

Appendix A – Schedule of recommended changes to the Preferred Option in Dereham and Shipham and the Rural Settlement Boundaries from the Preferred Options document

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
Dereham	240 dwellings on site D2 – land off greenfields Road.	240 dwellings on site D2 – land off greenfields Road.	This site has generated considerable local opposition from residents at Greenfields Road and Wheatcroft Way including concerns on traffic impact and loss of undeveloped land. The site is supported by Dereham Town Council and the Highways Authority. The long term strategy for Dereham has always intended for this area to come forward and the preliminary infrastructure is already place to deliver the site.	The proposed submission document retains the site notwithstanding the significant scale of local objections. However, given concerns over development numbers in this location and an acknowledgement to secure a density of development which respects its context it is proposed to reduce the allocation down to 220 new homes (equivalent to 25dph). It is recommended that - Land at Garden Centre, Shipdham Road, Toftwood including the glasshouses and industrial buildings be identified as a fourth residential development allocation in Dereham for 50 new homes. It would be known as D4.	Agree with officer recommendation of 220 dwellings on site D2 but remove site D4 from the submission document.

Shipdham	30 dwellings on SH2.	30 dwellings on SH2.	Large number of local community responses does not wish to see the Thomas Bullock Playing Field allocated for development and for the area to be left open, ideally for public use. The Highways Authority has raised doubts about access, particularly from Chapel Street.	Site SH.2 no longer be included as a preferred site and as such becomes a reasonable alternative site. It is not proposed to allocate the site for public open space given the covenant on the site. In accommodating the balance of 30 new homes, it is recommended that Site SH.1 be enlarged to incorporate some of the land to the east which was identified as reasonable alternative site SH.8. SH2 will accommodate 80 dwellings and SH.3 20 dwellings.	Agree officer recommendation.
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------	---	--	-------------------------------

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
Beetley	Boundary is considered logical, defensible and has scope to allow for some modest potential for infilling without causing harm to the form and character of the village. Recommendation was to retain the	Retain settlement boundary	Three comments were made on the recommendation to retain Beetley's settlement boundary as the status quo. One comment was in support of its retention. A second comment requested that an area situated within the CWS was removed to prevent	Amend the settlement boundary to remove the playing field from St Mary's Primary School. This is to limit the potential for future residential development which could prejudice the ability for the school to expand to meet its own needs.	Amend settlement boundary as per officer recommendation.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	settlement boundary as the status quo which was endorsed at the meeting of the 25 th of November 2009 by the task and finish group and Cabinet on the 26 th April 2010.		development within this area. This small cul-de-sac, Beetley Meadows gained planning permission in 1998 within the CWS. The Wildlife Trust may as to re-visit their designation in this area. The third comment suggested the removal of the school playing field from the settlement boundary to limit the potential for future residential development which could prejudice the ability for the school to expand to meet its own needs. This was taken on board and is recommended within the submission document.	Recommendation – Amend settlement boundary.	
Cockley Cley	Officer recommendation was to delete the settlement boundary as there is only 1 facility (Pub) and the village is completely within 1,500m stone curlew buffer. Following representations from	Retain settlement boundary.	No comments were received on changes to the settlement boundary during the consultation either in support or objection to the proposal to retain the boundary. Cockley Cley lies completely within the 1,500m buffer from	The village is entirely within the 1,500m Stone Curlew protection buffer and further infill development is unlikely to satisfy the Habitats Regulation Assessment requirements. Recommendation: Delete Settlement Boundary.	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	<p>chairman of the Parish Council and the Ward Member, the panel recommended the boundary be retained.</p>		<p>the Breckland SPA supporting or capable of supporting Stone Curlew which is one of a number of internationally important habitats and species which are protected by European Directives. CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy provides a policy approach for reviewing settlement boundaries including deletions for those Parishes containing limited services facilities and situated within the Stone Curlew buffer zone. No new evidence has been submitted during the Preferred Options consultation to demonstrate that limited housing development in Cockley Cley would not have an adverse effect on Stone Curlews. In accordance with Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy the Stone Curlew buffer would not inhibit the commercial re-</p>		

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>use of existing factory buildings on the edge of the village.</p> <p>Cockley Cley is a small village with very limited services or facilities (1 pub) and can be considered an unsustainable location for further development.</p> <p>The deletion of this settlement boundary would be consistent with both higher order policy contained within the Adopted Core Strategy and it is recommended that the proposed recommendation within the submission document is for the deletion of the settlement boundary.</p>		
Croxton	Amend settlement boundary – At the Task and Finish group meeting on 11/12/2009 the recommendation for the settlement boundary was	Amend settlement boundary.	No comments were received on changes to the settlement boundary during the Consultation. However, change CRO.6 recommended the tightening	Amend the settlement boundary as per the preferred options consultation, with the exclusion of change CRO.6. Recommendation: Amend	Amend settlement boundary as per officer recommendation.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	<p>to amend it. Members recommended that a further meeting was held with Croxton PC to discuss further tightening of the boundary, this occurred on 08/01/2010, and that these were taken to Cabinet. Changes as discussed with the PC were subsequently agreed by Cabinet and these recommendations were shown in the preferred options document</p>		<p>of the boundary between 99 The Street, and Ty Cae. The subsequent granting of planning permission 3PL/2010/0228/F, means that this recommendation is no longer appropriate and should not be included within the proposed submission document.</p> <p>It is considered that the remainder of the changes recommended within the preferred options document are still appropriate and should be carried forward to proposed submission.</p>	Settlement Boundary	
East Tuddenham	<p>Officer recommendation to the LDF task and finish group on the 25th November 2009 for East Tuddenham was for the deletion of the settlement boundary.</p> <p>This recommendation is consistent with Core</p>	<p>Amend settlement boundary to remove land north of Mattishall Road / The Street and include land east of</p>	<p>A small number of representations were made, including the Parish Council which disagreed with the sustainability assessment of and level of service provision in and near the village and wished for land north of Mattishall Road 'Baylings' to be included along with one</p>	<p>Amend settlement boundary as per Preferred Option Consultation Document.</p> <p>Recommendation: Amend Settlement Boundary</p>	<p>Amend settlement boundary to include additional land north of Mattishall Road at the Baylings.</p>

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	<p>Policy CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy which sets out the planning approach for sustainable communities within the District. Alternatively, the option remained for the settlement boundary to remain as 'status quo' as a result of limited essential services and facilities to support net gain in land allocation.</p> <p>The LDF Task and Finish group on 25th November recommended the retention of the settlement boundary and the request from East Tuddenham Parish Council to include two additional pieces of land within the envelope (land north of The Beeches on Common Road and Baylings, north of The</p>	Common Road (The Beeches)	<p>dwelling on land north of the Beeches.</p> <p>A meeting was undertaken with the Parish Council and the Local Authority on the 7th of July 2010 to discuss officer recommendation and Cabinet decision. In summary, the Parish Council were not opposed to the principle of ET.1 or ET.2 but wished to see the Baylings included as opposed to all of the land at ET.3.</p> <p>Officer considered Parish Council comments but following further assessment (including site visit) recommend that the Baylings given its form and character of this part of the village would not be suitable for future development. ET.3 would enable increased housing to be provided within the village as this piece of</p>		

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	<p>Street).</p> <p>These were considered and Cabinet on the 26th April 2010 endorsed officer recommendation which was to;</p> <p>[ET.1] Amend settlement boundary to Land north and west of property 'The Green', which is situated north of The Street. This would result in the removal of this part of the settlement boundary. This has received support from the Parish Council.</p> <p>The general form and character to the north side of 'The Street', including Green Farm and associated lands, Wellgate Farm and the Baylings in part, consists of relatively undeveloped</p>		<p>land has been which has positively identified by the owner as being available.</p>		

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	<p>land in comparison to the rest of the village. This area is predominantly detached, working farmhouses and ancillary buildings, situated amongst generous amenity areas and associated garden and lands. There is mature boundary screening adjacent to the highway including the Baylings frontage. This area depicts a more rural character to this part of the village which to retain and/or include additional lands within the settlement boundary may harm the form and character of this part of the village if developed.</p> <p>[ET.2] Removal of properties 32 and 33 Mattishall Road which fall within the settlement</p>				

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	<p>boundary north of Mattishall Road. This is to provide consistency with the removal of EC1 and protect the form and character of this part of the settlement.</p> <p>[ET.3] It is proposed to redraw the settlement boundary on land to the north of property 'The Beeches' on the east side of Common Road. This site was previously within the draft settlement boundary in the early 1990's. The rear boundary is drawn in line with the 'The Beeches' rear boundary, as opposed to the boundary of 'The Hollies' to the North. This is to limit the potential of over development of this site and causing harm to the character of this part of</p>				

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	<p>East Tuddenham village; which is predominantly detached dwellings, set back from the road with generous front and rear amenity areas. The addition of this site, as opposed to the Baylings, north of the Street offers consistency with residential development on the east and west of Common Road, if this site ever came forward for development. As discussed in [ET.1], the site covering Baylings depicts more of a rural in nature and if developed, may harm the form and character of this apart of the settlement.</p>				
Foxley	Delete settlement boundary	Retain settlement boundary.	No comments were received during the preferred options consultation in either support or objection to the recommendation.	The deletion of settlement boundary at Foxley would be in accordance with Council policy and provide a consistency of approach with similar settlements across the	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			Since the closure of the Natterjack Public House, Foxley lacks any of the essential services and facilities (as included within Policy CP14) to support additional growth within the village. Therefore, the recommendation to retain the existing boundary conflicts with adopted council policy and does raise concern.	District. Recommendation: Delete Settlement Boundary.	
Garvestone	Amend settlement boundary	Amend settlement boundary	Area GV.6 has been granted planning permission.	Area of concern regarding GV.6 has recently been granted, as such it is considered that specific change to the boundary be maintained.	As per officer recommendation.
Guist	Delete settlement boundary	Retain settlement boundary.	No comments were received during the preferred options consultation in either support or objection to the recommendation. However, the retention of the existing settlement boundary within the village raises a number of further concerns.	The deletion of the four settlement boundaries within the village, as initially recommended to the Task and Finish group, would be in accordance with adopted council policy and help to provide consistency with similar settlements across the district.	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>Whilst there is a small level of service provision remaining within the village with a post office and village store, this is not of a sufficient quantity to meet the requirements of Policy CP14. In addition to this, the nature of the settlement boundaries within the village is of relevance. Guist's settlement boundary is made up of four individual components, which are drawn tightly around the existing buildings. This therefore creates very limited opportunities for expansion within them. One of the boundaries currently contains two dwellings, whilst another boundary contains pairs of estate dwellings. Any further development within any of these four boundaries is likely to result in infill development on greenfield land. This is reflected in the fact that no houses were built within the</p>	<p>Recommendation: Delete Settlement Boundary.</p>	

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>village between April 2001 and March 2010.</p> <p>Furthermore the extension to the village settlement boundaries would be contrary to the aims of CP14, which looks to limit growth in these areas.</p>		
Gressenhall	<p>Recommendation was to make two amendments to the settlement boundary which was endorsed at the meeting of the 25th of November 2009 by the task and finish group and Cabinet on the 26th April 2010.</p>	<p>Amend settlement boundary.</p>	<p>Two comments were made to the proposed amendments to the settlement boundary. The first comment suggested that the rear boundary of 18 Bittering Street should match that of the rear boundary of 14-16 Bittering Street. This would result in an increase in backland/garden land therefore it was considered to make a third amendment to the settlement boundary to exclude land to the rear of 14-16 Bittering Street, consistent with PPS3 and CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy. A second comment wished to see more</p>	<p>GR.3 – Additional amendment to the settlement boundary to exclude land to the 14-16 Bittering Street. This is to limit the rear potential for backland development which would harm the form and character of this part of the settlement. The revision would provide consistency with the rear boundary of number 18 Bittering Street and reduce the pressures of backland development consistent with PPS3 and CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Recommendation - Amend settlement Boundary.</p>	<p>Amend settlement boundary as per officer recommendation.</p>

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			distribution of housing in villages; however the Distribution of housing within this document is consistent with National Planning Policy and CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy.		
Ickburgh	Delete Settlement Boundary. Following representation from the Ward Member at the Task and Finish group meeting of the 11th of December 2009, the group recommended the settlement boundary be retained. This was then agreed by Cabinet.	Retain settlement boundary.	<p>1 comment was received on Ickburgh during the preferred options consultation suggesting the village could accommodate some additional development.</p> <p>However, Ickburgh lies completely within the 1,500m buffer from the Breckland SPA supporting or capable of supporting Stone Curlew which is one of a number of internationally important habitats and species which are protected by European Directives. CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy provides a policy approach for reviewing settlement boundaries including</p>	Delete settlement Boundary. The village is entirely within the 1500m Stone Curlew protection buffer and further infill development is unlikely to be satisfy the Habitats Regulation Assessment requirements	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>deletions for those Parishes containing limited services facilities and situated within the Stone Curlew buffer zone. No new evidence has been submitted during the Preferred Options consultation to demonstrate that limited housing development in Ickburgh would not have an adverse effect on Stone Curlews. In accordance with Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy the Stone Curlew buffer would not inhibit the commercial re-use of existing factory buildings on the edge of the village.</p> <p>Ickburgh is a village with very limited services or facilities (1 petrol filling station with limited retail offer) and can be considered an unsustainable location for further development.</p>		

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			The deletion of this settlement boundary would be consistent with both higher order policy contained within the Adopted Core Strategy and it is recommended that the proposed recommendation within the submission document is for the deletion of the settlement boundary.		
Little Cressingham	The officer recommendation was to delete the settlement boundary for Little Cressingham as the village is completely within the 1,500m stone curlew buffer and has no services and facilities. Following representations by the Chairman of the Parish Council, the LDF Panel recommended the boundary be retained. This was endorsed by Cabinet.	Retain settlement boundary	Five representations were received in respect of the proposal to retain the settlement boundary. Of these, 1 was from the Chairman of the Parish Council as well a further representation from Mr Abel in a personal capacity requesting further land be included. Other representations considered the boundary should be retained 'as is' in order to protect the village from unwanted speculative proposals.	The village has no services or facilities and is entirely within the 1500m Stone Curlew protection buffer and further infill development is unlikely to be satisfy the Habitats Regulation Assessment requirements. Conversions of existing buildings may be permissible irrespective of the absence of a settlement boundary. Recommendation: Delete Settlement Boundary.	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>Little Cressingham lies completely within the 1,500m buffer from the Breckland SPA supporting or capable of supporting Stone Curlew which is one of a number of internationally important habitats and species which are protected by European Directives. CP14 of the Adopted Core Strategy provides a policy approach for reviewing settlement boundaries including deletions for those Parishes containing limited services facilities and situated within the Stone Curlew buffer zone. No new evidence has been submitted during the Preferred Options consultation to demonstrate that limited housing development in Little Cressingham would not have an adverse effect on Stone Curlews. In accordance with</p>		

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>Policy CP10 of the Core Strategy the Stone Curlew buffer would not inhibit the commercial re-use of existing factory buildings on the edge of the village.</p> <p>Little Cressingham is a village with no services or facilities and can be considered an unsustainable location for further development.</p> <p>The deletion of this settlement boundary would be consistent with both higher order policy contained within the Adopted Core Strategy and it is recommended that the proposed recommendation within the submission document is for the deletion of the settlement boundary.</p>		
Shropham	Amend settlement boundary.	Amend settlement boundary.	Following Preferred Options there has been constructive dialogue with the Ward	SHR.3 Amend settlement boundary to subdivide the proposed change at SHR.1 to	Amend settlement boundary as per officer recommendation.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>Member on how best to ensure that the proposed settlement boundary changes achieve the outcomes which the Parish is looking for. The amendment at SHR.3 is considered to allow for two separate but appropriately scaled schemes to come forward in Shropham whilst maintaining the rural character in this part of the village.</p>	<p>reduce the amount of developable land area and secure a scale of development consistent with local objectives and policy CP14 of the adopted Core Strategy.</p>	
Sparham	<p>Delete settlement boundary – Following representation from the parish council at the Task and Finish group meeting, the group recommended the settlement boundary be retained. This was then agreed by Cabinet.</p>	<p>Retain settlement boundary.</p>	<p>No comments were received during the preferred options consultation in either support or objection to the recommendation.</p> <p>Sparham lacks the essential services and facilities that policy CP14 of the adopted Core Strategy would look for in the expansion or retention of a settlement boundary. Currently a number of houses within the village are located outside of the settlement</p>	<p>The officer recommendation for Sparham is that the preferred option is reconsidered, and that the proposed submission document should recommend that the boundary is deleted. This approach would be consistent with both CP14 and other settlement boundaries across Breckland, which have a similar level of service provision.</p> <p>Recommendation: Delete</p>	<p>Retain settlement boundary.</p>

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>boundary, and in planning terms would be classified as countryside. Whilst the settlement boundary is focused around the core of the village. Within the existing settlement boundary, there are no opportunities for further development, and therefore it's retention rather than deletion will not facilitate further growth within the village.</p>	Settlement Boundary.	
Stanfield	Delete settlement boundary – Following representation from the parish council at the Task and Finish group meeting, the group recommended the settlement boundary be retained. This was then agreed by Cabinet.	Retain settlement boundary.	<p>No comments were received during the preferred options consultation in either support or objection to the recommendation.</p> <p>The settlement boundary within Stanfield represents one of the smallest remaining settlement boundaries within Breckland. The existing boundary reflects the core of the village, however large</p>	The deletion of settlement boundary at Stanfield would be in accordance with Council policy and provide a consistency of approach with similar settlements across the District. Recommendation: Delete Settlement Boundary.	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>proportions of the village remain outside of the designated settlement boundary.</p> <p>The village is bereft of any of the essential services and facilities which would normally be required to maintain the settlement boundary. Future expansion of the settlement boundary would therefore not be considered to appropriate. In addition to this, the existing settlement boundary, leaves no opportunity for further development, within it's existing limits.</p>		
Stow Bedon	Delete settlement boundary – Following representation from the parish council at the Task and Finish group meeting of the 25 th of November 2009, the group recommended the settlement boundary be	Retain settlement boundary.	<p>No comments were received during the preferred options consultation in either support or objection to the recommendation.</p> <p>The part of the village that has a defined settlement boundary (Mere Road) has</p>	<p>The deletion of settlement boundary at Stow Bedon would be in accordance with Council policy and provide a consistency of approach with similar settlements across the District.</p> <p>Recommendation: Delete</p>	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
	retained. This was then agreed by Cabinet on the 26 th April 2010.		no services or facilities and as such is no longer a sustainable location for further development. There is land remaining within the settlement boundary at Mere Road at Chapel Farm but whether it can be developed without harming the form and character of this part of the village is questionable. Otherwise all remaining plots for development have been built / permitted.	Settlement Boundary.	
Shipdham	Amend settlement boundary	Amend settlement boundary.	Whilst a number of representations have been raised in regards to the Shipdham settlement boundary, it is not considered that the materially alter the preferred options. However, an additional amendment to the settlement boundary is recommended to include site given planning	Amend settlement boundary, as per the preferred option, with the additional inclusion of site SHP.5. Recommendation: Amend Settlement Boundary	Amend settlement boundary as per officer recommendation.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>approval under 3PL/2001/0221/D (between 27 and 29 market Street). This site has now been completed and its inclusion within the settlement boundary would result in a logical and defensible boundary which reflects features on the ground.</p>		
Tittleshall	Delete settlement boundary	Retain settlement boundary.	<p>Within the preferred options document, the settlement boundary at Tittleshall was proposed for retention, with its alternative option being for deletion. No comments were received during the consultation to support or object either the preferred or alternative options.</p> <p>Tittleshall lacks any of the essential services and facilities which would normally be needed to justify the retention of the settlement boundary in accordance with</p>	<p>The deletion of settlement boundary at Stanfield would be in accordance with Council policy and provide a consistency of approach with similar settlements across the District.</p> <p>Recommendation: Delete Settlement Boundary.</p>	Retain settlement boundary.

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>the principles set out within CP14. There is limited opportunities for further development within the existing boundary, that would not harm the form and character of the settlement. Future expansion of the settlement boundary would also not be consistent with the aims of CP14, which only looks to expand settlement boundary, where there existing services to support the growth.</p>		
Watton	Amend settlement boundary	Amend settlement boundary	<p>Two comments were made to the proposed amendments to the settlement boundary. NCC objected to the removal of WAT.5 - school land from the settlement boundary as this would restrict future school expansion or development. It was considered that WAT. 5 is not designated as open space through the Adopted Core Strategy as a result of</p>	<p>WAT.16. Additional amendment to the settlement boundary. Extend settlement boundary to include land behind 115 - 125 Norwich Road in Watton. Land behind 115-121 Norwich Road received planning approval in August 2010 for 14 dwelling outside of the existing settlement boundary. This area has been included to ensure that the settlement</p>	<p>Amend settlement boundary as per officer recommendation.</p>

Parish	Original Officer Recommendation to LDF Panel (2009/10)	Preferred Option Consultation (2010)	Issues since Preferred Options	Proposed Submission Recommendation	Recommendation of the LDF Task and Finish Group 15.12.10
			<p>restricted use for school only, its removal from the settlement boundary would provide protection for future redevelopment. A second comment provided a late submission of land with a number of constraints. Neither of these comments resulted in any further action.</p>	<p>boundary reflects existing development. Land behind number 123-125 is also been included to provide a logical settlement boundary that reflects features on the ground.</p> <p>Recommendation – Amend settlement boundary</p>	