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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Heritage Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared by Joanna Burton of Barton Willmore LLP on behalf of Quantum Land (Brundall) Ltd ('the Appellant'); and Chris Bennett on behalf of Broadland District Council ('the Council'), in respect of an appeal made by the Appellant against the refusal by the Council of hybrid planning permission for up to 170 dwellings and a community/sports pavilion a Country Park, formal and/or informal outdoor sports provision, access, and other earthworks and engineering works ('the Proposed Development') at Land to the East of Memorial Hall, Brundall ('the Site').

1.2 This Statement has been prepared pursuant to guidance included in Annex R of the Procedural Guide (July 2020). Accordingly, this Statement sets out Heritage matters that are agreed between the parties and those matters that remain in dispute.
2.0 AREAS OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES

2.1 The application subject to this appeal is in hybrid form. Full permission is sought for Phase 1 (23 dwellings) and outline permission for up to 147 further dwellings, open space, and associated development. The description of development is:

“Outline planning application with the details of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved for later determination, with the exception of Phase 1 for which details of all matters in relation to the 23 dwellings within that Phase are provided. Development to comprise: up to 170 dwellings (Use Class C3), and a community/sports pavilion (Class D1 and D2 use), a Country Park, formal and/or informal outdoor sports provision, access, and other earthworks and engineering works. All development, works and operations to be in accordance with the Development Parameters Schedule and Plans.”

2.2 The Proposed Development was amended during the determination period to introduce a greater set back to the development edge on the north-western corner (dwg. 26007 07 Development Parameters Rev D Development Parameters Plan 2). This layout leaves the western portion of the Site retained as open space with a viewing corridor from the Memorial Hall and retained recreational land towards the Church of St Andrew and St Peter (the church) (dwg. 26007 09 Rev D Development Parameters Plan 4).

2.3 The church is located at a distance of approximately 1.15km from where the site boundary meets Links Avenue.

2.4 The north-eastern corner of the Site at the closest point to the church retains a separation distance of over 400m from the red line boundary, with the proposed extent of built form as shown on dwg. 26007 07 Rev D Development Parameters Plan 2 at a minimum distance of approximately 600m.

Setting Matters


2.6 GPA 3 makes clear that the setting of an asset cannot be definitively mapped or defined as the surroundings of an asset can change over time. Setting is not itself an asset; its importance is derived from what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to an ability to appreciate that significance. This contribution can be positive, negative or neutral.
2.7 In instances where change is not harmful, it is agreed that this would not have any adverse impact on the contribution made by the setting to the significance of the asset. In such a scenario, there would be no requirement to apply the tests required at paragraphs 195 or 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Heritage Assets**

2.8 The only heritage asset considered by the Council to be adversely affected by the Proposed Development is the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew and St Peter in Blofield (the church). No other designated or non-designated heritage assets are material to the determination of this appeal.

2.9 The architectural and historic significance of the church lies in it being a good example of medieval perpendicular style and the level of intactness of its architectural form with significant features such as the font, monuments, the dado remains of a rood screen and stained glass.

2.10 The Site shares no direct historic or functional relationship with the church. Potential setting impacts in this instance therefore relate to the potential visual impact of development encroaching on the views of the church tower.

2.11 The church tower is visible from the Site. It dates from the C15th. It is a square tower which is the common form of tower constructed in Norfolk in the C15, an indication of the rural wealth in the county at that time, and Blofield Church has one of the tallest towers in Norfolk.

2.12 The church tower continues to be viewed across the agricultural field from the footpath, however within the wider panoramic view the setting has to some extent been denuded by the urban expansion of Blofield along Brundall Road, the urban expansion of Brundall around Highfield Avenue, and to the north of the Site the change in landscape character from agricultural fields to a golf course.

2.13 The church tower is visible from other viewpoints, including views from the western approach to Blofield along Yarmouth Road (LVIA Figure 5 Site Context Photograph 11); and north-easterly views from PROW Brundall FP2 (LVIA Figure 5 Site Context Photograph 1).

2.14 The view to the church from the Memorial Hall as identified in Figure 4 of the Brundall Neighbourhood Plan is not of greater heritage sensitivity than other views to the church across the landscape in which the tower is visible.

2.15 The location and siting of development together with the proposed maximum height is such that there will be no change to an experience of the church from within the churchyard which characterises its immediate setting.
**Consultee comments**

2.16 As reported in the Planning Committee Report, it is agreed that the previous Broadland District Council Historic Environment Officer was satisfied that the amended footprint of the developable area should retain the view of the church from the northern end of Links Avenue.

2.17 As reported in the Planning Committee Report, it is agreed that Historic England raised no objection to the proposals, deferring to the views of the Council’s specialist conservation and archaeological advisers as relevant.
3.0 AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES

3.1 Whether or not there is harm caused to the significance of the church, and the level of this harm if there is any, is not an agreed matter.

3.2 The extent to which the Proposed Development complies with Policy 3 of the Brundall Neighbourhood Plan, Policy 1 of the Joint Core Strategy and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
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