



Appeal Decision

Hearings held on 13 January 2026 (in person) & 10 March 2026 (virtual)

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V2635/W/25/3372985

Land East Side Station Road, West Dereham, PE33 9RR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr H Rody against the decision of King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01769/F.
 - The development proposed is Relocation of existing access; Change of use of the land for the stationing of 10 Gypsy / Traveller plots, each containing one static home and touring caravan. Associated hard and soft landscaping and ecological enhancements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The parties confirmed at the hearing that the description of development set out in the banner heading above incorrectly referred to plots and that this should be amended to pitches. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. As part of their appeal statement the appellant submitted an updated drainage strategy, however due to an administrative error the original version was provided to the Council with the appeal documents. This was rectified on the 5 January 2026, however insufficient time was available between that date and the opening of the hearing for consultation on that document to take place. Therefore, the main issue relating to drainage was dealt with at a separate virtual hearing on the 10 March 2026.
4. The Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Local Plan 2021-2040 (LP) was adopted in March 2025, after the decision was issued. It is incumbent upon me to base my decision upon the most up to date planning policy and this is what I have done. The policies in the LP supersede some of those referred to in the Council's delegated report. The parties have had an opportunity to address these changes in policy as part of their appeal submissions.
5. On 16 December 2025, the Government published a consultation on proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst broad changes to the structure of the Framework are proposed as part of this consultation, these proposals could be subject to further change and can only be given very limited weight at this stage. It has therefore not been necessary to consult the parties on the changes, and in reaching my decision, I have had regard to the Framework published in December 2024.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this appeal are:

- whether the site represents an appropriate location for the proposed development, having regard to the council's spatial strategy and the accessibility of services and facilities;
- the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
- whether the development would provide acceptable surface and foul drainage.

Reasons

Spatial Strategy

7. West Dereham is identified within Policy LP1 of the LP as being within tier 6 of the Council's spatial strategy, Smaller Villages and Hamlets and the supporting text to the policy at paragraph 3.47 sets out that these areas have very limited services and facilities and that growth will be through committed development or windfall development.
8. Policy LP2 confirms that in tier 6, outside the development boundary residential windfall development will not normally be supported. However, the parties agreed that Policy LP32 provides an exception to these policies as Part 2 of the policy sets out how windfall Gypsy and Traveller sites will be considered, subject to a number of detailed criteria.
9. The supporting text sets out that the policy LP32 provides a robust framework to consider windfall proposals for any unidentified needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community during the plan period.
10. The Council is required to deliver 72 pitches by 2029 and is hoping to achieve this through the allocated sites within its LP and these comprise extensions to existing pitches. The Council accepted that these sites were unlikely to be available to the proposed occupiers of the site as most were in private ownership and any expansion would be to meet the needs arising from those already occupying the site and their families.
11. Allocation GT14 is an extension to an existing site owned and managed by a housing association and is due to provide an additional 14 pitches. The Council confirmed that discussions were underway with regard to an application being submitted for an expansion of the site but could not confirm if this would be for the total allocation of 14 pitches or whether the pitches, once provided, would be available to the proposed occupiers, as the housing association may wish to offer the pitches to the families of existing occupiers.
12. Furthermore, the Council confirmed that the needs of the proposed occupiers were unlikely to have been considered as part of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment as they were not known to the authority and some, if not all, of the occupiers were living outside of the borough at the time of the survey.

13. Therefore, taking all of this into consideration, whilst the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of pitches, the development would be considered to meet those with an unidentified need for the purposes of LP32 and would, if permitted, contribute to the Council's need for windfall sites to meet the supply requirements beyond 2029.
14. Paragraph 25 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) seeks to strictly limit new traveller site development in the open countryside that is away from existing settlements. However, there is a distinction between this and paragraph 11 which considers the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings.
15. The site is located a short distance from the village of West Dereham and as a result is not away from the existing settlement, in terms of paragraph 25. The site is also located within its own defined landscaped boundaries and contains an existing building. As such it is distinct from the open countryside which is experienced beyond the appeal site, and as such development, such as that envisaged within the PPTS, does not need to be strictly controlled.
16. Policy LP32 does not set out that sites should be located either within or adjacent to upper tier settlements, and none of the criteria requires sites to be within walking distance to services and facilities or accessible by public transport. Therefore, in spatial terms, I have not identified any conflict with the Council's strategy for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

Access to services and facilities

17. The parties agree that future occupiers of the site would be wholly reliant on the private vehicle to access services and facilities, such as doctors, shops and schools, provided within the nearby town of Downham Market. There is a lack of public transport in the locality and there are no facilities within West Dereham itself.
18. Thus, future occupiers of the proposed pitches would be predisposed to use private motorised transport when accessing everyday facilities and services. This would result in negative impacts on carbon emissions and from disincentivising healthy travel options such as walking.
19. However, the appeal site is only around six miles to the centre of Downham Market and the railway station. The A10 is a classified road that provides good access into the national road network. This road can be accessed from the appeal site via rural lanes and is approximately 3 miles from the site. The proximity to the national road network would facilitate travel and the nomadic habit of life the occupants' engage in.
20. Therefore, any journeys made by car would be reasonably short when bearing in mind that accessibility needs to be considered in the context that members of the travelling community are generally reliant on vehicles wherever they live given their lifestyle.
21. Moreover, for parts of the year some of the proposed occupiers would be away travelling and therefore the number of journeys would be reduced and noting the interpersonal relationships between the occupiers, it is likely that some journeys would be shared, for example when taking children to school or undertaking trips to the shops.

22. As such, the proposal would provide the future occupants, who have a nomadic habit of life, with adequate access to services and facilities. Given the site's proximity to a sustainable settlement and a classified road, when the future occupants would be generally be reliant on the private car.
23. Whilst policy LP13 has a preference for access to these by foot, cycle and public transport, this has to be applied in the context of the site specifics, it recognises at part 3 of the policy that in the rural areas the private car will remain an important means of travel. This echoes the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 110 which sets out that in rural areas opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary.
24. In conclusion, the site represents an appropriate location for the proposed development, having regard to the council's spatial strategy and the accessibility of services and facilities.

Character and appearance

25. The proposed development would occupy the central portion of an existing rectangular paddock, which is open and undeveloped, with the exception of a corrugated shelter located in the corner adjacent to the existing access. The site is flat with boundaries defined by ditches, post and wire fencing and a variety of established scrub and trees.
26. The Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) divides the Borough into character areas, with the site being within Wereham Settled Farmland with Plantations. The LCA sets out that potential landscape sensitivities are, of relevance to the appeal site, the landscape setting of the small villages, with a moderate to strong sense of tranquillity throughout the area.
27. The planning guidelines, as set out in the LCA, for this area seek to conserve the mostly rural character of the area, conserve and enhance the landscape setting of existing small villages and to ensure that any new development responds to historic settlement pattern. Development should be well integrated into the surrounding landscape and conserve the largely undisturbed and tranquil nature of the area.
28. The appellant's Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) considers that the appeal site is small scale in relation to the wider landscape type. As such, the LVA considers that the wider landscape and character type has a medium or medium low sensitivity to the development proposed and the site has a medium level of sensitivity to change, with the potential for mitigation.
29. The LVA concludes that, as a result of the proposal, there would be a permanent loss of paddock grassland and therefore some harm to the setting of the LCA landscape. However, it considers that such harm will be limited in extent and scale, with clear opportunities for mitigation that could have landscape and biodiversity benefits in the long term. The landscape effects of the operation on the site and its immediate setting are considered within the LVA to represent a moderate-slight effect.
30. However, from localised viewpoints it is my view that the development would be noticeable, and its urban form would fail to enhance or protect the existing landscape. The proposed development would result in the siting of ten mobile homes, with a single access point leading to driveways and parking spaces.

31. These will be laid out in two rows extended back into the site. I consider that the overall scale of the development and its in depth form and pattern across the site would fail to respond to the context and character of the area, where development has a linear pattern, particularly along Station Road. It would not result in development that enhances the quality of the environment.
32. The Framework also makes clear that, in general terms, decision-makers should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions. Even allowing for possibilities for landscape planting to screen the development, this would take some time to establish. As such I find the development would remain unduly harmful for the reasons described.
33. The proposal would lead to an intrusion into the countryside, failing to recognise the intrinsic rural character of the countryside, contrary to policies LP02, LP18, LP19 and LP21 which together seek to maintain and respond to the local character context, provide a high quality environment, protecting the countryside for its intrinsic character and beauty and be sensitive to the surrounding area.
34. Paragraph 187 of the Framework sets out that planning decisions should contribute to the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
35. I therefore conclude the development would lead to moderate harm to the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings contrary to the policies within the development plan. This is a matter to which I attach considerable weight as part of my planning balances to follow.

Drainage

36. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such the site itself is at the lowest risk of flooding. However, there is localised evidence of surface water drainage issues beyond the appeal site with residents in Station Road having experienced flooding during periods of heavy rainfall.
37. Having regard to the rural location of the village, most, if not all, residents are unable to connect to a mains drainage system and rely upon individual sewage treatment plants and the proposal includes provision for 10 sewage treatment plants, one to serve each pitch.
38. Other measures for surface water drainage include areas of hardstanding being constructed with a permeable surface and a tanked sub base to attenuate the surface water generated on the hardstanding and from roof areas, with a restricted discharge (orifice of 50mm) to the ditch system which is adjacent to the site boundary.
39. During the reopened hearing detailed evidence was given in relation to drainage matters and from these discussions it was clear that a number of matters pertaining to drainage remain unresolved and there is uncertainty as to how an appropriate drainage strategy will be achieved.

40. The Stoke Ferry Internal Drainage Board (IDB) attended the virtual hearing and confirmed, as set out in their written evidence, that the principle of the IDB being able to grant Bye Law consent is unlikely due to outstanding issues with the submitted drainage strategy not been adequately resolved. Whilst the Bye Law consent is outside of the planning process and is normally dealt with separately, the drainage scheme could not be implemented without such consent being in place.
41. Whilst it has been put to me that through the imposition of drainage conditions these matters can be addressed, I consider that the level of uncertainty as to whether the site can achieve a suitable drainage strategy, with the appropriate consents from the internal drainage board, is such that it would not be appropriate to leave this level of detail to be resolved by planning condition. This is in part due to the potential changes to the scheme which would be required if the submitted drainage strategy could not be implemented.
42. Based on the evidence before me it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the site would be served by an appropriate means of drainage to serve the proposed occupiers, giving an unacceptable level of amenity. Furthermore, there is a degree of uncertainty as to whether the proposals would leave existing occupiers at increased risk of surface water flooding.
43. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with policies LP18 and LP21 of the LP which together require development to provide sufficient evidence that there is or will be sufficient wastewater infrastructure capacity to accommodate the development and prevent any adverse impact on water quality.

Other Matters

European Designated Sites

44. The appeal site falls within the 'Zone of influence' for a designated habitats site. As the competent decision making authority, if I had been minded to allow the appeal following a consideration of all of the main issues, it would have been necessary to undertake an appropriate assessment before ascertaining if the appeal should succeed overall. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not taken the matter further.
45. The appellant has made a direct payment to the Council for a contribution towards mitigation for the designated habitat. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons it is not necessary for me to consider whether the contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and is fairly and reasonably related to it in scale and kind or whether it would meet the tests for a planning obligation as set out in regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

Heritage Assets

46. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be had to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses when dealing with planning applications.

47. The application site lies to the west of the schedule monument Site of St Mary's Abbey (List Entry Number 1020141) and comprises the site of a medieval abbey. Four listed buildings are within the monument and comprise The Ruins of West Dereham Abbey House (Grade II*), the Ruins of Service Wing (Grade II*), the Gatepiers at north-east corner of Abbey Precinct (Grade II*) and Bridge at north east corner of Abbey Precinct (Grade II).
48. The Site of St Mary's Abbey is of high significance, notably for its archaeological interest, which provides a high level of evidence of layout, phasing and design of the Premonstratensian monastic precinct. Its setting is predominately within the designed parkland and is separated from the surrounding fields by the moat and substantial wooded boundary.
49. The Ruins of West Dereham Abbey House (now The Priest House) are of high significance, with the existing house containing some of the former ruins of the late 16th Century mansion of Thomas Dereham, with evidence of reused fabric from the former monastery. The Ruins of Service Wing (now Stables) are of high significance, derived from its physical remains, including part of the 12th Century monastery. The evidence also sets out the artistic, architectural and historic interest of the assets. The setting for both buildings is again predominately within the designed parkland surrounding the mansion and is separated from the surrounding fields and village by the moat and woodland belt.
50. The Gatepiers at the north east corner of Abbey Precinct are of high significance, dating from the 1690s and would have provided the entrance to Sir Thomas Dereham's mansion and estate. Their setting is enhanced by parkland views and an avenue of trees. The Bridge at north east corner of Abbey Precinct is of high significance, dating from the 1690s and provides evidence of the construction and design features of that period. The setting for both of these assets is limited to the designed parkland and tree avenue on the Eastern side of the Abbey Park.
51. Historic England confirmed that the impact on the setting of the Site of St Mary's Abbey would be minimal and resulting harm to its significance would be negligible and as such they had no objection to the proposal.
52. The Council's Conservation Officer concludes that whilst historically the setting of the site would have been one of seclusion and isolation, that this is not the case currently, with the village of West Dereham having been developed on its edges.
53. The proposal would erode the rural character of the appeal site hence diminishing the contribution it makes to the setting and significance of the heritage assets. However given the changes to the setting of the heritage assets on the ground, and that this is but one small part of the countryside within which the assets are experienced I find the harm to the setting of the heritage assets to be less than substantial in this instance, and at the lower end of that spectrum. However, this still attracts considerable importance and weight. Where development proposals will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
54. The development would be considered to meet those with an unidentified need for the purposes of LP32 and would, if permitted, contribute to the Council's need for windfall sites to meet the supply requirements beyond 2029 and the provision of ten additional pitches would be a public benefit to which I afford considerable weight.

55. Therefore, having regard to the importance given in the Framework to the protection of heritage assets, the provision of ten additional permanent pitches would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the setting of the designated assets outlined above.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

56. The appellant has provided a legal obligation to secure BNG capacity outside of the appeal site in order to achieve an appropriate level of BNG and a monitoring fee payable to the Council. The Council have confirmed on this basis that they are satisfied that the development will achieve a 10% BNG.
57. The contributions would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations.

Other considerations

Previously Developed Land

58. It has been put to me that the presence of the existing stable building demonstrates the site has been kept for horses and should be considered previously developed land. Paragraph 27 of the PPTS sets out that when considering applications weight should be attached to the effective use of previously developed (brownfield) untidy or derelict land.
59. The majority of the site is an open field with only a limited structure at the front of the site. The definition of previously developed land within the Framework sets out that it includes land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including and within its curtilage.
60. Even if I were to accept that the site comprises previously developed land, it would attract only moderate weight in favour of the development.

Personal Circumstances

61. The appeal site would be occupied by a single group comprising friends and direct family relationships. In total there would be nineteen adults and twenty six children between the ages of 14 years and 3 months. The households have a wish to have a settled base together in order that the women would be able to support each other with the children whilst the men are away travelling for work.
62. If the appeal is dismissed, then the families would continue living in temporary locations on the roadside and the children's welfare would be seriously disrupted. In addition, living an uncertain roadside existence would not support the children's welfare and development. Instead, an enduring settled base would enable access to education, healthcare and generally supporting the children's welfare by, for example, attending clubs, making friends and being close to family.
63. Article 1 of the First Protocol sets out that a person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions and that no one shall be deprived of his possessions except in the public interest. Article 8 of the Human Rights Act states that everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life and his home.

64. Dismissing the appeal would represent an interference with the home and family life of the proposed occupiers, such that both Articles would be engaged. There is also a positive obligation imposed by Article 8 to facilitate the gypsy way of life.
65. The future occupants of the proposed pitches are an ethnic minority, and thus have the protected characteristic of race under s149(7) of the Equality Act 2010. The proposal would meet the needs of those persons with a relevant protected characteristic, by reason of race, and so, as required by section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010, the public sector equality duty is applicable.
66. There is therefore a need to have due regard to eliminating discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations. Aside from the best interests of the children, I attach moderate weight to the other personal circumstances as a factor in favour of the scheme.

Best Interests of the children

67. Where Article 8 rights are those of children, as in this case, they must also be seen in the context of Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. This requires a child's best interests to be a primary consideration. More particularly, case law identifies that, although a primary consideration, the best interests of a child are not a determinative planning issue, but no consideration must initially be regarded as more important or, in advance of the subsequent assessment of the individual circumstances, be given greater weight.
68. The Guidance advises that decision-makers need to consider whether children's best interests are relevant to any planning issue under consideration. In doing so, it similarly advises they will want to ensure the approach is proportionate. Decision-makers need to consider the case before them and need to be mindful that the best interests of a particular child will not always outweigh other considerations including those that impact negatively on the environment or the wider community.
69. The appeal site would provide a settled base for twenty six children, including some with special educational needs and medical conditions requiring access to a hospital. Their best interests need to be carefully considered. The children of school age are receiving a mix of home schooling and tutoring. The parents have set out that it is their wish to have a settled base for all of the children to go to school locally, with provision identified in Downham Market.
70. I accept that the best interests of the children would, in principle, be served by a permanent and secure home, whilst having regard to the fact that their educational needs are not currently being met by a school in the local area.
71. The merits of the case presented are such that I afford the benefits, of this development to the best interests of the children, significant weight.

Other benefits

72. Paragraph 13 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) sets out that traveller sites should be sustainable economically, socially and environmentally and should give proper consideration of the effect of local environmental quality on the health and wellbeing of any travellers that may locate there, or on others as a result of new development.

73. However, with regard to wider sustainability benefits, the proposal would provide limited economic and social benefits for the wider community through the spending of future occupiers in the local economy. In terms of environmental benefits, the proposal would provide a settled base that reduces the need for long distance travelling and possible environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment. However the weight I give to these benefits is modest, noting the sites occupiers would need to travel by car to access services and facilities.

Planning Balance

74. Notwithstanding that the scheme would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and would not thereby be a sustainable development, the question remains whether there are material considerations which would warrant a decision in this instance other than in accordance with the development plan.
75. Policy H of the PPTS requires applications for gypsy sites to be assessed in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and with regard to the application of specific policies in the Framework and the PPTS.
76. There are several points in favour of the proposal. The Council are unable to meet the accommodation needs of the proposed occupiers as there are no alternative sites available to them. The appeal scheme would support the traditional way of life of families that have a protected characteristic.
77. The appeal scheme would facilitate the establishment of a settled base for the families whilst they continued to pursue a nomadic lifestyle for economic purposes. This would allow cultural traditions to be balanced with the practicalities of modern living thereby, advancing equality of opportunity. The unmet need for pitches for the families also indicates inequality in housing opportunities and the proposal would help to offset this in a modest way.
78. These are important points in achieving the social sustainability sought by Paragraph 13 of the PPTS. It does not automatically follow that the appeal should be permitted because the PSED is relevant. Nonetheless, the equality implications weigh notably in favour of permitting pitches at the appeal site because dismissing the appeal would perpetuate the disadvantages currently endured.
79. The accommodation needs and personal circumstances of the intended occupiers are together, significant points in favour of the proposals. Furthermore, the best interests of twenty six children is a primary consideration. All would benefit considerably from a settled base from which to gain stability and an education. I have attached moderate weight to the accommodation needs and personal circumstances of the appellant, and significant weight to the best interests of the children.
80. Nevertheless, I attach considerable weight to the significant collective harm to the intrinsic character and appearance of the area as described and risk to occupants of the site resulting from its location where a suitable drainage strategy has not been demonstrated and therefore there is uncertainty as to whether the living conditions of both future and existing occupiers would be acceptable or that the development would not place undue pressure on the local infrastructure, in terms of the drainage channels maintained by the Internal Drainage Board.

81. In the overall planning balance, the benefits of the proposal, including that the development would provide a settled base for ten households, are not sufficient in this case to outweigh the harm identified.

Temporary Planning Permission

82. Possibilities for a temporary planning permission require a second balancing exercise taking into account the limited duration of any permission and any reasonable expectation of a change in planning circumstances by the end of that period.
83. I have considered the best interests of the children, and in granting a temporary period that they may become established in local schools and to the difficulties of finding alternative, authorised accommodation.
84. However, the harm arising to the character and appearance of the area, would remain but be incurred for a strictly limited period of time only and during this time the unresolved drainage issues could still pose a problem. Furthermore, the proposed drainage strategy, requires significant investment into the site, and it would not be reasonable for to require this to be implemented on a temporary basis.
85. Furthermore, after this time the children would be settled in the local school and as such the appellant would be less likely to want to relocate if allocated sites were to become available elsewhere in the Borough.
86. Therefore, the material considerations would not clearly outweigh the temporary harm arising from a limited period of occupation such to justify the grant of a temporary permission personal to the proposed occupiers.

Proportionality

87. The human rights interference associated with this conclusion is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society to protect the countryside by restricting inappropriate development, and to safeguard public health and the environment where adequate foul and service water drainage infrastructure is unavailable which are legitimate objectives. The relevant planning policy objectives could not be achieved by means less imposing or intrusive, and the minimum action necessary to achieve those important ends, would not have an excessive or disproportionate effect on the interests of the persons affected. This includes the particular interests and accompanying rights of the children, to which I attach significant weight.
88. The public interest cannot be served by means that cause less interference with the appellant's rights. Therefore, dismissing the appeal is a proportionate response in all the circumstances and a violation of rights under Article 1 and Article 8 would not occur.
89. In accordance with the public sector equality duty, due regard has been paid to minimising the disadvantages suffered by the intended occupiers of the site and to meeting their needs in so far as they are different to those without a relevant protected characteristic. Whilst ultimately the appeal is to be dismissed, these considerations have been at the forefront of the decision-making process. Because of the significant objections identified the outcome is a proportionate one.

Conclusion

90. My overall conclusion is that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan, both on a permanent and temporary basis, and that this finding would not be outweighed by all other material considerations including all relevant provisions of the Framework and the PPTS. In accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004, I find no basis for planning permission to be granted.

91. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

G Pannell

INSPECTOR

Appearances

For the Council:

Claire Dorgan BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Senior Planner

Julie Barrow MRTPI Principal Planning Officer

Luke Brown MSc Senior Planning Policy Officer (13 January only)

Claire Wiggs Zoology (Hons)(First Class) ACIEEM Senior Ecologist (13 January only)

Oliver Dodd BEng (Hons) Civil &Environmental Engineering.

For the appellant

Mr Simon McKay BSc MA MRTPI

Mr Joe O'Donnell MEng

Mr Richard Morrish CMLI (13 January only)

Other Parties (attended on 10 March only):

Mr Terry Parsons – Parsons Engineering

Andrew Newton – Stoke Ferry Internal Drainage Board

David Clarke - Stoke Ferry Internal Drainage Board

A number of other interested parties and representatives from interest groups and the Parish Council attended the hearing on 13 January and 10 March, however they requested that their names are not published.