Copied from supplied documents from South Norfolk CC on the impact of the site : NCC Highways – **Red. Satisfactory access likely to require significant removal of mature hedge and affect substantial trees. Site remote from local facilities with poor standard**

**footway, little if no scope for improvement to satisfactory standard.**

**Below sections copied from legal advice document consulted to oppose these plans:** The council’s assessment of the ‘historic environment impacts’ of the area around the ancient barn has not demonstrably considered the contribution that the agricultural settings makes to the importance of these listed buildings. There is no evidence that this has been taken into account in the planning process.

The guidance in the NPPF advocates a positive plan for conservation of the historic environment, as laid out in paragraph 185 ,which states ‘plans should set out a positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of thor the reasons set out above, the development of site SN2007 and SN0531 would not meet the objectives of the positive plan making as per the NPPF.

This has been tested numerous times in court with judgments being explicit that when an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area ,it must give that harm considerable importance and weight in decision making (Mr Justice Lindbolm, Forge Field Society v Sevenoaks DC [2014]).

The South Norfolk Place Making Guide requires that the rural quality of this area is maintained, and that consideration be given to the impact of development on skylines in open areas. This proposal will have a very adverse effect in both respects. Add to this the factors that should be considered in view of the listed buildings adjacent to the site, and it becomes clear that the site cannot be developed within the scope of the guidance.

The proposed site is situated on the brow of a hill, 18 metres above sea level, and can be seen for miles around. Views from here extend towards the Yare Valley, overlooking marsh lands, water meadows, RSPB reserves, conservation areas and fields. The view back towards this hilltop would be obstructed and diminished by the new housing development. This is the only aspect from which the previously mentioned listed building can be seen, and currently allows them to be viewed from as far as Buckenham Railway Station.

The proposed site forms part of a large field, which together with adjoining land is interspersed by footpaths and thus offers a delightful recreational area, much used by villagers, walkers, bird watchers and naturalists who enjoy the wide range of flora and fauna, including buzzards, hawks, owls, bats, skylarks in abundance and wild and rare plants.e historic environment including heritage assets’.

This biodiversity would be adversely effected by this proposal.

**Precedents**

The ‘Reasoned justification’ states that the recent approval of the Eel Catcher Close development in 2017 set a precedent for development of the site. In fact this is not the case. Eel Catcher Close was deemed an ‘exception site’ for developing outside the Village Development Area, only because it was used for social housing. This omission of detail in the ‘reasoned justification’ undoubtedly invalidates it as a justification if the proposal is for private development.

Moreover, a precedent for permission refusal was set in May 2017, when an application for a single dwelling directly opposite site SN2007 was refused (2017/0638/O). The grounds for refusal were stated as " outside the development area, had an adverse effect on the character and landscape of the rural area, and was unsustainable". With this in mind we cannot see how the planning authority can support an application in the same location, for 25 times the number of houses, that would have a far more profound impact on the character and landscape of the rural area and much more unsustainable.

As part of the recent Greater Norwich Local Plan, the land owner of part of the proposed site at new Inn Hill initially proposed the development of 200 homes. This was met with 70 objections (only one other site had more objections). Approval of this site would no doubt result in the landowner pursuing the original number of dwellings, quoting precedent.

**Covenants**

There is a long standing covenant on the land beside this ancient listed building stating that ‘no dwelling shall be build on the adjoining land and it shall be kept as farmland’. This is the land behind Eel Catcher Close and has been tested in court when a neighbor sought to widen access and build a structure on land adjoining.