



Easton Parish Council

www.eastonparishcouncil.co.uk

Mr Rooke
Broadland District Council
Planning Department
Thorpe Lodge,
1 Yarmouth Road,
Norwich, NR7 0DU

23 July 2018

Dear Mr Rooke,

Broadland Council Planning application 20181090, Proposed Development for the Processing of Agricultural Produce / Manufacture of Food Products

I would first like to raise our disappointment in that Broadland District Council (BDC) have chosen not to formally consult with locally elected organisations regarding the above screening opinion request. To state that the only organisations with whom you are willing to consult are statutory organisations once again shows the total disregard to openness and transparency when it comes to dealing with local communities.

Having been told by another party about the application we have reviewed the online documentation that has been displayed to date and while we welcome the prospect that new jobs will be created in the local area, we have a number of concerns in relation to this specific proposal.

We wish our views to be taken into consideration with regard to this application.

Firstly when the Local Development Order (LDO) for this site was drafted and implemented by Broadland District Council (BDC) a number of provisions were adopted so as to minimise any likely visual impact would have on the local area. A key element of this was the setting of a maximum roof height of 10m. The current proposal is in contravention of section 2.22 of the LDO. We would also draw to your attention Policy 1 Heritage Protection which forms part of the adopted Easton Neighbourhood Plan (ENP), the proposed application site is only 800m direct line of sight away from the Grade 1 Listed Church of St Peter. The proposed site is situated on a plateau at approximately 48m above sea level on open flat arable land.

This proposal would potentially lead to degradation in the setting of the Church of St Peter and as such is contrary to ENP Policy 1. The developer has not provided any satisfactory evidence to prove that this is not the case and does not seem to have

considered Policy 4 of the ENP which requires development proposal in the immediate vicinity of the Church should demonstrate that they have been designed so that they do not generate substantial harm to the setting of the building. Development proposals should ensure that their arrangement of open space and landscaping are designed in a fashion that would protect and enhance the setting of the Church.

We contend that this proposal is in the immediate vicinity of the Church as it is on a raised elevation to the church and is in direct line of sight of the Church over open countryside. At present some limited screening exists near the sharp corner outside the church. However once the proposed road improvement are agreed it is very likely that a large proportion of the existing screening will need to be removed to improve the safety of going round the bend near the Church and thus exacerbates the problem.

Until such time as all the matters surrounding the outstanding issues of road, footpath, cyclepath and entrance improvements have been detailed and approved by Norfolk County Council the potential impact this will have on the local area. It is difficult to see that this proposal can progress until such time as an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has been completed. As with the LDO we would be looking for the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to provide an option on the need for an EIA given this proposal sits way outside the agreed conditions of the LDO.

The foul and surface water drainage of this site is dependent upon the complete system for the whole of the LDO proposals. The suggestion of a separate septic tank solution, albeit as a interim but unending period, for a major industrial undertaking is not acceptable and will have environmental implications. The site is on a plateau sloping to river valleys both north and south. Unless the whole of the surface water infrastructure for the LDO site is installed, there is no consideration given in the application to contaminated paving run-offs from flash floods discharging in to these sensitive areas.

The appraisal in Lanpro's letter with regard to (ix) Landscape and Visual Impacts and (x) Heritage Assets has not taken into account the impact of this proposal may have on the new housing that is to take place in Easton. Housing will be around 600m away with direct line of site of this industrial area. Existing houses are only 940m away with direct line of site to this proposal.

Cumulative effect has a massive effect on this proposal and any precedents it may set for the future development of the whole area.

It is the belief of Easton Parish Council that given our already mentioned concerns and many other potential environmental issues surrounding this proposal an EIA should be undertaken in compliance with the 2017 EIA Regulations and based on the full 100 acres of the proposed development which is currently being promoted by

the developer and not to rely on the outdated option that solely looked at the LDO site.

We await your comments.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Milliken', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Cllr Peter Milliken
Chair Easton Parish Council