



Yare Valley Society Newsletter

Issue 43

April 1999

Annual General Meeting

We hope that many of you will be able to attend the AGM on Monday 10 May 1999 at 7.30 pm in Cringleford Playing Field Pavilion. At this meeting, the committee is elected for the year. If you would like to nominate someone or volunteer yourself for election to the committee, please contact Alison Ward (01603 452330) before 4 May. Do come to the meeting and make your opinions known about what we are or are not doing! On the back of this newsletter is the agenda. The talk by Dr Tom Williamson, a lecturer in Landscape History in the Centre of East Anglian Studies at UEA should prove to be of great interest.

Land at Bartram Mowers - Public Inquiry

The Inquiry lasted from 2nd to 5th March and because of the interest shown by the public, took place in the spacious Council Chamber at City Hall. About a dozen members of the public attended for the whole of the three and a half days, including ten from the Yare Valley Society who were also joined by many other members for shorter periods. We all wore attractive badges advertising our allegiance so that the Inspector was in no doubt as to whom we were representing!

First, Bartram Mowers' case was presented by Mr Michael Innes with two other experts, then it was the City Council's turn to show that its refusal of permission for the housing and other development was justified. It did so strongly, with a barrister and three experts.

The Inspector then gave members of the public a chance to speak and this was taken up by three objectors. Bill Ellis of Cringleford Parish Council; City Councillor Judith Lubbock (who attended the whole Inquiry) and also spoke on behalf of County Councillor Gordon Dean and City Councillor Ian Couzens; and your chairman on behalf of the Yare Valley Society.

The Inspector had received about 80 letters, all but two or three objecting to the proposal, including objections from our Euro MP Clive Needle and MP Charles Clarke.

At the end of the Inquiry, the Inspector complimented everyone on the amicable way in which it had been conducted - not the case in every Inquiry apparently!

We now await his decision letter which should be out in the first half of April, hoping of course that it will be in the City's favour.

Cringleford Residents

Our chairman, Elaine Tucker, will be seeking re-election to the Cringleford Parish Council on 6 May. She would be very pleased to have your support.

Millennium Project: Yare Valley Guide

As a project to mark the millennium, the committee has been giving further thought to the publication of a guide (in the form of a booklet) to the Yare Valley Walk, from Harford to Bowthorpe.

One option under consideration is for an A5 size booklet with maps and text, covering the valley in four or five sections (eg, Marston Marshes, Eaton and Cringleford, UEA and Earlham Park, Earlham and Bowthorpe Marshes).

Anyone who would like to help with information which might be included (eg wildlife, history, features) and/or with expertise or experience in illustration, cartography, or desk top publishing, or with ideas on possible sponsorship or other funding, should contact Alison Ward.

A walk at Colney Hall

Mr and Mrs James Boddy, the owners and occupiers of Colney Hall, have extended a warm invitation to all members of the Yare Valley Society to walk in their lovely grounds. We are very grateful to them for this. Just three things to note - please ring Mr Boddy on 811960 before you take a walk; no animals please; and the bluebells, a particularly beautiful sight, should be at their best towards the end of May.

Stop Press

Neighbourhood consultation meetings to explain and discuss **Norwich River Valleys Strategy** as follows. All start at 7.30 pm.

8 April West Earlham Community Centre

14 April Eaton Church Hall

19 April Cringleford Playing Field Pavilion

29 April Labour Club, Bethel Street - Special Interest meeting on Environment

Articles, comments and letters for possible publication in future newsletters can be sent to: Alison Ward, 20 Brettingham Avenue, Cringleford, Norwich NR4 6XG

1. Apologies
2. Minutes of the last AGM on 11 May 1998
3. Matters arising
4. Chairman's report
5. Treasurer's report
6. Election of officers and committee members for 1999/2000
7. AOB.

*** **

The AGM will be followed by a talk by Dr Tom Williamson
Lecturer in Landscape History, Centre for East Anglian Studies, UEA
on
The Landscape of the Yare Valley

Coffee/Tea

BARTRAM APPEAL PUBLIC INQUIRY, 2-4th MARCH 1999

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Land at: Bartram Mowers, Bluebell Road, Norwich

Proposed Development: Residential development comprising 60 units, including surgery/community building and open space

Application reference: 4980200/0

DOE Appeal Reference: APP/G2625/A/98/301045

Appellant's name: Bartram Mowers Ltd.

Points made at YVS sub-committee meeting, 1st February 1999

Present: JA, GH, AS, JT, ET, AW.

Outline of evidence to be given at public inquiry into above appeal on March 2-4 1999

N.B. These are just preliminary notes that need a lot of structuring!

1 The Yare Valley Society

Similar to evidence given at last appeal in 1989 - a "proper" society, our purpose generally (who we are and why we are here), covering both Eaton and Cringleford. **JT to prepare map with dots showing distribution of members.** Probably include list of members as well though there could be a problem if some members have supported housing in reply to Bartram's leaflet.

2 Our role in the history of the site

Consistent, as City's in protecting valley from developers.
Inspectors have consistently dismissed appeals for residential development and, in other cases, consistently stressed the importance of the valley landscape and supported its protection whether upholding or dismissing individual appeals.
Numbers in Society have increased over the years (102 in early '70s, 326 now - particular increase in last few years because of increasing threat to valley). No objections to Society's views from members but much evidence of support.
AS to draft this section.

3 The present application

(a) Our objection in principle

We are fundamentally opposed to any new residential development in the valley. Present proposal is a serious intrusion, would urbanise valley, introduce suburban development, affect wildlife.

60 new houses would be an inappropriate urban intrusion into the valley's rural landscape - policies in Structure and Local Plans; in updated plans "normally" in relation to the definition of what is allowable is omitted.

Need to quote section in Planning Act upholding these Plans.

Continued.....

.....continued

The valley is particularly narrow and vulnerable at this point.
Inspector's letter 1989 para. 36 discounted residential development in valley (but refers to "residential development as proposed" in that application in line 13 - isn't this why they think it is worth appealing?)

Describe amenity value of valley as it is now.

Applicant seeks to camouflage proposal with earthworks and woodland - admitting that it is an intrusion into the valley.

Also valley is an open river valley not a woodland - the proposals to increase woodland are not in keeping with the character of landscape.

As time elapses, valley becomes even more important to preserve (recognised in omission of "normally" in statutory plan definitions, see above)

JA to draft this section.

(b) Our objection to residential development as opposed to a garden centre

The proposed development does not enhance the Yare Valley.

Amenity value as it is now.

In last 10 years (plus), applicant has shown no interest in protecting the valley (e.g. failure to provide landscaping for warehouse required by City and DOE).

Much more land is involved in the residential proposal both to north (Strawberry field) and south. More intrusive than existing permission. Attractive area being urbanised.

Threat of exhibition areas in garden centre - but these would not permanently affect the landscape. Also, the need to use the whole extent of the garden centre area was questioned in the 1989 Inspector's letter, last sentence, para. 27.

Issue debated in 1989 inquiry with Inspector dismissing appeal for residential development. Again debated in 1992 in Norwich Local Plan inquiry resulting in re-iteration of Inspector's decision.

(c) The leaflet distributed by the appellant and its interpretation

Wait to see appellant's evidence before proceeding with section - but leaflet misleading and can be dismissed. Retail village ad. also misleading - again wait to see evidence.

Refer to volume of protest against proposal.

4 Ecology

Need for this section?

Need to contact NWT, Norwich Fringe, George Ishmael etc..

5 Conclusion

Public concern.

Quote a previous Inspector about the increasing value of the valley.

Would create a precedent for housing etc. elsewhere in valley,

Nothing has changed since last appeal except form of housing. Also, valley has become even more valuable with development going on around it.

Appendix

Photos - **ET to sort out.**

Newscuttings? Sketches?

Continued.....

.....continued

Other points made at meeting

AW to produce newsletter a.s.a.p. and encourage members to write and attend Inquiry.

GH to suggest Cringleford Parish Council is represented at Inquiry.

JT to see if badges for YVS members at Inquiry can be organised.

*Plan a mee
30*

We need to get together copies of City's and Appellant's Statements - former being posted to us;
City's and Appellant's Evidence - see at City Hall next week;
Refusal notice;
Application;
Norwich Local Plan;
South Norfolk's Land Use Report;
Deposit Norfolk Structure Plan

We need to contact South Norfolk to find out what they are doing;
Judith Lubbock;
Eaton Residents Association, via PF;
Eaton Community Council, via PF;
Charles Clarke, ET; suggest he write to Inspector;
Euro MP; quote 326 members and suggest he write to Inspector;
Other environmental societies (especially Norwich Soc. and Norfolk Soc.) and encourage them to appear at Inquiry;
Norfolk Wildlife Trust, via JA, also Norwich Fringe and George Ishmael re wildlife issue;
Local media only if necessary

We need a meeting with Norwich City planners to ask certain questions., e.g. -

Is the suggested design scheme of the development part of the application? How committed would the appellant have to be to it if the application were approved?

Can Bartram puts up huts etc. in exhibition space without additional planning permission?

What exactly does the garden centre permission allow?

If we have points for cross examination, can they be made through your barrister?

ET; 3.2.99