



Statement of Case

Ref: Land adjacent to Overtons Way/Devlin Drive, Poringland, Norfolk NR14
Planning Ref: 2020/1689

This Statement of Case has been prepared in order to support the appeal against refusal of planning permission for the above application – which was decided at SNDC Committee hearing on 5th May 2021 – contrary to the South Norfolk Case Officers recommendation for approval and the support of the South Norfolk Conservation and Design Officer and the Ward Councillor for Poringland, Framinghams and Trowse within which the proposed site is located.

The application/development site has been subject to a previous appeal (APP/L2630/W/19/3243415), albeit with a different development proposal - after SNDC Planning Committee refused to grant permission despite the recommendation for approval by the Case Officer and the Conservation and Design Officer - which was subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 2nd April 2020

The Inspector, Matthew Woodward, laid out a very clear set of reasons for the dismissal of this appeal and outlined the influencing factors that had informed his decision, and, whilst we do not agree with *some* of the matters raised – we acknowledged and respected the observations contained within the appeal decision report and set out to address these matters in the preparation of a revised proposal which is the subject of this current appeal.

For the preparation of the revised scheme, we again worked closely with the SNDC Case Officer and the Conservation and Design Officer – paying particular attention to the matters contained within the inspector's appeal decision (which was extensively used as reference by all parties), and made sure that all matters were addressed without exception. The application and revised scheme was only submitted once all parties agreed that this was indeed the case and that the application was deemed acceptable.

It should be noted that during the preparation of the revised scheme, we also consulted with Poringland Parish Council in order to clarify and discuss any concerns that they may have, and to explain to them the rationale and viability of the proposals and what had informed the proposed residential development of the site – as it was obvious that collectively (with the exception of the Ward Councillor) they viewed the site as being more purposeful as either a retail/commercial addition to the existing adjacent retail/commercial facilities, or as a community based development (i.e. nursery etc.) – despite extensive viability studies and reports prepared by Lambert Liversley and King proving quite emphatically that this would simply not be viable - compounded by the fact that the adjacent Budgens supermarket had significant covenants and restrictions on any future retail/commercial operations.

We mention this in such detail as it is important to understand that Poringland Parish Council (PPC) have not been minded to consider any other option for the site apart from their own, despite the appellant even offering to sell it to them in order that they may pursue their own agenda, and have quite determinedly, and some would say stubbornly, objected to any form of development of the site, even though deemed reasonable and suitable (as acknowledged within the inspector's report) for the location, other than that which would suit the PPC wishes or aspirations.

It appears that once again the PPC have exercised an unexplainable influence on committee members to reject two fully supported applications on the site without any legal or lawful reason to do so.

It is noted that the conduct of the planning committee is a matter between the main parties and will have no bearing on the Inspectorate's decision – but it is important to understand and acknowledge some of the key issues and obstacles that have prescribed the need to submit an appeal in this instance.

It is acknowledged that the site is an emotive and sensitive, particularly to the Parish Council – but this should be outweighed by the significant arguments that are in support of the development as proposed in terms of planning and policy requirements.

We believe that the current proposals have satisfied all comments raised by the Planning Inspectorate and are quite evidently supported by the Local Authority – and that the committee's refusal of the application should be overturned accordingly.

For, and on behalf of client.

David Jewell (Agent)