

**SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED**

Plan No	Application No	Location	Update	Page Nos
1	2024/0296	Aylsham	<p><b>Officer update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in recommendation to Approve with Conditions</li> <li>• Additional condition: Landscape Scheme to be submitted and agreed</li> </ul> <p>Para 5.6 line two should read 'proposal is NOT so significant'.</p> <p><b>Landscape Architect</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal requires the loss of a mature category B oak tree to achieve an additional temporary access, as required by the highways authority.</li> <li>• I am satisfied that there is no reasonable alternative location nearby for an access that would have neither equal nor greater arboricultural implications,</li> <li>• Whilst it is proposed to reinstate the verge once the need for the access has gone, full reinstatement will take a generation or more to achieve due to the time required for any replacement tree to reach maturity. I suggest that multiple new trees are required (in addition to the hedgerow mitigation required by the ecologist) and that full details of their specification, position and management to establishment are required by a condition that is time-linked to the commencement of the development.</li> </ul>	
2	20220488	Lamas	Lobbying letter sent to all members	22

3	20230148	Taverham	<p><b>Officer update:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree Preservation Order has been served on the two mature oak trees on the boundary between 89 Taverham Road and the public right of way.</li> <li>• The track surface/compaction is already in place adjacent to the trees.</li> <li>• No mitigation is required as a result of the TPO being served.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 5.58 line 2 should be notice and not noticed.</p> <p><b>Cllr K Kelly:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have been asked by Taverham Parish Council, to call in this amended application and be rejected if you are minded They, at their Planning Committee agreed to Unanimously REJECTED this application and have sent you their reasons why.</li> </ul> <p><b>Norfolk Historic Environment Service</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No archaeological investigation required.</li> </ul> <p>Four additional letters of objection have been submitted Largely covering issues previously raised Additional points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant does not own the track or boundaries along it.</li> <li>• Dispute over the boundary line</li> <li>• No new site notice erected</li> </ul> <p><b>Officer response:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant has a right of access down the track.</li> </ul>	33
---	----------	----------	--	----

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundary disputes are a civil matter and planning does not override land ownership, if the applicant does not own the whole site a planning permission cannot be lawfully implemented.</li> <li>• Additional site notice does not require a site notice.</li> </ul> <p>Applicant: has submitted information regarding the significant self-build demand which is not identified by the self-build register.</p> <p>Applicant: has submitted additional information on the proposed construction using Insulating Concrete Framework which has good thermal properties.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> This type of construction can not be secured by planning condition so although there are benefits from the proposed construction because it can be secured, it has been given a neutral impact in the planning balance.</p> <p>Applicant no conclusion on social role, they believe it does meet the social role.</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> As identified within the report and in paragraph 5.62 the proposed development does have the provide social benefits of providing a self-build dwelling in a sustainable location, which outweigh the small amount of social harm which would result from conflict between pedestrians /horses and vehicles on the public right of way.</p> <p>Applicant: The nearest bus stop is Shakespeare Way</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> correct error in report there is a pedestrian footpath</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>between Taverham Road and Shakespeare Way, which makes the nearest bus stop on Shakespeare Way there is also one in Sylvan Road.</p> <p>Applicant: Paragraph 5.23 should be a not between could be</p> <p><b>Officer response:</b> correct typo paragraph 5.23 line 4 add in “not” between could and be. And should read “a reason for refusal could not be substantiated on highway safety grounds”</p> <p>Applicant: no conclusion on environmental role. They believe that is no adverse impact on landscape and development has been designed to a high environmental standard.</p> <p>Officer response: As identified within the report and in paragraph 5.62 the proposed development does not cause significant harm to the wider landscape there is a small amount of environmental harm from the development of a green field site. It is considered that the other environmental considerations would have a neutral impact including the eco – credentials as they cannot entirely be secured by condition.</p> <p>Applicant: Refuse vehicle does access the bridleway to collect refuse from number 73.</p> <p>Officer Response: Contract Officer has confirmed they do currently collect refuse from number 73, using their narrow vehicle so would provide this service to the new dwelling.</p> <p>Applicant: Paragraph 5.53 the development is exempt from CIL and exemption forms have been submitted</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

---

			<p>Officer response: As stated in the paragraph 5.53 the development is liable for CIL, a self-build exemption has been submitted.</p> <p>Applicant: The bridleway is not called The Loke,</p> <p>Officer response: The bridleway has been referred to as The Loke in a number of representations.</p>	
<b>4</b>	2023/1758	Acle	<b>No updates</b>	<b>51</b>