lane is unsuitable for heavy traffic such as caravans and lorries.	Not specified	Yes	<p>GTRA(E) did not form part of this consultation in terms of it being identified as a potential site. The size of the site would likely have a negative impact on the character of this part of Blackborough End and therefore is not being considered at this stage.</p> <p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to</p>	None.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
023		GTRA(E), GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	GTRA (E), GTRA (L), GTRA (M) & GTRA (N) all sit within a site bounded by Water Lane, Sandy Lane and Satch Road, Blackborough End. The assessment document identifies GTRA (E) as unsuitable, based largely on assessment against access, accessibility to core services, townscape, transport/roads and compatibility with neighbouring/ adjoining uses.	Not specified	Yes	<p>GTRA(E) did not form part of this consultation in terms of it being identified as a potential site. The size of the site would likely have a negative impact on the character of this part of Blackborough End and therefore is not being considered at this stage.</p> <p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
024		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I do not wish to invite the gypsy or traveller community into our village, having had previous experience of such communities, the crime rate increases, property prices decrease and the waste pollutes the environment locally. Please allow our rural community to remain quiet and crimeless as it is today	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
025		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My feedback is about all 3 sites. Reading what has been proposed puts worry, anxiety and also concern. We recently joined the village due to its location, tranquillity, safety. What is proposed is compromising all of this, there is a strong correlation with travellers and thefts, crime and this will devalue our property which we have spent so much money in achieving. In addition there will be added traffic in a small village and we will be losing our environmental spaces. There is so much wildlife around the village and this can impact habitat of farm birds which are already in decline. There is already a smell from the tip at times, there are no plans of drainage which is another concern especially as the village does flood also. We did not move into small villages to have this disturbance and potential crime, this is not appropriate nor what Norfolk villages represent. Sandy Lane already has restricted access...this will add more to the problem. This should not be accepted and sights which are not surrounded by villages should be looked at where it will not impact village living. We cannot be investing in our properties to have it devalued by this decision, this is not appropriate at all. - impact on the habitat in these spaces - there is no drainage on any of these sites, what happens to the waste? - Blackborough ends watercourse is overloaded and we already have flooding - detrimental impact on small village life - restricted access on Sandy Lane, can't handle more traffic	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
026		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to the opposed site because Middleton is a small village mostly of older people. I feel that with a large traveler site this will significantly increase "tree surgeons" in the area potentially taking advantage of the older people within our community. I also think it will highly impact crimes as in thefts of people's belongings and tools and equipment. Myself and many others I have said if the traveler site was to go ahead then they wouldn't feel safe within the community and worry that things would go missing and/or be stolen! I understand not all travellers and gypsy people are the same but unfortunately the majority are.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
027		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to all 3 locations Reasons - Small village centre location Traffic increase Crime increase House prices devalue Fly-tipping increase Wildlife on that piece of land will decrease Not sufficient drainage	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
028		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	These sites would not be in keeping with the local community, lack of amenities & public transport, added noise and disturbance in a quiet hamlet. And would also suffer from the same access issues which has halted planning being permitted in the past. Also we often see bats, deer, foxes, owls & other wildlife inhabiting this land.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
029		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My comments relate to all 3 of the sites identified above. As a nearby resident, I object most strongly to this suggested change of use. The site is wholly inappropriate for such use, being surrounded by private dwellings and I suspect the submission is not serious, It is purely a bit of mischief making by the landowner concerned to create unrest with the local residents. He has had numerous planning applications turned down in recent years and if the site is not appropriate for residential development, it cannot be suitable for this suggested use for the same reasons. I also suspect that this is a tactic that once the site is rejected, yet another planning application will be submitted by the landowner for residential development knowing that this would be better received by the local residents than a traveller's site. The sites are not appropriate because of the significant adverse impact they would have on the character of the area due to then being located centrally within the small Hamlet of Blackborough End and surrounded by residential properties. The infrastructure including the roads are not suitable and there is a serious problem with surface water drainage (See previous planning applications for residential development on these sites). Site GTRA(M) is also directly over the site of the remains of a medieval moat. Previous planning applications have been refused citing the existence of these remains of historic significance. My concern is also the effect this proposal will have on local property values. If the site was to be allocated then there is likely to be a mass compensation claim made to the Borough Council for the loss of value of numerous properties together with applications to lower the Council Tax banding. This will clearly have financial implications for the Borough Council.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage. However, when allocating all those existing sites where a direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision has arisen through the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Assessment (GTAA), the Council still has a remaining five-year unmet need to allocate within the Local Plan. To help meet this unmet need, the Council has assessed all available sites, including all reasonable alternative that have been submitted to the Council such as the sites at Blackborough End. GTRA(E) was previously discounted due to its size and impact on character. GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) would have a similar impact individually. GTRA(L) is a smaller site that is directly adjacent to the existing linear built form of this part of the settlement and therefore would have a more limited impact on the character of the area. The site is also directly adjacent to access to the highway and any surface water drainage could be accommodated through existing drainage infrastructure. In addition, the site is within close proximity to the Primary School at Middleton. Therefore, the Council believe that on balance, allocating GTRA(L) will both help contribute towards meeting the needs for Gypsy and Traveller</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						<p>provision in the Local Pla and limit the impact on the character of the settlement. The Council recommend that site GTRA(L) is allocated for 2/3 pitches and associated infrastructure. A site-specific policy will be produced to help manage the future development of the site.</p> <p>The other three sites are also subject to such consultation. A revised Site Assessment document will include the 3 new sites.</p>	
030		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>My comments relate to all 3 parcels of land. The two small villages of Middleton and Blackborough End have, together, just one small shop and only a small primary school, which according to Ofsted is already struggling to provide effective education to the existing school roll, let alone having to cope with more children that are likely to be irregular attendees. There are no other amenities or meaningful employment opportunities locally. The proposed sites are located by/on roads that are narrow in places and with some areas prone to regular surface/rainwater flooding. Access on to the nearest trunk road, the A47, is a known accident blackspot so increasing turning traffic can only exacerbate that risk. Access to all other roads, A10 and A134 is only possible via small rural lanes with little or no safe route provisions for pedestrians. On at least one of the sites, previous applications to use it for holiday accommodation, including pitches for touring caravans and cabins, has been refused, so it is unclear why it being used as a travellers site in future could be deemed acceptable? This seems contradictory. I acknowledge that it is necessary for such sites to be made available but this must be where there is the prospect of meaningful and practical support and amenities being available. Otherwise, this risks locations resulting in isolation from community and health services, which are likely to be key service needs to the intended users of the sites. These villages do not currently provide full facility and support to all existing residents so there is no prospect of being able to do so for a greater number, particularly with the likelihood of this including more families with young children.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
031		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>The impact on house prices in and around the surrounding area More traffic in a small village Losing a lot or our environmental spaces The obvious impact on the local habitat in these spaces Where will all of the drainage and sewerage go as there is none The detrimental effect on small village life</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>Noted. The Council has consulted other relevant statutory organisations to seek their input on the constraints identified for the sites.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
032		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I strongly object to all three parcels of land to be developed into Gypsy &amp; Traveller sites GTRA(L) ,GTRA(M) &amp;GTRA(N) in the small village of Blackborough End.The village is not equipped for such an influx of people and the Gypsy and Traveller sites would have a massive impact on the roads as they're inadequate for any extra traffic, they are narrow and winding and would not cope with more vehicles and peoples safety should be considered. The local school is small so would not have extra places for schooling Gypsy &amp; Travellers. The local health centres are full to capacity and its near on impossible to get an appointment for existing residence. i would also like to point out that we need to have more green spaces for insects and wildlife, and we should not fill them with people and the three sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) &amp;GTRA(N) Gypsy and Traveller site would be disastrous on the nature found there. I strongly object to the planned GYPSY &amp; TRAVELLER site in Blackborough end as feel the village totally unsuitable for this plan.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p> <p>The other three sites are also subject to such consultation. A revised Site Assessment document will include the 3 new sites.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
033		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>All three are an outrage. The roads are not capable of facilitating the traffic already , I have lived in blackborough end for 44 years. It's a lovely little village peaceful and safe. Why on earth would anybody wish to destroy that. Unbelievable .</p>	Not specified	No	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
							consultation document.
034		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>My listed concerns relate to all of the proposed 3 sites and are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Having lived in the area for many years I am aware that the sites contain several natural springs. The water table is also very high. So any levelling off of the ground, which would be required to make the site suitable, would inevitably result in a disruption to the water drainage and a consequent increased risk of water damage/flooding to neighbouring properties and roads.</li> <li>2. There is already a lot of traffic passing through the village, including many heavy goods vehicles and farm vehicles. Further large vehicles needing access would cause a significant traffic flow problem.</li> <li>3. The majority of properties in the village are accessed directly from the main village roads. There is also a primary School nearby with access immediately onto the road and on any day there are usually several children walking/cycling through the village. This together with my concern 2) would result in an increased public safety risk. There are limited public footpaths within the village and none bordering the proposed sites.</li> <li>4. The proposed sites lie right at the centre of the village and could cause a property devaluation. This would be especially true if there was an increased reported crime rate.</li> <li>5. Whilst understanding of the need, a site at the edge of a village with better access would be more suitable.</li> </ol>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p> <p>The other three sites are also subject to such consultation. A revised Site Assessment document will include the 3 new sites.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
035		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I wish to place on record my strong objection to the potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites at Blackborough End, GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N). The lack of transparency in this assessment period is of great concern as members of the local parish council have not been informed about these potential developments and it is only through local word-of-mouth that others have been briefed. The potential site location GTRA(L) has already been deemed to be unsuitable, and likewise the locations L, M and N should be found to be unsuitable for almost identical reasons. I wish to object to the proposal as I believe that this site is completely unsuitable for members of the gypsy and travelling communities. The proposed site and associated facilities in Middleton and Blackborough End would not be suitable nor meet the needs of the gypsy and travelling community, nor the existing communities of Middleton and Blackborough End for the following reasons; Shops/conveniences access – There is a very limited number and range of small shops within the village. The village's convenience store/post office is only really for essentials and small items if you have run out completely. The nearest supermarket is in Kings Lynn 4.3 miles away (assessed by Google Maps), accessed by the A47 via School Road or the A10 via Setch Road. Therefore, if a Gypsy and Traveller site were to be established on this site it would result in a sharp increase in the use of cars and other vehicles in the local area to allow residents of the G&amp;T site to obtain their provisions from supermarkets in remote towns or to reach places of employment. Vehicle access is already an important consideration in this area due to heavy vehicles and farm machinery. The primary school that is located just before the turning to get onto the A47 (crucial in travelling into Kings Lynn) has already implemented time specific speed limits in order to safeguard the children and families accessing the school which are unfortunately regularly exceeded already. Following on from increased road traffic, noise levels are also of significant concern; there are numerous small farms and homesteads in the area with domesticated and farming animals that enjoy the peaceful environment and quiet ambience here along with their owners. In particular, there are a significant number of well-established horse stables for whom the peace and quiet contribute to their overall wellbeing greatly. There is a lack of clarity on who will be responsible for running and maintaining the site and any details re the proposed length of stay. Who would be paying for it? Who would be responsible for maintenance and clean up of the area following the stay of unclear duration? Who would be responsible for making sure the biodiversity and cleanliness of the area is maintained and that the numerous local wildlife populations are not affected? Will it fall upon the local council tax payers to cover the costs? The proposed site at GTRA(E) was rejected due to the potential impact on the townscape and was found likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located on the edge of the village and abodes. The proposed site is also large and its development for gypsy and traveller accommodation are extremely likely to overbear the built form and ambience of the existing settlement. These conditions also apply to GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) which sets a precedent. Upon reading the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document [F56] it would appear amount of pitches does not satisfy the requirements of the Gypsy/Traveler community and runs the risk of overflow to the adjacent area. The site location GTRA(M) also has a significant risk of water incursion that has apparently not been taken into account. Its presence is neatly demonstrated by the name "WATER LANE". The local roads are completely unsuitable for this sort of site establishment — there will be a sharp increase in traffic and due to few</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p> <p>The other three sites are also subject to such consultation. A revised Site Assessment document will include the 3 new sites.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			walkable pavements, there is very likely to be a precipitous increase in RTAs and injuries, especially considering dangerous access points. These points could of course be developed to reduce the risk, however this sort of development will certainly have a detrimental impact on local wildlife such as the muntjac population. Have the gypsy/traveller population even been consulted on the potential site establishment and its suitability? For all of the reasons above, I must strongly object to the establishment of any gypsy/traveller site on any of the three proposed locations in this area and what will be a deleterious result for all parties involved				
036		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	- added traffic in a small village - losing our environmental spaces - impact on the habitat in these spaces - there is no drainage on any of these sites, what happens to the waste? - Blackborough ends watercourse is overloaded and we already have flooding - detrimental impact on small village life - restricted access on Sandy Lane, can't handle more traffic - increased flooding - Crime, burglary and anti social behavior impacting residents - Vulnerable local residents	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
037		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My husband and I object to the proposal of the Gypsy, Traveller sites in the hamlet of Blackborough End for the reasons stated below. 1. Our main reason is that our property in Setch Road is prone to flooding from surface water which drains down from other properties and roads. This a real problem for us as we have to get specialist help and have even had a tanker come on two occasions to take water away. Before any more properties are built in the area, all the surface water drains need to be cleaned out and improved. There is a large puddle on the bend of Sandy Lane at the junction with Water Lane and adjacent to GTRA(N) and over the years we have been here that proposed site has flooded. Water Lane adjacent to GTRA(M) is running with water every time it rains and the ditch along side it is full even in summer. Sewage pipes have flooded our neighbours garden in Setch Road on one occasion. In fact the whole area's sewage and surface water drains need to be updated before ANY new planning permissions are permitted, this includes Gypsy and Travellers sites. 2. The roads in Blackborough End around the proposed sites are very narrow with poor visibility and it is important to give consideration to access points as the road is bendy adjacent to proposed sites and it would be a hazard to drivers.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
038		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Referring to all 3 sites I OBJECT to these proposals. The local infrastructure is not suitable at all. The area being a very quiet village, there are no amenities such as shops the local school is too small to accommodate a large influx of children the roads are too small to cope with the accompanying increase in traffic a considerable amount of which may prove to be commercial. The dangers to local residents due to this would be considerable and with an increasingly aged population the disruption caused by the inevitable increase in noise and possible anti social behaviour would be intolerable. Finally in my opinion house prices would be seriously adversely affected as the area which is popular with retirees because of its current quiet and sleepy status and this status would doubtless be destroyed	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	To produce a site assessment for the new sites identified through the consultation period.
039		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Having read through all the information relating to all proposed sites I don't feel that any of the sites are adequate to accommodate the Gypsy Traveller community. The impact on the green spaces the noise impact on existing residential properties is a huge concern. Many of the travelling community utilise their outdoor space for working. The road infrastructure is insufficient to carry vans and caravans. The roads are narrow and struggle to support the	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to	To produce a site assessment for the new sites identified

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>traffic that presently use it. Drainage is poor and the additional hard standing areas required would further add to the run off issues that are already apparent and dangerous. The Borough have deemed site GTRA(E) unsuitable and having read through the documentation the other three locations have the same concerns. I strongly object and feel that there are more suitable locations within the borough for a Gypsy Traveller site. Why not increase the size of the one presently used? Property values will most certainly be affected if these sites were approved. I urge a member of the council to inspect the road infrastructure and the sorry state of the drainage post haste. Climate change will continue to impact. There are no street lights or safe pedestrian paths on some routes. There will be increased traffic throughout the day from these sites. The remaining 3 sites are not suitable and should not be considered. Traffic use the Setch and Wormegay as a cut through from the A47. I envisage this to increase in volume when the new A47 A10 link road is under construction. The roads are already in a terrible state.</p>			<p>the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	through the consultation period
040		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I object to this proposition for the following reasons The traffic on school Road is already busy and fast, the school is in dire need of speed bumps and a safe crossing space. With large boost in people living here, this is only going to get worse. It would be helpful if someone from the council actually came at school times to see the people speeding passed the school and putting the children at risk. We are already facing terrible financial hardship without any government assistance, should the proposal go ahead, house prices will drop and we will struggle even more. This is a small village with lots of open space and wildlife. Not every piece of land needs to have something on it. I believe the wild animals that reside her will suffer and more pets and wild animals being injured on the roads once their space has been taken. We don't have many local recourses as it is, if definitely can't be stretched any further. The school is already closed due to flooding and lead paint! The proposed areas also often flood, there is no drainage at all, once people and vehicles start going over it it's going to damage the land and cause injuries. Sandy land traffic is already a nightmare, these roads were not built for heavy traffic. We struggle to walk around the village, mist roads have only one path, some have none. Council vehicles in particular are always flooding these paths and causing people and children to walk on the road, how will people move around the village once the traffic flow increases?</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The local Highway Authority has been informed for these new sites and the Borough Council is awaiting feedback on highway safety and capacity.</p> <p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage. However, when allocating all those existing sites where a direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision has arisen through the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Assessment (GTAA), the Council still has a remaining five-year unmet need to allocate within the Local Plan. To help meet this unmet need, the Council has assessed all available sites, including all reasonable alternative that have been submitted to the Council such as the sites at Blackborough End.</p> <p>GTRA(E) was previously discounted due to its size and impact on character. GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) would have a similar impact individually. GTRA(L) is a smaller site that is directly adjacent to the existing linear built form of this part of the settlement and therefore would have a more limited impact on the character of the area. The site is also directly adjacent to access to the highway and any surface water drainage could be accommodated through existing drainage infrastructure. In addition, the site is within close proximity to the Primary School at Middleton.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council believe that on balance, allocating GTRA(L) will both help contribute towards meeting the needs for Gypsy and Traveller provision in the Local Pla and limit the impact on the character of the settlement. The Council recommend that site GTRA(L) is allocated for 2/3 pitches and associated infrastructure. A site-specific policy will be produced to help manage the future development of the site.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
041		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I'm objecting to all 3 proposals on these parcels of land As it will spoil our village and have expressed my views to the local MP and three of the borough and county councillors by email &amp; yet to forward on to parish council as well</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
							consultation document.
042		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My comments refer to all three parcels of land. None of these sites are suitable to add to a very small village environment, due to the lack of drainage, sanitation, access to/from sites, all three being in very close proximity to residential houses, the noise and pollution is extremely unfair to residents of this village. I would like my council tax to be paying for local services that are in dire need for the residents, and cannot understand why these do not take priority. I moved to a quiet village, for that very reason it was quiet with a village community, it is totally unsuitable for traveller sites. Not to mention my safety when walking with my dogs, it's common knowledge that gypsies and travellers commit various crimes, and thus make it an unsafe and undesirable area. Travellers should be placed well away from residential areas, it's totally unfair on the people who live here and pay all their relevant taxes to live in such an area. This literally would ruin our tiny village. I'd also like to know who would be paying for this site to be produced, as I would be extremely unhappy if my tax money goes towards building their landscapes, for them to destroy. The wildlife that already live in these areas would be affected as well, and would lose their homes, and ruin all other wildlife in the vicinity. These are small spaces to be putting such sites and no consideration has been given to residents. Giving us approx just 4 weeks to object to these proposals, which is totally unacceptable.	Not specified	Yes	<p>These sites have been put forward to the Council for consideration for Gypsy and Traveller use. All local and statutory consultees will provide information as to the scale of any planning constraints.</p> <p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
043		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I've lived here for 35 years, as a social psychologist I am acutely aware of the severity of damage this could do to the community from a societal standpoint as well as to people's mental health. The local road infrastructure is not fit for purpose after an increase in development in the village in recent decades, such a significant burst of extra traffic would put people in danger as well as compromise air quality noticeably. It would be hazard to those living along both sides of the blind bend of the Freebridge Terrace area. The road takes enough damage from the volumes of traffic using the road as a "ratrun", this traffic creates access risks to those passing and those using the proposed sites. The footpaths aren't fit for use due to their narrow width past School Road, many turn to walking along the very special crown of the area that is Water Lane, the much safer option despite having no footpath. This area would be entirely ruined by numerous factors relating to any development. It will destroy an enormous amount of natural habitat as well as devastate a part of the village that provides mental and physical benefits to all. In an area that is pretty much all fields with long-gone hedgerows and the A47 in the middle nature has no place at all to go. It is a hive of wildlife activity. The area along Sandy Lane and Water Lane are notoriously waterlogged places (hence the names, water run-off from fields to the west created a Sand-like road then the Water ran down to where the lane is). I know the site well from childhood and most of it has always been very wet, without it the water it controls as in most of Norfolk will cause floods further down road. Noise and other related pollution related to development will be detrimental to the mental wellbeing of those who already live in the village. Many less invasive proposals have been turned down for that site over the years. Would seem senseless to go ahead having already said no to things that would have had much less effect on the balance of what makes the village special. This fine line can easily be destroyed if this goes ahead. The school is very small and limited, it will be unable to cater for the influx of extra children to the area increasing local traffic movements when many parents go on foot.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
044		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My response is regarding all sites proposed. I have lived in Blackborough End since 1996 and have remained due to the character of the village, the small roads and tastefully build and maintained properties being an important factor. There have been many planning applications turned down due to dangerous corners/small roads, backland building and unsuitable access. Any new development like this proposed would open the door introducing backland development and would definitely contribute extremely negatively towards the existing character of this part of my village of Blackborough End. Whilst I appreciate that the council has a responsibility to provide places for the Gypsy and Travelling communities the council also has a duty of care to people who have lived within a community for many years contributing to it with their taxes whilst maintaining the character of the area. I have worked alongside many traveler sites for 11 years whilst working for Norfolk Police and have also been extremely concerned regarding the amount of dumped items around the site which are a health hazard and dangerous ( Kirkhams lane being one example ) Which in turn causes significant cost to clear by either the local authority or local landowners if dumped on their land I have also spend many hours with distressed horses which have been tethered and then have escaped onto the highways causing significant problems. Public footpaths have had	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			undocumented and unpassported horses tethered on them which have, in turn then kicked out or attacked ( in the case of tethered stallions) members of the public lawfully exercising their rights using the footpaths. There are plenty of sites around kings lynn with suitable established Traveler sites like Saddlebow and plenty of open spaces nearby which have plenty of access and room this would be my recommendation to make the site at Saddlebow bigger then the community could really be a community instead of trying to integrate the travelling community into unfamiliar surroundings where they could feel vulnerable. Why are you, the council not looking to accommodate these people next to familiar people and surroundings. Blackborough End is a small village with distinctive character any proposed opportunities to have traveler site development would negatively impact substantially on this character and would become overbearing for the village.			meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
045		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	All three sites proposed for Blackborough End are unsuitable for the following reason: The site has historical remains of a castle which should not be disturbed due to significant local importance and local interest, the property Kiln House at the top of the Sandy Lane has a preserved Kiln uncovered beneath the property, this should be fully investigated as to the nearby remains of a Roman settlement beneath the peaty subsoil of all three areas of land. The land is not nearby to any local amenities and currently all villagers have to travel to get to shops quite a distance. This therefore means that a traveller/gypsy settlement is not well placed. The area of land is full of local wildlife such as deer, foxes, badgers, stoats, rabbits, various reptile species such as grass snakes and newts. All of these species have been observed by myself on multiple occasions as committee used to live adjacent to GTRA (N) and had a clear view over the land. The three parts of land are also very close to historical buildings which have been in place since the 1800's such as my previous home (home farm in water lane) which was built in 1854. A gypsy/traveller site is badly suited to the fabric of the community here which is committed to maintaining the deep heritage of Blackborough End. The proposal of a traveller community on any of the three sites will be detrimental to the housing value in what can be described as a semi affluent community due to its vast difference in appearance of dwellings. Special attention should be given to the narrow rural road on which the entrances to each plot falls. The top of the hill at sandy lane is a blind summit which is unsuitable for a busy entrance. The plot at GTRA (N) is located on a tight bend where three roads meet, totally unsuitable again for a busy entrance. The areas of land proposed are plots of land where proposals for holiday chalet buildings was previously rejected and attention should be brought to this previous application as a traveller site is less suited than this application which was already rejected.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
046		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The following observations relate to three parcels of land under consideration by the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk for the settlement of Gypsy and Travelling People. The three parcels are GTRA(M), GTRA(L) and GTRA(N). These three parcels of land are adjacent to GTRAE, an area of land that has already been deemed unsuitable for settlement, therefore the same criteria must apply to the remaining sites under consideration. Extremely limited accessibility to local services and facilities with no core services within 800m were key factors in rejecting GTRAE as a potential site. As the remaining sites are all adjacent to this plot, the same rationale must apply thus rendering the remaining three parcels of land unsuitable also. The character of the village would be significantly altered as GTRA(M), GTRA(L) and GTRA(N) are also on the edge of the village. Indeed GTRA(N) is on the corner of Water Lane and would be the first thing one would encounter arriving in Blackborough End, thus spoiling the rural nature of this small village. All the parcels under consideration also back onto residential areas and would contribute negatively towards the existing character of the village. As GTRAE was considered unsuitable as it was on the edge of the village, the remaining three parcels of land must also be regarded as unsuitable. The highway constraints are considerable. Water Lane which GTRA(M) is adjacent to is a narrow one-way street, barely wide enough for a single vehicle to use. There is a water filled ditch on one side of the lane making this small country lane unsuitable for larger vehicles, lorries or caravans. The other potential access route to the proposed sites is on the brow of a hill on Sandy Lane. This would be a hazardous entry and access point for both travelling people and existing village dwellers due to the dangerous blind spot. Anyone wishing to leave the proposed site on foot would have to cross the road at the blind spot onto the very narrow pavement opposite. This would be extremely dangerous for children crossing to walk to the school bus stop, especially in the winter months with dark nights and no street lighting in the village. The local primary school, Middleton Church of England Primary Academy, is currently under special measures as it was deemed 'inadequate' at its last Ofsted inspection. The potential introduction of more pupils originating from settlements on the land under consideration in Blackborough End will not improve this situation at all and will only create greater challenges for the staff and existing pupils of the school. In conclusion, the precedent has already been set when GTRA(E) was rejected as a suitable area of settlement for gypsy and travelling people. If the same criteria are applied, as they should be, to the remaining GTRA(M), GTRA(L) and GTRA(N) then they must also be deemed unsuitable for the proposal. The following observations relate to three parcels of land under consideration by the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk for the settlement of	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>Gypsy and Travelling People. The three parcels are GTRA(M), GTRA(L) and GTRA(N). These three parcels of land are adjacent to GTRA(E), an area of land that has already been deemed unsuitable for settlement, therefore the same criteria must apply to the remaining sites under consideration. Extremely limited accessibility to local services and facilities with no core services within 800m were key factors in rejecting GTRA(E) as a potential site. As the remaining sites are all adjacent to this plot, the same rationale must apply thus rendering the remaining three parcels of land unsuitable also. The character of the village would be significantly altered as GTRA(M), GTRA(L) and GTRA(N) are also on the edge of the village. Indeed GTRA(N) is on the corner of Water Lane and would be the first thing one would encounter arriving in Blackborough End, thus spoiling the rural nature of this small village. All the parcels under consideration also back onto residential areas and would contribute negatively towards the existing character of the village. As GTRA(E) was considered unsuitable as it was on the edge of the village, the remaining three parcels of land must also be regarded as unsuitable. The highway constraints are considerable. Water Lane which GTRA(M) is adjacent to is a narrow one-way street, barely wide enough for a single vehicle to use. There is a water filled ditch on one side of the lane making this small country lane unsuitable for larger vehicles, lorries or caravans. The other potential access route to the proposed sites is on the brow of a hill on Sandy Lane. This would be a hazardous entry and access point for both travelling people and existing village dwellers due to the dangerous blind spot. Anyone wishing to leave the proposed site on foot would have to cross the road at the blind spot onto the very narrow pavement opposite. This would be extremely dangerous for children crossing to walk to the school bus stop, especially in the winter months with dark nights and no street lighting in the village. The local primary school, Middleton Church of England Primary Academy, is currently under special measures as it was deemed 'inadequate' at its last Ofsted inspection. The potential introduction of more pupils originating from settlements on the land under consideration in Blackborough End will not improve this situation at all and will only create greater challenges for the staff and existing pupils of the school. In conclusion, the precedent has already been set when GTRA(E) was rejected as a suitable area of settlement for gypsy and travelling people. If the same criteria are applied, as they should be, to the remaining GTRA(M), GTRA(L) and GTRA(N) then they must also be deemed unsuitable for the proposal.</p>				
047		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I wish to object to all of the proposed sites namely GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N). Firstly, having read through all the documents available on the Council's web site I have been unable to identify any potential sites marked as either GTRA(L), GTRA(M) or GTRA(N). The only site that has been referenced is GTRA(E) which has been rejected as a potential site under the Council's own assessment. Therefore I am somewhat confused as to how the other sites have been identified and as to whether any potential assessments have been undertaken. The site marked as GTRA(E) was rejected due to "no core services within 800m/10 minutes walk and "due to a significant impact on the character of the area causing an overbearing impact of the built form". There was also concern in respect of the narrow roadway and constraints on neighbouring land. If the proposed "new" areas GTRA(L-N) are being considered, then as the sites are adjacent to the rejected GTRA(E) site, then the same constraints would apply. The PPTS (2015) states that plan-making and decisionmaking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development and should protect local amenities and environments. This is confirmed in the Council's SADMP plan under DM22 for the Protection of Local Open Spaces. Further DM3 covers "Development in the Smaller Villages and Hamlets" and in particular states "New development in the designated Smaller Villages and Hamlets will be limited to that suitable in Rural Areas, including: Small Scale Employment use Small Scale Tourism facilities Conversions of existing buildings Rural exceptions for affordable housing; and Development to meet specific identified Local need. None of the above provisions are fulfilled by the creation of the proposed pitches for Gypsy or Traveller communities, and in-fact by evidence of the rejection of GTRA(E) show a significant impact on the character of the village. This is further supported by the Council's own policy under DM3 which states that "modest levels of development which deliver against Rural and other identified local needs while avoiding scales of development which are either inappropriate to the scale and character of the settlement. Based on the Council's own assessment of future requirements for pitches against those currently available, it would appear that there is sufficient scope within the existing pitches to meet this potential requirement and therefore no legal justification for the creation of new sites. In summary, I wish to object to any proposals to develop any of the sites recorded (somewhere!) as GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N). As a further point, as I have been unable to find those relevant sites listed on any Council documents on line, it makes it near on impossible for any Tax Payer to raise objections or provide comments in respect of those sites, it is only due to the actions of local residents in providing a leaflet setting out the details that I became aware of the issue. I find it hard to understand how a Council can engage in a purposeful consultation process without notifying their residents in the first place that they are undertaking a consultation. It should be remembered that not everybody has access to a computer or smart phone and a percentage of the population struggle with the use of such technology. By not notifying</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	<p>Produce a site assessment for GTRA(L-N)</p> <p>Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.</p>

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			residents in writing, the Council may be in breach of Equality Legislation and is potentially discriminating against a protected minority in the Borough. Perhaps the Council should examine how it interacts with its residents.				
048		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>Responding to Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council's consideration of prospective Gypsy and Traveller sites in Blackborough End. I refer to G&amp;T prospective locations GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) which do not show in the Document at reference - on page 232 of the recent Borough Council report (Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessments dated January 2024). I note that the Council has already judged that adjoining GTRA(E) is "unsuitable". The assessment states that there is potential impact on local character and landscape. The site is served by rural roads with limited capacity. Furthermore, it identifies substantial impact to the landscape and townscape of the village from the likely development pattern and its negative contribution to the character of Blackborough End. Specifically, the assessment identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No core services within 800m/10 mins walking distance</li> <li>• Development of the site would have significant impact on the village due to both its location and to what would be the overbearing size and nature of the proposed settlement.</li> <li>• The site has no current access to an existing highway</li> <li>• The existing road nearby is narrow and additional highway works/expenditure would be needed.</li> <li>• There would be constraints on the site due to adjoining land usage and residential properties. These factors and characteristics that have determined GTR(E) unsuitable to the Borough Council apply equally to the adjoining prospective sites: GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N). I would also add the following additional observations relating to Access and Accessibility that contribute to the unsuitability of these proposed G&amp;T sites:</li> <li>• Access to the proposed sites is only possible from 2 directions: from the northeast via Sandy Lane - GTRA(L) and GTRA(M) sharing one possible entrance, GTRA(L) another at the junction of School Lane, Sandfy Lane and Water Lane; or for GTRA(M) from the south west via Water Lane. o The Sandy Lane access for GTRA(L) and GTRA (M) would be at the very top of the small hill rising from the top of Water Lane and then descending towards the Blackborough End Village Green. The site access point is blind to cars coming from both directions. There is also only a narrow pedestrian footpath on the northeast side of Sandy Lane. Vehicle access in and out of the site would therefore significantly increase the risk of accidents to drivers and pedestrians. Access into GTRA(N) is even more challenging, on the junction of 3 roads with only one pedestrian pathway between the 3 of them. o Access from Water Lane would be even more problematic. At the boundary of the GTRA(M) it is a one way (south to north) single track, barely a car's width wide with no footpath. Access into the proposed site from Water Lane would be untenable. • Blackborough End (and Middleton) has no roadside lighting. This absence of roadside lighting together with increased road traffic created by the G&amp;T community would only serve to increase the risk of accidents inherent within the limited options for site access covered above.</li> <li>• Primary Schooling. Although Middleton Church of England Primary Academy sits just within proximity guidelines, as stated above there is only one narrow pedestrian path serving the proposed site and it is on the other side of Sandy Lane. There is therefore no safe crossing point for children nor safe pathway for them to walk to the school. Furthermore, as at July 2023 Middleton Church of England Primary Academy remained inadequate, requiring special measures. Adding new children possible with challenging educational profiles would compound the challenges of the local school, assuming there is capacity to accept more children. The only other alternative will be for the G&amp;T children to travel by car into Kings Lynn or elsewhere, further increasing traffic flows through the dangerous Sandy Lane site access point. • Secondary Schooling. Bus pick in the village for secondary school students is at the village green. G&amp;T secondary school students would have no pedestrian pathway their side of Sandy lane to walk to the bus pick up. They would have to cross Sandy Lane at the blind spot for cars to get to the narrow path down to the Village Green. • The assessment of the landscape appears to be light on detail regarding the quality of the land. Water Lane is called that for good reason. It is an extremely wet area, GTRA(N) is swamp like as a result of run off from Middleton down School Road, and there is a natural spring that runs through the site, emerging in Setch Road by the Old Dairy. The site also provides a valuable and safe haven for the multitude of local wildlife that coexist with us in the village: deer, muntjac, foxes, a range of small mammals and birds of prey (buzzards nest in our garden) all use the site for feeding/catching prey and traveling safely through the village.</li> </ul>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
049		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Surely there are more appropriate sites, or extensions to other sites within Lynn could be considered. This seems an ill thought out plan that will negatively effect the community in the surrounding area, this could also have a negative impact on the land value while also promoting hysteria by locals.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						<p>heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	consultation document.
050		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My response is in relation to all 3 parcels of land referenced above. The small and quiet village of Blackborough End within the parish of Middleton is not a suitable location for a gipsy and traveller site, any more than a housing estate would be, both are out keeping with this rural village. The infrastructure within, and around Blackborough End is not conducive to such an influx of such a large number of people. The noise from such a site will impact on all of the local residents nearby, particularly in the summer time. It is well documented that most such sites accumulate significant amounts of rubbish, including fly-tipping, which in a rural location inevitably result in a problematic rat population, as well as other vermin scavenging for food. There is a high risk that bonfires within the site will impact on local residents. Rubbish and fires will both produce unwanted smells for locals. Clearly the Borough Council is obliged to provide such sites within the borough, however there can be few less suitable sites, and as such more appropriate locations should be sought.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
051		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Surely there must be more appropriate places for this. why slap it in the middle of a village . why not extend the Saddlebow one. myself and my family do not want this due to the effect it can have on land value and house value in the local area, among other reasons.	Not specified	No	Saddlebow is an existing gypsy and traveller site and has been assessed for possible identification. However, there is no remaining capacity on the site and therefore it has not been included within the consultation document.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
052		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	There is no possibility of creating access to GTRA(N). It is on a dangerous blind bend going down Sandy Lane and Water Lane is a Cul de Sac. There is no suitable access to GTRA(L) or GTRA(M) for both construction or occupation at this point. There are no core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance such as doctors surgery, retail and service provision, secondary school or local employment opportunities in relation to GTRA(L), (N) & (M). Utilities infrastructure affects GTRA(N) in particular in the form of power lines. Utilities capacity affects GTRA(L), (N) & (M) in terms of access to main sewerage - there is no septic tank on site. The provision would incur significant extra cost. Flood risk is now an issue that will affect GTRA(L), (N) and (M). There is severe water surface flooding at the point where Water Lane and Sandy Lane meet. This is a blind bend and we have had continuous water on this section of road throughout 2024. Excess rain from climate change is likely to make this a very regular event. To alter this would need large investment in the road and water drainage set up in Blackborough End. In relation to Townscape GTRA(L), (N) & (M) would have a massive impact on the character of the area due to their location not on the edge but within the centre of the village and would overbear the current buildings in the village. The fact that all the proposed sites sit right in the heart of the village also makes them very unattractive to Travellers and Gypsies. In relation to Transport and Roads GTRA(L), (N) & (M) are totally unsuitable as Sandy Lane is a very narrow road. While there is access to the highway -A47 this is already a huge safety issue as no traffic lights exist and major roadworks would be needed to address this. Any extra traffic would add considerably to both risk and delays in accessing the A47 from Blackborough End. There are no street lights currently in Blackborough End with the associated risk. There is a single very narrow footpath on School Road and Sandy Lane. There are obvious risks associated with GTRA(M) in terms of unauthorised access to Water Lane which has no pedestrian provision. Compatibility with Neighbours and Adjoining Issues make GTRA(L), (N) & (M) a non-starter. They would have a major impact on the current residents in terms of noise, odour and light pollution. There is a possibility that GTRA(L) & (M) could become a major amenity for the people of Blackborough End in the future as the sites are in the heart of the village.	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
053		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to the suggestion of allocation of sites for the travelling community in Blackborough End for the following reasons; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a village community and as such the access roads do not need any further traffic using them.</li> <li>2. There isn't any local facilities for additional people to use and that is why no further houses are being built in this area.</li> <li>3. You would be using land that is currently being cultivated by nature and as we're in a current climate crisis I would think you'd be better placed in supporting the community to enhance this, rather than destroy it.</li> <li>4. Whether you like this answer or not there is proven evidence that when travelling communities move into an area, crime rates increase and anti social behaviour takes over. This is not the type of area we want to be living in.</li> <li>5. The road structure is not fit to take that amount of vehicles on a regular basis.</li> <li>6. That area is prone to flooding, hence the road name of water lane. So what do you propose to do, should this take place, to ensure the flooding doesn't affect other homes?</li> </ol>	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
054		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I am a resident of Blackborough End and I object to all 3 proposed locations in Blackborough End for the use as Gypsy and Traveller sites. Blackborough End is a small pretty hamlet and these 3 very large proposed areas are right in the middle of an established community, surrounded by residential homes and a narrow country lane, populated by lots of wildlife, including foxes, deer, frogs and bats, which I regularly see on my walks. This surely would have a detrimental effect on the existing landscape and environment in this small picturesque hamlet, and the impact would be substantial. There would be a massive impact on house prices and added traffic to the country lanes. Also the village in general has a drainage problem and the proposed sites do not have any drainage, so what would happen to the waste? I believe a 4th piece of neighbouring land GTRA(E) has already been rejected by the council for these very same reasons.		Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
055		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I wish to register my objection to this development for all parcels of land. I have resided in Blackborough End for over 20 years & the decision on this location for me then & now was its attraction as a small quiet hamlet with a low volume of housing & pleasant surrounding countryside. I believe that this proposal would seriously detract the reasons to reside here. The proposed development would strongly impact on the people who live in the hamlet with increased noise, traffic & pollution as already we endure heavy farm vehicles throughout the year as well as daily traffic especially in Sandy Lane. In Water Lane there are numerous properties & this is a narrow one-way lane which is also subject to flooding. I believe the proposal would severely impact on the surrounding properties in these parcels of land. I also believe that there will be serious damage to wildlife in the surrounding areas. The whole community of Blackborough End would seriously be affected by this development if it is approved.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
056		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I wish to register my objection to this development for all parcels of land. I have resided in Blackborough End for over 20 years & the decision on this location for me then & now was its attraction as a small quiet hamlet with low volume of housing & pleasant surrounding countryside. I truly believe that this development would severely impact on the character of the village in terms of appearance compared with the existing properties & landscapes in this location. There are numerous residential properties in Sandy Lane facing the potential site which I believe would severely impact on their views of the surrounding landscape & the traffic on this section of the road would certainly increase as will the traffic in other parts of the village. The highway from A47 leading into the centre of the village is a narrow road & the present volume of traffic including many heavy farm vehicles is busy, so the development would increase traffic noise & pollution to the area. As there are no facilities in the village ie. doctors, dentist, shops & transport this proposed development does not appear appropriate for an increase in the village population. The parcels of land for this proposed site	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			are currently very tranquil areas & are natural habitats for all wildlife & so if this development were approved this would have a devastating effect on the environment & the villagers who enjoy this facility			Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
057		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I wish to register my objection to this development for all parcels of land. I have resided in Blackborough End for over 20years & the decision on this location for me then & now was it's attraction as a small quiet hamlet with low volume of housing & pleasant surrounding countryside. I truly believe that this development would severely impact on the character of the village in terms of appearance compared with the existing properties & landscapes in this location. There are numerous residential properties in Sandy Lane facing the potential site which I believe would severely impact on their views of the surrounding landscape & the traffic on this section of the road would certainly increase as will the traffic in other parts of the village. The highway from A47 leading into the centre of the village is a narrow road & the present volume of traffic including many heavy farm vehicles is busy, so the development would increase traffic noise & pollution to the area. As there are no facilities in the village ie. Doctors,dentist,shops & transport this proposed development does not appear appropriate for an increase in the village population. The parcels of land for this proposed site are currently very tranquil areas & are natural habitats for all wildlife & so if this development were approved this would have a devastating effect on the environment & the villagers who enjoy this facility costs. Limited access to roads in the village. Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses - At all sites there are neighbouring or adjoining land use constraints. and there are nearby residential properties which will be greatly affected by these sites. In my opinion, a suitable site would be one with no residences within the vicinity, such as, Saddlebow Caravan Park.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
058		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I am providing my objections for all three sites in Blackborough End as listed above in one summary of comments as these locations are in close proximity of each other. I would initially like to state that Blackborough End is a relatively small village with a significant number of residences, mostly of which are owned, with a small amount of housing association properties included. There is no land within this village that is situated a sufficient distance away from peoples homes so as not to cause any issues. If this area was used for a potential site it would create environmental health issues, cause drainage and waste problems and the water course is overloaded which causes flooding at certain times in different areas. Access to Site – although there is a access to the village and these sites, this is a small village and additional large construction vehicles will greatly impact on the roads and local residences within this village. There are also potential access constraints on these sites. Sandy Lane and Water Lane cannot handle more traffic. Accessibility to local services and facilities – there are no core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance of these sites in town centres. Utilities capacity and infrastructure – Blackborough End watercourse is overloaded and there is already flooding at times. There is no drainage on any sites and what would happen to waste in these areas Townscape – Development at these sites is likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located within a small village. The site is also large a–d its development for gypsy and traveller accommodation would overbear the built form of the existing settlement. This is a built up village and it will impact on rural village life and house prices within the area. People that live in this village have worked hard to obtain a property here and have invested significant capital in order to live within a semi-rural community. Transport and roads – The roads are narrow in this area, limiting the site to a small scale of development only. Additional highway works is needed, which would increase costs. Limited access to roads in the village. Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses - At all sites there are neighbouring or adjoining land use constraints. and there are nearby residential properties which will be greatly affected by these sites. In my opinion, a suitable site would be one with no residences within the vicinity, such as, Saddlebow Caravan Park.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
059		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The introduction of sites on the parcels of land in Blackborough End GTRA (L), GTRA (M), GTRA (N) will very negatively affect the landscape and character of the village.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
060		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	As a long term resident of the area I have major concerns as to the impact of any development whatsoever of all 3 proposed sites for any reason. The village has no amenities for the current villagers that reside. The village already suffers from heavy through traffic from the Leziate sites that send heavy goods vehicles through on the opposite side of the A47, numbers of which have already increased year on year. The roads already need much attention	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			because of this with the surfaces being in a very poor state of repair with much flooding. The Access on to the A47 from both sides of the A47 is already unsafe with accidents occurring at that junction on a regular basis. There is only 1 small school and no Doctors facilities in the village and so feel that we do not have the infrastructure for further developments			the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
061		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	these are my observations on all 3 of these parcels of land in Blackborough End.....*No NEED has been proven for such eyesores which would be totally out of keeping with the long existing homes and architecture in the adjacent neighborhood.. *The Setch Road from the T junction in the village going towards the A10 westward becomes a hazardously dangerous "river" when there is heavy rain let alone with the additional water created by the additional hard surfacing over the land mentioned which has quite a steep incline towards the junction. *The access for emergency vehicles such as fire and ambulance is totally inadequate to any part of this land given the the very narrow aspect of Water Lane and the one way system in force. *The access to Water Lane has a completely inadequate circle and the exit to Sandy Lane would be very hazardous owing to the hilly aspect of the road restricting visability considerably. *There has been no thought given to surface water ,sewage and drainage disposal or more apparent lighting. *There is a lack of information regarding the supply and connection of clean water ,electricity and oil and the the storage of such utilities.There is also no mention of how considerable disruption to the highways and the free flow of traffic would be overcome during there installation and what contingency plans would be put in force should emergency services be required for nearby properties..*There is no mention as to the disposal of water and rubbish created on the site and no information is to hand regarding the fact that the correct Caravan licensing requirements need to be met.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
062		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to the proposals for potential Gypsy and Traveller sites at all of the three locations. I understand that planning permission for permanent housing here has been refused in the past. It must surely follow that the same criteria apply for this application	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
063		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I write to raise my objection to all of the proposed Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites - GTRA (L), GTRA (M) and GTRA (N) for the following reasons. i) The village does not have sufficient core services to accommodate the needs of occupants without a car. ii) There are no employment opportunities within walking distance. iii) The small village shop is located over a busy main road - A47 and is over 800 metres away in excess of 10 minutes walking distance. iv) The developments will have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the village v) The roads are narrow, one access is one-way only. vi) Flooding has occurred close to the sites due to natural springs. vii) Poor availability of public transport viii) No dental or doctors surgeries are in the village ix) There are no churches within 10 minutes walking distance. x) There is no street lighting and a footpath is only on one side of the road.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
064		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I oppose all three proposed sites in Blackborough end. These sites would increase traffic through our small villages (Middleton & Blackborough end) Water lane is a small single track road and not suitable for regular traffic or additional foot fall. These sites would remove large green spaces. The sites would increase the carbon footprint of the village due to increased traffic emissions, additional residential energy and waste; as well as noise and light pollution. The sites would impact on the natural habitat & wildlife in these spaces. There is no drainage or facilities on any of these sites Blackborough End watercourse is overloaded and already has flooding leading onto Sandy lane & down Water lane. Such sites would have a detrimental impact on small village life due to limited		No	The highway authority has been consulted for their opinion on the access and traffic issues related to these sites. Any feedback will help inform the Council of its decision on which sites are proposed for allocation in the Local Plan.  The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			resources & facilities. Additional traffic passing outside the school would put children and parents at increased risk whilst walking to and from school and while trying to cross the road. Traveller sites such as those proposed are not in keeping with the surrounding homes and in turn could affect their value.			constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	consultation document.
065		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	GTRA(N) GTRA(L) There are significant constraints - No core services within 800m/ 10mins walking distance. Development is likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located on the edge of the village. The development of a Gypsy Traveller site would become overbearing on the existing settlement, the road leading through the village is winding, narrow and liable to flooding at times. There is a potential to impact on the local character and landscape, it will contribute negatively upon the existing character of this part of black borough end. Suitable access for construction and settlement is questionable. GTRA(N)- there are nearby residential properties on all three sides of this triangular wooded area. There is potential to devalue existing properties in the area due to the proximity of the site.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
066		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Object - to site references GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N) It seems totally irrational that these three sites are being considered, given the exact same scores and comments for site GTRA(E) are all pertinent. GTRA(E) has been deemed not suitable because significant constraints have been identified, therefore sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N) which are literally feet away should deemed not suitable for the same reasons. All of the following reasons of non-suitability apply to sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N) in equal measure. i. Rural roads, not suitable for site development. ii. Potential impact on local character and landscape of the village. iii. No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. iv. Nearby residential properties. v. Backland development is highly likely to have a negative impact on of these parts of Blackborough End.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
067		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	All 3 sites have very limited access due to narrow roads, and in GTRA(N) also on a bend which is dangerous at the best of times due to large vehicles and turning caravans into an area would be very dangerous.an increase in traffic especially some of which will be trying to negotiate very narrow lanes along with the proximity of a bad bend will result in accidents. I am concerned at the best of times that other traffic coming in the opposite direction on this bend and the straight bit afterwards often wonder across the center of the road as its so narrow. I myself have had to replace 3 offside driver mirrors when hit by opposing vehicles, there is only a very narrow pavement for walkers so its imperative to give them enough room to safely walk along the road. If heavy duty vehicles are coming the opposite way its necessary to slow down and sometimes stop altogether to allow passage. This is in sandy lane. Water lane is much more narrower and turning a caravan or any such larger vehicles would be a task in itself. Probably resulting in holding up traffic. The area often seems to get waterlogged in winter. And water lane is often used by walkers and even if a car comes along forces walkers to climb onto the banks which are not at all sound to avoid accidents. The red kites in the area also hunt on this land so they will lose a valuable hunting ground if the area is changed.	Not specified	No	The highway authority has been consulted for their opinion on the access and traffic issues related to these sites. Any feedback will help inform the Council of its decision on which sites are proposed for allocation in the Local Plan.  The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
068		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I am very strongly objecting to the suggested use of these sites, as a resident of Blackborough End for almost 40 years I am very fond of the quiet tranquil village we have been used to, it is nice to welcome new people to our village however I'm concerned about the proposed travellers site being built near to our community because it may increase traffic congestion, noise pollution, and a strain on local resources such as water and waste management systems. Additionally, there might be potential safety and security issues that could arise from the presence of unfamiliar individuals in our neighbourhood. Having found a quiet safe area for ones sanity and peace of mind, to have all these worrying issues now arise in later part of your life, is not acceptable.	Not specified	No	The highway authority has been consulted for their opinion on the access and traffic issues related to these sites. Any feedback will help inform the Council of its decision on which sites are proposed for allocation in the Local Plan. The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
069		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Increase in traffic in the area and unsocial.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thanks for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
070		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I wish to object to all 3 applications for planning permission for Gypsy and Traveller sites at Blackborough End. I refer to sites GTRAL, GTRAM, GTRAN.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	This is a small village with only a small shop in the next village. I also would feel unsafe with a large traveller community so close.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
071		GTRA(A)	The proposed site is next to a large drainage ditch. I am concerned about pollution due to trash and effluent being discharged in it from the site.	Not specified	No	Local water and drainage consultees have been consulted on the potential site.	None.
072		GT67	I am lodging an objection on behalf of the residents of Wicken Green Village, 210 properties with a majority elderly population. I represent the residents as Chair of Wicken Green Village Management Company. The residents have discussed the proposed expansion of the traveller site GT67 Llamados at the junction of Lancaster Road and Tattersett Road, Syderstone. Their concerns are:	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is the gateway to our village. It is not a through road. This is the only access to Wicken green Village and Blenheim Park. The residents pay to ensure that Lancaster Rd is kept clean, tidy, grass mown and hedges trimmed to ensure that the gateway is welcoing to residents, visitors and potential future property buyers. An unsightly encampment at the entrance to the village would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life and financial future of the residents.</li> <li>2. There are no core services or other facilities in the village. No shops, leisure or healthcare facilities.</li> <li>3. There are no play areas dedicated to children. Just a village green and woodland.</li> <li>4. The site is contaminated - buried asbestos and other contaminants left after its previous use as a USAF military airbase.</li> <li>5. The site is a dense mature woodland. 6. The residents of Wicken Green Village are majority elderly and thus have a degree of vulnerability.</li> <li>6. The residents are concerned about antisocial behaviour in this quiet village. It is not possible to leave the village on foot without passing immediately by the proposed encampment.</li> <li>7. It is understood that the traveller community need access to residential sites, however, this location is wholly unsuitable for family living.</li> </ol>			Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	
073		GT67	I strongly object to traveller site proposal. This is a quiet, close knit community with a primary school a stones throw away. This site is in the middle of syderstone, blenheim park and wicken green and is at the only access road to blemheim Park and wicken green. Every child will have to pass this to get to school! This will significantly lower the appeal of our area, lower lower house values and increase our insurances once the crime increases. I for one will not feel safe letting my young children out alone and will certainly be re thinking my home security. I understand not all people act the same but I have seen enough bad behaviour from these groups to be extremely worried,scared and anxious or their arrival. We've all seen crime rates increase when they visit and most goes unsolved. The most recent proven example being their attacks on Cromer in late 2017. There is an abundance of crop fields here and I worry that more will follow unlawfully. Why do we need this when fakenham has 2 large sites 7miles away???	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
074		GT67	I strongly object to traveller site proposal. This is a quiet, close knit community with a primary school a stones throw away. This site is in the middle of syderstone, blenheim park and wicken green and is at the only access road to blemheim Park and wicken green. Every child will have to pass this to get to school! This will significantly lower the appeal of our area, lower lower house values and increase our insurances once the crime increases. I for one will not feel safe letting my young children out alone and will certainly be re thinking my home security. I understand not all people act the same but I have seen enough bad behaviour from these groups to be extremely worried,scared and anxious or their arrival. We've all seen crime rates increase when they visit and most goes unsolved. The most recent proven example being their attacks on Cromer in late 2017. There is an abundance of crop fields here and I worry that more will follow unlawfully. Why do we need this when fakenham has 2 large sites 7miles away	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
075		GT67	firstly I would like to point out that the plan on your planning page GR67 for the proposal of a showman site is marked across half of my garden land. This is at the back of No. 25 Tattersett road which is also included in the plan. Secondly my garden runs for 40 metres along the back of this site with just a see through military fence dividing us from this proposed site. At the moment it is full of large bushes and trees which have birds and wildlife within If this is removed this will leave us with an open view of whatever is to take place there. My other concern is that the site is on a junction of 2 busy roads on a 40mph limit. In Lancasterq road is the local primary school, a footpath runs around two sides of this site which children uses to get to school.Also I am concerned that a single showman site could in the future be used by many more travellers. Please feel free to contact me for more information.	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.</p> <p>The proposed site boundary will be checked and revised accordingly. The boundary was established via previous planning history, but due to the age of this information, the boundary may have changed overtime.</p>	<p>Check the boundary of site GT67 and revise accordingly.</p> <p>Remove GT67 from the consultation document.</p>
076		GT67	As the planned site is the only access to our village and the majority are elderly or disabled residents it will make people feel very vulnerable. I know not all travellers are the same but they do have a reputation for stealing and leaving rubbish and I know, even though a lot of houses have CCTV it will still worry people. Also there are a lot of school children at Blenheim park school whose only access to the school is past this site	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	
077		GT67	Firstly the outlined plan for GT67 is incorrect as it includes my private freehold property of Halcyon, 25 Tattersett Road, Syderstone, PE31 8SA. I have informed Michael Burton, Principal Planner of this. I object to the proposal to expand the existing Travelling showman site as will be directly on to my boundary and intrude on my privacy. I also feel it would devalue my property. I also believe the site is contaminated with Asbestos from previous demolished buildings. It is also a haven for wildlife which includes Monkjacks, Rabbits and Owls and a variety of Birds The roads are narrow and not well maintained so extra large and heavy vehicles having access to the site would be damaging and cause congestion problems. To conclude I would be against this site being developed	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.  The proposed site boundary will be checked and revised accordingly. The boundary was established via previous planning history, but due to the age of this information, the boundary may have changed overtime.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.  Check the boundary of site GT67 and revise accordingly.
078		GT67	The proposed piece of land is contaminated with asbestos, the neighbouring housing estate would be greeted by the gypsy site on arrival and this would devalue the property. Also the school is nearby.	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
079		GT67	We do not need any form of gypsy or travelling our small, happy community. With these we would feel very unsafe. At the moment my children can go out and play with no worries, also we don't need to worry about things getting stolen or trouble being caused in the middle of the night. Therefore having Gypsy/traveler sites here would change all of that. People wouldn't feel safe anymore, I wouldn't feel comfortable letting my children play out without worry or being bullied etc. also they have no respect for their surroundings and leave rubbish etc laying around which we then have to pay extra for. It's a ludicrous idea!	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
080		GT67	I object to the site on Lancaster road as not only will it impact on all the local properties at blenheim park and wicken green but also impacts directly to my parents and neighbours properties directly. These are all old people with health concerns and do not want or need the stress of a disruptive life.  I also object to the site as it is contaminated with asbestos from the old buildings that were once on the site . This would cause fibres to get air Bourne.	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
081		GT67	I don't think it should go ahead, syderstone is a nice little community with very little to no trouble, the traveler community are not all bad I know as I used to work at a fair ground. However if anything happened syderstone is 15-20 minutes away from any sort of authorise an a lot of harm can be done in that short amount of time	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
082		GT67	Concerns on appearance into our estate. Increased traffic, negative impact on surrounding houses and school. Potential decrease on house value in the area	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers	Remove GT67 from the

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	consultation document.
083		GT05	We are not aware of any riparian watercourses adjacent to the site, however this should be confirmed by developer. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to a watercourse.	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT05 to include this information.
084		GT09	Adjacent to a Board Maintained watercourse - DRN138P0101 Kimberley Cut. No works within 9 metres of the watercourse are permitted without prior written consent from the Board. We are not aware of any riparian watercourses adjacent to the site, however this should be confirmed by developer. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to the watercourse.	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT09 to include this information.
085		GT11	Near a Board Maintained watercourse - DRN138P0101 Kimberley Cut. No works within 9 metres of the watercourse are permitted without prior written consent from the Board. We are not aware of any riparian watercourses adjacent to the site, however this should be confirmed by developer. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to a watercourse	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT11 to include this information.
086		GT14	Adjacent to a Board Maintained watercourse - DRN145P1019 Green Drain. No works within 9 metres of the watercourse are permitted without prior written consent from the Board. Also adjacent to riparian watercourses. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to any watercourse	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT14 to include this information.
087		GT33	Adjacent to a riparian watercourse. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to a watercourse	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT33 to include this information.
088		GT43	Near a Board Maintained watercourse - DRN145P0910 St Pauls Drain. No works within 9 metres of the watercourse are permitted without prior written consent from the Board. Also adjacent to a riparian watercourse. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to the watercourse	Not specified	Not specified	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.  Update the Site Assessment for GT43 to include this information.
089		GT56	Adjacent to a Board Maintained watercourse - DRN145P1019 DRN145P1030 Kersons Dyke. No works within 9 metres of the watercourse are permitted without prior written consent from the Board. We are not aware of any riparian watercourses adjacent to the site, however this should be confirmed by developer. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to any watercourse	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT56 to include this information.
090		GT59	Adjacent to a riparian watercourse. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to a watercourse.	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT59 to include this information.



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
091		GT62	Adjacent to riparian watercourses. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to a watercourse	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GT62 to include this information.
092		GTRA(A)	Adjacent to a riparian watercourse. Consent would be required from the Board for alteration of or discharge to a watercourse	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the Site Assessment for GTRA(A) to include this information.
093		GT59	No comments to make.	Not specified	Not specified	Noted.	None.
094		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	We strongly object to the proposed addition of the 3 (referenced above) Travellers Sites to the village of Blackborough End. The location of the sites are totally unsuitable for many reasons. These include Limited access to the site Increased traffic through the village of Middleton including passing the village school There is no street lighting in the village and to have a traveller site without lighting would be a safety issue Increased potential crime in the area Lack of provision of services to the site The development would also have significant impact on the character of the area as there are very limited dwellings in the village and a gypsy site could overwhelm the village	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
095		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	We would like to comment on sites GTRA(N) GTRA(L) GTRA(M) Having lived in our bungalow in Sandy Lane, which is opposite GTRA(N) and close to GTRA(L) in Blackborough End for 45 years, we feel outraged and totally astonished that gypsy sites could be located in the village. We have been lucky enough to live in a quiet area and these sites would disrupt us and the whole village 1) The road floods regularly in bad weather on the corner of Sandy Lane and in front of our bungalow 2) Sandy Lane is quite narrow and would not be suitable for heavier traffic especially large caravans and mobile homes etc., the road already has a lorry restriction and highway works would be needed 3) There are no services within 800 m or 10 minutes walking distance 4) This development will have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the sites being in the middle of Middleton and Blackborough End settlements 5) The proposed developments would be very close to residential areas 6) There have been planning applications for housing in these areas in the past and they have been refused, so we do not understand why a gypsy site would be preferable to housing.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
096		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	GTRA(L) The site is adjacent to Sandy Lane. Sandy Lane is a two-lane carriageway subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, Sandy Lane is a relatively narrow rural carriageway not suited to a large increase in vehicular traffic, and particularly owing to its physical characteristics, unsuitable to larger vehicles. There are no parking restrictions on this section of unlit carriageway. An increase in traffic would inherently have some impact on local residents and any overflow parking on Sandy Lane from the proposed site would cause additional hazards to other road users. Access to the wider national road network from the site is possible from 4 locations: School Road j/w A47, East Winch Road j/w A47, Setch Road j/w A10, and Castle Road j/w A134. The most likely junction to be impacted is the School Road j/w A47, although all 4 junctions and their access routes have their individual characteristics and potential issues. The School Road j/w A47 is an unlit section of road. As stated in the latest Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination concerning the nearby potential site identified as GTRA(E) 'No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance'. This potential site falls within the same geographical area so the same would apply. The nearest doctors surgery is over 5 km from the site and likely to be already operating at capacity. I have	Not specified	Yes.	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>concerns over capacity of the relevant wastewater and surface water network. There is some history of localised flooding at the bottom of Water Lane j/w Setch Road. Any further developments such as those under consideration are only likely to exacerbate this issue to the detriment of the local community. The development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area owing to the site being located on the edge of the village. The site is likely to impact the existing settlement. There are nearby residential properties. Blackborough End is a relatively small close-knit community and use of the site as proposed will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on the owners of residential properties within the village and surrounding areas.</p> <p>GTRA(M) The site is adjacent to Water Lane, which being a narrow single-track carriageway is unsuitable for any increase in vehicular traffic. Substantial perimeter barriers would be required and maintained to prevent occupants of the site from making their own access onto Water Lane. Water lane is used by me and other community members as a pedestrian walkway due to its pleasant surroundings and currently low levels of vehicular traffic. Access to the site from Sandy Lane would be of a lower impact. Sandy Lane is a two-lane carriageway subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, Sandy Lane is a relatively narrow rural carriageway not suited to a large increase in vehicular traffic, and owing to its physical characteristics, particularly unsuitable to larger vehicles. There are no parking restrictions on this section of unlit carriageway. An increase in traffic would inherently have some impact on local residents and any overflow parking on Sandy Lane from the proposed site would cause additional hazards to other road users. Access to the wider national road network from the site is possible from 4 locations: School Road j/w A47, East Winch Road j/w A47, Setch Road j/w A10, and Castle Road j/w A134. The most likely junction to be impacted is the School Road j/w A47, although all 4 junctions and their access routes have their individual characteristics and potential issues. As stated in the latest Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination concerning the nearby potential site identified as GTRA(E) 'No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance'. This potential site falls within the same geographical area so the same would apply. The nearest doctors surgery is over 5 km from the site and likely to be already operating at capacity. I have concerns over capacity of the relevant wastewater and surface water network. There is some history of localised flooding at the bottom of Water Lane j/w Setch Road. Any further developments such as those under consideration are only likely to exacerbate this issue to the detriment of the local community. The development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area owing to the site being located on the edge of the village. The site is also large and its development for gypsy and traveller accommodation will come to overbear the built form of the existing settlement. There are nearby residential properties. Blackborough End is a relatively small close-knit community and use of the site as proposed will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on the owners of residential properties within the village and surrounding areas.</p> <p>GTRA(N) The site is adjacent to Water Lane and Sandy Lane. Water Lane is a narrow single-track carriageway unsuitable for any increase in vehicular traffic. Substantial perimeter barriers would be required and need to be maintained to reduce the risk of occupants of the site from making their own access onto Water Lane. Water lane is used by me and other community members as a pedestrian walkway due to its pleasant surroundings and currently low levels of vehicular traffic. Access to the site from Sandy Lane would be of a lower impact regarding carriageway trackwidth but has other considerations. Sandy Lane is a two-lane carriageway subject to a 30mph speed limit. However, Sandy Lane is a relatively narrow rural carriageway not suited to a large increase in vehicular traffic, and owing to its physical characteristics, particularly unsuitable to larger vehicles. There are no parking restrictions on this section of unlit carriageway. An increase in traffic would inherently have some impact on local residents and any overflow parking on Sandy Lane from the proposed site would cause additional hazards to other road users. The proximity of the junction of Sandy Lane with Water Lane and School Road is likely to elevate risk to all road users at this location where vehicles are caused to join the main carriageway at low speed with restricted views available to road users particularly on approach from School Road. There is some degree of frequency of severe standing water (after heavy rainfall) being present on nearside of Sandy Lane when travelling South, which creates an additional hazard to road users near to the junction identified above. This risk falls as the proximity of site access from this 3 road junction increases. However, I believe it unlikely that there is any possibility of creating a safe access to this site from the adjacent roads. Access to the wider national road network from the site is possible from 4 locations: School Road j/w A47, East Winch Road j/w A47, Setch Road j/w A10, and Castle Road j/w A134. The most likely junction to be impacted is the School Road j/w A47, although all 4 junctions and their access routes have their individual characteristics and potential issues. As stated in the latest Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination concerning the</p>			<p>meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>nearby potential site identified as GTRA(E) 'No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance'. This potential site falls within the same geographical area so the same would apply. The nearest doctors surgery is over 5 km from the site and likely to be already operating at capacity. I have concerns over capacity of the relevant wastewater and surface water network. There is some history of localised flooding at the bottom of Water Lane j/w Setch Road. Any further developments such as those under consideration are only likely to exacerbate this issue to the detriment of the local community. The development is likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area owing to the site being located on the edge of the village. The site is likely to impact the existing settlement. There are nearby residential properties. Blackborough End is a relatively small close-knit community and use of the site as proposed will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on the owners of residential properties within the village and surrounding areas.</p> <p>GTRA(N), GTRA(M), GTRA(L) In conclusion. The above sites fall within a small geographical area of approximately 8.3968 hectares, which will have mostly identical or similar characteristics as the site identified as GTRA(E). In the recent Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination, GTRA(E) has already been determined as not being suitable for the use under consideration. I can see little difference with the remaining three sites as listed above.</p>				
097		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to this proposal. I was born in the village and parents still live in village , I am in fair green Middleton so still affects me and family. Firstly , road not adequate for more traffic , it floods and can't cope with traffic now in village. The village is too small to have more traffic. The noise levels and pollution levels will go up. The village is a quiet place to live and people like it that way. The house prices would be affected I object to everything. All Gypsy camps are on the outskirts of places where they are not seen , not in the center of a village.	Not specified	Yes.	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
098		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I reject the proposed Gypsy/Traveller or Travelling Show people on all three sites for the following reasons. The infrastructure surrounding the sites is not sufficient enough to support any further expansion. The primary school is over subscribed and the main road is already a death trap waiting for an accident to happen. There are no amenities nearby and the villages rely on one small shop. There is absolutely nothing available that could support this location	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
099		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to all three sites proposed for Blackborough End for a Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Show people for the following reasons: The sites proposed are unsuitable for such a development, the areas proposed are in the centre of a very quiet village which would have a negative effect on the neighbours and the community. There are existing properties that would overlook the sites. These properties would loose some of their privacy as the sites may be too close to their boundaries. The development would not align with the area as the village is classed as a hamlet and it would have an adverse effect on the character of the village as some of the properties have been in the village for hundreds of years. Several years ago the village was classed as a hamlet and it was stated that there could be no more developments or building of new homes in this village so this proposal contradicts previous decisions. The sites would impact the roads in the village, the roads are narrow and not suitable for large caravans, trailers and any other vehicles that may be brought into the village by the travelling community. The	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			village roads are already impacted when the A47 and or the A10 has any issues such as road works or accidents which means the village roads are used as a 'rat run' when there are problems on the A47/A10. As the roads are narrow the access to the sites proposed would be difficult as the turning area would be severely restricted for any large vehicles. There is also an existing weight limit to vehicles that may try to come through the village. The area has no amenities apart from a local primary school, there are 'o shops, no doctors surgery , no local buses through the village and no street lighting. The villagers have to travel several miles for shops, doctors, dentist and any other amenities. The land proposed was previously rejected for development, please review previous applications and the reasons for rejection. The land was deemed not suitable in the past for development of holiday chalet buildings therefore a traveller site would not be anymore suitable than the previous plans. The land proposed is inhabited with wildlife including newts and deer and in my view it would harm the local environment. I believe newts are a protected species in the UK and I believe that was one of the reasons why the land was not developed in the past.			Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
100		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	We are commenting on all three sites (L, M and N). It is our view that these three sites suffer from exactly the same issues as GTRA(E) which was rejected. These are; Development will have a very negative impact on the character of the area being located near the heart of the village (which contains many period properties), the road systems around all three sites are also limited being essentially rural lanes, amenities are someone limited and this will introduce an additional burden, the current sites currently attract a wide variety of wildlife which will be lost when their habitats are destroyed	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
101		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I have just found out that there are plans for a Gypsy Traveller site in Blackborough End . I am writing to object to the areas that have been allocated , the areas are GTRA(L),GTRA(M)&GTRA(N) , the reason for my objection on all three proposed sites are as follows, The area is a stones throw from the centre of the village Which in my opinion is not acceptable and would not be to any other Town or village , The roads are not adequate for the amount of traffic that flows through the village at present and the plans would only increase the burden on the existing roads, There is already a restriction on some class of vehicles that can traverse the roads , so once again these plans would make the situation worse. The entrance and exits to these sites would defiantly cause restriction to the small road , Which is more than inadequate to cope with the burden these sites would impose . There are no amenities in the village at all and the School which is shared with Middleton and adjoining areas would also struggle to take on more pupils There are no local medical services or doctors surgeries in the village , they are situated in other villages or king's Lynn, so once again traveling would increase the burden on the village roads The village area its self has built up a vast array of wildlife encouraging many species of insects and animals and not to mention Kites Buzzards & owls , Long tailed tits Bull finches and the like . the area that these sites are proposed to be situated on will take away land that has been left to nature for many years and would have an adverse affect on the local plants and wildlife	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
102		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to these proposed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) due to the fact that data from around 200 sites in England revealed crime rates there are also a third higher than the average in a quarter of cases. The Cambridgeshire police have also stated that they are unable to tackle the issue head on. The roads leading to these sites are small and full of pot holes due to the already heavy traffic and the extra traffic from the caravans these people have will create even more problems. These sites should not be situated in residential areas but built in open countryside. I accept not everyone in the Gypsy community are bad but putting up a site in the middle of a village is going to cause worry and concern from residences, and rightly so as i have been a victim of gypsy menace and also seen the state they leave a place when they have been situated for a time (QEH)	Not specified	No	Noted. The Highway Authority has been consulted for their opinion on the access and traffic issues. This information will help inform the Council of its decision on which sites are proposed for allocation in the Local Plan.  The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
103		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	We are against this proposal as we think developing this site for travellers is not in keeping with the village . The roads are very narrow for large vehicles and increased traffic. There are minimal facilities in the village which mean people would have to travel for shopping etc which again means more traffic in this area. Drainage facilities in this area are already poor without adding extra demand	Not specified	No	The highways and water authorities have been consulted as part of the consultation process. Their feedback will help inform the Council of its decision on those proposed sites it seeks to allocate in the Local Plan.  The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
104		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My comments are for all three parcels of land being considered GTRA(L) GTR(M) and GTRA(N)in the village of Blackborough End.I start by saying I am against the proposed traveller/gipsy site. The land in question has lots of water problems and is prone to flooding ,the bottom end on water lane can become marsh like in nature I have seen frogs toads and newts in the area. There is no nearby amenities in the area. I assume the entrance would be on sandy lane which is near to a blind corner with the increased traffic flow this would prove to be a hazard. There is no infrastructure in place to hold many caravans on the land which has quite a gradient towards water lane where the sewer pipe there is only 150mm(6')all sewerage would surely fall this way ,this pipe suffers with surcharge in heavy rain causing sewage to come into my house and lift lids in the area ,with many more people residing there it would cause more problems than already exist. This site would not be in keeping with the character of the village and would surely bring down the price of the properties down (if not worthless)in the area. Please take my views Into consideration.	Not specified	Yes,	Noted. The water authorities have been consulted during the consultation. Any feedback received will be included within a revised site assessment and will help the Council in its decision as to which sites are included as allocations within the Local Plan. The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
105		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I do not want this in my village. I'm a young woman who loves to walk her dogs through the adjoining villages. I will no longer be able to do this, feeling safe. This is turn with affect my mental health severely regarding me personally and the affect it will have on my whole family. A BIG NO TO THIS SUGGESTION FROM ME !!!!	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to the use of the following parcels of land - Blackborough End GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N), as suggested sites for use by Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople. The reason that I object is for all the reasons that GTRA(E) was rejected, but also that this will increase the number of vehicles using the area which has trouble with speeding vehicles, HGVs from Middleton Aggregates. Roads around are narrow and footpaths are only on one side of the road. Motorists regularly exceed the speed limit, and many pets have been lost because of this. This is also used as a cut through between A10 and A47. These sites would generate additional vehicles, which the current road infrastructure is struggling. The visual impact of these sites would also be detrimental to the area.	Not specified	No	<p>The Highway Authority has been consulted for their opinion on the access and traffic issues. This information will help inform the Council of its decision on which sites are proposed for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
106		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I am writing to object to the proposal to use the area of land in Blackborough End, between Sandy Lane and Water Lane, referenced as GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(L). The development of this land for a site will have significant impact on the character of the village. There would undoubtedly be an impact on village life; additional noise, lighting, the impact on properties immediately adjacent to the site e.g. being overlooked, value of properties. The road marked for access is narrow and already used by too much traffic (cutting through from the A10/A47). The road is on a hill and has a number of small bends which increase the risk of being unsighted to turning traffic. This land is currently a wildlife haven and developing it would cause significant loss of habitat. The land is impacted by localised flooding, the dykes and ditches running down Water Lane are currently overflowing and there is regularly water running down the road. The reasons for rejecting site GTRA(E) apply to all these other proposed sites.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
107		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>The following comments and statements relate to all 3 parcels of land in Blackborough End.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to these parcels of land are extremely narrow and tight that it would be impossible for Lorries and vehicles servicing the building of these plots to access and leave the sites in their current state.</li> <li>• In addition, the extra volume of building traffic traversing the surrounding area would disturb the local neighbourhood along single track and urban neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Once built, the additional traffic from the inhabitants of the plots would exacerbate what is already an extremely busy and over utilised road network. • If Setch road were to be widened to accommodate extra and larger traffic it would become a route taken by A10 traffic connecting to the A47 as a "rat run" to eliminate the Constitution round about. • The road from A10 through Wormegay would also become a "ratrun"</li> <li>• There are no shops in Blackborough end so traffic would be increased to access facilities in Kings Lynn via School Road. • Similarly, there are no Junior/Secondary schools / Medical facilities such as doctors surgeries there, Employment opportunities such as industry, and no train or bus services. Anyone coming to or leaving these sites will put yet more pressure on existing road systems.</li> <li>• There are no gas, electricity or waste water supplies from these plots. These would need to be implemented which would impact the road networks whilst being installed, leading to traffic congestion. New footpaths plus road widening would be necessary to support new inhabitants which again would disrupt traffic whilst being implemented.</li> <li>• The plots under consideration are extremely beautiful and by building in this area will impact the natural look of this area dramatically. • There is no bus or rail infrastructure in this area which will force traffic on to the road, which may be an extra 200 vehicles possibly horse and carts and definitely vans.</li> </ul>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 97 new homes will put a strain on existing amenities. Not just shops and hospitals, but garages, schools, doctors, motor repair facilities and hairdressers, police, ambulance and fire brigade.</li> <li>• I would suggest Saddlebow may be a more appropriate site for new traveller sites as there is already an existing facility with associated infrastructure and a local police facility.</li> <li>• Or possibly near Sainsburys on the A149 bypass to the hospital.</li> </ul>				
108		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Inappropriate use of these three sites Entirely out of keeping with the character of the village and current buildings Likely to overload local infrastructure, schools, bin collections, sewerage etc Access to roads from these sites would be difficult and dangerous and could cause accidents Having a large number of homes on these sites will add to the volume of local traffic	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
109		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The proposed development will have a significant detrimental affect as it is totally out of keeping with the general character of the village and the housing surrounding the proposed site. The roads are already narrow and awkward, and the extra traffic generated will have a negative effect on road safety. Local services and amenities will be even further stretched. One earlier proposed site GTRA(E) has already been rejected as unsuitable, all the same reasons that the Borough Council flagged red in their own assessment apply to all three of the new proposed sites, they are all totally unsuitable.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
110		GT65	<p>I would like these comments to be made public (with my original typo corrected):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The marked boundary of GT65 is wrong - the area highlighted is actually "Two Acres", a private residence, while the "Tall Trees" traveller site is the adjacent plot on its north boundary (where the words "Two Acres" appear on the map segment).</li> <li>• Therefore, the comment "No Neighbouring or adjoining land use constraints identified" in section 'Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses' is also incorrect.</li> </ul>	Not specified	Not Specified	Noted. The boundary for the site will be revisited and amended accordingly.	Check the boundary of the site and amend accordingly.
111		GTRA(C)	<p>I wish to Strongly OBJECT to: 23/01606/F   Relocation of existing access; Change of use of the land for the stationing of 10 Gypsy / Traveller plots, each containing one static home and touring caravan. Associated hard and soft landscaping and ecological enhancements.   Land East Side Station Road West Dereham Norfolk Planning policies: in April 2018 outline planning permission for application of six dwellings 18/00712/0 was refused on the basis of 'The proposal is remote from local service centre provision conflicting with the aims of accessible development, the need to minimise travel, and the ability to encourage walking, cycling, use of public transport and reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the NPPF and Core Strategy Policy CS11.'</p> <p>Highways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Station Road has no footpaths and has high verges.</li> <li>2. It is a single track carriage way which doesn't cope with the current amount of traffic.</li> <li>3. The road is cracking with the current traffic.</li> <li>4. The pictures below show that the carriage way bollards and signs have been knocked into due to the carriage not clearly being sufficiently upkept and wide enough for the current traffic.</li> </ol>	Not specified	Not Specified	This site has now been granted planning approval under 23/01606/F. Therefore, the site will no longer be considered as a potential allocation in the Local Plan.	Remove GTRA(C) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>5. The proposed additional site will double the occupancy of station road and therefore the possibility of doubling the traffic and being a NEGATIVE contribution to the traffic on Station Road.</p> <p>6. The road is not suitable for additional traffic on the scale of the proposed site.</p> <p>7. The road is not safe for pedestrians to walk down.</p> <p>8. The proposed site is not suitable to accommodate the additional type of traffic that the proposed site would engender i.e. static caravans, additional cars, touring caravans.</p> <p>Station Road is a single track road which is not substantial enough to cope with the current traffic let alone the new proposed traffic in the above application. Consideration needs to be taken into account of any future increased traffic if Glazewing's lorry capacity increased which is highly probable with the amount of licences the site holds. There are currently less of the lorries on the road than there has been in the recent past. With this potential increase of traffic along with the proposed application above, this single track road would simply not cope with the volumes of traffic. The roads coming into West Dereham are untreated in the winter months and poorly maintained all year round, i.e pot holes and protruding tree roots on the road from Downham Market to West Dereham. Increased traffic into the village will only add to highways problem.</p> <p>Noise and Disturbance:</p> <p>The proposed planning permission for 20 residences (10 touring and 10 static) is a dramatic increase on the approximately 40 properties on Station Road. This makes this proposal a major development in Station Road.. It is currently a quiet road in the evenings and weekends. Having an extra 10 plots and 10 touring caravan plots would increase the noise and disturbance levels. We have no street lights on the road so light pollution from this development would also be an issue for residents and wildlife. I'm assuming the site will be connected to the mains electric. As stated by another objector, we often get reduced electricity and power cuts. This site would put extra pressure on the existing struggling resources. Generators would add unnecessary noise pollution. The proposal will at least double the population of Station Road, overwhelming the current residents of Station Road, with additional traffic, noise and light pollution. 14. When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local planning authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community." THIS SITE WOULD DOMINATE STATION ROAD AND IT@S RESIDENTS. Social facilities: West Dereham has very limited facilities. There is no shop, school, doctors, supermarket. The internet in village is poor with not all of the village receiving fibre. In December this year Clackclose children's nursery closed down in Downham Market leaving many parents struggling to find new childcare arrangements. The amenities in West Dereham are almost non existent and nearby Downham Market is struggling to cope with the increased population due to the new builds going up currently in Downham Market. It is very clear that the proposed new traveller site will not have satisfactory access to community services, public transport, education and health services, which are currently overwhelmed as it is.</p> <p>Infrastructure: The land is question is prone to flooding. It is water logged and has been for a couple of months now. This area is sitng on low level ground. Station Road is prone to a high water table after heavy rain, making it very difficult for septic tanks and soakaways to be efficient. This could cause environmental issues. Our local guys who empty the septic tanks on Station Road are kept very busy during the winter months after continuous rain. The water supply to Station Road is clearly not adequate enough to serve such a large sized development. The water pipe on Church Road bursts frequently leaving Station Road with reduced water pressure until dealt with. The Bottom blue boundary line for the proposed drainage into the ditch is currently populated with numerous Poplar trees which are directly growing in the middle of the dyke. To excavate these would mean disturbing the tree roots making the trees quite unstable. These trees are meant to be screening the site. To move the ditch further into the plot would mean that the 9m exclusion zone would need to also be amended. The site is only 1.45ha so would imply that with a 7 property within 1ha allowance would not now accommodate the 10 properties applied for. The allowance for 10 properties is pushing the 1.45ha boundaries as it is.</p> <p>Pollution:</p> <p>As quoted from the drainage plans 'Surface water to be attenuated within paving sub-base with restricted outfall to ditch'. With the amount of vehicles and potential vehicles of the families proposing to living there, which will increase with the age of any children reaching the age of 17 years old, there is a high risk of pollutants i.e. diesel, oil and petrol from cars, vans, lorries and generators, being parked on these permeable block roadways, seeping into the outfall and reaching the ditch and surrounding areas and therefore contaminating the soils around. Please listen to the resident's reasons for objecting to the proposed traveller site. The residents of Station Road</p>				



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			chose to live there because of the safe, quiet and dark rural environment. It is a quiet, dead end road which does not need it's residents population doubling in size and suffering from light and noise pollution. I can see from a couple of previous objectors how selling their house has now become an issue because of the proposed development in its size and nature. Please take this into consideration when making your decision.				
112		Potential new Site	<p>Land for potential Gypsy and Traveller Site at New Road, Upwell</p> <p>Further to our recent telephone conversion, regarding your ongoing consultation for possible new sites for Gypsies, travellers and travelling show people, we have been asked by our clients mr and Mrs Redworth to put forward an area of land they own.</p> <p>Attached is our location and plan showing the site.</p> <p>If accepted the site would be for one gypsy family, covering three generations of the Redworth Family Ivy and Dennis Redworth, their son Nathan and his partner Roseanne and their son Nathan. The Family live Locally and are registered at the local Upwell Health Centre, which along with all other amenities are within easy reach of the proposed site.</p> <p>The site is currently paddock land and contains a stable, and mobile caravan.</p> <p>The majority of the site is situated in Flood Zone 2 of the environment agency's Flood Map for planning, with a small section in Flood zone 3, although the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, as shown below, shows the site within Flood Zone 1, suggesting that flood risk at the site should not be a concern.</p>	Not specified	Not Specified	Thank you for your submission. We have included this as a reasonable alternative within the site assessment. However, as it is located within a higher risk flood zone we have not taken it forward as a potential allocation. As there is no accommodation need arising specially from this site within the GTAA, there is no justification for the site to be developed for such use at this time.	None.
113		GTRA(B)	I object to the above planning application as I feel that it is unsuitable for the village of West Dereham and the surrounding area. A development of this size is not in keeping with the unspoilt rural setting and nature of the countryside here. The development will bring extra traffic, noise and pollution to the village. Station Road is only a single track carriageway that has few passing places with no footpaths or lighting and already needs regular repairs. The extra traffic would make this road and others leading in/out of the village dangerous and overcrowded making then unsafe and in need of further future repairs. The village itself and the surrounding area lacks facilities for an extra 30 to 40 residents. Local amenities such as doctors, dentists and schools are already struggling to cope with demand. There are few public transport links in and out of the village therefore use of vehicles for access is inevitable. The close proximity of the ancient Abbey and it's quiet unspoilt nature is also of concern to me. Such an area should remain untouched and preserved for future generations. I understand the need for this type of site but I do not think that West Dereham is the right place for it. We can not offer shops, schools, dentists and doctors that would be needed by the travellers. Their basic daily needs would not be met unless they travel by vehicle in/out of the village every day. This in turn will disrupt the lives of the current villagers. I believe this development would cause more harm than good for the village of West Dereham and the local area.	Not specified	No	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.
114		GTRA(B)	We wish to object to the proposed plan for a traveller's site at West Dereham Ref 23/01606/F for the following reasons:- The increase in traffic that this will cause both during construction of the site & after the development is completed will be of great magnitude to 4 Abbey Meadows. 10 pitches with say 2 vehicles each would equate to say 10 vehicles moving once morning & evening = 20 & 10 vehicles taking children to & from school twice per day = 40 . That would be a minimum of 50 vehicle movements per day passing the property just for the traveller residents to go to work/school and back. The noise, disturbance and pollution this would cause would be life changing. The road would become very unsafe for walking & driving with the single track access of the road and it's limited passing places. It just could not cope with this much extra traffic on a daily basis. The property is already suffering from cracks to the gable in part due to vibrations from the current traffic. This development would make things much worse. We do not feel that this development is in keeping with the rural village setting and would make Station Road and the other roads in the village unsafe and cause harm and damage to the village and it's road infrastructure.	Not specified	No	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.
115		GTRA(B)	I wish to offer my objections to the above for the following main reasons: • The single track road adjacent to the site offers limited access and will cause congestion with the Glazewing Waste Management site down the same road with heavy vehicles frequenting the road • Inadequate parking for residents and travellers due to the single track road • Inadequate drainage and there is already a problem with houses in the area suffering with flooding, cesspit problems etc • Some local businesses would either be forced to close or be adversely affected by the site • Concerns about potential excessive noise, increased traffic flow through the village which has no footpaths and	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove the GTRA(B) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			many people walking their dogs around the village which could be a safety concern. • The potential site is in close proximity to the Abbey ruins which have historical importance and this will have a detrimental effect				
116		GT67	I own and live at 25 Tattersett Road, Syderstone, Norfolk, PE31 8SA. Please note that you have incorrectly included my freehold property in the site plan GT67. I would be grateful if you can correct the plan and confirm to me when you have done so. You have also incorrectly included the piece of land behind my property which is part of my neighbour at 23 Tattersett Road Garden. He will be contacting you ref this. I am led to believe GT67 is an existing site. Is this correct and if so when did this become a Gypsy and Travellers site as when I purchased my property in November 2006 this did not show up on any of the searches. I also see GT67 is classed as a semi permanent site for 1 (one) extra unit. Can you please explain what the semi permanent part means	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.  Check the site area for GT67 and revise if necessary.
117		GT43	This site has an enforcement order on it, the residents haven't yet left, why on earth has it been flagged up as a potential site Included in this email are two neighbours to the site. The general feeling in this area is enough is enough, we have more than our fair share of travellers and all that goes with them, high crime rates, fly tipping, litter. If we must have more sites, let's spread them throughout the Borough, not just in our area.	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.
118		GTRA(B)	I have lived and worked in West Dereham since 1996 and I feel the need to strongly object to the current proposal of putting a traveller/gypsy site in Station Road. There are major problems here, one with the road usage, and distance to amenities and the other being the water/sewage problem. Firstly, the road usage. The council are already well aware of the safety issues over countless years. My question to the Planning Department is how by adding 10 permanent mobile homes and 10 temporary caravan type homes and the possibly hundreds of extra vehicle movements a day going to improve that station They will have to pass almost every property in Station Road or Basil Road - which is even narrower - in order to leave the village to get to any amenity which are a minimum of 5 miles away down more completely unsuitable lanes. Station Road is unlit and has no pavement, is always awash when heavy rain falls and in the winter with freezing temperatures it's an ice rink, the rest of the one you are literally soaked whilst precariously balancing on the edge of a grass bank to avoid getting run over or falling into a deep water filled ditch. The planning department are normally very insistent on any new buildings/extensions being kept in-keeping with the current surroundings. Are they going to insist on brick-type plastic wrap for the outsides of these mobile homes so that the site isn't out of keeping with the current environment? It can only end up looking like a complete eyesore, whatever it is. It isn't classed as 'in-filling' gaps between other properties. It isn't within the building envelope and it will destroy the wildlife that live there. Various people have had other building projects along Station Road refused, which would have been in keeping with the current environment, and would have been minimal additions to traffic, so I don't quite understand what logic is applied here. If a previous owner of this field had wanted to put a house or two on it, they would have been refused, so how is this even considered? Then there is the sewage issue. There is no mains drainage. The water table is very high here and septic tanks backfill from surface water from gardens etc when there's a lot of rain. The new type of treatment plant allowed now is a filtration system which has a pump to put the water into the water courses and drain away. This relies on having free flowing water courses which are well maintained, which ours are not. Also an uninterrupted power supply. Often, when we have bad weather, it involves a lot of wind and rain. With the way the weather is changing, this problem is only likely to become worse (unless we're all sticking our heads in the sand). Are the people on the proposed site going to be up to their ankles in their own effluent when this happens? Or is untreated sewage going to end up in the dykes causing an unhealthy mental health problem? Plus of course encouraging flies and rats? If the council is going to offer a site to people, it should at least be fit for purpose. Either needs to be on top of high ground where the water can run away easily, uninterrupted power supply using underground supplied power (not overhead), or better connected to mains sewage systems. It's the least that ought to be offered! Not some half baked idea on a completely unsuitable site.	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
		GT59	In relation to the proposed site GT59 Land at Spriggs Hollow, Wiggenhall St Mary Magdalen the Parish Council support this application as long as there are suitable services for the increased capacity - notably sewage and waste removal.	Not specified	Not Specified	Noted Thank you for your comments.	None.
119		GTRA(B)	<p>Amenity Impact – Having moved from Oxford to West Dereham 18 months ago the change in environment and lifestyle has been beneficial to my mental health, anxiety and insomnia. This was a carefully thought decision, not taken lightly, as a family we would be re-locating out of an established environment. However, due to recent trauma my mental health declined and whilst living in Oxford it was suggested by Clinicians that I could be suffering from PTSD and that a complete overview of my environment, lifestyle would be beneficial, to me and my family. Allowing me the opportunity to look at a more relaxing environment, locate to open countryside where I feel less overwhelmed, surrounded by the beauty of nature, together with its peace and quiet. Within months of moving to Station Road, West Dereham, myself and family noticed an improvement in my symptoms, the open air, smaller community, peace and quiet, friendly village community, together with a slower/relaxed pace of life appeared to aid my well-being and I went from strength to strength. Sadly, since notification of this proposed planning application, I can feel my symptoms re-surfacing. I am anxious and unable to sleep, waking numerous times during the night, have started to experience “panic attacks”. The recent episodes of flooding into our property have not helped, during these times we are unable to use our toilet/shower/washing machine, all basic “human rights” that should be available to everyone and in this day and age an expected necessity. This rural space, healthy, natural environment provides West Dereham, especially Station Road residents with opportunities to improve our physical and mental wellbeing. Norfolk’s “Local Nature Recovery Strategy” plays a crucial part in creating healthy and resilient communities with direct and indirect advantages affecting virtually every aspect of societal well-being. Involving local communities in the development and implementation of this Local Nature Recovery Strategy fosters a sense of local ownership, responsibility and appreciation for biodiversity. Our surrounding green spaces and natural 2 areas are a joy to local residents, walkers and cyclist in the Summer months. This gives us physical and mental health benefits to foster a deeper connection with and appreciation for, the natural world we live in and should be protected not taken advantage off. With the addition of 10x dwellings, with possible families living in the Touring Caravans could amount to an additional 40+ individuals, increase traffic flow, impact on drainage, not to mention the additional noise and air pollution. Whilst I appreciate the Council has unmet demands for these proposed sites and have to look at housing such requests, Station Road with all the issues mentioned is not a suitable location. Sustainability – We are all responsible to ensure our actions and practices have a positive impact on the long-term well-being on the environment, yes, we need to sympathetically consider meeting the needs of the present, but this should not be at the compromise of future generations or others. West Dereham has several properties for sale at the moment, that are already established within the Community and village that could be potential habitable locations for those wishing to move to this area. Our Doctors, Dentists and Schools are already full to capacity, there are no spaces available for an increase in population of this size. Adjoining Villages such as Denver already has development housing works, adding pressure on services which are already struggling. Drainage – Due to the water saturation levels of the proposed land, (photographic evidence has been provided, previously) there is grave concern about the safe and effective use and operation of a water sewage treatment plant. Under general building rules, updated Jan 2020 discharge from tanks/plants cannot be dispersed to surface water area such as drains and ditches, all systems installed must treat the water and discharge to drainage fields. This is not possible in this location. Furthermore, we have had flood water come into our front bedroom three times in under a year, once in November, December and January. We have, at a huge cost to ourselves commissioned Watlington Drainage to install French Drains around our property to aid this. However, we have been informed by experts that whilst this would help the water levels around our Bungalow, it may not solve the problem completely, due to uncleared ditches along Station Road, the fact that we are at one of the lowest points along the road. Excess water from surrounding fields has to drain to the lowest point, which sadly our property is located. Adding an additional 10 Gypsy/Traveller plots, each containing one static home and touring caravan, together with hardstanding on drainage land is going to considerably make our situation and others along Station Road considerably worse. Highways – The road to the proposed site is an already heavily trafficked, with HGV’s and Farm traffic, it is a single-track road with no streetlights or footpath and access to the proposed development is on a slight bend and not suitable for larger vehicles. This proposed development site is remote from schooling; town centre shopping; health provision and has restricted employment opportunities with limited scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The distance from service centre provision precludes any realistic opportunity of encouraging model shift away from the private car towards public transport. Although we have had a recent Bus stop installed along Church Road, providing links to Downham Market, Thetford and Brandon, the remote location from the nearest services does not support walking or cycling. In fact, all roads leading into West Dereham are single tracked, there are</p>	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>limited passing places, Station Road has only a few passing spaces which are often used by residents whose houses face directly onto the road as parking for their vehicles and delivery drivers often frequent them. As you will be aware Station Road is the only access to Glazewing, we experience huge “roll-on – roll-off” HGV’s from 6am – 6pm 6 days a week. The single-track road is edged by deep ditches to one side and properties to the other making it extremely dangerous when out walking with dogs, children cycling and 3 frequented walkers. Many a times I have had to step, quickly onto saturated, often slippery grass verges whilst out walking, with our dogs. Thankfully the Glazewing HGV drivers/local Farmers are respectful and allow you time to get to safety prior to passing, sadly this cannot be said for all large vehicles using Station Road. The road is prone to flooding, it is not treated during the icy winter months. Where our Bungalow is situated, we are on the corner leading into Station Road, neighbouring vehicles are parked directly opposite our driveway gate so exiting our property can be hazardous as you are already on the opposite side of the road when leaving the driveway, on a bend with large vehicles facing you. Numerous times we have had near misses, the local school children walk to get the School Bus at the top of the road, in all weather conditions, taking shelter on the unsuitable grass verges when the HGV’s/Farm traffic come through. Any large scheduled deliveries to properties along the road need to be carefully planned, having our sewage treatment plant emptied/Oil Tanks filled can cause chaos as the larger vehicles have to wait for any deliveries/works to be completed before being able to move passed. Thankfully Glazewing and local farmers are aware of these issues and are respectful and supportive to local residents, however with the increase in vehicles that this proposed site is going to make this may not remain the case. Impact on Local Business – West Dereham is home to several well-established businesses, namely a Restoration and Race Preparation Company and West Dereham Abbey Stud. This proposed planning application will have devastating effects on the day to day running of these businesses which have been built up, over the years, through hard work and determination. Together with local Farmers, many are considering their future in West Dereham should this proposal be granted. Concerns with increased traffic, population, increased noise levels and potential nuisance is going to have a severe detrimental effect on the running and sustainability of these business. Impact on Village as a whole – Should this application be approved; this will destroy the very heart and community spirit that is paramount in the Village. With excessive noise, increase traffic flow along the road and through the Village together with night-time lighting, this will have a huge impact on residents, especially along Station Road. Many of the properties along the road are individually designed, making this unique, (one of the reasons many residents move to West Dereham) surrounded by open countryside with an abundance of wildlife, low pollution, and noise. West Dereham is often described as a “peaceful rural village”. This proposal is a large development and as stated in the 2016 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (for use up to 2026), West Dereham is designated as a smaller village and Hamlet by the 2011 Core Strategy. As such it does not have any specific site allocations or development boundary, that only very limited development should be expected, in fact smaller planning proposals have been declined. This large development would create a significant physical change to the rural area and will impair the views from houses currently situated on Station Road, it would have an untold impact on the village character, not to mention the already settled community, which would sadly, be changed forever. No amount of suggested mitigation, through design and size, (which would not be policed) is going to alter any of these facts. In this day and age we should all be working together to preserve and safe keep Britain’s rural countryside, not tarnish it with overdevelopment in unsuitable locations just to meet targets. Historical Importance – Within close proximity to this proposed planning application sits the site of St Marys Abbey, the site lies on the south east side of West Dereham village which includes a variety of features within a precinct boundary which remains intact, although very little of the fabric of the monastic buildings is visible above ground, crop marks have provided remarkably detailed evidence for the survival of their buried remains and these and the extensive earthworks to the south of them illustrate the layout and organisation of the monastic precinct and will no doubt contain valuable archaeological information 4 concerning both the conventual life of the monastic community. Many of these features will contain waterlogged deposits in which organic materials, including evidence for the local environment in the past, are likely to be preserved. The remains of the Great House which was later constructed on the site give the monument additional interest. This historical importance is a drawing factor to visiting walkers, a beautiful location of historical interest, it should not be spoilt by 10 Gypsy / Traveller plots, each containing one static home and touring caravan, with associated hard and soft landscaping and ecological enhancements. As a community we are passionate about the Abbey, proud of its historical importance and local village stories, Norfolk Council should make ever effort to preserve this peaceful, idyllic site not consider placing what will be an eyesore to not only the Village but to History itself. Finally, may I take this opportunity in thank you for taking the time to read our objection. As mentioned, we do appreciate that the Council have a difficult job of identifying suitable local areas for planning proposals, that you have pressure to meet targets etc.</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			However, Station Road, West Dereham is not a suitable location for such a proposal on so many grounds. If possible, an acknowledgement of receipt of this email would be appreciated.				
120		GTRA(B)	I wish to Strongly OBJECT to : 23/01606/F   Relocation of existing access; Change of use of the land for the stationing of 10 Gypsy / Traveller plots, each containing one static home and touring caravan. Associated hard and soft landscaping and ecological enhancements.   Land East Side Station Road West Dereham Norfolk The proposed site is on an unsuitable, heavily trafficked single track road, which is getting busier with shipping container lorries which are hauling material from Glazewing. The high banks on Station Road makes it incredibly difficult to avoid traffic whilst walking, creating a serious hazard and safety issue. The proposed site will clearly have a detrimental impact on the current tenants because of the constrained size of the single carriage way of Station Road. The highway is constrained by it's current size and width with no footpaths and is clearly unsuitable for additional traffic which would be incurred by the proposed site with static caravans, additional cars/lorries/vans and caravans, putting ourselves at increased danger trying to dodge the increased traffic whilst entering and leaving our property and also walking on our village road. Station Road leads onto Basil Road which is an even smaller carriageway. We wouldn't feel safe walking down Station Road or Basil Road with the proposed increased traffic and the type of traffic that this site would bring. Village life means quieter roads and scope for exercise which this would stop us participating in. It would remove our choice for where we like to walk and have a detrimental impact on our village for ever. Passing laybys: There are only 2 passing places from the start of Station Road to the proposed site. We continuously witness vehicles reversing down the road because the width of the road is too narrow to pass each other. This is a health and safety risk for pedestrians, drivers and cyclists and totally NOT suitable for the traffic to be increased. Pollution: As quoted from the drainage plans 'Surface water to be attenuated within paving sub-base with restricted outfall to ditch'. With the amount of vehicles and potential vehicles of the families proposing to living there, which will increase with the age of any children reaching the age of 17 years old, there is a high risk of pollutants i.e. diesel, oil and petrol from cars, vans, lorries and generators, being parked on these 2 permeable block roadways, seeping into the outfall and reaching the ditch and surrounding areas and therefore contaminating the soils around. Property security: Station Road is a quiet rural road. With the increase in movements on the road from additional proposed tenants and their associates I am concerned that there will be an increased security risk to current tenants of Station Road's tenant's properties. Townscape: There will be a clearly negative impact on the existing character of the village and road if the proposed site goes ahead. Light pollution from each of the properties, noise pollution if on generators, noise pollution from additional vehicles. There has never been a development application this large for domestic properties on agricultural land since I have lived here (over 50 years). I am amazed that this site is even being considered due to it's location.	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.
121		GTRA(B)	I have lived in the village for over 65 years. It is a lovely village in an area which my family have inhabited for generations. I am an elderly resident of Station Road. I am seriously worried that the that the proposed site is being considered on the road I have lived on for over 65 years. I am worried about the increased activity in the evenings and at night due to proposed inhabitants and their visitors. The increase in noise, traffic and light pollution the site will impact on the road. There is no street lighting in Station Road therefore no light pollution which would change with this proposed development. There are no footpaths and Station Road is a very narrow single carriageway road. Adding a further 10 mobile homes and 10 caravans to the road would clearly make the traffic overwhelming, dangerous and detrimental to our end of the village. The drainage on this road is extremely poor and the septic tanks constantly need emptying. There is a real issue with this. The area of the proposed site is usually flooded and the ditches not able to cope with the water. How will the proposed residents cope with this and how will it effect the rest of the road and the current residents. It will be detrimental to all. The infrastructure of this end of the village would clearly not cope with the proposed site or the amount of residents it will bring into the village. Please accept this as a strong objection.	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.
122		Not Specified	Thank you for consulting National Highways on the abovementioned Gypsy and Traveller Potential Sites and Policy Consultation document. National Highways is a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It has been noted that once adopted, the policy document will become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Where relevant, National Highways will be a statutory consultee on future planning applications within the area and will assess the impact on the SRN of a planning application accordingly. Notwithstanding the above comments, we have reviewed the document and note the details of set out within the draft document are unlikely to have an severe impact on the operation of the trunk road and we offer No Comment.	Not specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
123		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My comments relate to all 3 of these parcels of land Blackborough End GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) that are suggested/ potential sites for Gypsy or Travelling Showpeople and I strongly object to these site being used or developed for the use of any kind of housing- temporary or permanent for use by Gypsy or Travelling Showpeople. Middleton and Blackborough End is a small area that does not have the infrastructure to accommodate the needs of what in essence is a separate community of people who are bound to be in need of the amenities that a town can offer to them and this development will have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located on the edge of the village. The site is also large and its development for gypsy and traveller accommodation will overshadow the built form of the existing settlement and I believe this will cause disunity and dissent in the parish of Middleton. The movement of static caravans and extra vehicles will be disruptive- the sites are too close to long established families and their properties. Water Lane is a quiet area for locals to walk and exercise their dogs and this would more than likely become a "No Go" area for locals who might feel unsafe walking along Water Lane. I live just of Setch Road and Wormegay Road and I personally would feel unsafe in this very small and close community. Because of the close proximity of these 3 sites to local housing the value of the properties in Middleton and Blackbrough End will certainly be adversely effected. I am not happy that this possible development has come to the attention to local residents so late and that KL Borough Council has not arranged a public meeting model of consultation - it feels that residents - many who are elderly and many not have access to a computer- have not been properly informed , nor given the opportunity to have their say. A Gypsy and Traveller site will not be welcome in Middleton and Blackborough End.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
124		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) are next to GTRA(E) which has been deemed as unsuitable due to lack of core services and impact on the character of the area. The same principles would apply to these 3 areas. GTRA(M) has also been subject to various planning applications 20/00232/F, 21/02480/F, 21/00884/F which have been refused due to the effects on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on highway safety. Additionally within the whole site there are 2 areas of earthworks of equivalent significance to similar features protected as Scheduled Monuments. I therefore object to GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) due to increased traffic, potentially dangerous accesses, potential environmental damage and harm to the rural character of the hamlet.	Not specified	No	Previous Planning history does form part of the consideration for the sites. The Council also consult relevant agencies and organisations responsible for any identified planning constraints and their feedback will help inform the final recommendations for allocations within the Local Plan.  The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
125		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	GTRA(L) The site is adjacent to Sandy Lane. Sandy Lane is a two-lane carriageway with a 30mph speed limit and it is a relatively narrow rural carriageway not suited to a large increase in traffic, and certainly not suitable to larger vehicles. There are no parking restrictions on this section of unlit carriageway. An increase in traffic would without doubt have an impact on local residents. As well as this any overflow parking on Sandy Lane from the proposed site would cause additional hazards to other road users. One can access the wider national road network from the site from 4 locations: School Road j/w A47, East Winch Road j/w A47, Setch Road j/w A10, and Castle Road j/w A134. The most likely junction to be impacted is the School Road j/w A47, although all 4 junctions and their access routes have individual characteristics and potential issues. The School Road j/w A47 is also an unlit section of road. As stated in the latest Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination for the nearby potential site identified as GTRA(E) 'No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance'. This potential site falls within the same geographical area so the same issues would apply. The nearest GP surgery is over 5 km from the site and likely to be currently already operating at capacity. I am concerned regarding over capacity of the relevant wastewater and surface water network: there is a history of localised flooding at the bottom of Water Lane j/w Setch Road. Any further developments such as those being considered would be likely to exacerbate this issue to the detriment of the local community. The development is also likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area owing to the site being located on the edge of the village. The site is likely to impact the existing settlement. There are nearby residential properties.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>Blackborough End is a relatively small close-knit community and use of the site as proposed will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on owners of residential properties within the village and surrounding areas.</p> <p>GTRA(M) The site is adjacent to Water Lane, which being a narrow single-track carriageway is not suitable for any increase in traffic. Substantial perimeter barriers would be required and would need to be maintained to prevent site occupants from making their own access onto Water Lane. I and other community members use Water Lane as a pedestrian walkway because of its pleasant surroundings and low levels of vehicular traffic. Access to the site from Sandy Lane would be of a lower impact. Sandy Lane is a two-lane carriageway with a 30mph speed limit. Sandy Lane is also a relatively narrow rural carriageway not suited to a large increase in traffic and particularly unsuitable to larger vehicles. There are no parking restrictions on this section of unlit carriageway. An increase in traffic would without doubt have an impact on local residents and any overflow parking on Sandy Lane from the proposed site would cause additional hazards to other road users. One can access the wider national road network from the site via 4 locations: School Road j/w A47, East Winch Road j/w A47, Setch Road j/w A10, and Castle Road j/w A134. The most likely junction to be impacted is the School Road j/w A47, although all 4 junctions and their access routes have individual characteristics and potential issues.</p> <p>As stated in the latest Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination concerning the nearby potential site identified as GTRA(E) 'No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance'. This potential site falls within the same geographical area so the same would apply. The nearest GP surgery is over 5 km from the site and currently likely to be already operating at capacity. I am concerned over capacity of the relevant wastewater and surface water network. There is a history of localised flooding at the bottom of Water Lane j/w Setch Road. Any further developments such as those under consideration are highly likely to exacerbate this issue to the detriment of the local community. The development is likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area owing to the site being located on the edge of the village. The site is also large and its development for gypsy and traveller accommodation will come to overbear the built form of the existing settlement. There are nearby residential properties. Blackborough End is a relatively small close-knit community and use of the site as proposed will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on the owners of residential properties within the village and surrounding areas.</p> <p>GTRA(N) The site is adjacent to Water Lane and Sandy Lane. Water Lane is a narrow single-track carriageway unsuitable for any increase in traffic. Substantial perimeter barriers would be required and would need to be maintained to reduce the risk of occupants of the site from making their own access onto Water Lane. I and other community members use Water Lane as a pedestrian walkway due to its pleasant surroundings and current low levels of traffic. Access to the site from Sandy Lane would be of a lower impact regarding carriageway trackwidth but has other considerations. Sandy Lane is a two-lane carriageway with a 30mph speed limit. Sandy Lane is also a relatively narrow rural carriageway not suited to a large increase in traffic, and it is particularly unsuitable to larger vehicles. There are no parking restrictions on this section of unlit carriageway. An increase in traffic would without doubt have an impact on local residents and any overflow parking on Sandy Lane from the proposed site would cause additional hazards to other road users. The proximity of the junction of Sandy Lane with Water Lane and School Road is likely to elevate risk to all road users at this location where vehicles are caused to join the main carriageway at low speed with restricted views available to road users particularly on approach from School Road. There is some degree of frequency of severe standing water (after heavy rainfall) being present on nearside of Sandy Lane when travelling South, which creates an additional hazard to road users near to the junction identified above. This risk falls as the proximity of site access from this 3 road junction increases. I believe, however, that it is unlikely that there is any possibility of creating a safe access to this site from the adjacent roads. One can access the wider national road network from the site via 4 locations: School Road j/w A47, East Winch Road j/w A47, Setch Road j/w A10, and Castle Road j/w A134. The most likely junction to be impacted is the School Road j/w A47, although all 4 junctions and their access routes have their own characteristics and potential issues.</p> <p>As stated in the latest Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination concerning the nearby potential site identified as GTRA(E) 'No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance'. This potential site falls within the same geographical area so the same would apply. The nearest GP surgery is over 5 km from the site and is currently likely to be already operating at capacity. I am concerned over capacity of the relevant wastewater and surface water network. There is some history of localised flooding at the bottom of Water Lane j/w Setch Road. Any further developments such as those under consideration are highly likely to exacerbate this issue to the detriment of the local community. The development is likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area owing to the site being located on the edge of the village. There are nearby residential properties. Blackborough End is a relatively small close-knit community and use of the site as proposed will undoubtedly have an adverse effect on the owners of residential properties within</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			GTRA(N), GTRA(M), GTRA(L) In conclusion. The above sites fall within a small geographical area of approximately 8.3968 hectares, which will have mostly identical or similar characteristics as the site identified as GTRA(E). In the recent Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan Examination, GTRA(E) has already been determined as not being suitable for the use under consideration. I see little difference with the remaining three sites as listed above.				
126		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The 3 plots of land are adjacent to GTRA(E) which has already been classed as unsuitable due to lack of core services and impact on the character of the area. The same principles apply to these 3 blocks. In addition GTRA(M) has been subject to various planning applications 20/00232/F, 21/02480/F, 21/00884/F all of which have been refused due to the effects on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on highway safety. Contained within the locations there are 2 areas of earthworks of equivalent significance to similar features protected as Scheduled Monuments. I therefore object to all three sites due to safety implications of increased traffic, potentially dangerous access, potential environmental damage and harm to the rural character of the hamlet.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
127		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I feel that by allowing all three sites to be developed for gypsy & traveller sites will have a huge impact on the local area. We don't have the infrastructure to support the extra residents. I am also concerned about the environmental impact it will have on the green space. I am also concerned about the effect the sites will have on the value of my property. I object to the development of Blackborough End GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N) sites.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
128		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	There are many reasons why I OBJECT to traveller sites being in Blackborough End. - impact on house prices. Having travellers in the village will impact property value. - added traffic in a small village. This is already at crisis with the amount of lorries passing through. - losing our environmental spaces. - impact on the habitat in these spaces. - there is no drainage on any of these sites, what happens to the waste? - Blackborough ends watercourse is overloaded and we already have flooding - detrimental impact on small village life - restricted access on Sandy Lane, can't handle more traffic	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
129		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My objections to the sites GTRA (L), GTRA (M) , GTRA (N) 1. All 3 of the developments will have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the village 2. The roads are narrow 3. Flooding has occurred in this area as there are main sprongs 4. Poor availability of public transport 5. No dental or doctors surgeries in the village 6. there is no street lighting in this area 7. No employment opportunities within the village 8.The village shop is more than 800 meters away and on the other side of the busy A47	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
130		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Comments apply to all three parcels of land. 1. Planning permission for the development of residential property was in the past refused ,why now even consider a travellers site!?. 2.The land is in the centre of a small hamlet of high value properties which would be devalued. 3. There are drainage and sewerage issues with the site which you should be aware of. 4. The roads in the area are very narrow making it unsuitable for large vehicles and caravans continually using them. 5. The land is in an elevated position creating an unacceptable noise level in the community. 6. Overall the scheme would destroy a quite small community who would not be happy creating possible frictions.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
131		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I OBJECT to the proposed development on all three parcels of land, namely GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N), for the following reasons: i) The pleasant view entering the village would be spoilt by settlements along the perimeter of sites GTRA(L) & GTRA(N). Also these would be very close to neighbouring properties. ii) Site GTRA(M) is on the lowest part of the land and has a history of being extremely wet and sometimes boggy. iii) Another entrance/exit onto Sandy Lane would create more traffic. This is a busy road serving the village and surrounding area and is used by large agricultural machinery. Large caravans would add to traffic activity. iv) Adequate provision would no doubt be provided in the forms of toilets/washrooms. These would create more load on an already stretched sewage system. v) There are limited local amenities such as shops, schools and other facilities within the village/surrounding villages	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
132		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I wish to offer the following objections to the proposal of Gypsy and Traveller sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N) in Blackborough End:- 1. The proposed sites are situated on the same piece of undeveloped land as the site GTRA€. This application was rejected and deemed unsuitable owing to 'some significant constraints.' These same restraints exist for all three proposed sites. 2. Access to Site GTRA(L) and GTRA(M) would appear to be using a current access on to an existing highway which is a narrow rural road. GTRA(N) appears to need an access via the minor roads of either Water Lane or Sandy Lane. In the rejection of plan GTRA€ it states, 'The road is narrow so only a small scale of development will likely be appropriate. Additional highway works is needed.' The existing roads are on an incline, bend, narrow, often water-logged and have adverse cambers with poor line of sights for motorists. There are no pedestrian pavements adjoining the proposed sites and no street lighting. These factors are already difficult for drivers and pedestrians to negotiate without factoring in enlarged vehicular entrances which would be necessary for access to any of the three sites. 3. Local Services and Facilities There are no core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. Neither Blackborough End or the surrounding villages can offer either health services or a secondary school Has Middleton Primary school the capacity to admit more pupils?  4. Townscape Any or all three of the proposed sites will impact on the character of the current village which is largely linear especially at the point of the proposed sites. All would alter the landscape considerably. Rejection of GTRA(E) states; 'In terms of Landscape and townscape the impact is considered substantial due to this being an undeveloped area of land within the existing but form. New development will introduce backland development within a largely linear character and is likely to contribute negatively towards the existing character of this part of Blackborough End.' The above would also be applicable to all three sites as it would involve developing the same undeveloped piece of land. The impact on the fauna, flora and birdlife would be considerable and potentially	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>devastating. 5. Transport and Roads The proposed sites would need to be accessed by narrow, minor rural roads. Rejection of GTRA(E) states, 'The highway constraints are limited to the capacity of existing infrastructure. Being rural roads, these are minor, but development here is existent and further growth identified is small in scale and unlikely to lead to any severe impacts to the road network.' These three proposals are not part of the existing infrastructure and so their needs on the existing roads would not be part of any improvement proposals. 6. Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses All three sites would have an impact on the adjoining land use and neighbours. All have adjoining or nearby residential properties. GTRA(E)s rejection states: 'Some neighbouring or adjoining land use constraints identified. Nearby residential properties.' It follows that these same constraints apply to all three sites as they are on the same undeveloped piece of land.</p>				
133		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>We object to all three of the sites at Blackborough End. Our reason for the objections are as follows the sites are all near to residential properties this would therefore de-value all the properties in the area. Also the roads cannot sustain the extra 97+ vehicles using them. We also have concerns with fly tipping as we are a rural community which already has rubbish dumped in the area. We strongly object to any of the sites as a resident of the Middleton and Blackborough end community.</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
134		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>Although none of them appear in the formal consultation documentation, I wish to comment on potential sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) to the effect that the Borough Council should assess all three sites as RED and therefore unsuitable for use as Gypsy and Traveller sites.</p> <p><b>SUITABILITY ASSESSMENTS</b> Following a lengthy period of review and assessment, the Borough Council launched on 26 January 2024 the first phase of consultation on existing and possible new Gypsy and Traveller sites. One of the potential new sites mentioned in the published consultation documents was GTRA(E) in Blackborough End. The Borough Council's own assessment of that site was RED. It appears that in early February, despite GTRA(E) being assessed as RED, the landowner of that site submitted to the Council three additional parcels of land for consideration as suitable Gypsy and Traveller sites. These sites (GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N)) are all coterminous with, or very close to, the rejected site GTRA(E). It is clear that the issues of access to core services and significant adverse impact on the character of the local area which caused the Council to assess GTRA(E) as RED apply equally to these three additional sites whether considered individually or collectively. On that basis, I submit that all three additional sites should, on the Council's own criteria, also be assessed as RED and so unsuitable for Gypsy and Traveller use.</p> <p><b>VEHICULAR ACCESS</b> Sites GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) are bounded to the west by Water Lane which for the most part is a narrow single track width carriageway. Although it is assumed that Water Lane would not be used to provide access to the sites, additional fencing or other measures would be necessary along Water Lane to secure the sites and prevent unauthorised vehicle access being sought via Water Lane. Such measures and any increased traffic in Water Lane, especially by larger vehicles, would be severely detrimental to its rural character, to the rich local wildlife and to leisure use by pedestrians. All three sites are bounded to the east by Sandy Lane which, although a two-lane carriageway, is narrow as acknowledged in the Council's assessment of GTRA(E). It has some tight bends and blind summits close to potential access points to the three additional sites which increased use, especially by larger vehicles, would make even more dangerous for local residents and other road users. The nature of the road would make it very difficult if not impossible to provide safe vehicular access to and egress from any of the sites. Whatever detailed arrangements might be proposed for vehicular access to the three sites, I submit that the use of any of the three sites would create a substantially increased and unacceptable danger to local residents and other road users.</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council received sites GTRA(L-N) sites after the consultation process had commenced. Therefore no site assessment profile has been published for these sites for this consultation. All the responses received for these sites will be reviewed and will help to inform the site assessments as they're being produced.</p> <p>All the planning issues raised from the consultation will be assessed and relevant agencies and organisations responsible for such issues have been consulted. This information will help the Council in its decision on those sites proposed for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>All responses received for these 3 additional sites will be accepted and process by the Council.</p> <p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Produce a site assessment profile for each of the additional sites at Blackborough End.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p><b>FLOODING AND DRAINAGE</b> The parcel of land within which all three potential additional sites are located has a history of problems for local residents arising from flooding and drainage issues. Such concerns have been raised in previous planning applications (Reference 20/00232/F and 21/00884/F) but have not been resolved. These flooding and drainage problems would be made worse if any of the three additional sites were allocated for Gypsy and Traveller use and so all of them should be assessed as RED.</p> <p><b>HERITAGE ASSETS</b> Recent planning applications (Reference 20/00232/F and 21/00884/F) for residential development within the area covered by GTRA(M) were refused in part because Norfolk County Council's Historic Environment Service objected to the potential adverse impact on archaeological deposits at the site and overall setting of adjacent heritage assets in the field to the west of Water Lane. These concerns would appear, therefore, to apply to all these three sites and create a presumption that they should all be assessed as RED.</p> <p><b>CONSULTATION PROCESS</b> It is not clear to me whether the Borough Council is formally seeking public comments on the three additional sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) at this stage, especially as the Borough Council has not provided its own assessment of their suitability. However, as views have been sought from Middleton Parish Council and Ward Members, I wish to submit these comments in case silence should be interpreted as approval.</p>				
135		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I am writing with reference to the proposed gypsy/traveller sites in Blackborough End. I live in Middleton but am a keen walker and know the area of the proposed sites very well. The site GTRA(N) is squeezed in between two existing residential sites which will clearly detract from the outlook and value of these sites. In addition, it is also on a fairly sharp bend in the road making egress from it a possible danger.</p> <p>GTRA(M) borders a very quiet narrow lane which isn't suitable for heavy traffic, so presumably the access is planned to be on the main road, Sandy Lane, through the village.</p> <p>GTRA(L) also borders this road which will mean a considerable increase in traffic through the village which is of course of concern to the local people. With the proposed incomers being by nature a transient population there is likely to be fairly frequent movement of caravans crossing this narrow road just around a bend which could represent a danger to other road users.</p> <p>All three sites would presumably require such amenities as electricity, water, sewage, hard standings and roads to be laid at considerable cost and disruption to this peaceful area. The children from the sites would put pressure on the popular village school which I understand is full. As an ex-teacher I know how disruptive to learning it can be to accommodate a transient group of children into a settled class.</p> <p>There are no facilities such as Doctors' surgeries etc in the locality. The nearest small shop/post office is the other side of the A47 in Middleton. The Hardwick shopping centre is the nearest place to buy most groceries and day to day supplies.</p> <p>In all I feel that these sites would be out of character in this quiet village and not be of benefit to either the traveller community or the existing residents.</p>	Not specified	Not specified	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
136		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>My comments below apply to all three sites under consideration. That is GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N). As our property backs on the GTRAE my comments would have been equally applicable to that one as well. I was appalled to hear that these sites were under consideration for travellers sites. We moved to this village just over two years ago from Fakenham for a quiet retirement. Our future here would be made very difficult to what we had anticipated and expected if this matter goes ahead. We would never have contemplated buying a property so close to such sites. The value of properties in the village would be hugely decreased if a site were in the village. Some properties would no doubt be unsalable.</p> <p>We walk the quiet lanes within the village twice a day within our dogs. We continue being delighted with the wildlife so close to our homes. This would be considerably marred by the development you suggest.</p> <p>The village of Blackborough End is inhabited by a good mix of retired people, working couples and young families. This is not the sort of environment for siting the sort of development you suggest. Please let us keep our village the way it is and look elsewhere for sites for the gypsy and travelling communities.</p>	Not specified	Not specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
137		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>We should like to register our objections to the proposed sites for gypsy and traveller pitches all the sites at Blackborough End. The road infrastructure is not sufficiently robust for the inevitable resulting upsurge and would cause yet another increase in the number of HGVs and LGVs using 'Hill road' as a form of rat run to villages beyond. The majority of these vehicles are unable to take the sharp bend at the bottom of the hill without</p>	Not specified	Not specified	The highway authority has been consulted on the access and traffic issues related to these sites. The information received will help inform the Council on its recommendations for the proposed sites to be allocated in the Local Plan.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			crossing the centre lane, with all the danger and potential hazards that this involves with on coming traffic. Not to mention the corresponding increase in the volume of heavy duty traffic, largely during un-social hours.			<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
138		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>We are writing to voice our concern about the proposed gypsy and traveller sites in Blackborough End on land named in the following 3 sites – Blackborough End GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) as named in the gypsy and traveller site assessment document (F56). Our concerns are expressed in the following points:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Access onto Sandy Lane is a narrow road and on a hill and on a bend.</li> <li>2. Water Lane (as its name indicates) is a very narrow one way lane which is often saturated with springs even in summer.</li> <li>3. The proposed development on all three sites is also constantly wet and saturated with springs even in summer</li> <li>4. There is a weight restriction through the village.</li> </ol> <p>We wish the above information to be taken into consideration regarding the development of a gypsy and traveller site at Blackborough End.</p>	Not specified	Not specified	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
139		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I AM REFERING TO ALL 3 REFERANCES AS SHOWN ABOVE. I object to these proposed sites on the the following basis. 1) These sites have been left to run wild for many years and now attract many form of wild life and flowers. Buzzards, Red Kites and barn owls and bats frequent this area, so has become a pleasurable area to walk, so the locals benefit from this which also helps their mental health. 2) Water lane road, is not suitable for any more traffic, which in turn will distract the wildlife, and the natural water ways crossing these sites from underground sources, could be polluted. The ground in most parts are very wet and boggy, almost 12 months of the year, so is not suitable for any hard standings or buildings. Consideration of the close surface water channels should be reviewed and any consequences of changing them considered. 3) , The amount of traffic is quite low, thus making the area a pleasure to be and live in, thus , with the extra traffic, past the school and generally through the village, will increase and consequently, possibly reduce the attractiveness and the values of local and nearby properties. 4) There are big issues with regards to the road junction School Road/A47 and despite recent changes, this junction is very dangerous, and the extra traffic will only exacerbate the problem. 5 ) the site should also be geologically/archaeologically examined because there is evidence of prehistoric occupation ie, there is a kiln (pre roman ) which is currently in a building occupied as a private residence call ' Kiln House' Sandy lane , which formed part of the land as shown above.</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
140		GT32 and GT42	<p>Hockwold cum Wilton Parish Council met to discuss the Gypsy and Traveller Potential Sites and Policy Consultation. The council specifically have comments on sites. Site references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. GT32 -The Parish Council (PC) do not find this site acceptable for the following reasons. A. The site is in flood zones 2 &amp; 3, and no acceptable mitigation measures have been included. The sites possible danger to people and property is not acceptable. B. The summary is confusing and seems to contradict itself. Clearer conclusions need to be included. C. The site clearly states it 'has some significant identified constraints. The site has significant constraints. The site is within the SPA zone and any development here would likely have a significant impact to the character if the natural environment and wider landscape setting.' Many planning applications for social and affordable housing have been denied because of the locational relation to this specific SPA area. D. The 'appropriate</li> </ol>	Not specified	Not specified	<p>The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT42. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other</p>	Remove GT42 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>mitigation' needed to support the size and current state of the highway used to access were not included. This highway is poorly maintained, and is found in extreme disrepair for the majority of the year.</p> <p>2. GT42 – The Parish Council (PC) do not find this site acceptable for the following reasons. a. The site is listed as being in Flood Zone 1, which is not correct as stated on the flood risk information for planning site on GOV.UK. On the official site its listed as Flood Zone 3. Looking at the stated zone using an altitude checker, the site should sit at 4m above seal level, however Cowles Drove is only at 1m above sea level in either direction (east or west) of the site entrance, so flooding could easily cut off the site from the road. This information can be found on <a href="https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk">https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk</a> b. The other concern is to the total number of sites(pitches) that would be located here. The council contacted the principle planner of two occasions to ask how many sites (pitches) are currently located on either site? We were not able to get that information, so it is difficult to support a plan without all the necessary information.</p>			<p>available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.</p> <p>GT32 did not form part of the potential site consultation and therefore is not likely to be allocated in the Local Plan.</p>	
141		GTRAE, GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>Please consider the following objections to the proposal of Gypsy and Traveller sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) &amp; GTRA(N) in Sandy Lane, Blackborough End: GTRA(L), GTRA(M) &amp; GTRA(N) are situated on the same triangle of undeveloped land as the site GTRA(E). This has already been rejected by the Borough Council as it is considered unsuitable owing to 'some significant constraints.' These same restraints exist for all three proposed sites. Access to Site GTRA(N) would need a new access from either Water Lane or Sandy Lane. As Sandy Lane approaches GTRA(N) from the north, there is a sharp left-hand bend, frequently flooded, where drivers regularly cross the centre line. This is at the same point as the junction with Water Lane. It is difficult enough under existing conditions, without the necessary access road. The exit from GTRA(L) and GTRA(M) onto Sandy Lane has the hazard, mentioned above, to the left and limited visibility to the right on account of the slope. There are no footpaths on the side of the road against the proposed site. Local Services and Facilities As the Council has stated, there are no core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. The only near-by school is Middleton Primary. Apart from Middleton Village shop, there are no other accessible health, education and very few social or cultural facilities. Townscape Blackborough End is a quiet, largely linear, rural community. It's character would be substantially degraded by any of these out of character developments, as has already been identified in the Council's rejection of GTRA(E). Transport and Roads The proposed sites would need to be accessed by narrow, minor, rural roads, within the existing infrastructure, as highlighted by the Council's amber flag. Upgrading the roads would spoil the rural nature of the village and quite possibly encourage further development.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
142		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>My comments and observations relate to all three of these parcels of land in Blackborough End. I OBJECT TO THIS PROPOSAL. If I may refer to the Assessment Criteria:- There is NO secondary school, there is NO healthcare service, there is NO village shop, there is NO public transport service and there is are NO local employment opportunities. If I may be allowed to state the following:- I have been a resident of Blackborough End since May 1975. During this time a few residential properties have been built. Apart from this the only thing that has changed is the amount of traffic going through, what is essential a Hamlet. It has increased significantly. This is most noticeable on Sandy Lane, East Winch Road and Setch Road. The three main roads. To my knowledge, the owner of the land which is the subject of this proposal, has had planning permission refused on three separate occasions. The reason given was regarding the traffic. Water Lane, as it didn't have room for a turning circle and Sandy lane due to the amount of traffic using it. If these reasons were given in the past, why should it be any different now especially as I have stated the traffic situation is considerably increased.</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
143		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>All three additional potential sites, GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) at Blackborough End, are totally unsuitable as Gypsy and Traveller locations as they do not meet the assessment criteria as set out in the Borough Council document, Draft Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment January 2024 (F56). GTRA(E) was declared an unsuitable site in F56 and, therefore, GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) should also be registered unsuitable, Red, for the very same and extra reasons. All these additional sites occupy the same triangular block of land as GTRA(E), bordered by Sandy Lane, The Alley (off Setch Road) and Water Lane. Access to Sites. All three sites have dangerous access points. GTRA(L) and GTRA(M) require access on a dangerous 'blind summit' on Sandy Lane. Indeed, GTRA(E) should also have been marked as Red. Although the overall site has limited access, and this was only ever in occasional use when this large field was used as an agricultural holding for the land owner's then herd of wild boar. Constant use by numerous vehicles and trailers would make this access point highly dangerous. GTRA(L) and GTRA(M) would (according to the Borough Council map of these potential sites) all require ingress and egress at points adjoining this blind summit on Sandy Lane. As for GTRA(N), any access for this site</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>would be very dangerous, whether it be on to Water Lane or Sandy Lane, or via the private driveway of the School Barn residence. Water Lane is not a suitable alternative access point for GTRA(M) as that would be on to a narrow, dangerous, one way road. There were multiple objections to using Water Lane as an access point when the land owner applied for planning permission for 4 houses, see ref 20/00232F and for 2 houses, see ref 21/00884/F and ref 21/02480/F. Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities. All three sites should be Red, as with GTRA(E), namely: No cores services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. Utilities Capacity. All three sites suffer from poor drainage and flooding and should be marked as Red - unsuitable. Surface water mixing with waste water is already a problem in the immediate area. So mains sewerage or septic tanks would have capacity problems. Utilities Infrastructure. Mains sewerage schemes would be problematic as mentioned in above item. Mark all three sites as Red - unsuitable. Flood Risk. The overall site suffers from poor drainage and springs, and properties in The Alley have been flooded in recent years. Norfolk County Council had become involved on behalf of residents' flooded property in The Alley because of drainage issues emanating from the adjacent field. I believe litigation was contemplated. There is currently flooding at the apex of Water Lane and Sandy Lane where it meets School Road, namely adjacent to GTRA(N). All three sites should, therefore, be Red - unsuitable. Townscape. GTRA(E) has been marked Red and all three of these additional sites should also be marked Red - unsuitable because 'Development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located on the edge of the village.' Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity. Blackborough End has very little wild green space. This overall site, with grassland, bramble patches and trees is home to many bird species. As a member of the RSPB, Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Nar Valley Ornithological Society I have watched birds in Water Lane and Sandy Lane for very many years and can confirm that it is home to a range of bird species, including Wood Pigeon, Jackdaw, Chiffchaff, Goldfinch, Chaffinch, Blue Tit, Great Tit, Long-tailed Tit, Robin, Mistle Thrush, Green Woodpecker, Great Spotted Woodpecker, House Sparrow, Dunnock, Starling, Greenfinch, Bullfinch, Song Thrush, Kestrel and Wren, amongst others. Some of these bird species are of conservation concern, according to BoCC - Birds of Conservation Concern. BoCC comprises wildlife organisations, including the British Trust for Ornithology, RSPB, Natural England et al. It produces a Red List and an Amber List, showing birds of conservation concern with the Red List highlighting the most threatened species. Birds on these three potential sites, such as Mistle Thrush, House Sparrow, Starling and Greenfinch all appear on the Red List. Kestrel, Song Thrush, Dunnock, Bullfinch and Wren appear on the Amber List. All 3 sites, therefore, should be deemed Red, namely unsuitable. Historic Environment. Norfolk County Council's Historic Environment Officer objected to the land owner's planning application for 4 houses, see ref 20/00232F, and his application for 2 houses, see ref 21/00884/F, "...on account of the effect on the setting of the medieval moat earthworks". (Incidentally, the former village pub is called The Castle and other Sandy Lane residences are named Castle View and Castle Lodge.) When the above officer commented on the land owner's subsequent application for 2 houses, see ref 21/02480/F, he remarked: "...those earthworks of schedulable quality have now been destroyed (I am not stating by who and why)". In this same note of 26th January 2022 the same officer asked for a "programme of archaeological mitigatory work in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework" in the event of any subsequent planning applications. Also, that "No development shall take place until an archaeological written scheme of investigation has been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing." All 3 housing applications were refused for the same parcel of land which is now identified as the potential GTRA(M) site. In view of the above all three sites should be Red, unsuitable, as there could be unauthorised spread across the overall site to these earthworks.. Transport and Roads. Sandy Lane access point is on a blind summit making this hitherto agricultural access far too dangerous for multiple vehicle movements to and from the sites, day and night. Water Lane is not a viable alternative access point as it is a very narrow, one way road, with a blind corner. Any access from GTRA(N) to either Water Lane or Sandy Lane would be exceedingly dangerous, with access via School Barn's driveway being unacceptable to the resident, as well as being dangerous. There is frequent flooding on the sharp bend where School Road meets Sandy Lane and Water Lane, adding to the danger. There is no public transport in Blackborough End. All three sites should be Red and, thus, declared unsuitable. Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses. All three additional sites are next to existing residential properties and in no way could they be deemed compatible with the immediate neighbourhood. All three potential sites would be likely to create noise, significantly increased traffic disturbance and a significant risk of unauthorised spread across the larger site. Introduction of any of these three sites would significantly reduce the wildlife habitat of the neighbourhood. All three locations should be declared Red - unsuitable. Conclusion. These three additional potential Gypsy and Traveller sites at Blackborough End, were obviously unsuitable from the outset. Having now gone through all of the assessment criteria in detail it is obvious that they are all unsuitable locations for all the reasons set out above, so all should be marked Red. I am surprised and disappointed that they were not all rejected at first sight. The whole character and landscape of Blackborough End would change immeasurable and detrimentally. It seems highly likely that there could be unauthorised</p>			<p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			encroachment from any one of these potential GTRA sites to the others, thus possibly spilling over into the overall larger site in some way. Bizarrely, the GTRA(M) site's proposed access is via a 'swan neck' route from Sandy Lane which would have to cross GTRA(E) which has already been rejected as unsuitable. I declare that all three potential sites, GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) in Blackborough End, are unsuitable for Gypsies and Travellers.				
144		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	As a previous home owner from the small hamlet/village of Blackborough End, Norfolk I strongly object to the proposed development of x3 traveller sites. The introduction of additional families to a quiet rural village that has nil facilities or infrastructure to cope with new arrivals will have a detrimental impact on an established community. How sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N) can be deemed as potential sites where GTRA(E) is not acceptable does not make any sense as they are adjacent to each other and will have exactly the same negative impact on the village. I am aware that the land owner has tried a number of applications over the years to build starter homes and a holiday home site which were all previously rejected due to various reasons. There are also natural springs in the area which create flooding issues on Setch Road during periods of heavy rain. This raises the question about how drainage will be managed to cope with the additional demand. The area also has strong evidence of having archeological significance as the end house on Sandy Lane has a Roman Forge located in the basement. I fully appreciate that travellers require suitable and approved areas to stay such as the Swaffham Bypass or Saddlebow but to destroy the heart of a small rural village community would be criminal. I sincerely hope that all involved in this decision see sense and reject the application for the 3x sites at Blackborough End.	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
145		GT43	<p>I am writing as a local resident to express my concern with regards to one of the three traveller sites immediately (within ¼ mile) surrounding my property. There are two existing sites, one of which, GT14, we have a good relationship with and the other GT27 who are very defensive, refuse right of way along common paths and have filled the surrounding ditches with litter. Photos attached. Expansion has been suggested for 10 further caravans for the former GT14. The third site GT43 is a proposal for just one caravan standing (and it is this that we are writing to object to) for the reasons discussed below and already put forward by planning, highways and the drainage board. We suggest that site GT14 be extended by one additional caravan from 10 to 11 caravans to incorporate the proposed site GT43 for which there are so many issues.</p> <p>OBJECTION TO SITE: GT43 HOMEFIELD, COMMON RD SOUTH, WALTON HIGHWAY For site GT43 Homefield, Common Rd South, Walton Highway, the details provided on documents F56 'Draft Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment January 2024' (hereafter referred to as F56) and F55 'Gypsy and Traveller Potential Sites and Policy Consultation Document January 2024 V2' (hereafter referred to as F55) are contradictory and in many places contain material factual errors. This plot has been refused planning permission and is subject to an enforcement order (documents attached Reference 21/00492/F). Planning was refused on 9 August 2021 and an Enforcement Notice (Case Reference Number: 21/00293/UNAUT) was effective from 27 February 2023 when the clock stopped for all rights arising from occupation alone. The occupiers are now subject to criminal sanctions. This is ironic given that document F55 states that the provision of suitable permanent accommodation also reduces the risk of unauthorised encampments across the borough, and that under Proposed Approach to meeting the Accommodation Needs 6.1. Accommodation needs should be met on authorised pitches/plots. Planning was refused following representations from the planning officers, highways and the drainage board and these are summarised in turn below:</p> <p>PLANNING ISSUES Planning was refused and an enforcement order issued for the following reasons: 'The application site lies some distance outside the development boundary for Walton Highway as defined by Policy DM2 and Inset Map G120 (West Walton/Walton Highway) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) 2016 and as such it is classified as 'countryside'. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies an environmental objective in order to achieve sustainable development. Planning should 'protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment...' Section 5 of the NPPF requires that applications for residential development should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and... not in a location which is well served by public transport or local service provision and therefore it is not considered to represent sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 79. The development of greenfield sites will be resisted unless essential for agricultural REF. NO: 21/00492/For forestry needs." Policy DM2 of the SADMPP 2016 defines development boundaries and supports this approach. The site is located within the countryside and notwithstanding the works that have been carried out on site without consent, it is not classed as previously developed land as defined by Annex 2 of the NPPF. In principle, it is considered that the proposed residential use is</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.</p>	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>not in keeping with the wider sustainability aims of local and national planning policies, given that the site is located within the countryside and no appropriate justification has been given for the residential use in relation to the criteria of Paragraph 79 or 80 of the NPPF and Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy 2011. The interference with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) rights of any proposed occupiers to respect for private and family life and the home is a qualified right and must be weighed against the wider public interest in the upholding of the law, including planning law which aims to protect the countryside by restricting residential development. This legitimate aim is only able to be upheld by resisting this inappropriate development. On this basis, the refusal of planning permission is necessary and proportionate, and would not result in any disproportionate interference with the rights of the applicant.</p> <p>Conclusion In light of the above issues, it is concluded that the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (Paras. 8, 79, 80, 110, 164, 165 &amp; 174), Policies CS01, CS02, CS06, CS08 &amp; CS11 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1, DM2 &amp; DM15 of the SADMPP (2016). It is therefore duly recommended for refusal for the reasons stated below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION REFUSE for the following reason(s): 1 The development is located within the countryside where there is no footpath or streetlighting outside the application site and therefore there is likely to be a heavy reliance on private vehicles to reach services and facilities. Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1 &amp; DM2 of the SADMPP (2016). 2 The NPPF seeks to manage new development with an objective of promoting sustainable patterns of growth. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policy REF. NO: 21/00492/F CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011) set criteria for determining applications for gypsy and traveller sites, including a requirement for these to be located within a reasonable distance from facilities and supporting services. Notwithstanding the lack of evidence provided to demonstrate the applicant meets the definition of a gypsy or traveller, the development is located in an isolated position within the countryside and is not located a reasonable distance from supporting facilities within Walton Highway, in direct conflict with the aforementioned policy advice. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policies CS01 and CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011). 3 It is the responsibility of the LPA to ensure that development is steered towards areas with the lowest risk of flooding. The application is for a highly vulnerable form of development within Flood Zone 3 and as such is considered inappropriate. Whilst the proposal passes the sequential test, the exception test still needs to be passed. The proposal does not represent a form of development where the sustainability benefits outweigh the flood risk, and therefore the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 164 and 165 of the NPPF and Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011.' HIGHWAYS ISSUES Highways have commented as follows: 'The proposed development site is remote from schooling; town centre shopping; health provision and has restricted employment opportunities with limited scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The distance from service centre provision precludes any realistic opportunity of encouraging a modal shift away from the private car towards public transport. It is the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed development are likely to conflict with the aims of sustainable development and you may wish to consider this point within your overall assessment of the site.' Access to the site is down a narrow single lane road in a very poor state of repair. The road is off St Paul's Road South where there are already issues with speeding; (most recent crash Police Incident NC-27012024-403). This road is in a terrible condition, the camber pushes cars into the centre in places. The risk of cars driving at high speed is multiplied by the fact that to do so they often drive in the middle of the road. FLOODING ISSUES Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal) Per government guidance (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3</a>) a sequential test should be performed. A sequential test compares your proposed site with other available sites to show which one has the lowest flood risk located within a reasonable distance from facilities and supporting services. Notwithstanding the lack of evidence provided to demonstrate the applicant meets the definition of a gypsy or traveller, the development is located in an isolated position within the countryside and is not located a reasonable distance from supporting facilities within Walton Highway, in direct conflict with the aforementioned policy advice. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policies CS01 and CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011). 3 It is the responsibility of the LPA to ensure that development is steered towards areas with the lowest risk of flooding. The application is for a highly vulnerable form of development within Flood Zone 3 and as such is considered inappropriate. Whilst the proposal passes the sequential test, the exception test still needs to be passed. The proposal does not represent a form of development where the sustainability benefits outweigh the flood risk, and therefore the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 164 and 165 of the NPPF and Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011.' HIGHWAYS ISSUES Highways have commented as follows: 'The proposed development site is remote from schooling; town centre shopping; health provision and has restricted employment opportunities with limited scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The</p>				



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>distance from service centre provision precludes any realistic opportunity of encouraging a modal shift away from the private car towards public transport. It is the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed development are likely to conflict with the aims of sustainable development and you may wish to consider this point within your overall assessment of the site.' Access to the site is down a narrow single lane road in a very poor state of repair. The road is off St Paul's Road South where there are already issues with speeding; (most recent crash Police Incident NC-27012024-403). This road is in a terrible condition, the camber pushes cars into the centre in places. The risk of cars driving at high speed is multiplied by the fact that to do so they often drive in the middle of the road. FLOODING ISSUES Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal) Per government guidance (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3</a>) a sequential test should be performed. A sequential test compares your proposed site with other available sites to show which one has the lowest flood risk Utilities Capacity / Water Stress The assessment states 'No concerns raised.' As a local resident I can confirm that there is minimal water pressure which is both an issue for residents and a fire hazard. We discussed the issue with the fire brigade (after a fire on our verge caused by a dropped cigarette) who have said that the hydrant on St Paul's Road South has been designated as unusable due to low of water pressure. The area is on the Cambridgeshire border where water stress is reaching a crisis point. The Environment Agency has recently classified the Cambridge Water operating area as an area of serious water stress. This means that future predicted rainfall may not meet the demand for water in the region. Utilities Infrastructure The assessment states 'has access to a water supply network and has its own septic tank or package treatment plant due to the remote location.' The current site was illegally installed over night. There is no building control sign off and no compliant septic tank has been fitted. Flood Risk The assessment states 'The site is located within Flood Zone 2 &amp; 3 of the BCKLWNSFRA (2017) and Flood Zone 2 &amp; 3a.'. This is incorrect the site is in Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal). The assessment states 'As this is an existing authorised site where a direct need has arisen through the GTAA 2023,..'. This is again incorrect. As discussed above the site is unauthorised and subject to an enforcement order to be removed. In the 'Draft_Gypsy_and_Traveller_Strategic_Flood_Risk_Assessment_Main_Report' (<a href="https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20216/local_plan_review_2016_2036/1097/level_2_sfra_addendum_gypsy_and_traveller_sites">https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20216/local_plan_review_2016_2036/1097/level_2_sfra_addendum_gypsy_and_traveller_sites</a>), Site GT43 is in Category G/H Red. The report itself says directly under this listing: 'The sites in Category H below are those with the highest risk from flooding. Due to the majority of these being already permitted, it is important to investigate whether existing mitigation measures are appropriate for an intensification and/ or extension of the site or whether new mitigation measures are required. These sites will only be considered appropriate for allocation if there is overwhelming justification to override such constraints. These reasons are likely to be linked to a lack of sequentially suitable sites and/ or a direct need arising from such sites.' The report also highlights that there is no funding for defences Site GT43 as discussed is not authorised or permitted and accommodation can instead be provided in site GT14. It appears from this report that there was an error in even taking this site forward for consultation. This site was established over night without authorisation so there is strong evidence to suggest that this site will if authorised be subsequently expanded in the same way. Open Space /Green Infrastructure The assessment states 'No known issues. The site is not located on an identified open space.' As stated by planning: 'The application site lies some distance outside the development boundary for Walton Highway as defined by Policy DM2 and Inset Map G120 (West Walton/Walton Highway) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) 2016 and as such it is classified as 'countryside'. Transport and Roads The assessment states 'Highway is constrained by its current size, but additional pitches could be supported through appropriate mitigation if and where required.' Again, this is a general comment referring to identified constraints which are not clarified and suggests that these constraints could be overcome through mitigation though no suggestions of mitigating factors are made. Coastal Change The assessment states 'The site is not adjacent to a Coastal Flood Hazard Zone.' Again incorrect. The site is in Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal). Compatibility with Neighbouring /Adjoining Uses The assessment states 'Near residential dwellings. Development of the site could have issues of compatibility with neighbouring/adjoin uses; however, these could be reasonably mitigated.' Yet again the assessment refers to identified constraints which are not clarified and suggests that these could be overcome through mitigation though no suggestions of mitigating factors are made. Residents and the local council have observed the results of littering and fly tipping in the area around sites which the council does not seem to have funding to control. There is a volunteer litter picking group run by concerned residents with cleared roads littered within days of being cleared. Approximately 40 used nitrogen gas canisters are collected on a weekly basis. The Availability Assessment does though seem to be correct: 'Availability Assessment Is the site available in the plan period? Not Available' The report conclusion strings together the above incorrect information to draw yet another incorrect conclusion. In particular, the conclusion refers to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment but again fails to state that the site is in Category H and of highest risk from flooding. 'These sites will only be considered appropriate for allocation if there is</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			overwhelming justification to override such constraints. These reasons are likely to be linked to a lack of sequentially suitable sites and/ or a direct need arising from such sites.' The Conclusion again incorrectly states 'in terms of Landscape and townscape the impact is minimal due to this being an existing and established site.' This is an unauthorised site subject to an enforcement order for removal. To conclude I suggest that site GT14 be extended by one additional caravan from 10 to 11 caravans to incorporate the proposed site GT43 for which there are so many issues.				
146		GT42 GT66 GT67	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England has reviewed the documents as provided below, and has the following comments to make:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gypsy &amp; Traveller Potential Sites &amp; Policy Document (January 2024);</li> <li>• Gypsy &amp; Traveller Site Assessment Document (January 2024);</li> <li>• Gypsy &amp; Traveller Sustainability Appraisal (January 2024);</li> </ul> <p>i) Norfolk Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS) All of the proposed site allocations for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople, fall within the 'Zone of Influence' (Zoi) for multiple European designated sites scoped into the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy ('GIRAMS'). It is anticipated that certain types of development resulting in net additional dwellings (see Section 3.4.1. of the GIRAMS report for a list of qualifying development), in this area are 'likely to have a significant effect' on the sensitive interest features of these European designated sites, through increased recreational pressure when considered either, alone, or 'in combination' with other plans and projects. Natural England advise that for all of the site locations that progress as being a potentially suitable and qualify as relevant residential growth in the GIRAMS (including the existing sites which have additional capacity, and the formalisation of existing sites) will need to be formally checked and confirmed by your Authority, as the competent authority, to determine whether the Norfolk GIRAMS applies in view of the European Site's conservation objectives and in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats &amp; Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). The GIRAMS has been put in place to ensure that this additional recreational pressure does not lead to an adverse effect on European designated sites in Norfolk. The strategy allows effective mitigation to be implemented at a strategic level, so that the relevant councils, Natural England and other stakeholders are able to work together to provide the best outcomes for the designated sites. It also has the benefit of streamlining the process, so reducing the amount of time taken to process individual planning applications for the councils and Natural England. Natural England worked collaboratively with all the relevant councils to set up the strategy. We fully support the aims of the strategy; in our view it is the best way to provide appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures for the European sites in question. ii) Site allocations GT42, GT66 and GT67 Natural England advise that for the site allocations, GT42, GT66 and GT67, further assessment may be required in relation to statutory designated sites for nature conservation should these locations be progressed as being suitable. We advise that site GT42 is within the 1.5km buffer around those parts of Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA) designated for stone curlew and site GT66 is within the 500m buffer for Breckland SPA/Breckland Forest SSSI in relation to nightjar and woodlark. Therefore proposed development in these locations would need further assessment as part of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) process to demonstrate that the requirements of Regulations 63 and 64 of the Habitats Regulations have been considered by your Authority. We advise that site GT67 is within close proximity (~350m) to Syderstone Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), so an SSSI Impact Assessment may be required to rule out any impacts to the designated site. It is also noted that in the sustainability appraisal for the above sites, sites GT42 and GT66 have a significance key of 'Dependent on implementation' for 'Natural Environment' and site GT67 has a significance key of 'Neutral effect'. To be precautionary with regard to the above designated sites, Natural England advise that a 'negative impact', or 'unknown impact' should be considered for the 'Natural Environment' until they have been assessed within a plan-level HRA, or SSSI impact assessment.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.</p> <p>The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.</p>	<p>Remove GT67 from the consultation document.</p> <p>Remove GT42 from the consultation document.</p> <p>Update the site assessment for GT42, GT66, GT67 to include NE comments.</p>
147		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The area and the school and ALL facilities are not going to cope with this. planning permission has been denied in the past on the grounds the access is not viable for two houses how can you permit a site of multiple dwellings	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
148		GTRA(B)	Given the outcome of planning application 23/01606/F, which has been refused. Please ensure that my comments contained in the attached letter, are taken into account as part of the wider consultation for the Review of the Draft Local Plan.	Not specified	No	Your comments to Planning application 23/01606/F will be considered by this consultation.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document
149		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	object to the proposal of all three gypsy sites - GTRA (L) GTRA (m) GTRA (n). The first reason is that this land has been intended for agricultural purposes, why is this no longer the case? Wild pigs were on site and it's hard to believe that the land was not an economically viable option so why change now? Furthermore destruction of property is a major consideration, we have spent thousands over the past few years on our garden and several hundred pounds eradicating moles which several experts confirmed came from land in question. Experts have also confirmed that activity on the site would result in moles moving and using old lanes, which would end up in potential destruction to our property and we would require compensation should that occur. We have also seen a barn owl and various other birds of prey and wildlife in this area. Access this site occurs on a busy corner in the village and is not suitable for a significant increase in traffic. I also think that the local school will not have enough space for more children and there are no local GP practices or dentists that can care for more people.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
150		GT14 GT27 GT43	I am writing as a local resident to express my concern with regards to one of the three traveller sites immediately (within ¼ mile) surrounding my property. There are two existing sites, one of which, GT14, we have a good relationship with and the other GT27 who are very defensive, refuse right of way along common paths and have filled the surrounding ditches with litter. Photos attached. Expansion has been suggested for 10 further caravans for the former GT14. The third site GT43 is a proposal for just one caravan standing (and it is this that we are writing to object to) for the reasons discussed below and already put forward by planning, highways and the drainage board. We suggest that site GT14 be extended by one additional caravan from 10 to 11 caravans to incorporate the proposed site GT43 for which there are so many issues. OBJECTION TO SITE: GT43 HOMEFIELD, COMMON RD SOUTH, WALTON HIGHWAY For site GT43 Homefield, Common Rd South, Walton Highway, the details provided on documents F56 'Draft Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment January 2024' (hereafter referred to as F56) and F55 'Gypsy and Traveller Potential Sites and Policy Consultation Document January 2024 V2' (hereafter referred to as F55) are contradictory and in many places contain material factual errors. This plot has been refused planning permission and is subject to an enforcement order (documents attached Reference 21/00492/F). Planning was refused on 9 August 2021 and an Enforcement Notice (Case Reference Number: 21/00293/UNAUT) was effective from 27 February 2023 when the clock stopped for all rights arising from occupation alone. The occupiers are now subject to criminal sanctions. This is ironic given that document F55 states that the provision of suitable permanent accommodation also reduces the risk of unauthorised encampments across the borough, and that under Proposed Approach to meeting the Accommodation Needs 6.1. Accommodation needs should be met on authorised pitches/plots. Planning was refused following representations from the planning officers, highways and the drainage board and these are summarised in turn below:  PLANNING ISSUES Planning was refused and an enforcement order issued for the following reasons: 'The application site lies some distance outside the development boundary for Walton Highway as defined by Policy DM2 and Inset Map G120 (West Walton/Walton Highway) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) 2016 and as such it is classified as 'countryside'. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies an environmental objective in order to achieve sustainable development. Planning should 'protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment...' Section 5 of the NPPF requires that applications for residential development should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and... not in a location which is well served by public transport or local service provision and therefore it is not considered to represent sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 79. The development of greenfield sites will be resisted unless essential for agricultural REF. NO: 21/00492/For forestry needs." Policy DM2 of the SADMPP 2016 defines development boundaries and supports this approach. The site is located within the countryside and notwithstanding the works	Not specified	No	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>that have been carried out on site without consent, it is not classed as previously developed land as defined by Annex 2 of the NPPF. In principle, it is considered that the proposed residential use is not in keeping with the wider sustainability aims of local and national planning policies, given that the site is located within the countryside and no appropriate justification has been given for the residential use in relation to the criteria of Paragraph 79 or 80 of the NPPF and Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy 2011. The interference with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) rights of any proposed occupiers to respect for private and family life and the home is a qualified right and must be weighed against the wider public interest in the upholding of the law, including planning law which aims to protect the countryside by restricting residential development. This legitimate aim is only able to be upheld by resisting this inappropriate development. On this basis, the refusal of planning permission is necessary and proportionate, and would not result in any disproportionate interference with the rights of the applicant. Conclusion In light of the above issues, it is concluded that the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (Paras. 8, 79, 80, 110, 164, 165 &amp; 174), Policies CS01, CS02, CS06, CS08 &amp; CS11 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1, DM2 &amp; DM15 of the SADMPP (2016). It is therefore duly recommended for refusal for the reasons stated below.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b>  REFUSE for the following reason(s): 1 The development is located within the countryside where there is no footpath or streetlighting outside the application site and therefore there is likely to be a heavy reliance on private vehicles to reach services and facilities. Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1 &amp; DM2 of the SADMPP (2016). 2 The NPPF seeks to manage new development with an objective of promoting sustainable patterns of growth. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policy REF. NO: 21/00492/F CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011) set criteria for determining applications for gypsy and traveller sites, including a requirement for these to be located within a reasonable distance from facilities and supporting services. Notwithstanding the lack of evidence provided to demonstrate the applicant meets the definition of a gypsy or traveller, the development is located in an isolated position within the countryside and is not located a reasonable distance from supporting facilities within Walton Highway, in direct conflict with the aforementioned policy advice. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policies CS01 and CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011). 3 It is the responsibility of the LPA to ensure that development is steered towards areas with the lowest risk of flooding. The application is for a highly vulnerable form of development within Flood Zone 3 and as such is considered inappropriate. Whilst the proposal passes the sequential test, the exception test still needs to be passed. The proposal does not represent a form of development where the sustainability benefits outweigh the flood risk, and therefore the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 164 and 165 of the NPPF and Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011.'</p> <p><b>HIGHWAYS ISSUES</b> Highways have commented as follows: 'The proposed development site is remote from schooling; town centre shopping; health provision and has restricted employment opportunities with limited scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The distance from service centre provision precludes any realistic opportunity of encouraging a modal shift away from the private car towards public transport. It is the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed development are likely to conflict with the aims of sustainable development and you may wish to consider this point within your overall assessment of the site.' Access to the site is down a narrow single lane road in a very poor state of repair. The road is off St Paul's Road South where there are already issues with speeding; (most recent crash Police Incident NC-27012024-403). This road is in a terrible condition, the camber pushes cars into the centre in places. The risk of cars driving at high speed is multiplied by the fact that to do so they often drive in the middle of the road.</p> <p><b>FLOODING ISSUES</b>  Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal) Per government guidance (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-riskassessment-in-flood-zones-2-and-3">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-riskassessment-in-flood-zones-2-and-3</a>) a sequential test should be performed. A sequential test compares your proposed site with other available sites to show which one has the lowest flood risk.</p> <p><b>POLICING ISSUES</b>  The police have had 5 calls for service for Road Traffic Collision's on this section of St Paul's Road South in the past 12 months. Daniel Edwards A/Inspector 1713 Downham Market Police Station has commented that 'the condition of the road is not ideal and it can be used as a bit of a rat run for vehicles leaving the A47'.</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>DOCUMENTATION ISSUES/ INACCURACIES (DOCUMENTS F55 AND F56)</p> <p>The site is correctly identified as Unauthorised in F56 only. General comments refer to identified constraints which are not clarified and suggests that these could be overcome through mitigation though no suggestions of mitigating factors are made. The majority of the Suitability Assessment is incorrect and directly contradicts the information provided by Planning and Highways between 2021 and 2023, since when no changes have been made to the locale. For example: Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities. The assessment states 'Site is within walkable distance to one to three core services within 1200m.' Planning have correctly stated that: 'There is no footpath or streetlighting outside the application site and therefore there is likely to be a heavy reliance on private vehicles to reach services and facilities.' 'The development is located in an isolated position within the countryside and is not located a reasonable distance from supporting facilities within Walton Highway.'</p> <p>Highways have correctly stated that: 'The proposed development site is remote from schooling; town centre shopping; health provision and has restricted employment opportunities with limited scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The distance from service centre provision precludes any realistic opportunity of encouraging a modal shift away from the private car towards public transport.' Government guidance: 'Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1 &amp; DM2 of the SADMPP (2016) says that the NPPF seeks to manage new development with an objective of promoting sustainable patterns of growth. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policy REF. NO: 21/00492/F CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011) set criteria for determining applications for gypsy and traveller sites, including a requirement for these to be located within a reasonable distance from facilities and supporting services.'</p> <p>Utilities Capacity / Water Stress</p> <p>The assessment states 'No concerns raised.' As a local resident I can confirm that there is minimal water pressure which is both an issue for residents and a fire hazard. We discussed the issue with the fire brigade (after a fire on our verge caused by a dropped cigarette) who have said that the hydrant on St Paul's Road South has been designated as unusable due to low of water pressure. The area is on the Cambridgeshire border where water stress is reaching a crisis point. The Environment Agency has recently classified the Cambridge Water operating area as an area of serious water stress. This means that future predicted rainfall may not meet the demand for water in the region.</p> <p>Utilities Infrastructure The assessment states 'has access to a water supply network and has its own septic tank or package treatment plant due to the remote location.' The current site was illegally installed over night. There is no building control sign off and no compliant septic tank has been fitted.</p> <p>Flood Risk The assessment states 'The site is located within Flood Zone 2 &amp; 3 of the BCKLWNSFRA (2017) and Flood Zone 2 &amp; 3a.'. This is incorrect the site is in Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal). The assessment states 'As this is an existing authorised site where a direct need has arisen through the GTAA 2023,..'. This is again incorrect. As discussed above the site is unauthorised and subject to an enforcement order to be removed. In the 'Draft_Gypsy_and_Traveller_Strategic_Flood_Risk_Assessment_Main_Report' (<a href="https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20216/local_plan_review_2016_2036/1097/level_2_sfra_addendum_gypsy_and_traveller_sites">https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20216/local_plan_review_2016_2036/1097/level_2_sfra_addendum_gypsy_and_traveller_sites</a>), Site GT43 is in Category G/H Red. The report itself says directly under this listing: 'The sites in Category H below are those with the highest risk from flooding. Due to the majority of these being already permitted, it is important to investigate whether existing mitigation measures are appropriate for an intensification and/ or extension of the site or whether new mitigation measures are required. These sites will only be considered appropriate for allocation if there is overwhelming justification to override such constraints. These reasons are likely to be linked to a lack of sequentially suitable sites and/ or a direct need arising from such sites.' The report also highlights that there is no funding for defences. Site GT43 as discussed is not authorised or permitted and accommodation can instead be provided in site GT14. It appears from this report that there was an error in even taking this site forward for consultation. This site was established over night without authorisation so there is strong evidence to suggest that this site will if authorised be subsequently expanded in the same way. Open Space /Green Infrastructure The assessment states 'No known issues. The site is not located on an identified open space.' As stated by planning: 'The application site lies some distance outside the development boundary for Walton Highway as defined by Policy DM2 and Inset Map G120 (West Walton/Walton Highway) of</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) 2016 and as such it is classified as 'countryside'.</p> <p>Transport and Roads The assessment states 'Highway is constrained by its current size, but additional pitches could be supported through appropriate mitigation if and where required.' Again, this is a general comment referring to identified constraints which are not clarified and suggests that these constraints could be overcome through mitigation though no suggestions of mitigating factors are made. Coastal Change The assessment states 'The site is not adjacent to a Coastal Flood Hazard Zone.' Again incorrect. The site is in Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal). Compatibility with Neighbouring /Adjoining Uses The assessment states 'Near residential dwellings. Development of the site could have issues of compatibility with neighbouring/adjoin uses; however, these could be reasonably mitigated.' Yet again the assessment refers to identified constraints which are not clarified and suggests that these could be overcome through mitigation though no suggestions of mitigating factors are made. Residents and the local council have observed the results of littering and fly tipping in the area around sites which the council does not seem to have funding to control. There is a volunteer litter picking group run by concerned residents with cleared roads littered within days of being cleared.</p> <p>Approximately 40 used nitrogen gas canisters are collected on a weekly basis. The Availability Assessment does though seem to be correct: 'Availability Assessment Is the site available in the plan period? Not Available' The report conclusion strings together the above incorrect information to draw yet another incorrect conclusion. In particular, the conclusion refers to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment but again fails to state that the site is in Category H and of highest risk from flooding. 'These sites will only be considered appropriate for allocation if there is overwhelming justification to override such constraints. These reasons are likely to be linked to a lack of sequentially suitable sites and/ or a direct need arising from such sites.' The Conclusion again incorrectly states 'in terms of Landscape and townscape the impact is minimal due to this being an existing and established site.' This is an unauthorised site subject to an enforcement order for removal. To conclude I suggest that site GT14 be extended by one additional caravan from 10 to 11 caravans to incorporate the proposed site GT43 for which there are so many issues.</p>				
151		GT43, GT27, GT14	<p>I am writing as a local resident to express my concern with regards to one of the three traveller sites immediately (within ¼ mile) surrounding my property. There are two existing sites, one of which, GT14, we have a good relationship with and the other GT27 who are very defensive, refuse right of way along common paths and have filled the surrounding ditches with litter. Photos attached. Expansion has been suggested for 10 further caravans for the former GT14. The third site GT43 is a proposal for just one caravan standing (and it is this that we are writing to object to) for the reasons discussed below and already put forward by planning, highways and the drainage board. We suggest that site GT14 be extended by one additional caravan from 10 to 11 caravans to incorporate the proposed site GT43 for which there are so many issues.</p> <p>OBJECTION TO SITE: GT43 HOMEFIELD, COMMON RD SOUTH, WALTON HIGHWAY For site GT43 Homefield, Common Rd South, Walton Highway, the details provided on documents F56 'Draft Gypsy and Traveller Full Site Assessment January 2024' (hereafter referred to as F56) and F55 'Gypsy and Traveller Potential Sites and Policy Consultation Document January 2024 V2' (hereafter referred to as F55) are contradictory and in many places contain material factual errors. This plot has been refused planning permission and is subject to an enforcement order (documents attached Reference 21/00492/F). Planning was refused on 9 August 2021 and an Enforcement Notice (Case Reference Number: 21/00293/UNAUT) was effective from 27 February 2023 when the clock stopped for all rights arising from occupation alone. The occupiers are now subject to criminal sanctions. This is ironic given that document F55 states that the provision of suitable permanent accommodation also reduces the risk of unauthorised encampments across the borough, and that under Proposed Approach to meeting the Accommodation Needs 6.1. Accommodation needs should be met on authorised pitches/plots. Planning was refused following representations from the planning officers, highways and the drainage board and these are summarised in turn below:</p> <p>PLANNING ISSUES Planning was refused and an enforcement order issued for the following reasons: 'The application site lies some distance outside the development boundary for Walton Highway as defined by Policy DM2 and Inset Map G120 (West Walton/Walton Highway) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) 2016 and as such it is classified as 'countryside'. Paragraph 8 of the NPPF identifies an</p>	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>environmental objective in order to achieve sustainable development. Planning should ‘protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment...’ Section 5 of the NPPF requires that applications for residential development should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and... not in a location which is well served by public transport or local service provision and therefore it is not considered to represent sustainable development in accordance with paragraph 79. The development of greenfield sites will be resisted unless essential for agricultural REF. NO: 21/00492/For forestry needs.” Policy DM2 of the SADMPP 2016 defines development boundaries and supports this approach. The site is located within the countryside and notwithstanding the works that have been carried out on site without consent, it is not classed as previously developed land as defined by Annex 2 of the NPPF. In principle, it is considered that the proposed residential use is not in keeping with the wider sustainability aims of local and national planning policies, given that the site is located within the countryside and no appropriate justification has been given for the residential use in relation to the criteria of Paragraph 79 or 80 of the NPPF and Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy 2011. The interference with the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) rights of any proposed occupiers to respect for private and family life and the home is a qualified right and must be weighed against the wider public interest in the upholding of the law, including planning law which aims to protect the countryside by restricting residential development. This legitimate aim is only able to be upheld by resisting this inappropriate development. On this basis, the refusal of planning permission is necessary and proportionate, and would not result in any disproportionate interference with the rights of the applicant.</p> <p>Conclusion In light of the above issues, it is concluded that the proposed development is contrary to the provisions of the NPPF (Paras. 8, 79, 80, 110, 164, 165 &amp; 174), Policies CS01, CS02, CS06, CS08 &amp; CS11 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1, DM2 &amp; DM15 of the SADMPP (2016). It is therefore duly recommended for refusal for the reasons stated below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION REFUSE for the following reason(s): 1 The development is located within the countryside where there is no footpath or streetlighting outside the application site and therefore there is likely to be a heavy reliance on private vehicles to reach services and facilities. Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM1 &amp; DM2 of the SADMPP (2016). 2 The NPPF seeks to manage new development with an objective of promoting sustainable patterns of growth. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policy REF. NO: 21/00492/F CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011) set criteria for determining applications for gypsy and traveller sites, including a requirement for these to be located within a reasonable distance from facilities and supporting services. Notwithstanding the lack of evidence provided to demonstrate the applicant meets the definition of a gypsy or traveller, the development is located in an isolated position within the countryside and is not located a reasonable distance from supporting facilities within Walton Highway, in direct conflict with the aforementioned policy advice. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policies CS01 and CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011). 3 It is the responsibility of the LPA to ensure that development is steered towards areas with the lowest risk of flooding. The application is for a highly vulnerable form of development within Flood Zone 3 and as such is considered inappropriate. Whilst the proposal passes the sequential test, the exception test still needs to be passed. The proposal does not represent a form of development where the sustainability benefits outweigh the flood risk, and therefore the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 164 and 165 of the NPPF and Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011.’ HIGHWAYS ISSUES Highways have commented as follows: ‘The proposed development site is remote from schooling; town centre shopping; health provision and has restricted employment opportunities with limited scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The distance from service centre provision precludes any realistic opportunity of encouraging a modal shift away from the private car towards public transport. It is the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed development are likely to conflict with the aims of sustainable development and you may wish to consider this point within your overall assessment of the site.’ Access to the site is down a narrow single lane road in a very poor state of repair. The road is off St Paul’s Road South where there are already issues with speeding; (most recent crash Police Incident NC-27012024-403). This road is in a terrible condition, the camber pushes cars into the centre in places. The risk of cars driving at high speed is multiplied by the fact that to do so they often drive in the middle of the road. FLOODING ISSUES Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal) Per government guidance (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3</a>) a sequential test should be performed. A sequential test compares your proposed site with other available sites to show which one has the lowest flood risk located within a reasonable distance from facilities and supporting services. Notwithstanding the lack of evidence provided to demonstrate the applicant meets the definition of a gypsy or traveller, the development is located in an isolated position within the countryside and is not located a reasonable distance from supporting facilities within Walton Highway, in direct conflict with the</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>aforementioned policy advice. The proposal is therefore contrary to the NPPF, Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) and Policies CS01 and CS09 of the Core Strategy (2011). 3 It is the responsibility of the LPA to ensure that development is steered towards areas with the lowest risk of flooding. The application is for a highly vulnerable form of development within Flood Zone 3 and as such is considered inappropriate. Whilst the proposal passes the sequential test, the exception test still needs to be passed. The proposal does not represent a form of development where the sustainability benefits outweigh the flood risk, and therefore the proposal is contrary to paragraphs 164 and 165 of the NPPF and Policy CS08 of the Core Strategy 2011.’ HIGHWAYS ISSUES Highways have commented as follows: ‘The proposed development site is remote from schooling; town centre shopping; health provision and has restricted employment opportunities with limited scope for improving access by foot and public transport. The distance from service centre provision precludes any realistic opportunity of encouraging a modal shift away from the private car towards public transport. It is the view of the Highway Authority that the proposed development are likely to conflict with the aims of sustainable development and you may wish to consider this point within your overall assessment of the site.’ Access to the site is down a narrow single lane road in a very poor state of repair. The road is off St Paul’s Road South where there are already issues with speeding; (most recent crash Police Incident NC-27012024-403). This road is in a terrible condition, the camber pushes cars into the centre in places. The risk of cars driving at high speed is multiplied by the fact that to do so they often drive in the middle of the road. FLOODING ISSUES Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal) Per government guidance (<a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-in-floodzones-2-and-3</a>) a sequential test should be performed. A sequential test compares your proposed site with other available sites to show which one has the lowest flood risk Utilities Capacity / Water Stress The assessment states ‘No concerns raised.’ As a local resident I can confirm that there is minimal water pressure which is both an issue for residents and a fire hazard. We discussed the issue with the fire brigade (after a fire on our verge caused by a dropped cigarette) who have said that the hydrant on St Paul’s Road South has been designated as unusable due to low of water pressure. The area is on the Cambridgeshire border where water stress is reaching a crisis point. The Environment Agency has recently classified the Cambridge Water operating area as an area of serious water stress. This means that future predicted rainfall may not meet the demand for water in the region. Utilities Infrastructure The assessment states ‘has access to a water supply network and has its own septic tank or package treatment plant due to the remote location.’ The current site was illegally installed over night. There is no building control sign off and no compliant septic tank has been fitted. Flood Risk The assessment states ‘The site is located within Flood Zone 2 &amp; 3 of the BCKLWNSFRA (2017) and Flood Zone 2 &amp; 3a.’ This is incorrect the site is in Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal). The assessment states ‘As this is an existing authorised site where a direct need has arisen through the GTAA 2023,..’. This is again incorrect. As discussed above the site is unauthorised and subject to an enforcement order to be removed. In the ‘Draft_Gypsy_and_Traveller_Strategic_Flood_Risk_Assessment_Main_Report’ (<a href="https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20216/local_plan_review_2016/_2036/1097/level_2_sfra_addendum_gypsy_and_traveller_sites">https://www.west-norfolk.gov.uk/info/20216/local_plan_review_2016_2036/1097/level_2_sfra_addendum_gypsy_and_traveller_sites</a>), Site GT43 is in Category G/H Red. The report itself says directly under this listing: ‘The sites in Category H below are those with the highest risk from flooding. Due to the majority of these being already permitted, it is important to investigate whether existing mitigation measures are appropriate for an intensification and/ or extension of the site or whether new mitigation measures are required. These sites will only be considered appropriate for allocation if there is overwhelming justification to override such constraints. These reasons are likely to be linked to a lack of sequentially suitable sites and/ or a direct need arising from such sites.’ The report also highlights that there is no funding for defences Site GT43 as discussed is not authorised or permitted and accommodation can instead be provided in site GT14. It appears from this report that there was an error in even taking this site forward for consultation. This site was established over night without authorisation so there is strong evidence to suggest that this site will if authorised be subsequently expanded in the same way. Open Space /Green Infrastructure The assessment states ‘No known issues. The site is not located on an identified open space.’ As stated by planning: ‘The application site lies some distance outside the development boundary for Walton Highway as defined by Policy DM2 and Inset Map G120 (West Walton/Walton Highway) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) 2016 and as such it is classified as ‘countryside.’ Transport and Roads The assessment states ‘Highway is constrained by its current size, but additional pitches could be supported through appropriate mitigation if and where required.’ Again, this is a general comment referring to identified constraints which are not clarified and suggests that these constraints could be overcome through mitigation though no suggestions of mitigating factors are made. Coastal Change The assessment states ‘The site is not adjacent to a Coastal Flood Hazard Zone.’ Again incorrect. The site is in Flood Zone 3a, Watercourse passing within 20m, Climate Change (Tidal). Compatibility with Neighbouring /Adjoining Uses The assessment states ‘Near residential dwellings. Development of the site could have issues of compatibility with neighbouring/adjoin uses; however, these could be reasonably mitigated.’ Yet again the assessment refers to</p>				



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			identified constraints which are not clarified and suggests that these could be overcome through mitigation though no suggestions of mitigating factors are made. Residents and the local council have observed the results of littering and fly tipping in the area around sites which the council does not seem to have funding to control. There is a volunteer litter picking group run by concerned residents with cleared roads littered within days of being cleared. Approximately 40 used nitrogen gas canisters are collected on a weekly basis. The Availability Assessment does though seem to be correct: 'Availability Assessment Is the site available in the plan period? Not Available' The report conclusion strings together the above incorrect information to draw yet another incorrect conclusion. In particular, the conclusion refers to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment but again fails to state that the site is in Category H and of highest risk from flooding. 'These sites will only be considered appropriate for allocation if there is overwhelming justification to override such constraints. These reasons are likely to be linked to a lack of sequentially suitable sites and/ or a direct need arising from such sites.' The Conclusion again incorrectly states 'in terms of Landscape and townscape the impact is minimal due to this being an existing and established site.' This is an unauthorised site subject to an enforcement order for removal. To conclude I suggest that site GT14 be extended by one additional caravan from 10 to 11 caravans to incorporate the proposed site GT43 for which there are so many issues.				
152		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Object to this due to it not being a suitable location . Access to these areas are poor and would be very dangerous with vehicles causing loads of issues. Blackborough end is a small village which is not suitable for this to happen	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
153		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Water Lane, as its name suggests, is prone to flooding. Any further development involving concrete/hard standing on the land bordered by Setch Road, Water Lane and Sandy Lane will exacerbate this problem. The middle part is 'one way' and not suitable for a new entrance. The nature of this road restricts the flow of traffic and the lane as a whole cannot cope with additional traffic. It is already dangerous for the many pedestrians who use it, particularly dog walkers, having no pavement or adequate verge. School Road is used as a 'rat run' by traffic on the A10 trying to avoid queues waiting to get on to the Hardwick Roundabout. They come along Setch Road and on to Sandy Lane, then up to School Road, exiting onto the A47 to go east. The 30mph speed limit is disregarded and exiting our drive onto School Road can be extremely dangerous as traffic speeds round the corner by Water Lane. This problem becomes much worse during weekends and holidays. Any further development of the land here will make this situation worse. Traffic is already far higher than expected for this standard of road. Further, on Sandy Lane, driving down to Setch Road, the slow bend makes vehicular access to the right dangerous. The areas GTRA(N), GTRA(L) and GTRA() all involve semiblind bends leading on to the road network.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
154		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There would be additional pressure on the infrastructure</li> <li>2. If consent were granted for part of the site, there would be a great possibility that the travellers would also take over the other area where consent had not been granted.</li> <li>3. There is risk of flooding if large areas of the site are concreted over. There is already standing water on the sharp bend at the top of Sandy Road whenever it rains - a traffic hazard when cars travel on the wrong side of the road to avoid the water. Several springs in the area add to the excess of standing water.</li> <li>4. Access to the site is precarious as it is on the brow of the hill.</li> <li>5. Blackborough End already has a heavy flow of traffic coming through the village to avoid delays on the A10.</li> <li>6. The privacy of the surrounding properties would be invaded and house prices in the whole village would fall. People would not want to move to the area. It is difficult to see how travellers would benefit the village, just cause anxiety.</li> </ol>	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
155		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I would like to raise concerns regarding the potential allocation of land for use by travelers, specifically pertaining to Plots GTRA(L), GTRA(M), and GTRA(N). I wish to object to this proposal due to several issues: Firstly, the pathway adjacent to the road near these plots is quite narrow, posing difficulty and potential danger for pedestrians. Adding more vehicles to this space could exacerbate the situation. Additionally, the environmental impact is a crucial concern, given that these areas are characterized by greenery and woodland. Any alternative use would significantly harm the environment and local biodiversity, similar to the situation with GTRA(E), which was previously rejected. Moreover, I have personally observed bats in the vicinity of these sites during the evening, highlighting the potential presence of these protected species. I would advise a specialist is contacted to survey these plots before any change of use is granted. As an employee of Norfolk Fire and Resue Serivce, I have access to the village's hydrant map, I am of the opinion that converting any of these proposed sites could heighten the fire risk for the village. The existing fire hydrants may struggle to adequately serve the increased population and additional structures. These hydrants were specified to serve a static number of properties/people within the village and by increasing this number it would be easy to overwhelm the system. Lastly, the area surrounding Blackborough already grapples with waterlogging issues. Preserving these green spaces is essential for the village to mitigate flooding. Removal of these green areas or woodlands could result in wastewater redirecting into roadways and overwhelming the greywater systems, further compromising the village's resilience. In conclusion, I strongly contend that the suggested change of use for the plots in Blackborough, namely GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N), and GTRA(E), is unsuitable. I believe there are more appropriate plots within the county that would better accommodate such changes without jeopardizing the village's safety, environment, and infrastructure.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
156		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	For the very same reasons as outlined as to why GTRA(E) is unsuitable. Namely a) Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities - No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance b) Townscape - Development will have a significant impact on the character of the area due to it being on the edge of the village. "It may be in the edge of the village but there are sill homes which will be impacted and will severely affect the value of our homes. My home is opposite one of those sites GTRA(N)". c) The other Constraints highlighted in your Suitability Assessment also identifies the narrow roads - large vehicles already have difficulty passing if another vehicle is coming the opposite way along Sandy Lane. This is a very small, quiet village and a Gypsy & Traveller Site will have a massive impact on those living here. It's madness	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
157		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Although I am supportive of traveller sites and agree that they should have a base and somewhere to reside. I feel that this would not be the ideal site for them or the residents that already live here. The area is already built up with many houses and adding more would cause a huge amount of added noise and traffic to the quiet, tranquil area of blackborough end. Many residents have lived here all of their life and I think adding this site to the quiet village would be disrespectful and inconsiderate. There is a lot of areas in kings lynn for this site to be considered. Somewhere that is already used to a certain level of noise so the added site would not have such an impact on residential areas. Also with this being a quiet village I am concerned that the proposed new residents will find it a struggle with the lack of facilities surrounding the area, the narrow roads and access would not be easy to accommodate and maintain.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
158		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I feel this is not the correct place for this site. The entrances will add to an already narrow road and the extra traffic in our village would be unacceptable. Having lived in the village all My life albeit I'm now back on station road to look after my dad, however my house for 30 years is on school Road,	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M),

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			I do feel if I ever need to sell this proposed site could de value my property. I've also concerns for the extra usage on our water, also the propos d land it prone to being water logged as this is and walk I often do with my dogs.				GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
159		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Site ref :Blackborough End GTRA (L) GTRA (M) GTRA (N) I would like to object to the suggestion of a traveller site in all of the suggested areas, I believe the land owner has had at least three applications for different forms of planning turned down which must have gone through the very council who are now trying to gain there own planning permission for the site,i am unsure how this will differ from previous planning being denied, as access was the main issue,so unless access is something that is not needed for the traveller site then the same issues must still remain, which would mean the application would be pointless as it would have to go through the same considerations with i assume the same outcome with planning being denied. As we have a shortage of affordable homes for young families in the area maybe this would be more appropriate for the council to be looking into. As i have seen many of the sites around the area they all seem to have many vans/working trucks etc so the amount of traffic which would be generated within the village would increase and i think one of the proposals previous on the land was for only three houses which was turned down ,the traffic would have been much less so access issues much less unsafe.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
160		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The 3 plots of land are adjacent to GTRA(E) which has already been classed as unsuitable due to lack of core services and impact on the character of the area. The same principles apply to these 3 blocks of land. In addition GTRA(M) has been subject to various planning applications which have been refused due to safety and effects on the character of the village. I therefore object to all three sites due to safety implications of increased traffic, potentially dangerous access, potential environmental damage and harm to the rural character of the hamlet	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
161		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I do not believe the areas listed are at all suitable for traveller sites for the following reasons: the roads in the areas concerned are narrow and winding - not at all appropriate for large caravans. In addition the roads in the area are prone to flooding. Moreover the is no street lighting in the areas concerned. Furthermore the roads concerned are already used by lots of agricultural vehicles and hgv's too	Not specified	No	The Highway Authority have been consulted as part of this consultation. Their feedback will help the Council in its decision on which sites are proposed as allocations within the Local Plan.  The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
162		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to the proposed locations as they are not suitable for habitation. Planning applications for houses on the land have been refused due to safety and the effects of the character of the hamlet. In addition area GTRA(E) has already been deemed unsuitable due to lack of core services and impact on the character of the area. These areas are all adjacent GTRA(E) and the same principles for unsuitability apply.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
163		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	THIS RESPONSE IS FOR ALL OF THE PROPOSED SITES IN Blackborough End GTRA(L) , GTRA(M) &GTRA(N) PLUS GTRA(E) The land and area in my option is not suitable for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Show people site because:- The Village is remote from any local services and facilities. The roads in to and out of the village are small and cause a nuance. This area is right in the middle of a small quite (sleepy) village and this type of development would be detrimental to village peace and tranquillity. The land is very wet and boggy which drains into local small common dyke system, which would be easy prone to be polluted. The area is adjacent to Water Lane, a very quiet unspoiled rural lane, which is rich in flora / fauna many species of birds and wildlife, development would be totally detrimental to this local environmental amenity.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
164		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I am objecting to all three of the above listed sites as being unsuitable locations for Gypsy & Traveller Sites The reasons being: 1. The road to the sites is constrained due to being a narrow country lane 2. There are no core services within walking distance 3. The local school Middleton Primary Church of England Primary Academy is already under a Special Measures Monitoring Inspection. There are no other schools Primary or Secondary within walking distance. 4. Development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located on the edge of the village. The site GTRA (M) is also large and its development for gypsy and traveller accommodation will overbear the built form of the existing settlement. 5. It will contribute negatively towards the existing character of Blackborough End due to backland development within a largely linear character 6. Some neighbouring or adjoining land use constraints 7. The input of landscape and townscape is substantial due to being an undeveloped area. 8. There are nearby residential properties to all proposed sites. the above reasons should be taken into consideration for all three proposed sites as entered in the Examination Library reference	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
165		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Reference: Proposed Gypsy & Traveller Sites in Blackborough End, Kings Lynn. Within Local Plan review (2016-2036) Consultation for the Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Potential Sites and Policy (January - March 2024) I wish to object to the countryside land in Blackborough End - Reference GTRA(E), GTRA(L), GTRA(M) & GTRA(N) being used to site Gypsy & Traveller caravans and large vehicles on the following grounds: 1) Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses The land is not compatible with surrounding land use and adjoining infrastructure. Impact on local character and landscape. There is no compatibility with the neighbourhood. 2) Townscape Development will have significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located in the village. The development of gypsy and traveller accommodation and trucks and trailers will overbear the build form of the existing settlement. 3) Accessibility to local services and facilities. There are no Doctors or Healthcare local to the village. No retail or bus service within 10 minute walk. 4) Archaeological Background. Ref Planning App 21/00884/F May 2021 KLWN Borough Council Environment and Planning (field west of Sandy Lane, Blackborough End, KL) Rejected The proposed development (GTRA (M) is adjacent to two areas of earthworks (remains of medieval moated site to the east and medieval enclosures to the west) at least one of which is of equivalent significance to similar features protected as Scheduled Monuments. In line with footnote 63 of NPPF this non-designated heritage asset should be considered subject to the policies for designated heritage assets as set out in the NPPF Section 16, paragraph 196. The development would affect the setting of the moated remains as it would be adjacent to them. There would also be potential for the development to affect any below ground deposits and any historic relationship between the moat and the earthworks to the west. Spreads of dressed and undressed	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			carstone, together with 15th -16th century tile are visible across the moat platform. The eastern arm of the moat has been obscured under later landscaping. Document letter from David Robertson Historic Environment Countryside Advisor Norfolk Landscape Archaeology Union House, Gressenhall, Dereham, Norfolk NR20 4DR Tel: 01362 869275 (direct) david.robertson@norfolk.gov.uk 18/11/2009 4.1) Kiln House, Sandy Lane has a protected Roman Kiln. The proposed development GTRA (L) is next door to Kiln House. This together with GTRA (E),GTRA (M), and GTRA (N) also probably contain Roman building and wall remains which should remain undisturbed. 5) Highway Authority Access onto and off Sandy Lane is dangerous due to the proposed entrance being near the brow of a hill. Previous planning applications the Highway Authority has never approved the proposed entrance as safe, being blind to speeding traffic traveling north along Sandy Lane. There are no street lights and daily speeding traffic will increase danger of road accident day or night! 6) Biodiversity Detrimental impact to wild animals, birds and insects feeding and living within the proposed site. Will have significant change to the ecology of the site. Many unusual bugs live and thrive on the land would be destroyed. Due to the lack of human presence and noise owls, kites, foxes and deer feed and live on the proposed development. At dusk bats can be seen flying over the proposed land. 7) Potential flooding Potential flooding along southern border of the field. Ref GTRA(M) & GTRA(E). Underground springs flow through the field could be affected. The junction of Sandy Lane and Water Lane is often flooded in heavy rain Ref GTRA (N) 8) Noise and Light pollution would increase dramatically. 9) My wife and I were told of this GTTS planning proposal for Blackborough End by neighbours not by the KLWN Borough Council. Also the process and deadline of 8th March 2024 to comment was shared to us by neighbours not by KLWN Borough Council				
166		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I refer to the following Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk documents... Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Potential Sites and Policy Consultation [F55] and Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document [F56] I strongly object to the consideration of the areas of land referred to as GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for potential Gypsy and Travellers. The reasons for my objection are as follows. General Reasons the loss of environmental space the significant impact on the habitat in the space there is no drainage on any of the sites - Blackborough End watercourses are already overloaded restricted access of roads around the land the road network in the immediate environment which is not able to handle additional traffic Specific Reasons Document "Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document [F56]" The parcel of land referred to as GTRA(E) has already been considered and concluded to be Not Suitable by the Borough Council. The areas of land referred to as GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) are part of the same piece of land in the same location and, therefore, have exactly the same attributes as GTRA(E). On this basis, GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) must also be concluded to be Not Suitable. This document (F56) has identified many existing sites which are Suitable or Potentially Suitable – these should be progressed. This document (F56) has also identified two reasonable alternative sites (GTRA(B) and GTRA(C)) which are Potentially Suitable – these should be progressed. Document "Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Potential Sites and Policy Consultation [F55]" This has identified many sites... for intensification already been deemed as Potentially Suitable as locations for growth These should be progressed. In addition, this whole area of land has been subject to several planning applications over recent years (see references below). These have been refused. The reasons for refusing building of dwellings on the land must also apply in these circumstances. Ref. No: 20/00232/F Received Thu 13 Feb 2020 Ref. No: 21/00884/F Received Mon 12 Apr 2021 Ref. No: 21/02480/F Received Thu 23 Dec 2021.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
167		GTRAE, GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The following comments relate to all three (GRA) areas listed above I believe the proposal to develop these areas as Gypsy traveller sites is completely unacceptable for the following reasons. 1) The area is remote from any core services. There are no core services within 800m or a ten minute walk 2) The proposed development will have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the area. The open areas proposed are almost central to the existing village 3) Existing residential properties are very close to the proposed areas 4) The existing roadways are narrow and offer poor access 5) The proposal GTRA (E) has already been rejected for similar reasons during the initial considerations by the planning authorities. All three of these areas are next to GTRA (E)	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
168		GTRAE, GTRA(L),	The following comments relate to all three (GRA) areas listed above I believe the proposal to develop these areas as Gypsy traveller sites is completely unacceptable for the following reasons. 1) The area is remote from any core	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning	Remove GTRA(E),

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
		GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	services. There are no core services within 800m or a ten minute walk 2) The proposed development will have a significant detrimental impact on the character of the area. The open areas proposed are almost central to the existing village 3) Existing residential properties are very close to the proposed areas 4) The existing roadways are narrow and offer poor access 5) The proposal GTRA (E) has already been rejected for similar reasons during the initial considerations by the planning authorities. All three of these areas are next to GTRA (E)			constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
169		GTRAE, GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My objection to the sites are as follows: 1: Our local school was rated inadequate, more children will only hinder this. 2: Health services in the local area are already at breaking point. 3: The areas being considered are often water logged. 4: Many traveller sites are unsightly and will affect local house prices.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
170		GTRAE, GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I consider these locations to be unsuitable for the proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites as there are no core services within a 10 minute walking distance and there is no bus service through Blackborough End. Access to these sites is on a narrow road and additional work would be needed to make it safer. The sites would have a significant impact on the character of the village and on neighbouring properties.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
171		GTRAE, GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I consider these locations to be unsuitable for the proposed Gypsy and Traveller sites as there are no core services within a 10 minute walking distance and there is no bus service through Blackborough End. Access to these sites is on a narrow road and additional work would be needed to make it safer. The sites would have a significant impact on the character of the village and on neighbouring properties.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
172		GTRA(B)	I strongly write to you to object to the area of Station Road West Dereham being included in the forth coming consultation/local plan to site a gypsy/traveller community on Station Road. The site is completely unachievable within this plan. Lack of amenities, over subscribed schools, doctors, dentist and local hospital. Beautiful countryside views would be lost forever with natural habitat taken from us. The main problem for us is drainage, I have sent previous email about the excess water. We have been pumping out from our front garden which is on our doorstep and emptying the soakaway continuously since early December. We have had our septic tank emptied 3 times since December and inspected, there is not fault with this system. So far this has been a total of over 75 hours, continuing today, once I have finished this email. The water table is very high, dykes are full and the gates that let water flow into the river are closed at the moment because the river is so high and likely to flood with water coming from Kings Lynn. Climate is changing we cannot take anymore water from new homes.	Not specified	Not specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.
173		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Robustly object to any suggested Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople site allocations options. There are no core services to support this proposal. The suggested areas would likely need very significant cost of land work, drainage etc. to overcome damp and marshy conditions. The development on any of the proposed sites will have a significant negative impact on the character of the area due to the site being located so close to traditional, long standing properties and other nearby residential areas. There are insufficient roads and access to facilitate additional traffic. Local surgeries, schools and other public amenities already over burdened.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
174		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	With reference to the following Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk documents Gypsy and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Potential Sites and Policy Consultation [F55] and Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document [F56] I strongly object to the use of land in Blackborough End for a proposed 'reasonable alternative' Gypsy and Traveller site. The areas are GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N). GTRA(E) located in the same parcel of land as the above areas under consideration has already been assessed as 'not suitable'. I would state that these areas are still 'not suitable' as they are part of the same land. Blackborough End is a small hamlet adjacent to the village of Middleton. It is a small rural area and as such has no amenities (i.e. no core services within 800m). There are no shops, public transport or doctors etc in the near vicinity. The only school nearby is the primary school in Middleton and the nearest small local shop/post office is across the A47 in Middleton. In addition the road through Blackborough End is narrow in parts especially around the proposed site. There has been recent significant and prolonged flooding on the road close to the area. The area also backs onto residential properties and as such this would have a negative and serious effect on the lives of the people living there as well as the wider community. It is an area that would not be able to absorb and effects of a site such as this due to the close proximity to well established residential properties in a small area. The whole rural character of Blackborough End would be spoiled if this development was allowed to go ahead. I am also aware that this whole area of land has been subject to several planning applications over recent years which have been refused. The reasons for refusing building of dwellings on the land must also apply in these circumstances. Ref. No: 20/00232/F Received Thu 13 Feb 2020 Ref. No: 21/00884/F Received Mon 12 Apr 2021 Ref. No: 21/02480/F Received Thu 23 Dec 2021 Please think carefully about the proposals. There are more suitable areas which would support the development of sites for Gypsies and Travellers which have already been identified.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
175		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	This objection is based on observations made on all 3 parcels of land in Blackborough End, GTRA(L), GTRA(M) AND GTRA(N). 1. Amenities and services. None within 800m or 10 min walk. 2. Compatibility with neighbouring property. Would not be compatible with nearby residential properties. 3. Site Access. Although site has access to existing highways there are already restrictions in place to the movement of large vehicles through the village. The roads are not suitable for the movement of large vehicles such as static caravans. 4. Impact on the character of the village. With these sites being in the centre of the village and surrounded by residential properties of age a development such as this would have a significant negative impact. Temporary or mobile accommodation would not contribute positively towards enhancing local character. 5. Impact on ecology. The proposed sites are on greenfield land as such any development would destroy the wildlife haven that these areas and hedgerows provide	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
176		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to this proposal! The negative effect it will have on village house prices, the added traffic to a small village which already struggles with traffic, our water course is overused, and we have issues with flooding, there is no sewage or other facilities on the sites, where will waste go? Sandy Lane has restricted access and cannot handle more traffic. The proposed sites are home to several species of wildlife.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
177		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Negative impact on quiet village life The sites have been untouched for years and are home to various wildlife, if this is taken away the village loses its natural spaces A negative impact on the value of our houses No sewage systems etc in place on these sites, where will the waste go? Our water course is already overused and the village suffers with flooding Sandy lane is a one way and very narrow so more traffic on this lane would be dangerous	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
178		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	- negative impact on house prices in village - added traffic in a small village - losing our environmental spaces - impact on the habitat in these spaces - there is no drainage on any of these sites, what happens to the waste? - Blackborough ends watercourse is overloaded and we already have flooding - detrimental impact on small village life restricted access on Sandy Lane, can't handle more traffic	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
179		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	As far as I can see, all of the three parcels of land in Blackborough End are completely unsuitable for the allocation of Gypsies. There is no need for such a situation, more than likely causing an eyesore and consequent fear and upset, in the heart of this village. It would be totally out of keeping with the the existing homes and adjacent architecture in the surrounding neighbourhood. The Setch Road from the T junction in the village going towards the A10 westward becomes a hazardously dangerous flooded area after heavy rainfall. Extra dwellings, with likely newly created hard surfaces would inevitably add to flooding area, which has a steep incline towards the junction. The access for emergency vehicles such as fire and ambulance is totally inadequate to any part of this land, given the very narrow aspect of Water Lane and the one way system in force. The access to Water Lane has a completely inadequate turning circle and the exit to Sandy Lane would be very hazardous, owing to the hilly aspect of the road, restricting visibility considerably. There has been no thought given to surface water, sewage and drainage disposal or more apparent, lighting. There is a lack of information regarding the supply and connection of clean water, electricity and oil and the storage of such utilities. There is no mention of how considerable disruption to the highways and the free flow of traffic would be overcome during their installation and what contingency plans would be put in force should emergency services be required for nearby properties. There is no mention as to the disposal of water, sewage and rubbish created on the sites and no information is to hand regarding the fact that the correct Caravan Licensing requirements need to be met.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
180		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to this proposal for the following reasons : - detrimental impact on house prices for residents - added traffic in a small village which already struggles with traffic from the aggregates and waste disposal tip - the village is losing our environmental spaces - the impact on the habitat in these spaces, they have been untouched for years and is home to many species of wildlife - there is no drainage on any of these sites, what happens to the waste from the travellers site? - Blackborough ends watercourse is overloaded and we already have flooding - detrimental impact on small village life restricted access on Sandy Lane, it can't handle more traffic	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
						<p>would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	
181		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I strongly object to all of the above 3 proposals for the following reasons: I recently decided to move to the village at a cost of over £400,000, as it offered peace, tranquillity and a true village feel which without doubt would be shattered by the presence of a Gypsy site. it is a well know fact that travellers do not mix well with local communities and prefer to be positioned away from other properties and communities. This allows them to live their lives, which is somewhat different to non transient dwellers, in a way that may cause unwelcome upset, disruption and attention. Thankfully not all travellers are poor citizens, living off ill gotten gains, at a cost to the local community, but there is a certain percentage that do. they also attract non-desirables into the area, who will operate under the guise of the travellers, who will take the rap for the illegal activity. The local population would appear, at first sight, to have a large percentage of elderly and retired people, which i am concerned will be very troubled by the sites presence and even more so by the occupants who tout their businesses locally and the children who tend to run wild. The sites themselves are located on an incline, with a soil structure that lays very wet, which is thankfully holding a considerable amount of water, which had this been hardstanding would no dauntedly ended up in the properties positioned lower down the slope. recently the roads surrounding the sites have been waterlogged and flooded, one being very narrow and restricted to one way traffic. This road, which is not much more than a track in places, in it's self is not suitable for commercial vehicles and large trailers. Site reference GTRA(E), which is adjacent to the above sites, was deemed unsuitable by yourselves for the following reasons: No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. Development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located on the edge of the village. The road is narrow so only a small scale of development will likely be appropriate. Additional highway works is needed. Some neighbouring or adjoining land use constraints identified. Nearby residential properties. The final conclusions stated: In terms of Landscape and townscape the impact is considered substantial due to this being an undeveloped area of land within the existing but form. New development will introduce backland development within a largely linear character and is likely to contribute negatively towards the existing character of this part of Blackborough End. To conclude, the site is considered 'Not suitable' for development with some mitigation measures. I would respectfully suggest that the above points are relevant reasons as to why the remaining 3 sites are not suitable for such a site.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
182		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I submit this form in order to make my views known about the potential Gypsy and Traveller Sites, in Blackborough End. My comments relate to each of the three pieces of land which have been put forward by the landowner to the council, for consideration. My initial reaction to these proposals was of surprise, because these potential sites are extremely close to dwellings, have poor access and would undermine the character of the small village. The roads in the village are narrow and inappropriate for accommodating the movement of additional and larger vehicles. The physical accessibility for moving vehicles such as, static caravans to and from the site, is a safety hazard for other road users, moving about the village during their normal day to day activities. The widths of the rural roads such as Setch Road, Water Lane and Sandy Lane are not suitable to accommodate the additional and type of traffic that this application would generate. There would most likely be vehicles that are wider than cars, accessing and moving to and from the site. The Setch Road can be hazardous due to the twists and turns in the road as well as the width. It is a small rural road which is already heavily used by fast moving traffic, to and from the A10. Water Lane is very narrow with dwellings located both at the roadside and/or very close to the road, making it unsuitable for excess traffic and large vehicles. It also operates a oneway system. Sandy Lane is narrow and bendy and is prone to some flooding, in parts. The visibility of traffic turning onto Sandy Lane can be hazardous. Due to the nature of these small village roads, there will be a negative impact on existing traffic conditions and local junctions. The site is very close to residential dwellings. Such a development would create noise and light pollution, and odours which will impact negatively on existing dwellers. The infrastructure in this area of the village is completely unsuitable. There are no core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. There is no accessibility to public transport, key services or employment opportunities. There are no local healthcare services available, or employment possibilities in the village. The nearest medical centres are over a 15 minute drive. There is no secondary school available and no shop in the village. Blackborough End is more like a hamlet than a village. New development would contribute negatively towards the existing character of this area of Blackborough End. There is likely to be a</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			significant negative impact on the character, and the landscape of the area due to the site being located on the edge of the village.				
183		GT05	Suitable access appears to be achievable. No provision for off carriageway walking/cycling The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
184		GT09	The carriageway is just one vehicle width but local traffic only as this is not a through road. No off-carriageway walking/ cycling. The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
185		GT17	Local highway network not of sufficient standard to support further development, and it is not considered highways impacts upon Small Lode could be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 13 additional pitches at this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
186		GT18	Local highway network not of sufficient standard to support further development and it is not considered highways impacts upon Small Lode could be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 5 additional pitches on this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
187		GT20	It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements. This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations nearby in Upwell/ Outwell on the local highway network. It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate an additional pitch on this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
188		GT21	It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements. This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations nearby in Upwell/ Outwell on the local highway network. It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate an additional pitch on this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
189		GT28	It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements. This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations on Small Lode It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 2 additional pitches on this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
190		GT33	It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements. This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations nearby in Upwell/ Outwell on the local highway network. It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate an additional pitch on this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
191		GT34	It is not clear how the site is or will be accessed, assuming this will be via restricted byway, this should be widened to 4.8m and surfaced for 10m from the B1355 to enable accessing vehicles to pass. Cutting of adjacent hedges would need to be secured to achieve acceptable visibility. No facilities for off-carriageway walking / cycling. Subject to securing width improvements and the land for required visibility, the Highway Authority would not object to the proposals.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
192		GT35	It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation as the local highway network not of sufficient standard to support further development, with no clear means of making meaningful improvements. This is compounded by the cumulative traffic impact of further proposed allocations nearby in Upwell/ Outwell on the local highway network. It is not considered highways impacts can be satisfactorily overcome, to accommodate 2 additional pitches on this site. The Highway Authority objects to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
193		GT39	Subject to being able to achieve access of the required standard, the Highway Authority would not object to this proposed allocation.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
194		GT43	The site is remote from the public highway, accessed from a public right of way. The highway access is adequate. Access rights of the public right of way need to be determined. No Highway Authority objection	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is	Update the individual site assessments and remove

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	GT42 from the consultation document.
195		GT54	Suitable access appears to be achievable. No provision for off carriageway walking/cycling The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
196		GT55	This site has a conditioned splay across their site which is not currently adhered to. Should that be maintained the Highway Authority would accept one additional pitch as traffic volumes are low. No opportunity for safe walking /cycling from site. The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch subject to meeting the conditioned requirements for access.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
197		GT56	No off-carriageway walking/cycling available but low traffic volumes likely & wide verges available. The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 9 additional pitches	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
198		GT59	No off-carriageway walking/cycling available but low traffic volumes likely & wide verges available. The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 4 additional pitches	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
199		GT66	Site remote with no off-carriageway walking/cycling. The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
200		GT09	The carriageway is just one vehicle width but local traffic only as this is not a through road. No off-carriageway walking/ cycling The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
201		GT43	The Highway Authority does not object to the provision of 1 additional pitch	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.  Update the individual site assessments
202		GTRA(B)	Local road network has constraints and there are reservations over the allocation of this site. If minded to allocate, then highway requirements will be as conditioned for 23/01606/F	Not specified	Yes	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation documents.
203		GTRA(C)	This site would be considered acceptable subject to access surfacing improvements	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
204		GT25	It is recognised that the site is already operational, however the Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation due to the increased slowing stopping and turning movements at the junction of the A134 which is a corridor of movement.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			Site remote with no off-carriageway walking/cycling The Highway Authority objects to the proposed allocation of 1 additional pitch				
205		GT62	Site remote with no off-carriageway walking/cycling facilities. Subject to demonstration that a suitable access can be achieved, the Highway Authority would not object to the proposed allocation of 2 additional pitches	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Update the individual site assessments
206		GT67	Subject to improvements to the existing access the Highway Authority would not object to the proposed allocation of 1 additional pitch.	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.  Update the individual site assessments
207		GT43	I object to the above proposal based on the following points: The site is already largely underwater after the recent rain. During this time there has been minimal traffic across the site from the residents of the single static caravan, but the ground is still flooded. Given the considerable increase in vehicular traffic on the site such an expansion would lead to it seems the site is unsuitable for increased habitation. It appears that there is unsuitable drainage for this proposed site. The flooding has implications for sanitation as the site will necessarily depend on septic tanks for waste, the high water table can prove problematic for this. It appears that the local infrastructure is unsuitable and could potentially contravene road safety. The additional traffic would be out of scale with the size of the single track road. This road is already in a state of disrepair and the additional usage would only be further detrimental to its state. The proposed development will have a negative affect on amenity. Currently, Common Road South serves only five houses plus the caravan at Homefield, as it is not a through road it is popular with local dog walkers and horse riders due to its quiet nature, this will be adversely affected by the proposed increase in resident numbers due to increased noise, disturbance, traffic, and potentially nuisance. The area around the site has significant litter issues already, the local volunteer Wombles do a great job at picking up the rubbish on a regular basis, this situation could be made worse by expansion of the site. Despite the assertion to the otherwise in F56, the local power services are already unreliable with frequent electrical outages, especially during the winter months. The additional load on the local grid will not help this. The core service noted in F56 as being withing 1200m walking means having to walk across both carriageways of the dual carriageways of the A47. The local public services such as doctors' surgeries, are already stretched, adding further load to this will not be beneficial for anyone. The site was subject to planning application for a house previously. This was turned down on the basis of the site being unsuitable for a residence. As nothing has changed at the site since, this ruling sets the precedence for future development. With the above points noted, these represent an overdevelopment of the site. I believe that all of the above would reduce the quality of life for the current residents of the local area, and so oppose the proposal. Further, the F56 document claims that several aspects could be mitigated, I would challenge the authors of the report to produce firm evidence of how any of this could be accomplished.	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.
208		GT43	I object to the above proposal based on the following points: The site is already largely underwater after the recent rain. During this time there has been minimal traffic across the site from the residents of the single static caravan, but the ground is still flooded. Given the considerable increase in vehicular traffic on the site such an expansion would lead to it seems the site is unsuitable for increased habitation. It appears that there is unsuitable drainage for this proposed site. The flooding has implications for sanitation as the site will necessarily depend on septic tanks for waste, the high water table can prove problematic for this. It appears that the local infrastructure is unsuitable and could potentially contravene road safety. The additional traffic would be out of scale with the size of the single track road. This road is already in a state of disrepair and the additional usage would only be further detrimental to its state. The proposed development will have a negative affect on amenity. Currently, Common Road South serves only five houses plus the caravan at Homefield, as it is not a through road it is popular with local dog walkers and horse riders due to its quiet nature, this will be adversely affected by the proposed increase in resident numbers due to increased noise, disturbance, traffic, and potentially nuisance. The area around the site has significant litter issues already, the local volunteer Wombles do a great job at picking up the rubbish on a regular basis, this situation could be made worse by expansion of the site. Despite the assertion to the otherwise in F56, the local power services are already unreliable with frequent electrical outages, especially during the winter months. The additional load on the local grid will not help this. The core service noted in F56 as being withing 1200m walking means having to walk across both carriageways of the dual carriageways of the A47. The local public services such as doctors'	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			surgeries, are already stretched, adding further load to this will not be beneficial for anyone. The site was subject to planning application for a house previously. This was turned down on the basis of the site being unsuitable for a residence. As nothing has changed at the site since, this ruling sets the precedence for future development. With the above points noted, these represent an over development of the site. I believe that all of the above would reduce the quality of life for the current residents of the local area, and so oppose the proposal. Further, the F56 document claims that several aspects could be mitigated, I would challenge the authors of the report to produce firm evidence of how any of this could be accomplished.				
209		GTRA (L) GTRA (M) GTRA (N)	May I start by saying I'm am against the proposed traveler sites. There are no amenities in the village and the roads are already under pressure on sandy lane with the blind corner near to the sites,there could be noise and light pollution with many caravan pitches and there occupancies. The site in question has a gradient running downhill east to south to water lane, this area has been prone to flooding in the past where the land owner seems to fill in dykes and divert them at will. with the event of caravan and their hard standing areas there would be more run off of water to bottom corner of the field this would cause more flooding and the contaminated surface water (oils ,heavy fuel and washing detergents from vehicle washing)this water runs down water lane through the fields into the Nar valley and eventually into the river Nar ,this is area is a site of special scientific interest with all of its wildlife. Any sewage piping would need to go downhill to the pipe in water lane which is already under pressure with full pipes causing more blockages (photos of this and flooding are available)	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
210		GTRA (L) GTRA (M) GTRA (N)	The following observations refer to all three of the parcels of land in Blackborough End being considered. Blackborough End is a small residential Hamlet forming part of Middleton Parish. Services and Facilities : There are no core services within 800 metres / 10 min walking distance There is only one small grocery shop situated within Middleton post office located across the busy A47 in Station Road over half a mile from the proposed sites. There is a local primary school ,which I understand is fully subscribed year on year but no secondary school. There is no surgery or other medical facility the nearest being in King's Lynn. All major services and retail outlets are located in King's Lynn some 6 miles away. Townscape: Development of the sites is likely to have significant impact on the character of the area due to the sites being located within the boundaries of the village on land that has previously been refused planning permission for residential housing. The sites are of significant size and it's development for gypsy and traveller accommodation will overbear the built form of the existing settlement. Transport and Roads: The sites are bordered by a very narrow country road, Water Lane which has been designated one way for the most part as cars are unable to pass. The other bordering road, Sandy Lane is itself narrow and already burdened with increasing amounts of traffic by vehicles using it as a cut through between the A10 and the A47. Sandy Lane has a only narrow footpath for pedestrians on one side who cannot walk two abreast. This also presents problems for people walking their dogs or accompanying children or with pushchairs etc. Any increase in vehicular traffic especially commercial vehicles which gypsies and travellers may use as a matter of course may further impact on road safety in the area. Compatability with neighbouring / adjoining uses. The proposed sites are in the midst of residential dwellings on all sides. approving the designation of any of the sites proposed will drastically and adversely effect the character and attractiveness of this small hamlet which does not have the necessary facilities or suitability to support a gypsy / travellers site. Utilities infrastructure : The proposed sites lack Mains water, electricity and sewage drainage .	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
211		GTRA (L) GTRA (M) GTRA (N)	I object to all sites being used for Gypsy, traveller or Travelling Showpeople. It will cause disruption to a peaceful village and is not appropriate. Extra traffic. They have a poor reputation for criminality which is not welcome in this village.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments	None.
212		GTRA (L) GTRA (M) GTRA (N)	I object the proposed gypsy sites for the following reasons: The access to the sites would be dangerous. There is no allowance for drainage and heating fuel storage. The resources of the village, road designs, lighting and layout would not be able to safely and adequately support such an influx of residents. (Inherently when a small number of gypsies are allocated a plot of land there is always a large influx of a lot more). Value of properties in the immediate area will be negatively impacted, possibly due to peoples experiences and therefore perception of gypsy sites. Those making the decision within the council.. would you honestly be happy with such a proposal nextdoor to your home and family?	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
						Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved. The other three sites are also subject to such consultation. A revised Site Assessment document will include the 3 new sites.	
213		GTRA (L) GTRA (M) GTRA (N)	Living in the village and backing onto the site in question, quite frankly I have never seen a site more unsuitable for a Gypsy and Traveller community as this one. There are several reasons for this objection. 1. The very well documented history of the anti-social behaviour of this community precedes them and in my opinion the site puts them way too close to the surrounding houses. 2. Access. The roads through the village are quite narrow and this community tend to have a lot of larger vehicles and trailers and access to and from the site could potentially cause a lot of disruption and danger to other traffic using Sandy Lane. 3. Pollution. Probably my major concern. My wife and I are caravanners and as you know, caravan toilets use strong chemicals to break down the contents before being discharged into proper tanks. The southern boundary of this site has a drainage ditch. In 2007 and 2014 the owner filled in this ditch causing significant flooding to our property as there is quite a slope down towards the southern boundary and with nowhere for the water to run, we got flooded. The first time the EA dealt with it and the second time by the Flood Team at the NCC in Norwich. The dyke was eventually re-instated and my concern is that some of the residents would use this dyke for emptying their chemical toilets. This would result in smells in hot weather but more importantly the dyke eventually drains in the river Nar with potential calamitous results. The dyke runs very close to the houses on the southern boundary. 4. The local infrastructure will not be able to deal with an influx of extra people. No doctor close by and only a very small primary school in the village. I hope the Council will take my views and the views of other villagers into account when deciding on the future of this site and see that it is totally unsuitable and probably for many more reasons than I have highlighted above.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
214		GTRA(B)	Objection on grounds of Amenity Impact: • Rural green field site - designated agricultural/grazing land • West Dereham has prominent rural character with small clusters of dwellings surrounded by open fields • 114 objections representing over 50% of the households in the village • Scale and size disproportionately large for rural character and location • Proposed site beyond any settlement boundary • Design materials (caravans/static units) not in keeping with surrounding materials of flint, carrstone and pantiles in existing neighbouring properties • Urban cluster style development not in keeping with sporadic ribbon development of Station Road • Residents have outlined adverse health, quality of life and economic impacts Objection on grounds of Sustainability: • The proposal is contrary to the central planning principle of sustainable development • Site is highly visible from neighbouring properties and a source of light and noise pollution • West Dereham is lacking in all basic services, facilities and infrastructure • Site users will be reliant on car usage – negative impact on air quality and goes against principles of working towards net zero Justification for selection of site unclear - not based on local demand which has been identified as being in Wisbech locality (18 miles away) • There are no available school places in Downham Market - survey undertaken. The Deputy Leader of NCC has recently called Downham Market the town that has run out of school places. With over 500 houses currently in build the system is at breaking point. Objection on grounds of Unsuitable Highways: • Station Road is inadequate to safely cater for additional traffic - it is of restricted width and lacks sufficient passing places • There are no pavements or street lighting making it perilous for pedestrians • There is restricted visibility at the proposed entrance site • Location is remote from all services and connecting roads into Downham Market are all single track • This road carries significant HGV traffic to and from the Glazewing Recycling Centre as well as large farm vehicles – it would be extremely negligent to consider this site with resident children as suitable. Objection on grounds of Drainage & Flooding: • The site suffers from extremely poor percolation rates due to clay composition of soil • Environment Agency have objected to this development due to concerns over pollution and contamination • Mitigatory measures will cost in excess of £0.5 million – completely unfeasible • Surrounding ditches not owned by applicant and permission to discharge waste water will not be given by neighbouring landowners • Site suffers sustained surface water flooding and is 50 metres from Flood Zone 1 • Residents in Station Road already experience surface water flooding – the water table cannot cope as it is • When the levels of the cut off channel reach a certain point the IDB close the discharge gates from this location and allow the water back up into the watercourses. This is the situation currently and exacerbating the surface water issues. • Caravans are designated as vulnerable dwellings and should not be sited on ground known to flood. Objection on grounds of Historic Importance: • Application site lies 100m to west of a historic scheduled monument St Mary's Abbey - list no. 1020141 • The Abbey was founded in 1188 and it is likely the grounds extended onto the proposed site. Any development here would see any potential archaeological finds lost. • This development would disturb and destroy the setting of the Abbey site. Objection on grounds of Environment: • Site will create significant visual	Not specified	Yes	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>disturbance and be harmful to the landscape • Loss of valuable habitat for a range of wildlife including several species of deer, owls and birds of prey. Also feeding grounds for bats, badgers and foxes. • Nature and wildlife extremely important to the residents in this locality and to walkers, cyclists and riders alike. This development would represent wilful destruction of it. • Goes against development principles as the site is classified as 'countryside'. Core Policy CS06 states that countryside should be protected for its intrinsic character and beauty. It also states that development of greenfield sites should be resisted unless essential for agricultural or forestry needs. Unclear how this site will deliver Biodiversity Net Gain - law from 12/02/24 for any development larger than 9 dwelling.</p>				
215		GT43 GT66 GTRA(B)	<p>GT42 Land at Red Barn, Cowles Drove, Hockwold cum Wilton Three extra plots are proposed for this site. We note that the site is adjacent to the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA – Stone Curlew) and within the Buffer Zone. Whilst the main report notes the proximity to the SPA, the full site assessment document (F56) incorrectly notes that 'development of the site would not have a detrimental impact on any designated, protected species or habitat'. The impact of the built environment on stone curlew, a designated feature of the Breckland SPA, is well known and has been an established part of Council planning policy for the last decade. Mitigation for built environment indirect impacts on stone curlew nesting density in the nearby Breckland SPA is not possible as the mechanisms that drive the negative effect of proximity to built development are not known. Therefore it is incorrect to state that adverse effects on the SPA could be avoided with mitigation. We therefore recommend that the wording of the biodiversity section of the main record in document F55 is revised to read '...not masked by existing development. Due to the location of the site within the precautionary 1.5km buffer around those parts of the Breckland SPA that are capable of supporting nesting stone curlew, there is a clear need for any development in this location to be able to demonstrate that it would avoid any adverse effects on the Breckland SPA'.</p> <p>GT66 Land at Brandon Road, Methwold We note that this allocation is less than 400m from the Breckland SPA. We disagree with the site assessment that this allocation 'would not have a detrimental effect on any designated, protected species or habitat'. The proposal is within 400m of the Breckland Forest SSSI element of the Breckland SPA. In this part of the SPA, the ground nesting species woodlark and nightjar are vulnerable to a range of indirect disturbance, and so a precautionary distance of 400m is applied within which a Likely Significant Effect (and therefore the need for an Appropriate Assessment) may be needed. We recommend that any allocation at this location is updated to take account of potential indirect impacts on the SPA due to its proximity.</p> <p>GTRA(B) Land at Station Road, West Dereham This is a proposal for a new site of 10 plots on arable land. The site is approximately 500m from The Cut Off Channel County Wildlife Site. We support the comments made by the County Ecologist in relation to this proposal. The plans indicate that there will be a 9m buffer around the two watercourses bounding the east and west of the site respectively, to be planted with meadow grass. This should be a suitable species rich grass mix is used to optimise the value of this area for biodiversity. The site should also have wildlife sensitive lighting to minimise light spill into the surrounding countryside and therefore reduce any potential impacts on nocturnal wildlife.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.</p> <p>The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.</p>	<p>Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.</p> <p>Remove GT43 from the consultation document.</p>
216		GT17 GT18 GT28 GT35 GT37 GT38	<p>UPC accept that within those sites where there is existing capacity to accommodate additional pitches for family members these should be permitted subject to planning consent. There are 12 such pitches identified in the consultation documents. However, UPC object to the number of pitches proposed as broad extension, where an additional 50+ (of 92 Borough wide) are located in the Parish, close together bordering on the edge of the settled community and accessed from Small Lode.</p> <p>GT17 13 pitches GT18 16+ GT28 2 GT35 2 GT37 7 GT38 10</p> <p>Relevant material grounds are: 1: Highways and transport. 2: Capacity of the physical infrastructure. 3: Deficiencies in social facilities. 4: Incompatible and unacceptable use.</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identifies a significant need arising from some of the existing sites at Upwell. However, the Council agree that the proposed quantity of potential pitches is not necessary as some of the sites showed no need for expansion. To reduce the impact on highway capacity, the Council will solely focus on those sites where a direct need has arisen. This means that GT35, GT37 and GT38 do not need to be allocated in the Local Plan. The proposed criteria based policy and site specific policies for some of these sites will help manage the developments' delivery over the coming years. In addition, GT18 pitches will be limited to 12 new pitches, not 16.</p>	<p>Remove sites GT35, GT37 and GT38 from the consultation document.</p>

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>5: Layout and density. Highways and transport. The following phrase is used throughout the documents for all sites within the Parish: Highway is constrained by its current size, but additional pitches could be supported through appropriate mitigation if and where required.</p> <p>The 50+ pitches proposed on Small Lode will result in a significant number of vehicles, both private cars and work related using a road that is unsuitable for such an increase in vehicular use, there is no reference to what kind of mitigation could address this. There are no footpaths beyond the adopted development boundary, discouraging access to services on foot and meaning that almost all movement in and out of these sites would be vehicular. UPC contend that this level of increased traffic could not be safely accommodated. GT21. March Riverside is a very narrow road bordering Welle Creek with a blind bend at Marmont Priory. This road is not safe for additional traffic. Land at New Road PE14 9HP: Pedestrian access to village facilities would be along th A1101 where there is no footpath and therefore unsafe.</p> <p>Capacity of the physical infrastructure. Flood risk, surface water drainage and sewerage. Where a site is located within a zone2/3 the SFRA shows the hazard associated with the undefended Tidal 200-year event with an allowance for climate change, i.e. an indication of the risk to sites if defences were to breach during an extreme event. This is barely relevant. The SFRA does not address potential surface water flooding from rainwater run off from the buildings, hardstanding and roadways or the run off from 'package treatment plants' that will cause additional pressure on local drainage systems. Once again the consultation refers to mitigation being possible but with no indication of how this might be achieved. Where significant numbers of additional pitches are proposed (i.e.GT 18) UPC believe the cumulative impact of the proposed development will pose a significant problem in the disposal of rain water and sewerage run off including sites within a zone 1 given the nature of the fen landscape.</p> <p>Upwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan Environment and Nature Policy EN1: Flood Risk and Prevention. Planning applications where appropriate must provide evidence relating to the risk of flooding from all potential sources to show that proposed developments will not adversely affect existing flood prevention measures (e.g. dykes, ditches, etc.) and will not increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere. The evidence to be provided will include the proposed method of foul and surface water drainage and any required mitigation, including the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for surface water management wherever feasible. (Proposals for new or extended buildings will also need to incorporate rainwater conservation elements such as water butts.)</p> <p>Deficiencies in social facilities. Upwell Health Centre, in a recent Parish newsletter stated that 'the daily demand for appointments is beyond what we have the capacity to manage.' A more detailed explanation from the Practice is submitted with this response. Of note, the Health Centre also serves Outwell and a number of satellite Parishes where a large number of dwellings are under constuction, further adding to pressure that they are already unable to manage. Upwell Academy is also at capacity. The following report has been provided by the Chair of the Academy Committee: Further to our conversation earlier this week I am writing to confirm Upwell Academy pupil numbers. Upwell Academy is an increasingly popular choice, both within the village and beyond. The school is currently full in all year groups. Looking ahead, intake for September 2024 is already oversubscribed. Whilst there will always be a small amount of movement in an out of the school for a number of reasons, it is not anticipated that numbers will diminish in any way. Given the amount of building within the Upwell area it looks likely that demand for school places will only increase. I hope this is helpful.</p>				
217		GTRA(B)	<p>As a Parish Council we have fully supported the substantial united responses from our parishioners to the above planning application reference 23/01606/F. Some 114 separate communications have been sent to the planning portal, all expressing their objection to this application. So, it was very well received when it was officially announced on Friday 1st March 2024 the decision that this application was not fit to be presented to the planning committee on the 4th March 2024 and a report compiled to reflect the refusal. The outline reasons for the refusal were: 1. Impact on landscape (countryside) 2. Sustainability (too far from amenities) 3. Drainage 4. Historic Importance (proximity to St Mary's Abbey) Whilst we understand that it could be argued that points 3 &amp; 4 could possibly be mitigated against, points 1 &amp; 2 are irrefutable. In light of the refusal, we strongly suggest that this site no longer is a reasonable alternative for a Gypsy &amp; Traveller development on the basis that it has been deemed unsuitable by Planning Officers and should therefore be removed from the Local Plan Review. Within Appendix B: Assessment of Reasonable Alternative for the consideration of Gypsy &amp; Traveller use, an initial assessment has been made on its suitability using the red, amber green approach and is assessed as a site of potential suitability. Surely</p>	Not specified	Not specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>this is now deemed an inadequate assessment following the planning refusal. We would reiterate the fundamental core planning matters upon which this application was so strongly opposed and how these should be acutely applicable in removing this site from the Local Plan – these are: Local, Strategic, National Planning Policies • The proposed development site is to be located to the East of Station Road on the opposite side to a loosely knit linear development of existing housing stock along Station Road. The proposed development comprises 10 Static Homes and provision for a further 10 tourer caravans for Gypsy/Traveller use. • The proposed site on Station Road is very rural in character with small clusters of dwellings set amongst large areas of open agricultural land. The West Norfolk Borough Council identifies West Dereham as a “Smaller Village and Hamlet” where new development is covered by countryside protection policy DM3 of the Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan (2016) (SADMP). Policy DM3 seeks to limit new development to those suitable to rural areas. • The proposed development is on a part of Station Road (East side) which is almost wholly rural in nature. The proposed introduction of 10 new Static Homes and associated siting for 10 tourer caravans would considerably alter the rural character of this part of Station Road and West Dereham. • Whilst we understand the Boroughs core strategies and Local Plans are being updated, these have not been approved to date and therefore current policies must surely be followed, and these currently state that West Dereham should not be subjected to any major new development. Previous Appeal Decisions • In 2018 Planning Application Ref. No 18/00712/O for a development of 6 dwellings on Station Road, West Dereham was refused outline planning. On Appeal it was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate, decision date 28th January 2019. • This previous planning application for 6 new dwellings is only 500m South along Station Road to the current proposed development for 10 new Static Homes and associated siting for 10 tourer caravans. • We believe this application should be judged as a private development as the validity of the Applicant being a part of the local Gypsy and traveller community is yet to be proven. Moreover, it would seem that the Applicant would be restricting occupancy to his family only, further determining this as a private development. Highway Issues • The site is on Station Road, which is itself a single-track road with limited passing places and no footpaths or street lighting. The road is regularly trafficked by articulated lorries on a daily basis, which require access and egress to Glazewing situated at the Southern end of Station Road. Glazewing being a metal recycling centre. • The entrance to the site is on a slight bend, itself giving impaired vision for entering or leaving the site. The ability to turn tourer caravans into and out of this limited entrance would automatically be problematic. • The Highways Management Officer’s letter of 1st November 2023 states that “the proposed development conflicts with the aims of sustainable development” presumably this should be considered. Whilst they state that a site visit has been completed, we very much doubt that any lorry movements accessing or egressing the recycling facility were witnessed at the time. If they had been it would be abundantly clear how unsuitable the location of the proposed site is. • Independent evidence has been submitted on the current volume of traffic using Station Road which has been recorded with a SAM2 traffic monitor. Over 5800 vehicle movements (one way) were recorded over the period of a month, the majority of which would have been articulated and heavy farm vehicles. It can be estimated that a development such as a Gypsy/Traveller site with 10 plots could easily increase the vehicle movements by some 24%. This is on a single-track road, with limited passing places which regularly have vehicles parked in them. There are no streetlights or footpath. The risk of collision on a road which residents and school children are required to walk will increase significantly. Noise or Disturbance • There would undoubtedly be a substantial increase in the volume of traffic and noise pollution that a 10 static home &amp; 10 Tourer Caravan development would bring to Station Road and its current residents many of whom are elderly. • In addition, immediately adjacent and to the East of the proposed development site is Abbey Farm &amp; Stud, which houses and trains thoroughbred horses. Certainly, a large development such as proposed would encroach on the quite surroundings currently enjoyed and necessary for these sensitive animals. • A development of this proposed nature will also generate a significant increase in light pollution further exacerbated by its rural location. This would, without doubt permanently change the rural environment of this area. Physical Infrastructure • The proposed development with a mixture of soft and hard landscaping, including access roads will substantially increase surface water run-off in an area which is already susceptible to flooding. Station Road in particular has recently seen flooding with some properties coming close to water ingress into their properties due to the poor drainage of the surrounding areas. • In addition, this field is known to have poor drainage qualities (from historical farming activities) as the soil has a high clay content. The recent heavy rainfall has caused significant problems to the residents of Station Road which are prolonged and ongoing. Some properties have seen water ingress and each time it rains the threat is constant. • There have been numerous photographs issued, showing the volume of standing water on this field and adjacent ditches full of water. Whilst we appreciate all fields are subject to standing water at present, unlike others, this field will not drain freely as it has high clay content and will see standing water for some time even without further rainfall. • There is no mains sewage drainage and whilst an outline design for Foul Water disposal has been submitted, this has been refused by the EA on a number of fundamental issues. Moreover, it is believed that this design is very cost</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>prohibitive and subject ongoing environmental and legal issues if not adhered to. Social Facilities • West Dereham is deficient of amenities meaning that the nearest centre for shops, doctors, schools, dentists etc. is Downham Market approximately 5 miles away. Therefore, to access such amenities requires vehicular use as there is only limited public bus transport. It should be noted that the nearest bus stop (limited use) is 700m north of the proposed site along station road which as stated previously is a single track road, with no footpath of street lights. • A development such as proposed will undoubtedly include a number of children of school age. The nearest primary schools are located in Denver or Stoke Ferry both 3- 4 miles away, with no assisted transport available. Similarly, Secondary stage schools are in Downham Market or Methwold, each 5 and 6 miles distant respectively. It is known that a number of these schools are already close to capacity with limited spaces available. • Similarly, Downham Market is the nearest centre for doctors and dentists, both of which are operating at capacity with new patient spaces either severely restricted or non-existent. Nature Conservation • The proposed site is set amongst rural and arable land on either side. The impact on wild life and ecology of the area would be significant with such a change of use. Over recent years the area has seen wild red deer numbers increase, which roam the area freely. • The location is regularly frequented by Tawny and Barn Owls, as well as badgers, bats and grass snakes. • Wild floras grow unimpeded in this rural setting. Incompatible or Unacceptable Uses • The proposed development poses a significant change in use that is without doubt incompatible to the area and unacceptable for the reasons highlighted above. We appreciate that the Borough of Kings Lynn &amp; West Norfolk is under pressure within a set time frame to provide a certain quantity of Gypsy and Traveller sites and that to date it is struggling to meet these criteria. Despite this pressure it does and must not alleviate the responsibility of the Local Plan committee to appreciate and understand decisions made by Planning Officers and why they have reached that conclusion. Although this application was submitted under the presage of and for a Gypsy &amp; Traveller site, above all this was a proposal for a private development on land already in ownership of the applicant and/or potential associates of the applicant. Furthermore, within the conclusion of the application it is noted that the personal circumstances of the applicant have not been verified, which we believe is still the case. We would question and request it to be demonstrated how such a private development application can be deemed to meet the requirements of reducing the Borough's commitment to provide spaces for Gypsy &amp; Travellers. When the applicant attended the monthly West Dereham Parish Council meeting on 5th October 2023, he declared that it was his desire to develop this site for his family, some of which currently reside in Suffolk. We ask how this is helping BCKL&amp;WN's commitment to this policy. We hope you appreciate the above view, and it will help you understand</p>				
218		GT67	<p>Subject: Objection to Proposal for Site GT67, Llamedos, Syderstone On behalf of Syderstone Parish Council, we are writing to formally object to the proposal outlined in the consultation document regarding Site GT67 at Llamedos, Syderstone. Our objections are rooted in several key concerns that we believe warrant serious consideration before any decisions are made regarding the accommodation of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople at this location. First and foremost, we must emphasise the unsuitability of Site GT67 for such accommodation. Situated at the junction of Tattersett Road and Lancaster Road, this site serves as the primary entry and exit point to the residential areas of Wicken Green and Blenheim Park, as well as being within close proximity to Syderstone village. Introducing additional plots for travelling showpeople at this location would undoubtedly result in an unsightly encampment that is wholly incongruent with the surrounding area. The current presence of scrap caravans, lorries, and vans on the site only exacerbates concerns about further visual degradation. The residential character of the neighborhood is significant, featuring a blend of families and elderly individuals, including some who are vulnerable, residing in nearby streets. It's important to emphasize the absence of essential services and amenities around Site GT67. Without access to vital resources like shops, recreational facilities, or healthcare services, the addition of more plots in this area would exacerbate the current difficulties residents face in obtaining necessary support and services. In addition to these concerns, we are currently considering designating Site GT67 as a Green Space for Nature in our draft Neighbourhood Plan. Local knowledge suggests that the dense woodland covering much of the site provides a habitat for bat species, which are protected by both European and UK legislation. Therefore, any development on this site would need to carefully consider the ecological impact and legal obligations regarding bat conservation. The Parish Council has also received concerns that Site GT67 is potentially contaminated due to the burial of asbestos material following the demolition of the hospital building from the Sculthorpe airfield. It would therefore be very important to address this issue properly to ensure the safety and well-being of the community. The necessary steps would need to be undertaken to assess the extent of any contamination and work towards implementing appropriate measures to mitigate any risks posed by the site. Finally, it is imperative to address the inaccuracies in the site plan provided as part of the consultation. The inclusion of neighbouring properties such as 25 Tattersett Road and part of an adjacent garden misrepresents the true extent of Site GT67. We have brought this significant issue to the attention of the Planning Department and Michael Burton (Principal Planner), and we have been assured that the site boundary will be refined following the conclusion of the current consultation. In</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.</p>	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			light of these considerations, we urge you to reconsider the proposal to accommodate Gypsies, Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople at Site GT67, Llamedos, Syderstone. We believe that such a decision would not only be detrimental to the visual integrity of the area but also pose significant risks to the well-being, and ecological balance of the local community. Thank you for considering our objections and we trust that our concerns will be given the attention they deserve.				
219		GT43	I have been contacted by constituents in relation to the Gypsy and Traveller Potential Sites and Policy Consultation, and in particular site GT43 located at Homefield, Common Rd South, Walton Highway. I believe that the proposed site is unsuitable for this use due to the poorly maintained single-track road that accesses the site. I have also been concerned at the risk of flooding with the site being situated in Flood Zone 2/3. I consider the proposed site unsuitable for this purpose and I therefore oppose the planning consultation's plans for site GT43, and call on the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk to refrain from permitting development on this site.	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.
220		Not specified	Good morning, I have concerns regarding the provision of providing more travellers site's in our local area. Firstly there is the safety aspect. When anyone makes a planning application for a dwelling they have to do a flooding assessment for the next 100 years and new builds have to be raised up to prevent flood water ingress. But by allowing more of these sites for people to live in continuously in caravans and mobile homes, surely this is a breach of health and safety issues. The other issues are the anti social behaviour that unfortunately seems to be predominant surrounding some of these sites, it's certainly a worry that the police don't have any control of what is happening and the council doesn't have any authority regarding flytipping.	Not specified	Not Specified	Noted. The site assessment has identified some constraints to development particularly its location and the impact these may have on the character of the area. The Council has also consulted the relevant statutory organisations to enable more detailed comment on these particular issues. The Site assessment will be revised following the consultation to provide a robust picture of the issues for the site. This will then help inform the Council in its recommendations on the final list of proposed sites.  The other three sites are also subject to such consultation. A revised Site Assessment document will include the 3 new sites.	None
221		Not Specified	I would like noted my discord with Borough by reiterating the unfairness of the distribution suggested for the 6 parishes named to take the allocation of 72 pitches. We at Upwell are expected to take on over 50% of the overall allocation. In our defence I would like to remind the Borough of the following: Whilst sympathising with the need for growth in the gypsy communities and the allegiance we hold for them regarding their contribution to labour needed for the fruit picking years of the past, we have to state that circumstances have now changed considerably. The fruit picking industry is a thing of the past and we have a total lack of employment opportunities on offer. Whilst compiling the Neighbourhood plan Agricultural land came out as top priority to protect. Our land is Grade A and as such belongs to the "Breadbasket" area of the UK. It is plain to see that the effects of climate change is destroying acres and acres of food growth with flooding which has affected yields of crops for the farmers and will result with higher prices for consumers. We therefore need to reserve all of our agricultural land for the purpose of farming. Whilst we have agreed to minor extensions to existing sites within our parish, we emphasize the need to avoid flood zones 2 and 3 for safety conditions when increasing pitches. We are part of the fens, which is reclaimed land and the lowest area in UK. Protected for now, by the 40-millionpound government investment, which will require more money for protection from the government for climate change. This is our main priority when refusing the number of new sites you wish to impose upon us. Secondly our road structure on Small Lode and Church Drove and Welle Creek Road, March Riverside and Stonehouse Road are substandard with hardly room for two vehicles to pass. Investment would be needed by the Highway Authority. Pathways included. Upwell Parish Council has already addressed the lack of provision at the School and Health Centre.	Not specified	Yes	The Council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2023 identifies those specific needs arising from particular sites across the Borough. The majority of this need is coming from those existing sites within the 6 parishes identified in this consultation.  The Council is also aware that some of these site do have some planning constraints such as flooding, highway capacity and access to local services.  All statutory consultees responsible for these constraints have also been consulted and their feedback will help the Council in its decision on which sites are proposed for allocation within the Local Plan.	None.
222		GTRA(L) GTRA(M) GTRA(N)	Objection I have registered I am objecting to the proposed sites listed. The development of these sites is likely to lead to a significant impact on the character of the area. The development needs to consider its context. Temporary or mobile accommodation may not contribute positively towards enhancing local character.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
		GTRA(L) GTRA(M) GTRA(N)	I have lived in Blackborough End for almost 40 years. I object to all three of the applications for multiple dwellings on these plots which have seen many building applications turned down over the years. Some applications received objections and were withdrawn before a council decision was required. My house backs onto this land. 35 years ago an application was rejected as the land needed to have drainage and Blackborough End was not suitable to have further traffic. I do not know what has changed as it is well known that this land floods and the roads have not been improved. The first plot of land behind my property has already been rejected GTRA(E). The other three plots GTRA(L) GTRA(M) GTRA(N) would have similar problems: such as lack of amenities within 10 minutes, there is no public transport in the village, the traffic problem with narrow roads, the large number of people who would be accommodated and it would be overbearing to the existing village of Blackborough End. In addition the noise created by so many people would be a big concern behind my house. A recent planning application ref: 18/01118/0 was made five years ago which was for two houses. Blackborough End Parish Council objected to this. The planning also received a letter regarding the site from the Historic Environment Officer for Norfolk County Council. The site was historically a pottery kiln of Roman date and had been partly excavated in 1989. As there is potential for further archeological findings there were conditions laid out for investigation. No building could take place without these stipulations being met. The planning application was withdrawn. There are wild animals in the field, foxes, deer, rabbits which will be disturbed again, the last time it was wild boar farming. The road (Sandy Lane) is narrow and already takes the traffic of residents and their visitors. In addition the village is used as a busy cut through for traffic to and from the A10-A47 and the A134-A47. This adds to the volume of traffic through this small village. In my opinion the village do not need any more traffic for our narrow roads and lanes.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
223		GTRA(L) GTRA(M) GTRA(N)	I object to the 3 sites because they are in a location where applications for houses have already been declined. The proposed plots are currently a haven for deer, hares and other wildlife and birds which I often see when I go for a walk. There would also be an increase in traffic. The sites would be out of character for a small country hamlet. There has also been a site GTRA(E) which was deemed unsuitable as there are no local amenities and it is out of character for the location.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
224		GTRA(L) GTRA(M) GTRA(N)	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed establishment of new Gypsy Traveller sites in our village. While I understand the need for accommodation for various communities, I believe there are significant reasons why this particular proposal should not proceed. Firstly, the introduction of Gypsy Traveller sites may have adverse effects on the local community's cohesion and sense of security. Historically, tensions have arisen in areas where such sites have been established, leading to social divisions and unease among residents. Moreover, the proposed site's location may pose practical challenges and risks. Concerns about increased traffic, noise pollution, and potential environmental impact cannot be overlooked. Furthermore, there are potential economic implications to consider. Property values in the vicinity of the proposed sites could be adversely affected, impacting homeowners and potentially deterring future investment in the area. Local businesses may also face challenges due to changes in foot traffic and perceptions of the area. I believe that alternative solutions should be explored to address the accommodation needs of the Gypsy Traveller community without compromising the well-being and cohesion of our village.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
225		GTRA(G)	Having examined the published documents listed in your e-mail below, I was both surprised and concerned to see that you have (currently) marked our above submitted site as 'Not being Suitable'. Following a 2 day Public Hearing, and the recent (14th December 2023) successful APPEAL and AWARDING of COSTS against KL&WNBC in respect of an application for a rural Gypsy & Traveller Site at Moyses Bank, half a mile further along School Road, our site (which is much nearer to the village) more than meets all the relevant NPPF, PPTS, SADMPP, Core Strategies, Policies and other criteria highlighted by the Planning Inspector.	Update the site assessment report to reflect the recent appeal decision for the site.	Not specified	The appeal decision was based on an application for a separate site. Each application is judged on its own merits. This site does have some identified constraints and it would need to be demonstrated that these can be overcome via future planning application. The site is located within FZ3 and the Council's position is to only consider those existing sites in FZ2 and FZ3 where a direct need has arisen through the GTAA. All other sites	None.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						in high-risk flood zones should be avoided where necessary in line with National Planning Policy.	
226		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I strongly object to all three proposed sites Refs GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) on the following grounds: 1) Access to local services/facilities: There are no core facilities in Blackborough End. All local services are in the adjoining village of Middleton and there is no shop or public transport within 800 metres of all three proposed sites. 2) Transport and Roads: Water Lane and Sandy Lane are minor, narrow rural roads with limited visibility for drivers. The junction between Water Lane, Sandy Lane and School Road is already a "blind corner" and is already particular road hazard located at the north point of GTRA(N). The access roads are totally unsuitable for additional traffic, especially mobile homes and large Showground vehicles. Both Blackborough End and Middleton already have an HGV weight limit for good reason. 3) Townscape: The development of these sites would overbear the existing village settlement. It would be detrimental to the community size and character. Existing housing development is linear along the roads and the introduction of groups of housing behind existing dwellings is not in-keeping with this.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
227		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	My view on this planning application is not in keeping with the hamlet village of Blackborough end.there has been applications on these sites previously & have been turned down do due to serveral issues . One of the main issues was the drainage problems at the south of the village which has been an ongoing problem for many years which would also add to the problem. We have lived here for 37 years & have seen major flooding down setch road with raw sewage overflowing out of the manholes on several occasions in which I can supply photo evidence if needed I hope this planning application will take this issue seriously	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
228		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	i object because this proposal will have a negative impact on local character and local landscape in general it will contribute negatively towards the existing character of this part of Blackborough End and Middleton as a whole. it will be another severe drain on resourses for the district council the value of existing domestic properties will be reduced and in some cases potentially un-saleable having previous experience of traveller sites in Essex there are many more fundamental reasons to object, although probably not appropriate for inclusion on this form.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
229		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I am making an objection to the above for the reasons stated below 1) There have been many applications put in for the above sites for housing. This has been refused because of potential flooding and drainage problems . This problem still stands, the roads often flood due to drainage issues . 2) Road safety , again this is a small hamlet and added traffic would have a huge impact to the 'feel' if the village it would add further noise pollution. 3) Using the land would have an impact on the environment and habitat, trees have already been illegally felled on this land with no action taken from the council. 4) There could also be possible noise pollution due to dogs living outside and barking at all hours. 5) Having a possible travellers site would have a huge impact on house prices in the village as the aesthetics would dramatically change.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
						would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
230		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	As per phone call I'm rejecting the proposal of the travellers site at Blackborough End Middleton Kings Lynn.	Not specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
231		GT67	No comments to make.	Not specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
232		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	At the Middleton Parish Council Meeting last night (6th March), there was a lot of confusion amongst the Parish Councillors, a County Councillor and Parishioners who attended as to whether the site GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) are actually within the scope of this consultation exercise which ends on 8th March, particularly as these three sites do not appear in any of the supporting Council documents (F55, F56 etc). I personally have two emails from Luke Brown (Council Planning Officer), one saying there are and another saying they aren't - this is very confusing and highly irregular for a consultation of this importance, as both statements cannot be correct. On that basis, we were advised at last night's Parish Council meeting, that we could still proceed with objection submissions before the 8th of March deadline. ** I would like to register my objection to all proposed Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites at Blackborough End [GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)]. I note from the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessments January 2024 document, that the land off Sandy Lane, Blackborough End "GTRA(E)" has already been deemed unsuitable and given the proposed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) are all situated either within or immediately adjacent to the previously rejected GTRA(E) site and would use the same access routes, then the same criteria for rejection should apply equally. There is a concern that although the main site. GTRA(E) has been deemed unsuitable, that proposing a smaller site(s) there, may be a "trojan horse" stealth tactic to enable future expansion into the original GTRA(E) site. The proposed locating of Traveller sites at Blackborough End is completely unsuitable for a small, rural village setting with a lack of basic infrastructure and no local services and was one of the reasons the GTRA(E) site was rejected. It's clear that the narrow access roads to all of the above mentioned sites are unsuitable for the size and volume of vehicles any site here would attract and the proposed site(s) are prone to waterlogging and flooding. Furthermore, I am also concerned that the close proximity to a primary school in Middleton, (already a problematic traffic area) would present an increased road traffic safety risk to pupils, parents and residents. Having had first-hand experience of official (and at times unofficial) Traveller sites located nearby to my last two residences in Cheshire and Greater London respectively, choosing an appropriate location is crucial to its success or failure. One site was located sensitively and set away from the main residential area, but with good connections to local services and it was generally a success and harmonious, whereas the other was located in a totally unsuitable setting, dominating a quiet residential area with few local services and amenities and despite the best efforts of the Police, Local Authority and Community Liaison officers, it was an unmitigated disaster and the cause of frequent and at times violent strife between Travellers and the local community. This is a real-life experience that King's Lynn & West Norfolk Council ought to consider when coming to its conclusions, so that a similar negative outcome can be avoided. The Council is in an unenviable position trying to balance the requirements of its statutory obligations in respect of the provision of Traveller sites against the preservation, support and wellbeing of its rural communities and green spaces and has an opportunity now, to provision new sites with sensitivity and pragmatism. The Traveller community are entitled to and should be provided with sites with suitable amenities and local services, but the proposed GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) locations at Blackborough End deliver neither and to approve these sites would be immensely harmful to the local area and would have a long-lasting and detrimental effect on community cohesion. Both local residents and the Traveller community deserve a better solution.	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
233		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	The proposed gypsy sites are objected to in the village of Blackborough End as would be centrally in the middle of the village right next to existing residential houses and gardens and therefore all these sites are unsuitable, normally traveller's sites are placed remotely or edge of village never in the heart of a village.	Not specified	No	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M),

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
							GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
234		GT05	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
235		GT11	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
236		GT17	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
237		GT18	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
238		GT20	The nearest designated heritage assets are approximately 250m away (the Upwell Conservation Area and a grade II listed War Memorial. Given the distance and intervening development and vegetation, any impact on designated heritage assets is likely to be minimal	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
239		GT21	The Priory, listed at grade II, and Upwell Conservation Area lie approximately 350m east of the site However dense woodland and the distance between means that any impact on designated heritage assets is likely to be minimal.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
240		GT28	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
241		GT33	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
242		GT34	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
243		GT35	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
244		GT39	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
245		GT42	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT42 from the consultation document.
246		GT54	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
247		GT55	The grade II listed Birdbeck lies approximately 300 m from the site. Given the distance, and intervening development the impact on designated heritage assets is likely to be minimal.	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
248		GT56	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
249		GT59	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
250		GT66	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
251		GTRA(B)	Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site, the site lies approximately 100m west of the Site of St Mary's Abbey, a scheduled monument. There are also three grade II* listed buildings/structures within the scheduled area including the ruins of the West Dereham Abbey House, the ruins of the service wing of West Dereham Abbey House, as well as the Gate Piers. The bridge in the north east corner of the Abbey Precinct is listed at Grade II. Pear Tree Farmhouse, listed at grade II, lies to the west of the site. The site of St Mary's Abbey includes a variety of features within a precinct boundary which remains intact. Although very little of the fabric of the monastic buildings is visible above ground, the layout of the site is known from cropmark and earthwork evidence. The site has a very high potential to contain important buried archaeological remains relating to the operation and activities of the religious community at the abbey and the site's post-Dissolution evolution. Whilst there is a landscape buffer along the western edge of the scheduled monument, development of the site has the potential to impact upon these designated heritage assets and their settings. The site has been the subject of a recent planning application, which was refused for a number of reasons including heritage. Historic England advised that the planning application did not include an assessment of the impact of the proposals on the historic environment as required in NPPF paragraph 200. Based on the application information, Historic England considered that the proposed development would result in a degree of harm to the setting of the 'Site of St Mary's Abbey' scheduled monument. This level of harm to the scheduled monument would be within the lower end of the range of 'less than substantial harm' in NPPF terms. In our application response we did however set out a number of mitigation	Delete site Or prepare an HIA to inform suitability of site and if found suitable any policy wording. Update site profiles and sustainability appraisal	Yes	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			measures that could be introduced to minimise the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the designated heritage assets, should permission be granted. We continue to have concerns regarding this site and in the absence of assessment of the impact of the proposals on the historic environment this site should be deleted, particularly if alternative sites with less impact on the historic environment are available. If the site is retained, given this is one of the more sensitive sites in heritage terms, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) should be prepared now to provide that assessment of impact, to inform the suitability of the site per se and, if the site is found suitable, any potential mitigation and enhancement as well as the policy wording. We note that the site profile makes no mention of these assets. The site assessment will need to be revisited and updated. The SA makes no mention of the nearby heritage assets. The SA should be updated to properly reflect the proximity of these assets.				
252		GTRA(C)	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
253		GT43	Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the Marshland Smeeth and Fen War Memorial, listed at grade II lies approximately 150m to the south east of the site. However due to the intervening development and scale of the asset and proposed development, this is not considered to be a constraint.	Prepare an HIA to inform suitability of site and if found suitable any policy wording. Update site profile and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	The Council has considered all relevant planning constraints, responses and advice from statutory consultees for GT43. As no specific need is arising from this site in relation to the Council's recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment (GTAA), the site is not needed to help meet such needs within the first five-year period of the Local Plan. However, the Council has also considered whether this site is suitable to help meet the wider Gypsy and Traveller provision over the remaining Plan period. The site is located within Flood Zone 3 and is therefore not sequentially preferable when considering against all other available sites across the Borough. Therefore, the Council has decided to remove the site as a potential allocation from the Local Plan at this time.	Remove GT43 from the consultation document.
254		GT25	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
255		GT62	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
256		GT67	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
257		GT14	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
258		GT37	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
259		GT38	No designated heritage assets within the site boundary or nearby. No comments	Not specified	Yes	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
260		F3.1	Whilst there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary, the grade II listed Austin House lies immediately to the east of the site. Development of the site has the potential to impact upon this designated heritage asset and its settings. If the site is retained, given this is one of the more sensitive sites in heritage terms, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) should be prepared now to inform the suitability of the site per se and, if the site is found suitable, any potential mitigation and enhancement as well as the policy wording. The SA makes no mention of this heritage asset. The SA should be updated to properly reflect the proximity of the listed building.	Prepare an HIA to inform suitability of site and if found suitable any policy wording. Update site profile and sustainability appraisal.	Yes	The Council is awaiting feedback from other statutory consultees on the issues raised and from Fenland Borough Council who are a partner in the delivery of the proposed strategic allocation at Wisbech Fringe.	
261		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I strongly object to the proposed sites in these locations for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Issues with safety and increased traffic flow on the two lanes (Sandy Lane and Water Lane) boarding the site with no safe access point as there is a large bend on the corner of Sandy Lane and Water Lane and the lanes are narrow.</li> <li>2. There are no core services nearby within a 10 minute walk</li> <li>3. Local school will not be able to cope with increased demand caused by the site.</li> </ol>	Not specified	Not specified	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>4. Blackborough End watercourse is already overloaded and can only worsen with increased demand, and development.</p> <p>5. The wildlife will be impacted negatively</p> <p>6. Development will have a significant negative impact on the character of the village</p> <p>7. GTRA(E) has already been deemed unsuitable.</p>			<p>heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	consultation document.
262		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I am writing in response to the Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People Sites and Policy Consultation. On behalf of concerned constituents, I am writing to object to the proposed sites at GTRA(E), GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N). Appendix B of the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document [F56], lists the land off Sandy Lane, Blackborough End (GTRA(E)) as not suitable for allocation as an alternative for Gypsy and Traveller sites. As well as there being no core services within 800m, it was deemed that the development would likely have a significant impact on the character of the local area due to the site being located on the edge of the village and the size of the development was also raised. In addition, the document notes that the road is too narrow and there are nearby residential properties. Blackborough End is a small hamlet that does not have the infrastructure to accommodate the needs of a Gypsy and Traveller site. Since the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document [F56] was released, three additional sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) have been submitted to the Council for consideration. I have heard from a number of concerned constituents who are strongly opposed to these sites being used as Gypsy and Traveller sites. Having visited the proposed site and met residents, on behalf of my constituents and for the reasons set out on pages 232-233 of the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment Document [F56] relating to GTRA, I oppose the wholly inappropriate inclusion of these sites</p>	Not specified	Not Specified	<p>The Council are aware that some of these site have existing planning constraints. These constraints have been investigated and the statutory agencies and organisations responsible for these constraints have also been part of the consultation process. The feedback the Council receives from the consultation will help it review existing documentation and make a decision to which sites are proposed as allocations within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has provided a public consultation for the statutory timeframe recommended in national planning practice guidance.</p> <p>Those sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) were submitted to the Council after the consultation went live. Elected Members were keen for residents to be made aware of any additional sites, so therefore these were released to enable local residents to have their say on the future development of these sites.</p> <p>Further consultation on this process will be undertaken later in the Spring.</p>	None.
263		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>This relates to all three sites. Could influence the value of local properties. Not enough schools, dentists, doctors or hospital facilities in the area. Also, not enough notice given to properly investigate.</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
264		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I wish to object to the land in Blackborough End - Reference GTRA(E), GTRA(L), GTRA(M) &amp; GTRA(N) being used to site Gypsy &amp; Traveller site on the following grounds: The first phase of consultation on existing and possible new Gypsy and Traveller sites. One of the potential new sites mentioned in the published consultation documents was GTRA(E) in Blackborough End. The Borough Council's own assessment of that site was RED. It appears that in February 24, despite GTRA(E) being assessed as RED, the landowner of that site submitted to the Council three additional parcels of land for consideration as suitable Gypsy and Traveller sites. These sites (GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N)) are all close to the rejected site GTRA(E). It is clear that the issues of access to core services and significant adverse impact on the character of the local area which caused the Council to assess GTRA(E) as RED apply equally to these three additional sites whether considered individually or collectively. I believe that all three additional sites should, on the Council's own criteria, also be assessed as RED and so unsuitable for Gypsy and Traveller use. Sites GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) are bounded to the west by Water Lane which for the most part is a narrow single track width road. Although it is assumed that Water Lane would not be used to provide access to the sites, additional fencing or other measures would be necessary along Water Lane to secure the sites and prevent unauthorised</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			vehicle access being sought via Water Lane. Such measures and any increased traffic in Water Lane, especially by larger vehicles, would be severely detrimental to its rural character, to the rich local wildlife and to leisure use by pedestrians. All three sites are bounded to the east by Sandy Lane which although a two-lane road, is narrow as acknowledged in the Council's assessment of GTRA(E). It has some tight bends and blind parts close to potential access points to the three additional sites which increased use, especially by larger vehicles, would make even more dangerous for local residents and other road users. The nature of the road would make it very difficult if not impossible to provide safe vehicle access to and exit from any of the sites. Whatever detailed arrangements might be proposed for vehicle access to the three sites, I believe that the use of any of the three sites would create a major increased and unacceptable danger to local residents and other road users. The piece of land within which all three potential additional sites are located has a history of problems for local residents arising from flooding and drainage issues. Such concerns have been raised in previous planning applications (Reference 20/00232/F and 21/00884/F) but have not been resolved. The flooding and drainage problems would be made worse if any of the three additional sites were allocated for Gypsy and Traveller use and so all of them should be assessed as RED. Recent planning applications (Reference 20/00232/F and 21/00884/F) for residential development within the area covered by GTRA(M) were refused in part because Norfolk County Council's Historic Environment Service objected to the potential adverse impact on archaeological deposits at the site and overall setting of adjacent heritage assets in the field to the west of Water Lane. These concerns would appear, therefore, to apply to all these three sites and create a presumption that they should all be assessed as RED.			meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
265		GTRA(L), GTRA(M),GTRA(N)	We object to the proposed site allocation to Gypsy, traveller and Travelling Show people due to the following reasons: Overcrowding and Increased traffic: We already have a Caravan parking site in A47 at the North Runcton junction which gets busy especially during Spring and Summer seasons. Closer to A47, there is ongoing Norfolk Offshore Wind zone project. This creates employment which means more people to move in and settle in closer proximity to the place of work. A47 is a single carriageway and it gets very busy during the peak hours. We are not aware of any plans to expand. It is very frustrating to travel in the morning/evening to and from work. Property value: We are concerned about the potential negative impact on the property value in this area making it difficult for people who want to sell. Schools: We are concerned that the local school may not have the capacity to accommodate more students from the increase in population in this area. Hospitals/Ambulances services/GP services: The NHS is already stretched especially during winter, the increased population in this area is going to add more strain to the local NHS services. Senior citizens: Norfolk has nearly 25%-30% of senior citizens. They may face challenges to their daily commute for essential shopping, hospital appointments, may face delay with Ambulance services, care services. Finally, we do agree that Gypsies and travellers do need a site for their stay but creating that in Blackborough end may have a negative impact for everyone for the reasons given.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
266		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Regarding GTRA (L) the following points apply Road access & Transport to site The road is narrow so not suitable for regular traffic that could be generated. Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses Set within residential area - not suitable. Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. Townscape Development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located in the village. The development of this site for gypsy and traveller accommodation would overbear the built form of the existing settlement.  Regarding GTRA (M) the following points apply Road access & Transport to site The road is very narrow and particularly unsuitable for the traffic that would be added to the village - could change the character of the area completely. Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses Set within residential area - not suitable. Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. Townscape Development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located in the village. The development of this site for gypsy and traveller accommodation would overbear the built form of the existing settlement. Drainage of run off water would need to be considered from this site.  GTRA(N) Road access & Transport to site The road is narrow so not suitable for regular traffic that could be generated. Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses Set within residential area - not suitable. Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities No core services within 800m/10 minutes walking distance. Townscape Development likely to have a significant impact on the character of the area due to the site being located in the village. The	Not specified	Yes	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			development of this site for gypsy and traveller accommodation would overbear the built form of the existing settlement.				
267		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	I object to the proposed/suggested Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople sites, Ref GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) under the following constraints:- Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities - All of the above referenced sites are in excess of 800m from the local services which are in the adjoining village of Middleton as there are no facilities at all in Blackborough End. This is as measured from the closest point of the nearest site (GTRA(N)). The distance to the actual entrance of GTRA(N) and all the other sites, would be even further from the services. Townscape - The developments are very likely to have a significant impact on the existing settlements of both Blackborough End and Middleton. Biodiversity - The area in and around the villages of Blackborough End and Middleton are part of a rural/countryside setting, with a diverse range of wildlife and habitats within. The area is also close by the Nar Valley which is in itself a significant haven for wildlife. Transport and Roads - The road infrastructure in and around the proposed sites is typical of those in many rural situations being narrow. Both villages already have an HGV weight limit for that reason. The approach to the junction between Sandy Lane, Water Lane and School Road can be particularly difficult with width of road, visibility and occasional flooding all being of existing concern, even before considering the impact of extra traffic from the proposed developments.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
268		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Any advancement of this kind would inflict considerable harm on the tranquility of this serene village center. Surrounded by well-established local residences, the introduction of a caravan site in this area would disrupt the essence of a cohesive rural community. With no nearby supermarkets or accessible local stores within walking distance, such a development would inevitably lead to a notable surge in traffic along the narrow local roads, particularly with vehicles towing caravans. The transformation of this land into a caravan site would clash entirely with the character of neighboring properties, imposing an excessive burden and significantly depreciating the value of established housing and properties within the village.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
269		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	Any development of this nature will have a significant detrimental impact on this quiet village centre. The location is surrounded by mature local housing and the impact of a caravan site positioned here, right in the centre of an established village will destroy the heart of a settled rural community. There are no local shops or services within walking distance which would mean significant increased traffic on the small local roads (especially with vehicles towing caravans). Any development of this land for a caravan site would be totally incompatible with and overbearing to neighbouring properties and would hugely devalue established housing and property values in the village.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
270		GTRA(B)	1 Access to Site Scored as Amber. Should be Red. The site access is on a slight bend and the road at that point is the national speed limit and could be deemed unsafe for all. The many HGVs (SAM data collated by the Parish Council) pass this site access, travelling to the recycling centre. Presumably the household general refuse/recycling bins of this proposed development would need to be placed at the site entrance for easy collection. 2 Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities Scored as Red. Should be same, Red. 3 Utilities Capacity/Utilities Infrastructure Scored as Green. Should be Red. The proposed site has no sewage system, mains water, electricity, telephone, nor gas. The clay soil, which does not allow free drainage may be problematic for any sewage system. The Environment Agency	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocation within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation document..

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>on planning application (01606) portal objected. Any works may involve a road closure, and the narrower single-track Basil Road, with no passing places, could be hazardous for all. 4 Contamination and Ground Stability Scored as Green. Should be Green 5 Flood Risk Scored as Green. Should be Amber at least. The clay soil holds water and does not drain freely (on a seam of Gault Clay). The area is low-lying and has a high water-table and frequently floods. A Flood Zone is close by. Extra water from households would be very challenging for the residents. Many objections were raised against the planning application itself (01606). 6 Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes Scored as Green. Should be Green? 7 Townscape Scored as Amber. Should be Red West Dereham is a village/hamlet that is very spread out. The mobile homes would be out of keeping with the village with its mostly brick-built homes and would change the character of the village forever if approved. 8 Biodiversity and Geodiversity Scored as Green. Should be Amber. It is a greenfield site, amongst farmland, surrounded by nature, with native trees and hedges supporting wildlife. Barn owls and bats forage this habitat. Other species inhabit too. The application would impact the wildlife. 9 Historic Environment Scored as Green. Should be Amber at least. The historic site of St Mary's Abbey (Scheduled Monument, Grade II*) is very close to this application. The village is steeped in history, with historic artefacts being found in various locations. Has this site been investigated for artefacts? The suggested screening of the mobile homes would presumably involve fast-growing non-native species, which would not be in-keeping with the Abbey's curtilage. 10 Open Space/Green Infrastructure. Scored as Green. Should be same, Green. 11 Transport and Roads. Scored as Amber. Should be Red. Station Road (and others) is single-track with no pavements, no lighting, and extra traffic (TRICS data states 10 vehicle movements/mobile home/day) would increase the risk to schoolchildren walking to catch the bus, pedestrians, those keeping-fit, walkers/cyclists for restorative wellbeing, wheelchair users, parents with pushchairs, dog-walkers, and horse-riders in this rural agricultural villages. HGV vehicles already use the road to reach Glazewings and the entrance to the site is in a 60 mph zone. The road can become icy in winter as it is not gritted. 12 Coastal Change. Scored as Green. Should be the same, Green Does the inland flood risk need to be included under this heading? If so, this could alter the Green score to Amber perhaps? 13 Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses. Scored as Amber. Should be Red. This suggested site would involve extra traffic (see above) for the villagers every day of the week, with added noise and more pollution for Station Road, in particular. This would totally change the character of the village for ever more, and there have been lots of objections from residents on the planning application (01606) site. To conclude, the application would alter the character of this village, its inhabitants and its rural landscape forever. West Dereham has few services, necessitating vehicle journeys with inherent increased carbon footprint. There have been a significant number of objections against the planning application (01606) itself.</p>				
271		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I object to proposed sites in the Middleton area - GTRA(L), GTRA(M) &amp; GTRA(N). The main reasons for my concern are the impact the development is likely to have on the character of this village, there are no local core services and the increase in what I expect will be generally larger vehicles down the narrow roads feeding the potential sites. More importantly we should also carefully consider how this will increase the volume of larger vehicles passing by the Middleton Primary Academy and the road safety of the young children attending</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
272		GTRA(L), GTRA(M), GTRA(N)	<p>I wish to register an objection to the proposed traveller sites GTRA (L), GTRA (M) and GTRA (N) on the following grounds None of these sites were included in the Gypsy and Traveller Sites Assessments documentation F56 circulated as part of the West Norfolk Local Plan examination and therefore have not been included in the proper consultation process. Residents have been denied due process to examine the proposal. None of these sites have been subject to an objective assessment of the suitability and deliverability of available land for accommodating the future needs for the Gypsy and Travellers as laid out in the Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessment document F56 and therefore have not been properly assessed. Proposed site GTRA (M) is adjacent to site GTRA (E) which has already been deemed as unsuitable due to lack of access to local services and impact on the townscape with additional concerns raised over access to the site, roads and compatibility with neighbouring uses. These issues apply equally to proposed site GTRA(M), if not more so. Proposed sites GTRA (L) and CTRA (N) are not suitable on</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development again any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.</p>	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			the following grounds;- lack of access to local services and facilities, significant impact on the townscape, and incompatibility with neighbouring residential properties			Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	
273		GT67	1)This area is our only access to Wicken Green Village. We pay to make sure that Lancaster Road is kept clean and tidy. The grass is always mowed, hedges trimmed etc to make this area welcoming for residents, visitors and any possible buyers of our property. 2) Many residents are elderly, including me, and we are alarmed by this. It could impact on property prices and gives us concern for safety. This private village is wonderful for vulnerable, elderly people and this potential plan could remove our security, which I am sure you will agree, in later years, is vital for our wellbeing. 3) We have no core services , no shops, no close health facilities or leisure facilities. 4) The site is known to be contaminated, the USAF military airbase buried many things, including asbestos on the land. 5) We are a quiet village, we pay management fees to keep the village in good order and we are concerned about the problems that sadly always seem to develop when such a site exists. Many of us walk to keep fit and we could not leave our village on foot without passing the proposed area. We believe the area is totally unsuitable for many reasons. 6) I would also ask you to note that this area is as far away from King's Lynn as possible and I have to wonder if this is in some way connected to the potential choice. 7) I am also interest to know why you assume this site may be suitable, when you do not appear to own the land. Having been in legal services for many years, it seemed logical to check.	Not specified	Yes	The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
274		Not Specified	I am writing to advise you that this Council recognises that a significant proportion of the proposed sites are within the western part of the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk (BCKLWN) located to the east of Fenland District. This reflects the historic settlement pattern of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showmen which is broadly in and around the Wisbech area. FDC is currently carrying out its own assessment of the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showmen which is due for completion in June/July 2024. This Council offers no objection to the use and intensification of the sites as proposed in the consultation document for the sites GT05 to GT67 inclusive as well as GTRA(B) and GTRA(C). In terms of site F3.1 - Land at Wisbech Fringe, the site is adjacent to an allocated site in the adopted Fenland Local Plan 2014 (FLP). See Policy LP8 – Wisbech with reference to the East Wisbech Strategic Allocation on pages 35 to 40 inclusive at this link: Fenland Local Plan - Adopted Web Of additional relevance to proposed development in urban extension areas of the Fenland market towns (of which the East Wisbech Strategic Allocation is one) is criteria (q) of Policy LP7 – Urban Extensions, of the FLP which states on page 34 that: “q) The Council will determine whether or not there is a need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots via a local assessment of need. If a need is identified, set aside a small area of land which is suitable for the provision of up to five Gypsy and Traveller pitches or Travelling Showpeople plots unless it would be demonstrably inappropriate to do so (e.g. in a wholly employment related urban extension). Such set aside land should be provided to the District Council at nil cost. Pitches and/or plots should be provided on-site unless the developer can demonstrate exceptional circumstances which necessitate provision on another site or the payment of a financial contribution (of broadly equivalent value) to the Council to enable the need for pitches and/or plots to be met elsewhere. Should the Council subsequently sell any land provided to it at nil cost, or sell any land it acquired through the payment of a financial contribution in accordance with this policy, then the payments received by the Council will be ring-fenced for the future needs of Gypsy and Travellers or Travelling Showpeople only;” There is therefore local plan policy support for inclusion of up to five Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showmen plots within the strategic allocation area. However, as you will be aware a joint Broad Concept Plan has been adopted by FDC and the BCKWLN which does not include any specific reference to this element of the policy. East Wisbech Broad Concept Plan - Fenland District Council It is theoretically possible that a small site might come forward in the future, but it is highly unlikely that this will be practically deliverable due to the reluctance of both the settled and traveller community to live in close proximity to each other within a traditional urban extension setting. This was highlighted in FDC's Issues and Options consultation in 2019 for a new emerging local plan which can be viewed at the following link - see responses to Question 16: Issues & Options Key Issues Report - Fenland District Council As suitable pitches and/or plots within Site F3.1 are very unlikely to be deliverable, the site should not be relied on to meet the current or future need of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showmen.	Not specified	No Specified	The Council agree that the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller provision on this site will only be required if the overall needs cannot be met elsewhere. In addition, the scale of the land needed to accommodate such a use may impact the viability and deliverability of this site at a late stage.	Remove F3.1 from the consultation document
275		GTRA(B)	Given the outcome of planning application 23/01606/F, which has been refused, I hereby vehemently object to this same area of land being included as part of the wider consultation for the Review of the Draft Local Plan. I am a resident of this small hamlet and am familiar with the land in question. I ask that the information in this letter is considered as part of the consultation and your decision making, my fear is that the proposal for GTRA (B) as a New Site, is being considered, due to the pressure to meet traveller site pitch targets. This site is wholly unsuitable for anyone to live on. So given that I am at loss to understand why it is considered suitable for the travelling community.	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the consultation documents.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			<p>It does not meet the draft criterion as set out in Section 8 (on page 10), of the draft document for new sites. This is even with the addition of works to 'mitigate' issues This is because there are major constraints relating to the site that cannot be adequately managed out by mitigating design measures, planning conditions or planning informatives, mainly Impact of development size and scale on the rural character, and sustainability. This site has been subject to Planning Application 23/01606/F, for 10 static and 10 mobile units. As of 1st March 2024 the Principal Planning Officer refused this application citing grounds of refusal as; - Impact on landscape character - Sustainability - Drainage 2 - Historic importance of adjacent area The site profile in the draft plan does not show the large amount of objections received in response to the connected (REFUSED) Planning Application 23/01606/F. There are 114 objections from villagers, local businesses, Liz Truss (MP), Campaign for Rural England, that state how unsuitable the site is for anyone to live on. I will now refer to specific points: (of the Draft Local Plan page 10) Section 8 b) :- Access to community services and facilities such as health and education provision West Dereham is a minimum of 4 miles distant for any such shop, school, doctors or dentist In 2018, planning permission was refused by the Borough Council for six new affordable homes on Station Road on the grounds that 'the proposal is remote from local service provision conflicting with the aims of accessible development, the need to minimise travel and the ability to encourage walking, cycling, use of public transport and reduce the reliance on the private car as represented in national and local policy'. In light of that decision, which was upheld at appeal, it is difficult to justify this proposed New Site being larger in size and density. Section 8 c):- Be of a scale that is appropriate to local character, its local services and infrastructure and would not overwhelm the nearest settled community. This proposed site would place intolerable strain upon community infrastructure in Downham Market and nearby villages, such as Wereham, Stoke Ferry and Boughton. Planning application 23/01606/F relevant to this site, proposed 10 static units plus a further 10 touring vehicles. At any time, this could be up to 20 families living onsite. This could be between 80 – 100 individuals. The current population of West Dereham is approximately 470, a population growth of 21%. This links into the Planning Officer decision to reject planning application 23/01606/F on grounds of Sustainability. 3 How can this proposed development be of an appropriate scale to a hamlet of 470 residents, forming some 200 households? West Dereham has no local services or supporting infrastructure to accommodate this huge increase to our population. This development would quickly overwhelm our small, settled community. No amount of design or mitigating measures or planning conditions could change the size of this proposal Section 8 d):- Have suitable, safe and convenient access to the highway network. VOLUME OF TRAFFIC TO BE GENERATED: I ask that you have regard to the recent Planning Inspectorate judgement (West Berkshire Council Application 21/02112/FUL – change of use to 7 Gypsy/Traveller pitches comprising 7 static and 7 touring caravans and associated works). The Council commissioned a Highways Engineer Report, part of which used a calculation to forecast predicted number of vehicles movements per day from the proposed site. The Engineer (using TRICS forecast model) forecast that 7 pitches would generate in the region of 33 vehicle movements per day. I have applied this to the proposed application using a simple calculation (division of 7 into 33 = 1 unit multiplied by 10). Using this, the proposed Station Road site would generate an estimated 47 extra vehicle movements per day. The generation of additional traffic on Station Road may result in increased risk of collisions between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. There is no pavement, on Station Road, and shelter has to be taken by climbing onto the grass bank beside the 7 feet deep ditch that runs the opposite side of the proposed site; Station Road is 3 metres wide at its narrowest and at times the grass bank is under a metre in width This location should be removed from the draft plan on Highways grounds because; · Station Road serving the site is considered inadequate to support the development proposed by reason of its restricted width/lack of formal passing places/lack of footway and restricted visibility at entrance/exit junction. The proposal if permitted would likely give rise to conditions detrimental to highways safety, contrary to Development Plan Policies (SHCR07) · The site is remote from local service centre provision, conflicting with the aims of accessible development, the need to minimise travel, and the ability to encourage walking, cycling, use of public transport and reduce reliance on car use as represented in national and local policy. Contrary to the National Policy Framework and Policy 5 of Norfolk's 3rd Local Transport Plan, entitled connecting Norfolk. 4 There is no lighting on Station Road, and in the winter, walking home from the bus stop from school in the dark is truly terrifying for the children. There are young families with children of school age that live in the homes at the old station end of Station Road and I see them walking home from school in the dark, dodging cars and other vehicles. Changing the access point to the site and cutting down vegetation will not effectively mitigate this risk to an acceptable level. Section 8 e):- Have the ability to connect to all necessary utilities on the site, including mains water, electricity supply, drainage, sanitation, and provision for screened storage and collection of refuse, including recycling. WASTE WATER DRAINAGE:- There is no mains drainage to West Dereham and no plans to install mains drainage for foul or surface water, to the hamlet for the next 20 years. The ditches surrounding the site are privately owned. Permission is unlikely to be given by the owners of the adjacent land and ditches they are responsible for. The additional volume of wastewater from an already poorly drained site will place</p>				

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>an additional intolerable strain on the settled properties in Station Road. The site profile of GTRA (B) on page 61 of the draft document does not adequately reflect these daily problems experienced by residents living in Station Road, the surface water flood risk, high-water table and 50 metre proximity to Flood Zone 3. ELECTRICAL SUPPLY: Sites would place additional demand upon the power network serving the village. There are power cuts in West Dereham most winters, the last significant one we experienced was 19 hours long. The most recent (February 2024) was 6 hours. It is questionable whether the current network would be able to withstand the further demand of a major development REFUSE AND RECYLING: There is no designated area for the storage of refuse. The topography of the landscape is flat and subject to strong sudden gusts of wind. Without adequate sheltered storage of waste, there is a risk of waste being blown into the surrounding ditches and causing blockages and hindering the free drainage of the land and causing localised flooding. Section 8 f):- Have the ability to be well integrated into the local townscape or landscape, have no unacceptable impact on biodiversity and/or heritage assets and use boundary treatments and screening materials which are sympathetic to the existing urban or rural form. VISUAL AMENITY: The proposal of a site would adversely impact the visual amenity of this area, through the introduction of Static Units on the land. The views 5 from the houses on Station Road and Basil Road would be adversely impacted both during the day (from the view of static units and touring caravans) and at night (subsequent light pollution) that this site would need to function as a traveller site. The size and density of the proposals would inevitably attract larger vehicles (touring caravans) which would detract further from the landscape and character of the area. SAFEGUARDING THE NEIGHBOURING AMENITY: The nature of vehicle movements associated with the proposed development of the site both during construction and afterwards as part of its day-to-day function is likely to have a noticeable impact upon the neighbouring amenity, particularly where it is necessary to navigate narrow and winding stretches of Station Road and Basil Road. There would be a definite impact of the safeguarding to the neighbouring amenity that the committee must have regard to. This is mainly due to the proximity of some of the Station Road properties to the road itself TREES AND HEDGEROWS: This site is surrounded by a line of beautiful mature trees. The construction of the proposed site and its day-to-day operation will cause compaction of soil due to parking of vehicles and laying of aggregate close to the boundary. This will adversely impact trees and hedgerows along the border. There is no Arboricultural Method Statement and remediation plan to show how the root protection area of the trees and hedgerows will be safeguarded. Loss of the trees will negatively impact the local visual amenity and adversely impact the character of the area. They also act as a natural windbreak for an area given to sudden strong gusts of wind and protect established properties in the area and form wildlife habitat Heritage. The location of this proposed site is not in areas of most need in West Norfolk, these being Outwell, Walsoken etc, it is doubtful that families in most need of accommodation will want to re-locate the 18 miles from these areas to West Dereham. The above information set out in this letter, supports the view that this proposed site is wholly unsuitable for the hamlet of West Dereham and is not of wider benefit to the traveller communities needing accommodation in Outwell, and Walsoken. The use of mitigating works and planning conditions /informatives will not be sufficient to overcome the majority of constraints that are present on the site, as specifically cited on the officer report relating to planning application 23/01606/F that sits alongside New Site GTRA (B) that forms part of the local plan review. 6 Huge concerns relate to about how proposed sites will be managed or whether they might be run as a commercial operation with the renting or selling of pitches as a Traveller Transit Site. Other, far smaller residential planning applications for Station Road have been refused. When the council placed a "Call for Sites" in 2019, the 3 sites that were put forward in West Dereham were deemed not suitable, so why now (when this site was not one of them) is this site now being considered? GTRA (B) is not an appropriate New Site for West Norfolk and should be considered for removal by the Task Group from the draft local plan</p>				
276		GT67	<p>I object to a further plot at site GT67 Llamados in Syderstone for the following reasons; 1. Llamados is sited on the ONLY road into the village and in very close proximity to Blenheim Park Primary School. Everyone entering the village by vehicle or on foot has to pass by the site. The villagers of Wicken Green and Blenheim Park pay our respective management companies a fee to maintain the upkeep of the area. The current plot is untidy with scrap vehicles and a large dog is frequently allowed to roam freely and foul the paths. This is unfair to local residents and a health hazard to parents and children walking to and from school. Any expansion of the site will no doubt only exacerbate these issues. 2. There is likely to be asbestos contamination of the site given its past history as part of RAF Sculthorpe. 3. The area is full of established trees and hedgerow which provide cover for wildlife and are a valuable amenity to residents. At a time when we are all encouraged to plant trees and support wildlife, we should not be considering destroying existing areas. 4. The village has a high percentage of elderly, vulnerable residents. Any expansion of the current site is going to cause concern and distress to many of those residents who may feel threatened by the close proximity to their homes</p>	Not specified	No	<p>The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.</p>	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.
277		GTRA(B)	<p>As a resident of this community, I believe that the proposed development would have a significant negative impact on our neighbourhood. These impacts include, but are not limited to, increased traffic congestion, noise pollution,</p>	Not specified	Not Specified	<p>The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including</p>	Remove GTRA(B) from

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>potential harm to local wildlife, environmental damage, and strain on our local infrastructure. • Drainage is currently one of our key challenges. Station Road is waterlogged, surrounding roads are not much better. The ditches are full, with some of the neighbours using sandbags to prevent surface water running into their homes!! Please can you highlight how you plan to protect properties from flooding if there are 10 more sewage treatment plants discharging to the ditches in the area. This will be a significant amount of additional water being pumped into the local waterways. How close is the site to Flood Zone 3, and, with the impact of climate change being taken into consideration, has an exercise been undertaken to understand whether the flood zone is correctly updated? 2</p> <p>• My understanding is that, in revised proposals, the treatment plants and surface waters will be discharged to the ditch at the rear of the site. It has already been acknowledged by the Council that this area suffers from Drainage Issues and is an area that is most likely to flood according to mapping tools. How do the Council plan to satisfy themselves, and in turn the residents of the village, that this is a satisfactory solution? • It is Policy that all sites identified as potential traveller / gypsy sites should have minimal impact on existing communities and should not overwhelm them!! The proposed development on Station Road could increase the population of West Dereham by over 21%. Our village is spread out, and therefore the impact will feel much greater than that. The likelihood is that it will more than double the population of Station Road itself. There are elderly residents in the vicinity of the site, some of whom live alone and are vulnerable. They will be worried by such a large scale change to their local environment, and will be upset by the additional traffic and noise that a site such as this will bring. How do you propose to protect those vulnerable villagers? • The road in question is already a very busy country road and is currently not up to a suitable width or standard to handle an increase in traffic, particularly when thinking in terms of the touring caravans that are being proposed for this site. I duly note the comments on the planning portal that the road is of sufficient width and that there are passing places along the road, however, if the appropriate bodies would care to come and take a look at the damaged verges, they would realise that, with the vehicles that are using this road, that is not actually the case. The road infrastructure needs significant improvements to handle the potential increase in vehicular movement. I also note that no consideration has been given to the other roads that are going to be used to travel to and from the site. Basil Road is a narrow road with no passing places, in fact, when out walking the dog, an ambulance wanted to get past me and the only way that could happen was for me to step up onto the grass verge which was both sodden due to the rainfall and I stood in animal faeces. The other roads are currently suffering with excess water due to the heavy rainfall we have had, and with climate change, this is expected to get worse over time. The roads are also very poorly maintained already, and with an increased volume of traffic, are likely to only get worse. What plans are the council going to put in place to better maintain, and increase the safety of our roads / walkways? • A Previous planning application for 6 houses on Station Road was rejected in 2018, and was also rejected on appeal in 2019. I fail to see what has changed since these applications that makes the current proposals any more suitable or desirable than the one in 2018. My understanding is that the previous application was for affordable housing for local people that could not get permission due to the unsuitability of the location and being remote from any amenities as well as the unsafe and unlit road with no pathways for pedestrians. The proposal also did not fit with local government strategy of moving away from reliance on private motor vehicles and promoting sustainable transport such as walking or cycling. Another reason for rejection was that this would be infill development and it also went against the principle of not developing on greenfield sites in rural areas. • There is a small area of pedestrian path in the village, not on Station Road!! And there is no street lighting along Station Road either. This lack of infrastructure puts pedestrians at risk, especially during the shorter days of winter. The proposed development, without corresponding upgrades to our road and pedestrian infrastructure, would compound any existing safety issues. There has been traffic monitoring on Station Road registering traffic in one direction, and this has shown a significant volume of traffic using this road, some of these more than the speed limit!!! What plans are the council proposing to put in place to ensure the safety of users of this road and the surrounding roads, both vehicles and pedestrians. 3 • Our area is home to many species of animals including Deer, Newts, Red Kites, Buzzards, Green Woodpeckers, Owls and Golden Pheasants. These species could be heavily impacted by the proposed development. The loss of their habitat and potential disruption caused by increased human activity could have serious consequences for their survival. • Neighbours who have properties for sale have lost potential buyers because of the outstanding planning application that is in place – this is the grim reality that villagers are facing. What are you going to do to protect, and help, these hard-working taxpayers of West Dereham. People have worked hard to achieve what they have, and they are now being hit hard for something that is not being given the consideration it deserves. • The strategy document notes that there are no amenities within 800 metres / 10-minute walk. The reality of that fact is that the nearest 'amenity' is the local village hall which is closer to approximately 1,300 metres away from the site. The closest any other amenities would be is Downham Market, for shops etc, and this is approximately 7,000 metres from site. Schools are mainly full, with limited availability. Unfortunately, nursery places were hit with a local nursery going into liquidation before</p>			<p>drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.</p>	<p>the consultation document.</p>



009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
			<p>Christmas, therefore displacing many younger children. There is also a considerable amount of construction being undertaken in Downham Market across two sites which will put further pressure on resources that are already at breaking point. What are the council proposing to increase health and education facilities to accommodate the proposals being made for this site along with the others that already under construction. • General infrastructure in our area is poor. Internet and electric services are often unreliable particularly in the winter months, with outages sometimes going on for days. The village is not on mains gas. What proposals are in place for heating that maintains the government strategy on green energy? • It is also my understanding that under planning laws, this site would allow for business development. Comment has already been made that the 'owner' of the site has his own business which will be run from this site, however, how many of the other 'homes' will be running a business from that site too? What impact will there be from business / businesses being run from this one site? • My understanding is that sites are to specifically address the needs of the Traveller/Gypsy population in West Norfolk, needs that the Council have identified through research and evaluation of the current population. The applicant of the site in West Dereham has not clearly evidenced any local connections. The closest connection is that he 'used to' live in Southery, and he has in fact stated that he intends to bring family to the site from other counties. Can the Council confirm that this site will fulfil their obligation to provide additional pitches for the growing traveller population of West Norfolk, or is this now allowing for, and encouraging, inward migration of a different group of people. That being the case, how does this help you achieve your target? • It has also been identified by Council research, that the need for sites is most prevalent in the Wisbech and Walsoken areas. What is the rationale for considering a site some 18 miles away from the greater need? Sites are supposed to promote sustainable travel such as walking or cycling, but this would demand excessive additional miles in private transport. 4 I understand the need for development and growth. However, I do not believe that this is the right site for a development of any kind. Issues with drainage are a key element in that thought process, but other questions also need to be answered. I find it remarkable that planning was rejected for affordable housing for local people, but 4/5 years later, you are considering a much bigger development that has less benefit to the local people, and in fact, is having a negative impact even at this stage. I kindly request that these concerns be taken into consideration when reviewing the planning application, and that a thorough assessment of all the potential impacts is given due consideration before any permission is granted.</p>				
278		GT17 GT18 GT21 GT28 GT35 GT37 GT38	<p>I have been asked by Upwell Parish Council to comment on behalf of the Practice with respect to proposed housing growth in the area. Historically we have always been very happy to embrace the challenge of a bigger practice list size and indeed, unless we are permitted by the Integrated Commissioning Board (ICB) to close our list we are obliged to register all patients within our catchment area. (For clarity, we have made no such request to the ICB but it is not something I can rule out in future.) The difficulties we are facing in recent times and seemingly in the immediate and medium future are no different to GP practices elsewhere in the country. We simply do not have the clinical capacity to manage many more (if any) patients safely. Recruitment of GPs in our area is a particular challenge as potential candidates are not always attracted to rural areas such as ours, increasingly want to work part-time and often it seems are leaving the country to work outside of the NHS. Since January we have been attempting to recruit GP capacity but no luck as at the time of writing. Demand for our services has increased, possibly a continued hangover from covid patients are needing to use our services more frequently as it is understandably taking time for secondary care to tackle the back log. This is creating pent up demand and frustration on the part of patients and ourselves. Demand for support for mental health and diabetes related illness for example is increasing. Roles from the Primary Care Network are helpful but effectiveness is limited by our geography. We are working very hard to maintain care for all patients with long-term conditions and those with more immediate needs. However, we are now find ourselves in a position where we, on most days, are having to say we are full when we have ran out of capacity. Financially government policy is forcing practices including ourselves to review our staffing levels as costs are going up significantly in terms of inflation and national minimum wage without anything like the appropriate increase in our contract funding. This may mean less people at the health centre. This statement applies to both clinical and administrative staff so we are concerned about increasing the patient list size with potentially less staff. I am also worried that the people in our team will burn out and this is will of course be absolutely no use to our patients. I would strongly urge the decision makers to have a serious conversation with us and the ICB before making significant planning decisions about additional housing in the area.</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Council's GTAA identifies that the majority of the accommodation need for the local gypsy and traveller community is through 'doubling-up' which means the people are already on the site and therefore may require their own pitch/plot on the established sites in the near term. The need is not coming through inward migration of additional people.</p>	None..
279		GT67	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed planning permission for an establishment of a gypsies traveller showman site in our rural village of cider stone. I am a resident and I am deeply concerned about the potential negative impact on this development could have on our community, particularly given to the predominantly elderly populations, and the absence of any in adequate amenities to support such a site village with its serene countryside surrounding and closing neck community is cherished by our residence, many of whom have spent their entire lives here the proposed site, if approved, would destruct and the peaceful ambulance of our</p>	Not specified	Yes	<p>The Council has considered all the planning constraints and boundary issues related to this site, along with the recommendations within the Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) 2023. On balance, the Council believe that sites to be allocated for such use should prioritise those locations where a site-specific need has arisen</p>	Remove GT67 from the consultation document.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			village, and alter its character irreversibly . One of my primary concerns is a lack of amenities to accommodate a sight of this nature our villages already struggling with the limited infrastructure and services. We have a significant elderly population who rely on the Tranquility in the safety of our surrounding the introduction of the travellers, showman and gypsy site Wood in their advert. Strain are already stretched resources and place undress on local services, such as healthcare, transportation and enforcement. furthermore, the proposed site could potentially compromise a safety and security of our residence given that the transient nature of such communities concerns about antisocial behaviour noise, pollution and increase traffic flow are legitimate and worrisome are village simply lacks the capacity to management manage and mitigate these potential risks affectively. in conclusion, I urge the local plan and authority to consider the well-being, an interest of our community before granting permission for the purpose of the travellers, gypsies and Showman site, the unique character and Tranquillity. Our village must be preserved for the current and future generations to enjoy.			from the GTAA. No specific need has arisen from GT67 within the GTAA for the first five years and therefore it is not necessary to allocate at this time.	
280		GTRA(B)	1 - Access to Site. I think this should be scored Red. It is a difficult access on a bend, with lots of other vehicles on this road, mostly HGVs or large farm traffic. If old hedgerows are cut this will have an impact on wildlife. It could be very dangerous for the residents and the existing users. 2 - Accessibility to Local Services and Facilities. I think it should keep as score Red. 3 - Utilities Capacity, Utilities Infrastructure I think this should be scored Red. No utilities are connected. Will the sewage treatment work? The Environment Agency objected to the planning application on the portal. 4 - Contamination and Ground Stability I think this should remain as a Green score. 5 - Flood Risk I think this should be Amber, or possibly even Red. This land floods already. I am sure the council will have received many complaints about standing water and flooding in homes over the years from Station Road residents. It is very difficult for them indeed at the moment. The land is so close to a Flood Zone. The clay soil holds the water and does not drain easily. 6 - Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes. I think a Green score here. 7 - Townscape Townscape does not apply to West Dereham as it is a hamlet or village that has a lot of history. Most properties are of brick and the mobile homes will not fit in with the existing homes. The character of the village would change, and never return, with these suggested new homes. 8 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity. I think this should be an Amber score. There is a lot of wildlife in this area (many people commented on it for the planning application) and residents gain so much enjoyment from it. The barn owls searching for food in this stretch is wonderful. Lots of bats there in the summer. The site is a green field. 3 9 - Historic Environment. I think this should be Amber (or possibly Red?) This site is so very close to St Mary's Abbey with all its history. Has an assessment been made on the land for buried history? The village has found many items so there may be some on this site. 10 - Open Space/Green Infrastructure. I think Green score. 11 - Transport and Roads. I think this should be a Red score. Station Road (and a lot of other village roads) is single track, few passing places, no pavement, no night lighting, lots of HGVs going to Glazewing, and large farm vehicles on the road. Children have to walk to school along this road, plus lots of other users such as runners, walkers for health reasons, horse riders, dog walkers, and part of this road is 60 miles per hour, and the road can be dangerous in winter as it is not gritted. 12 - Coastal Change. I think the Green score. 13 - Compatibility with Neighbouring/Adjoining Uses. I think this should be a Red score. This will be very different and difficult for residents. Lots more vehicle journeys, lights of an evening where it is dark now, noisier due to lots more people and vehicles, different buildings. The village character will be changed and will never return. There have been lots of objections on the planning application portal.	Not specified	Not Specified	The Council has recently made a decision on planning application 23/01606/F. This has been refused for several reasons including drainage, impact on character and location. This will not mean that the site will no longer be considered as an allocations within further Local Plan consultation documents for the examination of the emerging Local Plan for Kings Lynn and West Norfolk.	Remove GTRA(B) from the Consultation document
281		All Sites and Evidence	Flood Risk Assessment of residual risk The level 2 SFRA that informs the Gypsy and Traveller potential sites documents utilises the undefended scenarios from The Wash tidal flood model. Although this model is used to inform the flood map for planning (rivers and sea), we do not recommend its use to assess the residual risk as the full removal of the defences will not represent the mechanism of failure of the defences i.e. the defences are likely to fail in a distinct breach rather than all the defences failing at once. For this reason, we still recommend the use of the Tidal Hazard Mapping (THM), the previous tidal flood model, to assess the risk of breach of the defences. The THM has breach scenarios reflect the most likely failure scenario for the defences i.e. a distinct breach location. The THM is still fundamental to the flood risk planning policies within the SADMP and the emerging local plan. This will allow for the easier screening of sites. Note, the THM does indicate that there are areas within flood zone 1 that would flood due to a localised breach of the defences so all sites should be screened. It will also enable the SFRA to provide a clearer picture on the residual risk of flooding. Recommendations from the SFRA into policy For sites identified as being at risk of flooding, the SFRA makes recommendations for the Flood Risk Assessments (FRA). We would like to see these recommendations translated into policy to ensure that the recommendations are enacted when the sites come forward for planning permission. Sequential Test document We recommend that a sequential test report/memo is produced that brings together the discussions over the preference to extend existing sites rather than create new sites. There are various new sites, that the SFRA shows to be at lower flood risk than some of the sites brought forward for consultation. The Environment Agency's technical position will always be to prefer sites in areas of low flood risk, but we are aware that there are other planning considerations that are material to	Not specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will be updated to reflect your comments. Continued engagement with the Environment Agency is necessary throughout the process of this work. A draft Statement of Common Ground is being produced between the authorities.	Update the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to reflect the EA comments.

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
			the decision. To ensure the Planning Inspector has sufficient information to determine whether the justification outweighs the flood risk, we recommend a distinct document is produced. Policies related to site beyond the recognised need We would like the inclusion of a flood risk policies point within Policy A. We need to ensure that there is a clear policy restriction to Highly vulnerable sites in area of high risk of flooding from all sources of flood risk, including residual risk. Houseboats – access and escape We recommend that the policies surrounding the provision of houseboat mooring/infrastructure includes the requirement for emergency planning. Although by their nature houseboats can adjust to river conditions, there will be circumstances where it will not be appropriate for the occupants to remain onboard i.e. long duration flooding, very high flows etc. This needs to be a consideration when determining intensifying this use. Foul Drainage Each site should be connected to mains sewer if reasonable to do so. Drainage systems on those sites proposed to be expanded should be able to cope with the increased capacity. If septic tanks are used on site, they must comply with the General Binding Rules regarding septic tanks: General binding rules: small sewage discharge to the ground - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)				
282		GTRA(L), GTRA(M),GTRA(N)	The following are my objections to a gypsy and traveller site at Blackborough End GTRA(L), GTRA(M),GTRA(N). Our roads in the village are already unsuitable to heavy traffic and essential large farm vehicles, any extra vehicles would impact the existing roads that are narrow and breaking up due to the heavy vehicles that have to come through the village at present. GTRA(L) is right in the centre of the village. The access being on Sandy Lane which at the point leads to a sharp corner where it converges with Water Lane. It is often badly drained and its constant use as it leads up to the A47. Not the place for any extra, non essential traffic. I also feel that any influx of people here who's interest is only fairly temporary will not be prepared to treat it with the consideration shown by the local population, who's taxes and hard work have ensured their surroundings are attractive and pleasant to live in. I also feel that sites GTRA(M) gypsy and traveller site would impact the surrounding homes, the surrounding roads and would not blend in with the existing ambience of the village with some of the properties being here for hundreds of years.	Not specified	No	The Council have reviewed sites GTRA(L), GTRA(M) and GTRA(N) for their suitability for development against any planning constraints identified. In summary, the Council agree that cumulatively, all these sites would lead to a negative impact to the rural character and the existing linear built form to this part of Blackborough End. The sites are also close to designated heritage assets and development is likely to negatively impact the character and setting of these assets. In addition, all sites would lead to impacts on the highway, the environment and drainage, which is unnecessary at this stage.  Furthermore, there is no direct need for Gypsy and Traveller provision arising from these sites and the Council's approach to meeting such accommodation needs is via existing sites and/ or new sites where this cannot be achieved.	Remove GTRA(E), GTRA(M), GTRA(N) and GTRA(L) from the consultation document.
283		GT05	On-site: Two areas of surface water ponding and pooling on north and east part of site (0.1% AEP event). Off-site: Moderate area of ponding /pooling in 0.1 and 1% AEP events to east.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? Unlikely, however consideration required to any impacts from ponding particularly to east.	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
284		GT11	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? Unlikely, however consideration required to any impacts from ponding to north-west.	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
285		GT17	On-site: Small area of surface water ponding/pooling to east of site in 0.1% and 1%, AEP events. Off-site: minor flowpaths in 0.1% AEP event.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
286		GT18	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: minor flowpaths in 0.1% AEP event and minor ponding in 01% and 1% AEP events.	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
287		GT20	On-site: Large area of surface water flowpath (end) in southern part of site in 0.1% AEP event and small area in 1% AEP event. Off-site: Ponding /pooling and minor flowpaths in 0.1 and 1% AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? Yes - consideration required to surface water drainage inc. any impacts from adjacent sw flowpath.	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
288		GT21	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding, Off-site: Ponding/pooling and minor flowpaths in 0.1% AEP event.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
289		GT28	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: 0.1% AEP flowapth lies to west (off-site).  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/proposals)
290		GT33	On-site: Small area of surface water ponding / pooling in north-west corner of site adjacent road in 0.1% AEP event. Off-site: Ponding and minor flowpaths in 0.1% AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
291		GT34	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: Moderate sw flowpath in 0.1%, 1% and 3% AEP events to north and west , also ponding / pooling in area in all three AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? Unlikely, however consideration required to any impacts inc. from adjacent sw flowpaths to north and west	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
292		GT35	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: Minor flowpaths in 0.1% AEP event and minor ponding / pooling in 0.1% and 1% AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
293		GT39	On-site: Not associated with surface water flooding but surface water flowpath in 0.1% AEP event crosses site acces at junction with road. Off-site: Flowpath in all three AEP events also lies to north of site.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? Yes - consideration required to any impacts from surface water inc. from adjacent sw flowpaths to north and west.	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
294		GT42	On-site: Small areas of surface water ponding/pooling in 0.1 and 1% AEP events on east boundary/west of access. Off-site: Lots of minor areas of ponding / pooling /flowpaths in all three AEP events in vicinity.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
295		GT54	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: minor areas of ponding and flowpaths in all three AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
296		GT55	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: Minor areas of ponding / pooling and flowpaths mainly in 0.1% AEP event.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
297		GT56	On-site: Small area of surface water ponding/pooling in 0.1% AEP events and flowpaths in 0.1% and 1% AEP events along northern boundary. Off-site: Minor flowpaths and ponding / pooling 0.1% and 1% AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
298		GT09	On-site: Very small areas of surface water ponding/pooling in 0.1% and 1% AEP events on northern boundary. Off-site- Ponding and flowpaths in 0.1%, 1% and 3% AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
299		GTRA(B)	On-site: Minor area of surface water ponding / pooling in 0.1% AEP event and edge of flowpath in 0.1% AEP event encroaches site to east, Off-site: Significant flowpath lies to east (off site) in 0.1%, 1% and 3% AEP events.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? Yes - consideration required to surface water drainage inc. any impacts from adjacent sw flowpaths to east	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
300		GTRA(C)	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: Minor flowpaths and ponding / pooling in 0.1% and 1% AEP events in vicinity.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
301		GT25	On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: Very minor areas of ponding / pooling in 0.1% and 1% within vicinity.  Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None

009	Respondent	Policy/ site ref/ para ref (as appropriate)	Summary Representation	Changes sought	Request to be heard?	BCKLWN Response	Proposed changes (Main Modifications) to Plan (policies/ proposals)
302		GT62	<p>On-site: Surface water flow path in 0.1% and 1% AEP events crosses the site and runs along east / west boundaries. Off-site: Flowpath in 3% AEP event abuts site boundary (west) with areas of ponding and pooling / flowpaths in all 3 events in vicinity.</p> <p>Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development?  Yes - consideration required to surface water drainage inc. any impacts from the sw flowpath affecting the site.</p>	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
303		GT67	<p>On-site: Not associated with onsite surface water flooding. Off-site: Minor areas of ponding / pooling in all three AEP events in vicinity.</p> <p>Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No</p>	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None
304		GT14	<p>On-site: Surface water flowpaths and ponding / pooling in 0.1% and 1% AEP events lie along north, south and west site boundaries. Off-site: Ponding and minor flowpaths in all three AEP events.</p> <p>Would SW Drainage constraints be likely to prevent development? No</p>	Not Specified	Not Specified	Noted. Thank you for your comments.	None