

Sequence consider that extending the Settlement Boundary to the A143 to include all of the proposed allocations provides a strong and defensible boundary, that will endure over the plan period, and is therefore a sound approach in comparison to the current proposals map. It will also potentially allow for a small level of windfall development on logical sites that have not been allocated.

This includes my client's land as shown on the enclosed site location plan (drawing reference 2021.03.22.Site_Location_Plan) which is currently under offer and purchase should be completed shortly. Accordingly, the site has not been previously promoted with no representations made by the current owners to the previous rounds of consultation.

Sequence consider that the Settlement Boundary is particularly illogical in relation the land immediately to the west of draft allocation GNLP2108, where the Settlement Boundary does not abut the allocation and accordingly looks somewhat contrived. For the reasons set out above we would consider that incorporating the draft allocations within the Settlement Boundary as shown on the attached drawing reference 2021.02.12.Settlement_Boundary_Option1, would be an appropriate strategy to ensure a sound approach.

As a general point, to ensure the plan is sound and based on an appropriate strategy, a consistent approach should be taken throughout the plan both to allocations and sites that have planning permission and/or are under construction. As set out under these representations for Redenhall with Harleston, Sequence would contend that an appropriate strategy is to include all allocations (and those sites with planning permission and under construction) within the Settlement Boundary. Similar representations have been made by Sequence in this regard with reference to the Draft Sites Plans for Horsford but there are inconsistencies throughout the Part 2 Plans.

Sequence contend that the current inconsistent approach is not an appropriate strategy - it is therefore not justified, or effective and is, therefore, not sound.

However, even if the draft allocations are not included within the Settlement Boundary, the current drafting of the Settlement Boundary to the west of the draft allocation GNLP2108 is illogical and needs revision to be sound. As shown on drawing reference 2021.02.12.Settlement_Boundary_Option2, an appropriate strategy is to extend the boundary up to the allocation, incorporating my client's property and the associated paddock. The paddock land is 0.45ha, with no constraints to development and is a discrete and well-enclosed site with existing and proposed development on 3 of its 4 sides.

As shown on the attached plan, the site could accommodate up to 9 new homes in a sustainable location. In this regard it would assist in meeting the requirements of paragraph 68 of the NPPF for allocation of small and medium sites.