



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 7 December 2022

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by D Szymanski BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/W/21/3285244

Land between Court Hill/Buxton Road and Pound Hill Opposite 39 Buxton Road, Frettenham, Norfolk NR12 7NL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Benedict Carver against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref 20210767, dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 1 new self-build home (0.48Ha).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Permission in Principle has 2 stages: the first stage (permission in principle, herein PIP) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle. The second Technical Details Consent stage (herein TDC) is when the detailed proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first stage. I have considered the plans indicating a potential dwelling location and accesses as indicative only.
3. The scope of considerations for a PIP is limited to location, land use and amount of development. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states a PIP may not be granted for development likely to have a significant effect on a qualifying European site, unless the competent authority has carried out an Appropriate Assessment (AA). Since the application was determined, the Council has advised of potential effects upon qualifying European sites. This is reflected in the main issues below. The parties have been given the opportunity to provide further evidence in respect of this matter.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are whether the location, the land use and the amount of development is suitable with particular regard to:

- policies for the location of new housing;
- access to services and facilities;
- the character and appearance of the area;
- biodiversity; and,
- European designated habitats sites.

Reasons

Location

5. Policy GC2 of the Broadland Development Management DPD (2015) (the DPD) aims to focus development within settlements in a defined hierarchy that are well linked and well related to existing development, services, facilities and employment opportunities, consistent with the objectives of the Joint Core Strategy (2014) (the JCS). Policy GC2 states development will be permitted within defined settlement limits on the proposals map. Outside these limits development will be permitted where it accords with a specific development plan allocation or policy, and does not result any significant adverse impact.
6. The Corbett¹ judgement relates the interpretation 'immediately adjoining' a settlement stated in a policy in a different authority area. Policy GC2 does not contain such wording. Within the vicinity of the appeal site, the defined Frettenham settlement limits encompass more tightly knit development. This appeal site is approximately 65m to the east and 80m from the west of those limits, within open surrounds. The gaps, absence of built development, open land, woodland and trees means the site is clearly distinct from, does not adjoin, and is significantly outside the defined settlement, in the countryside.
7. The Council cites a number of other policies, the Site Allocations DPD and Growth Triangle DPD as exceptions for development including dwellings outside settlements. The parties agree that the proposal is not compliant with a specific allocation or listed policy for types of development. Therefore, the proposal contrary to Policy GC2 of the Broadland DPD.
8. I am provided with appeal decision letters relating to whether GS2 is out of date². In some there is limited analysis, given they were written for informed parties, and the full circumstances and evidence provided is not clear. While a restrictive policy, GC2 needs to be read in-combination with other policies. It seeks to focus residential development in locations with good access to services and facilities subject to a number of exceptions in policies and proposals. This is consistent with paragraphs 11, 79 and 85 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) in seeking to promote sustainable patterns of development and locate development where it will maintain or enhance the vitality of rural communities, which might be outside settlements.
9. It is consistent with Framework objectives at paragraphs 120 and 174 in seeking to use suitable brownfield land within settlements and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. As a residential proposal that the parties agreed is not isolated, paragraph 80 and some parts of paragraph

¹ Corbett v Cornwall Council [2022] EWCA Civ 1069;

² APP/Y2620/W/20/3248468; APP/K2610/W/20/3255135; APP/K2610/W/21/3273694; APP/K2610/W/21/3275889; APP/K2610/W/21/3278369; APP/K2610/W/20/3251549.

85 are of more limited relevance, and whether this is considered a suitable site will be dependent upon my findings in respect of the other main issues. The Council is understood to have delivered significantly above its target for homes in rural areas, indicating further the policy is responsive to local circumstances and supports housing developments that reflect local needs.

10. Based upon the evidence before me, Policy GC2 is compliant with the Framework. This differs to the view of the Inspector for 3255135, where they considered it not wholly consistent, but that Inspector also did not state it is out of date. In Ref 3251549, the Inspector did not expressly state the GC2 is not Framework compliant. My views are not inconsistent with those of Inspectors for other decisions provided by the Council³. However, the full evidence before those Inspectors is not before me and I have considered this matter based upon the evidence before me in relation to this appeal.
11. The emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) examination report is not yet published. Modifications to the wording of Policy 7.5 were requested by the examining Inspector, but the final detail of these is not clear. While the thrust of this policy complies with some Framework objectives, given the uncertainty of the final wording and its stage of progression, it attracts limited weight. To comply with it, a proposal also has to meet landscape and natural environment requirements of Policy 7.5. I discuss these matters below.
12. Whether or not I was to agree with the Council's counting of custom and self-build plots, a number of single plots and CIL exemptions have been permitted, and there is no-one on the Council's register. The evidence suggests they have met their duty under the Act. As there were significant numbers on the Council's register in Ref APP/G2435/W/18/3214451, it is not directly comparable. The substantive evidence does not lead me to conclude a discrete custom and self-build policy is necessary to comply with the law. The appellant is not on the custom and self-build register. While this dwelling is intended as a custom or self-build dwelling, being beneficial in this regard, there is no planning obligation before me to secure this, and a condition cannot be imposed upon a PIP. Overall, this matter attracts little weight.
13. The Council's reason for refusal makes reference to housing land supply (HLS). Policy GC2 does not specifically state exceptions for situations where a 5 year HLS cannot be demonstrated.
14. For the reasons set out above, the location, the proposed land use and the amount of development is not suitable having regard to policies for the location of housing. It conflicts with Policy GC2 of the DPD, the relevant provisions of which I have set out above.

Services and facilities

15. Services and facilities for day-to-day life around Frettenham include a village hall, public house, mechanical garages, fruit and veg outlet, a dairy, nursery and primary school. Others such as roofing, shooting and lawnmower businesses service more occasional needs. Access to and from services and facilities would include using either one of a short section of unlit 30 mph limit roads with a narrow verge before accessing a footway. This, and the distances, means journeys on-foot or cycling would have only limited appeal to future

³ APP/K2610/W/21/3273694; APP/K2610/W/21/3278396; APP/K2610/W/21/3275889.

- occupiers, particularly outside daylight hours. It might put-off parents with young children or people only able to walk shorter distances. Some reliance upon private vehicle to access these facilities cannot be ruled out. Moreover, given the limited services, occupiers would need to travel to other settlements.
16. Spixworth and Horstead/Coltishall include takeaways, cafés, a hairdresser, estate agent, post office, food retail, petrol garage, primary schools, dental and medical surgeries, recreational facilities, and access to the wider bus network. Most services and facilities are 2.5 – 3km away, with part of the routes being unlit national speed limit roads without a footway. Therefore, walking or cycling would not be viewed as particularly attractive or convenient.
 17. The bus journey to those settlements and to Norwich which has a large number of services and facilities, might be relatively short but not particularly frequent and I could not see a shelter or lighting at the stops in Frettenham. While it provides an option for future occupiers it is likely to be of limited appeal. Therefore, while not essential for access, it is likely a number of journeys to services and facilities such as wider professional services, employment, recreation, education and retail would be by private motor vehicle.
 18. While Frettenham is identified as being potentially suitable for 50-60 dwellings, the emerging GNLP does not allocate any sites. There are no detailed proposals, and there might be other considerations or circumstances other than access to services and facilities, as to why the settlement is deemed suitable for that number of homes. Given this and the stage of preparation, this matter attracts limited weight. Opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and the number of trips generated, and distances travelled would be relatively limited. However, it would soon add up to a significant number of vehicular miles per year, which needs to be considered in the context of other policy considerations⁴.
 19. My findings are not inconsistent with those of an Inspector for a nearby site⁵, although I have based my views upon the evidence specifically before me. The Brundall⁶ scheme was a large development including 170 dwellings. Brundall was described as having facilities including a medical centre, dentist, primary school, two co-ops, other local shops, post office, restaurants, church, library and village hall as well as access to two railway stations, so well linked and well related to services, facilities and employment opportunities. Therefore, it is not directly comparable to the situation at this appeal site.
 20. For the reasons set out, in principle the location is not particularly suitable for access to services and facilities. The proposal conflicts with the aims of Policies 1 and 6 of the JCS and Policy GC4 of the DPD. In combination and amongst other things these seek to ensure that proposals are accessible to all, primarily via sustainable means, minimise the need to travel and concentrate development close to essential services and facilities. Overall, given the distances to travel and accessibility, this matter attracts limited weight.

Character and appearance

21. I am not aware of any legislative provision or authority that character and appearance is not a matter that can be considered for a PIP proposal. This

⁴ Braintree DC v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2018] EWCA Civ 610

⁵ APP/K2610/W/15/3137276.

⁶ APP/K2610/W/19/3239986.

- should be considered on a case by case basis. Within the Marsham and Hainford character area the Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document (2013) seeks to conserve and enhance landscape structure.
22. The appeal site includes informal grassland, forming part of a distinctive larger land parcel comprising grassland, woodland, and seasonal ponds between tree and hedgerow lined highways. The appeal sites verdant rural appearance makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, with some filtered visibility through trees and thin hedgerows, from adjacent highways. A new dwelling would result in new built development, access and areas for use by vehicles, comings and goings as well as some domestication and associated paraphernalia. Therefore, it is unavoidable that the proposal would result in some urbanisation of the appeal site.
23. Matters including the dwelling location, size, design, layout, access, garden areas, could be agreed at the TDC stage. A dwelling might be able to be designed to not be out of keeping with some development nearby. However, given the nature of the appeal site and its surrounds, the location, size and use, would result in domestication and urbanisation that would be inherently harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Although the visibility of it may well be more limited to that of the dismissed dwelling nearby, there would still be some inherent harm due to its location on grassland.
24. If the existing trees and much of the hedgerows were retained, with further high quality planting, visibility could be somewhat limited. However, it is highly likely the new dwelling would still be visible from limited sections of Buxton Lane, Pound Hill and some land to the north.
25. Therefore, the location, land use and amount of development would not be suitable, having regard to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies EN2 and GC4 of the DPD and Policy 2 of the JCS. Amongst other things these seek to protect and enhance gaps between settlements and green spaces that make a significant contribution to defining an area, reinforce local distinctiveness and respect the landscape setting of settlements.

Biodiversity

26. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) explains the site comprises grassland, trees and hedgerows within the Chisel Hill County Wildlife Site (CWS). Bats have been recorded within 2km of the appeal site. A detailed bat roost assessment of site trees was not undertaken. However, the woodland on the site is considered to provide suitable habitat for roosting bats. It states in the absence of further mitigation, any tree removals have potential to impact upon roosting bats, and those identified for removal should be assessed.
27. Circular 06/2005 states it is essential the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected is established before planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed. However, protected species surveys should not be required unless there is a reasonable likelihood of them being present and affected by the development. Based upon the assessment in the PEA, the age, condition and features of the protected and other trees bats are likely to be present. Therefore, in this case protected species are a material consideration I am required to take into account in determining this appeal and it cannot be left to the TDC stage.

28. There is space for a dwelling outside root protection areas (RPAs). However, the site plan does not identify all trees that could be affected by the development. Bat roosts could be lost, as well as foraging and commuting habitat, through tree removal directly on an access or visibility splay, or as a result of a loss of a proportion of their RPA necessitating felling, or any crown or scaffold branch removal. While access details are to be decided, it appears unavoidable that trees with bat roost potential as described in the PEA would be affected. The absence of adequate surveys means it is not demonstrated the effects can be mitigated.
29. Allowing this appeal would amount to agreeing to the change the use of the appeal site to domestic land, so a judgement needs to be made as to whether the residential land use is acceptable on the defined appeal site. The grassland has been managed and improved due to the appellant's efforts, although was assessed as of a relatively low ecological value. Despite this, it is of value to the CWS is by virtue of its contribution to the overall habitat mosaic.
30. A new dwelling would result in a loss of grassland habitat through new operational development and the residential land use would result in the potential for damage from domestication, ornamental planting, seeding, management, and use of the space for the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. Biodiversity enhancements are potentially capable of being achieved at the TDC stage. However, some habitat fragmentation is unavoidable.
31. The appellant has clearly worked to improve the status of the CWS. However, the future applicants for any TDC application and the occupiers of the dwelling are by no means certain. There is no certainty the appellant's good work would not be undone in the future by permitting residential use of the land. There is little detail of ecological management in the future, and no condition can be imposed upon this appeal scheme. Therefore, the residential use of part of a designated CWS, as a matter of principle, is not suitable.
32. For the reasons set out above, the location and use is not suitable having regard to the effects upon biodiversity. It would conflict with the aims of Policy EN1 of the DPD which aims to protect and enhance biodiversity, prevent fragmentation of habitats, and expects that where harmful effects may occur it should be demonstrated the development cannot be located elsewhere where it would cause less harm.

Habitats sites

33. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) (the Regs) require where a plan or project is likely to result in a significant effect on a European site, a competent authority is required to make an AA of its effects on the integrity of the European site in view of its conservation objectives. Any likely significant effects (LSEs) arising need to be considered alone and in combination with other development, adopting the precautionary principle.
34. Natural England (NE) updated its advice in relation to nutrient pollution in a number of river basin catchments⁷. This appeal site lies within the catchments of two Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) that are components of the Broads⁸. The SSSIs are in an unfavourable condition due to excessive

⁷ Natural England - Advice for development proposals with the potential to affect water quality resulting in adverse nutrient impacts on habitats sites – March 2022.

⁸ The Broads Special Area of Conservation, Broadland Special Protection Area and Ramsar site.

- nutrients. The site is also within a number of Zones of Influence (ZoIs) of Habitats sites adversely affected by recreational disturbance.
35. The Boards is a low-lying wetland complex with connecting river systems and a mosaic of wetland and associated habitats. It includes designated habitats with a rich array of flora and fauna, including protected, important or rare invertebrates, mammals, amphibians, over-wintering and breeding rare and vulnerable birds⁹, comprising the qualifying features. The conservation objectives can be summarised as to maintain or restore the integrity of the sites by maintaining or restoring the extent, distribution, structure, function and supporting processes of the qualifying habitats and the habitats of the qualifying features and species, the population of the qualifying features, and the distribution of the qualifying features and species within the sites.
36. Phosphorus and Nitrogen are adversely affecting the Bure Broads and Marshes SSSI and the Yare Broads and Marshes SSSI, which include designated features and species. The development lies within their surface and foul water catchments. NE has adopted a precautionary approach that LSEs on the SSSIs, due to the increases in nutrients from surface and foul water, cannot be ruled out. The appellant does not dispute this matter.
37. Allowing this appeal would permit the principle of an additional dwelling within the catchment, so could result in LSE due to increased nutrient inputs¹⁰. While work is in progress, presently there is no formally agreed adopted mitigation strategy. The appellant intends to either create a nutrient neutral development, use on site mitigation, or take part in a credits scheme being worked upon, to be agreed at the TDC stage, but their approach is not decided. Therefore, there is no detailed mitigation scheme for me to assess and the proposal does not make adequate provision to mitigate the nutrient impacts. Moreover, I cannot impose planning conditions on a PIP. NE advises that as no mitigation is provided, adverse effects cannot be ruled out.
38. In consequence, it is not demonstrated the proposal would not result in increases in nutrient loads. Applying the precautionary principle, alone and in combination, the proposal would result LSEs harmful to, and that would not maintain or restore, the integrity of the Broads. Regulation 63(5) of the Regs state that, the competent authority may agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained it will not adversely affect the integrity of a habitats site.
39. Therefore, the appeal scheme would fail to adhere to the Broads conservation objectives. Imperative reasons of overriding public interest do not exist, it has not been put to me there are no alternative solutions to this development, and no compensatory measures are secured. Therefore, the location, land use and amount of development are not acceptable.
40. In the Lymington¹¹ decision that Inspector appears to have had a defined detailed mitigation scheme before them, the principles of which were agreed by NE and the organisations responsible for its delivery. As a full planning permission, it was agreed the mitigation could be secured legally against that

⁹ As listed in the table on pages 11 – 12 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment of published Proposed Submission Greater Norwich Local Plan (July 2021).

¹⁰ Natural England - Advice for development proposals with the potential to affect water quality resulting in adverse nutrient impacts on habitats sites – March 2022.

¹¹ APP/B1740/W/20/3265937.

permission. I am informed the Bunwell decision¹² is subject to a legal challenge, but it is yet to be heard, so presently it is a legal decision. That full planning permission included a condition requiring mitigation before the development commences. A condition or limitation cannot be secured against this decision. Therefore, those schemes are not directly comparable to this PIP, and do not justify allowing this appeal.

41. The appeal site lies within the ZoIs of a number of habitats sites¹³. The Broads qualifying features are summarised above. The other sites can be summarised as including a variety of designated land, aquatic, coastal and other habitats that host a rich array of flora and fauna, including protected and important flora, invertebrates, mammals and amphibians, and over-wintering, migratory, breeding rare or vulnerable birds and internationally important assemblages¹⁴, comprising the qualifying features. The conservation objectives can be summarised as to maintain or restore the integrity of the sites by maintaining or restoring the extent, distribution, structure, function and supporting processes of the qualifying natural habitats and the habitats of the qualifying features and species, the population of the qualifying features, and the distribution of the qualifying features and species within the sites.
42. Studies have identified new residential development within the ZoIs is likely to have LSEs on the Habitats sites, alone or in-combination with other development, through increased visitors, recreational damage and disturbance¹⁵. The Norfolk GIRAMS (Green Infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance Strategy) identifies a detailed programme of measures to mitigate against the adverse effects on the Habitats sites.
43. GIRAMS introduces a per-dwelling tariff to ensure development is compliant with the Regs. The tariff will fund hard and soft mitigation measures at the designated Habitats sites to increase their resilience to greater visitor numbers. It includes a contribution to Green Infrastructure to secure adequate provision of a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) to divert residents from regular visits to Habitats sites. NE advises a contribution to the GIRAMS¹⁶ should be sought to ensure the delivery of the mitigation. The Unilateral Undertaking (UU) before me secures index-linked contributions.
44. The contributions secured by the UU are necessary, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. The mitigation secured would be effective to adequately overcome any LSEs of a dwelling in respect of recreational disturbance, so the development would adhere to the conservation objectives in this regard. I am satisfied, following an AA, the mitigation is secured and would be delivered in a timely manner.
45. Therefore, in respect of recreational disturbance I am satisfied that the proposal would be adequately mitigated and not result in harm to European

¹² APP/L2630/W/21/3289198.

¹³ The Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), the Breckland Special Protection Area (SPA), The Wash SPA, The Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, The Wash Ramsar, North Norfolk Coast SAC, North Norfolk Coast SPA, North Norfolk Coast Ramsar, Norfolk Valley Fens SAC, Winterton – Horsey Dunes SAC, Great Yarmouth North Denes SPA, Broadland SPA, Broadland Ramsar, Breydon Water SPA and The Broads SAC.

¹⁴ As listed in the tables on pages 10 – 13, 17 – 19 and of the Habitats Regulations Assessment of published Proposed Submission Greater Norwich Local Plan (July 2021) and The Wash Special Protection Area Citation.

¹⁵ Guidance Note for South Norfolk Council planning applications on preparation of the Template Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment.

¹⁶ Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy habitats Regulations Assessment Strategy Document (March 2021).

designated habitats sites. However, in respect of nutrients, the location and use is not suitable, and it conflicts with the Regs and Policy EN1 of the DPD as it is not demonstrated that adequate mitigation is incorporated and secured to address the effects to maintain the integrity of Habitat sites.

Planning Balance

46. I am provided with significant evidence in respect HLS for the JCS area, although a 5 year HLS is not a ceiling. When determining the application, the Council considered it could demonstrate an HLS of 6.05 years. The appellant believed this to be 4.06 years. However, these figures pre-date the nutrients matter. Nutrient catchments cover much of the JCS area including Norwich, although some larger settlements in South Norfolk are not within them. I am informed this matter is not likely to affect the delivery of all sites.
47. At the Hearing, neither party ventured to provide an HLS figure, although presently it is acknowledged the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year HLS. Having regard to the evidence before me and what I heard, until a suitable mitigation strategy is adopted and having regard to any potential implications upon viability, at the present time the HLS position is likely to be acute. Therefore, the policies most important for determining the proposal would be deemed out of date¹⁷.
48. Paragraph 11 of the Framework states that permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the development, having regard to footnote 7, which includes habitats sites. Therefore, even if I were to agree fully with the appellant's HLS critique¹⁸, conclude the HLS figure is very low, and I were to have reached the view GC2 is out of date so the conflict with it is afforded reduced weight, the tilted balance does not apply.
49. The proposal would result in a modest economic benefit during design and construction, once complete some small on-going spend in the local economy, and benefits from Council Tax and the New Homes Bonus. There would be a small contribution to the vitality of rural communities, services and facilities. As a small windfall site, it might be built out relatively quickly. Although in light of my findings above it cannot be considered a suitable site. Having regard to the effects of the pandemic upon build-out rates and allowing for a very low HLS position, the social and economic benefits and contribution to supply from one dwelling attracts moderate weight.
50. I see no reason why the development could not be made compliant with policies in respect of matters such as detailed design, access, parking, archaeology and heritage assets, arboriculture, landscaping, the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers, utility protection, flood risk and drainage, and contamination at the TDC stage. Compliance with these policies would be a neutral matter. The proposal is for an eco-home, and I see no reason it could not be made compliant with policies in relation resource and energy efficiency and renewable energy. However, there is no substantive evidence it would result in a net renewable energy benefit. Overall, the policy compliance and benefits attract moderate weight in favour of the scheme.

¹⁷ Footnote 8 of the Framework.

¹⁸ GNDP April 2020 5-YHLS Investigation (April 2021) by Parker Planning Services.

51. The proposal conflicts with policies for the location of new housing and access to services and facilities. It would be inherently harmful to the character and appearance of the area, harmful to biodiversity and I cannot be certain it would not be harmful to protected species. It would also result in LSEs to the Broads as a Habitats site. Therefore, it conflicts with Policies GC2 and 7.5 as a whole. The harms attract significant weight against the scheme, which significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits. Moreover, Regulation 63(5) of the Regs preclude the proposal from proceeding.

Conclusion

52. For the reasons set out above, the proposal is contrary to the development plan taken as a whole, and the Habitats Regulations. There are no material considerations advanced including the policies of the Framework that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr Thomas Wheatley (Parker Planning Services);

Mr Daniel White (Parker Planning Services);

Mr Ben Carver (Appellant);

FOR THE COUNCIL

Miss Helen Bowman (Broadland District Council);

Mr Chris Raine (Broadland District Council);

Mrs Catherine Dew (Broadland District Council);

Ellie Yarham (Broadland District Council);

INTERESTED PARTIES

Dr Karen Lawrence (Broadland District Council, Buxton Ward Councillor)

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

PH-1: Unilateral Undertaking signed by Benedict Carver;

PH-2: Shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment by Broadland District Council;

PH-3: Joint Core Strategy Policy 5;

PH-4: Joint Core Strategy Policy 17;

PH-5: The Wash Special Protection Area Conservation Objectives;

PH-6: The Wash Special Protection Area Citation;

PH-7: Map showing SSSIs affected by nutrients;

PH-8: The Broads Special Area of Conservation Water Quality monitoring evidence;

PH-9: Frettenham settlement boundaries;

PH-10: Aerial Image of Frettenham including services and facilities;

PH-11: Aerial Image of appeal site in relation to bus stops;

PH-12: Aerial Image of Bus stops and routes;

PH-13: Plan indicating the location of TPO protected trees;

PH-14: Village hall programme of events;

PH-15: Site Allocations DPD adopted Frettenham boundary extract;

PH-16: Emerging GNLP Frettenham boundary extract;

PH-17: Appeal Decision Letter APP/K2610/W/21/3273694;

PH-18: Appeal Decision Letter APP/K2610/W/21/3275889;

PH-19: Appeal Decision Letter APP/K2610/W/21/3278396.