

Broads Authority

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 August 2010

Present:

Mrs C Sheridan – in the Chair

Mrs S Blane	Mr C Gould
Mr M C Broom	Dr J M Gray
Mr N Dixon	Dr J S Johnson
Mr S Dorrington	Mr G W Jermamy
Mr A Duce	Mr A S Mallett

In Attendance:

Mrs S A Beckett – Administrative Officer
Mr P Cox – for the Solicitor
Mr F Bootman – Planning Officer
Mr J Coles – Planning Officer (Compliance and Implementation)
Ms A Long – Director of Planning and Strategy
Mrs A Macnab – Planning Officer
Mr A Presslee – Planning Policy Officer
Ms C Smith – Head of Development and Regeneration

Members of the public in attendance who spoke:

BA/2010/0113/FUL Moses Wind Engine Museum, Repps with Bastwick

Mrs J Joseph	Agent for Applicant
Mrs D Nicholson	Applicant

BA/2010/0234/FUL Ferry Marina, Ferry Road, Horning

Mr L Funnell	Applicant
--------------	-----------

12/1 Apologies for Absence and Welcome

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting. She introduced members and officers and explained the composition of the Planning Committee.

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs J Brociek-Coulton and Mr J Sharpe.

12/2 Declarations of Interest

Members expressed declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

12/3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

12/4 Points of Information arising from the Minutes

There were no points of information arising from the Minutes to report.

12/5 To note whether any items have been proposed as matters of urgent business

There were no items of urgent business.

12/6 Chairman's Announcements and Introduction to Public Speaking

(1) The Chairman gave notice of the Fire Regulations.

(2) Planning Officer (Compliance and Implementation): John Coles

The Chairman announced that this would be John Coles' last meeting as he was leaving the Authority to take up a permanent post at the University of East Anglia. On behalf of the Committee she thanked him for his contribution to the work of the Authority. In reply Mr Coles expressed appreciation for providing him with a valuable insight into such a special organisation in his short time with the Authority while commenting on the genuine commitment, enthusiasm and considerate attitude of all those in the Authority as to what it stood for and represented.

(3) Public Speaking

The Chairman reminded everyone that the scheme for public speaking was in operation for consideration of planning applications, details of which were contained in the Code of Conduct for Members and Officers. Those who wished to speak were requested to come up to the public speaking desk at the beginning of the presentation of the relevant application.

12/7 Requests to Defer Applications Included in this Agenda

No formal requests for deferrals of items had been received.

12/8 Applications for Planning Permission

The Committee considered applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as well as matters of enforcement (also having regard to Human Rights), and reached decisions as set out in Appendix 2 to these minutes on the blue pages. Acting under its delegated powers the Committee authorised the immediate implementation of the decisions.

The following minutes relate to further matters of information, or detailed matters of policy not already covered in the officers' reports, and which were given additional attention.

- (1) **BA/2010/ 0232/FUL 25a North West Riverbank, Potter Heigham**
Retrospective application to clad existing stainless steel chimney with brick
Applicant: Dr R H Alston

The Head of Development and Regeneration reminded members of the previous application at this site for the replacement of two boatsheds (BA/2009/0260/FUL) that had been granted in December 2009 with a condition which restricted overnight occupation to 14 days. This was for informal accommodation for groups. Construction work, which began in the Spring but was not yet complete, had incorporated a chimney and the retrospective application sought permission for the retention of the brick clad stainless steel chimney. This had not been included in the original plans. However, the larger of the previous two boatsheds included a stainless steel chimney.

Concerns had been expressed by the neighbour that the chimney was out of keeping with the character of the area, which was the reason for bringing the application to Committee.

The Head of Development and Regeneration explained that although the chimney was larger in scale and more domestic in form and material than the original stainless steel one, it remained a subservient feature and was not considered to have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the boatshed or the surrounding area. It was also not considered to significantly adversely affect the residential amenities of the neighbours. It was therefore recommended for approval.

Members concurred with the officers' assessment and considered that the proposal was acceptable.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions, as set out in the schedule at Appendix 2 to these minutes, as the application is in accordance with saved Policy B11 of the Broads Local Plan (1997) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007).

- (2) **BA BA/2010/0113/FUL Morse's Wind Engine Museum, Staithe Road, Repps with Bastwick**
Retention of log cabin/chalet for holiday cottage and retention of existing driveway
Applicant: Mrs D Nicholson

The Planning Officer gave a detailed presentation outlining the history of the site, drawing attention to the policy issues involved with the application and the question of the temporary permissions for a mobile

home linked to the management of the wind engine collection and extended while work to Marsh Cottage (the existing on-site dwelling owned and occupied by the applicant) was carried out. As the works to Marsh Cottage were now completed, permitted development rights for the mobile home and the Staithe Road access had expired. The applicant had previously been made fully aware of this and had been advised that the Authority would consider enforcement action if necessary to secure the removal of the mobile home from the site. As a result the applicant had submitted this application which sought to permanently retain the mobile home, constructed as a log cabin for a holiday cottage and to retain the existing driveway from Staithe Road. It was emphasised that Marsh Cottage and the wind engine collection were accessed by Marsh Road. There was a considerable area of separation between the mobile home and the wind engine collection which was of concern as it could enable the mobile home to be separated from the wind engine collection in the future. The Planning Officer also drew attention to the definition of a mobile home.

In drawing attention to the policies it was emphasised that the proposal had to be assessed as new development within the countryside as the mobile home did not have the benefit of an extant planning permission as there was no development boundary. Policy H2 was applicable and provided that generally speaking residential development outside of development boundaries would not be permitted unless specified exceptions applied. One such exception, which was potentially available in this case, was Policy TR11 which allowed for some residential development in relation to holiday accommodation to support an existing holiday/tourism facility. For the reasons outlined in the report, however, officers did not consider that all the necessary criteria in this policy were satisfied and that accordingly the fundamental objection raised by Policy H2 remained.

The applicant had stated that the main purpose of the retention of the mobile home and its use for holiday accommodation was to generate income to help maintain the wind engine collection (enabling development). The special value of the heritage collection was appreciated although it was stressed that it was currently undesignated. It was noted that it might be considered for inclusion in the Authority's proposed Local List in the future. However, on the basis of government advice in relation to enabling development, (Policy PPS 5 Planning for the Historic Environment) it was considered that the criteria and tests had not been satisfactorily addressed in this instance to justify departing from the development plan and from the national policies, referred to in the report and accepting the proposal as enabling development. The collection was private and viewed by appointment only and did not specifically relate to the site in that the site had no specific contextual importance. No other options for generating the finance required to secure the long term future of the wind engine collection had been explored. If the applicant wished to develop the site further as suggested in the planning report, a comprehensive scheme for the development of the site needed to be

put together, which may or may not include holiday accommodation, and be submitted as a comprehensive planning application.

The Planning Officer drew attention to the comments from the Highways Authority not objecting to the application subject to conditions and the concerns from other consultees relating to the continued use of the Staithe Road access and objection to the permanent retention of the mobile home on the basis of creeping development. In addition, members had received a letter in support of the application from the local MP, Mr Brandon Lewis, particularly emphasising the potential of the highly useful educational asset of the Wind Farm Park and supporting the concept of enabling development.

In conclusion, the Planning Officer considered that the mobile home had served its purpose in providing temporary accommodation, had exhausted the time period provided and a sufficiently robust case had not been submitted to justify its permanent retention in the current location. The heritage value of the wind engine collection was accepted although there was no guarantee that it could be retained in the future and it was considered that the circumstances did not outweigh the strong policy presumption against the development. Therefore the application was recommended for refusal.

Mrs Joseph, on behalf of the applicant, was given the opportunity to address the Committee expressing concern that the report did not represent a full and accurate assessment of the case, particularly as it did not refer to the supporting material with the application from the English Tourist Board, a detailed Business Plan from the Norfolk Rural Business Advice and 20 supporting letters including those from the Norfolk Windmills Trust, and the Mills Archive. She also referred to factual inaccuracies stating that the Staithe Road access had been in existence for over 40 years, the mobile home was located on the site of a previous large unsightly shed and therefore not on undeveloped land, the site had previously been used for holiday accommodation, and relocating the log cabin could raise flood risk issues. The Authority's Design Officer had considered that there were not sufficient grounds to refuse the application on design grounds and had no objection to the materials being used. There were no objections from The Highways Authority, the Parish Council or the Environment Agency and the site was a museum and had been so since the 1980s so there was no material change of use nor proposed intensification of use. Mrs Joseph also referred to other factors considered as minor discrepancies. It was argued that the proposal was not contrary to policy TR11 and explained that the applicant was willing to enter into a legal agreement for the chalet to be tied to the windpump collection. She requested that the application be deferred to enable the correct information to be placed before members and suggested a site visit.

In answer to questions, Mrs Nicholson confirmed that the mobile home was brought on to the site in 20 sections and assembled over a number of weeks and that the access from Staithe Road served the log cabin. The wind engine collection was not advertised actively since she was

aware of it being sited in a small village. She also confirmed that neither the opening times nor a contact telephone number to enable people to arrange an appointment to view the collection were displayed at the site entrance. There was also no sign for the wind engine collection at the Staithe Road entrance. She considered that the collection was representative of the history of drainage in the Broads and only three out of the nine wind engines had been brought in from outside Norfolk to demonstrate the differences in mechanisms.

Members considered the proposal in detail, recognising the complex issues involved and the claimed heritage value of the wind engine collection with its potential as a tourist attraction.

Members considered that the structure defined as a mobile home needed to be treated as such. Since the applicants wished to let the log cabin as holiday accommodation, and it was, in policy terms, situated in open countryside, Policy H2 was relevant, unless exceptions could be made to that policy. Members were mindful of the advice they had received in relation to Policy TR11 of the Broads Local Plan and to Policy HE11 of PPS5.

Members considered that the management of the collection was not specifically linked to the mobile home/log cabin in this application. The temporary permissions had fulfilled their function. It was noted that English Heritage advice required that the heritage asset must have substantial public benefit and information on this was not considered to have been sufficiently substantiated. Evidence of exploring other avenues for obtaining financial support should be demonstrated. Members considered that Policies TR11 and HE11 did not outweigh the presumptions against approval in Policy H2.

Members considered both the suggestion of a further three year temporary personal approval for the mobile home linked to the wind engine collection, and the request that the application be deferred to enable a site visit to take place.

The Solicitor advised that the recommendation and advice from the officers was clear and that in their view the application did not satisfy the relevant criteria to justify it being granted approval. That advice needed to be borne in mind when considering the suggestion to grant a temporary permission linked to a legal agreement. It was open to members to defer the application for a site visit and to further investigate a legal link between the wind engine collection and the holiday accommodation. He advised that such a course of action should only be taken if members considered that there was a realistic prospect of the application ultimately being granted permission. If, to the contrary, members considered that the policy objections were overriding and not capable of being overcome, then in fairness to the applicant that should be made clear now.

Mr Mallett proposed, seconded by Mr Dorrington, that the application be deferred to the October Planning Committee meeting to provide

opportunity for a site visit and for officers to explore the possibility of linking any potential permission for the log cabin with the wind pump collection by way of a legal agreement and for additional information relating to the criteria set out in PPS5 to be submitted.

On being put to the vote the motion was lost by 3 votes to 7.

Dr Gray proposed, seconded by Dr Johnson, that the officers' recommendation be accepted and it was

RESOLVED by 7 votes to 2 and one abstention

- (i) that the application be refused. The proposed new holiday chalet is considered to be contrary to saved Policies H2, B11, TR11 and TR21 of the Broads Local Plan (1997), Policies CS1, CS9, CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007), Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth, Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment and Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas; and
 - (ii) that authority be given for enforcement action to be taken as required to secure the removal of the mobile home; and for the site of the mobile home and the track running from the Staithe Road access to be reinstated to grass.
- (3) **BA/2010/0228/COND The Haven, Ropes Hill Dyke, Horning Variation of Condition 2 of pp BA/2009/0234/FUL Addition of roof light and PVS panels and larger flue**
Applicant: Mr Andy Parker

The Head of Development and Regeneration explained that the new building granted permission by the Committee in 2009 for a replacement dwelling and boathouse on the site was in the process of being constructed. The applicant wished to vary the permission to include a roof light and PVS panels and larger flue, the details of which were carefully outlined to the Committee. The Head of Development and Regeneration particularly drew attention to the objections received from a representative on the grounds that the amendments would increase the prominence of the building, the roof light would adversely affect the privacy of adjoining occupiers and the reflective surfaces would confuse wildfowl. The Parish Council had also reiterated its strong objections particularly in relation to the original consent feeling that the amendments would further add to the inappropriate nature of the building.

Members concurred with the officers' recommendation that the proposed amendments were relatively small scale and in isolation and in combination were not considered to adversely affect the approved design which had been considered to be appropriate. The amendments were not considered to have a significantly adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers, particularly to justify refusal.

Mr Jermany proposed, seconded by Mr Dixon, and it was

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the schedule at Appendix 2 to these minutes, as the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the saved Broads Local Plan Policies B11, H11 and HOR1 and the adopted Core Strategy Policies CS1 and CS8.

Mrs Sheridan had to leave the meeting at this point.
Dr Murray Gray in the Chair

- (4) **BA/2010/0234/FUL Ferry Marina Ltd, Ferry Road, Horning**
Extractor Fan for food preparation area to satisfy condition 4 of
ppBA/2010/0125/CU
Applicant: Ferry Marina Ltd.

The Head of Development and Regeneration confirmed that the original application for the change of use of the former games room and extension to the existing food sales area of the Helska Leisure Centre to allow for the inclusion of fish and chip sales had been granted planning permission under delegated powers. One of the conditions required the submission of details of a kitchen extractor fan and the application was for a chimney to the proposed extractor system which in itself requires planning permission. The application was before the Committee due to the objections received from the neighbour and the Parish Council.

The key issue related to the smell, noise and nuisance. The Environmental Health Officer was satisfied that the extractor system as proposed would not cause problems to neighbours and that the condition could be discharged and was acceptable. North Norfolk District Council Environmental Health Officer had been fully consulted on the original conditions of application BA2010/0125/CU.

It was noted that the original application BA/2010/0125/CU was the subject of a complaint from Horning Parish Council on the grounds that consultation had not been fully conducted. This was not a material consideration to the determination of the current application.

Mr Funnell was given the opportunity to address the Committee in support of the application explaining that all the correct procedures had been followed, particularly on his part. He referred to the comments from the Parish Council emphasising that the complaints were matters between the Authority and the Parish Council.

Members gave careful consideration to the proposal seeking clarification and assurances on the adequacy of the system bearing in mind and having concerns about the impact on neighbours. The proposed system was considered to be functional in design, form and scale. Given that the details of the proposed flu system was acceptable

to the EHO and provided it was properly installed and maintained in accordance with the necessary regulations, they considered the proposal acceptable.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out at Appendix 2 to these minutes, as the proposal is considered to be in accordance with saved Policies B11 and EMP3 of the Broads Local Plan (1997) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007).

(5) **BA/2010/0215/FUL Land off Damgate Lane Martham, Great Yarmouth**

Proposed retention of wildlife pond, replacement shed and proposed new shed

Applicant: Mr K Parsons

The Planning Officer advised that the area of land was a leisure plot and as such only very limited development was allowed without the benefit of planning permission. The proposal for a wildlife pond, which had recently been excavated, was operational development and therefore required planning permission as did the shed described as a replacement. The application also proposed an additional shed. The main issues related to the impact on the ecology of the site and the surrounding area and on the landscape. In conclusion, and bearing in mind the detailed ecological report submitted with the application, including additional measures proposed, the Planning Officer considered that in this distinct landscape context, the introduction of one shed, replacement of one shed and retention of a pond would not have a significantly detrimental impact on either the landscape character or ecology of the site. The objection to the development from the Parish Council on the grounds of precedent was considered and could not be justified as a refusal of planning permission in this case. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The Planning Officer reported that a further issue that had come to light but was not connected to the determination of this application was the existence of decking which would require planning permission. This was considered to lend a suburban appearance in a rural setting and would be contrary to saved Broads Local Plan Policies. It was considered expedient to seek removal of this structure and therefore authority was sought to take enforcement action if this should be required.

Members considered that the proposals were acceptable and were content with the officer's recommendation. With regard to the subject of proposed enforcement, a member considered that a separate report would have been desirable.

RESOLVED by 8 votes with one abstention

that the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the schedule at Appendix 2 to these minutes as the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Local Plan Policy TR18 and protects the defining and distinctive qualities of the landscape particular to the application site and its immediate environs, as well as being in accordance with adopted Core Strategy Policy CS1.

RESOLVED by 6 votes to 2

that enforcement action be taken should this be necessary in respect of the unauthorised decking on the grounds that it was contrary to development plan policies contained in the Broads Local Plan and the adopted Core Strategy in view of its suburban nature in a rural setting.

**12/9 Enforcement of Planning Control: Enforcement Item for Consideration
The Croft, Romany Road, Oulton Broad, Lowestoft**

The Committee received a report relating to unauthorised development of a converted garage in the grounds of the property known as The Croft, Romany Road, Oulton Broad, providing an update on progress on matters since consideration at the Committee's meeting on 21 May 2010. The report provided details on the legal issues involved with the original application and the details relating to taking enforcement action and on what basis that action was to be taken. It was noted that an enforcement notice had been issued which took effect on 30 July 2010 with a period for compliance of six months. The Notice required restoration of the building to its original condition as a garage. The reasons for issuing a Notice in this form were explained in the report. In summary, it ensured that if any permission was granted on appeal, there would be the opportunity for the imposition of a condition linking the occupation of any conversion to the occupation of the main dwelling house. That would not be the case if the Notice required restoration to a condition similar to that earlier approved under application W15372/3BA.

The agents or the owners of The Croft had indicated that they intended to appeal the Enforcement Notice. The agents had also maintained that the Notice as issued went beyond that which had been agreed by members at the 21 May 2010 meeting. Members were informed that it was for this reason that the matter had been brought back to Committee to give members the opportunity, if they so wished, of endorsing the action taken with regard to the content and requirements of the Enforcement Notice.

Members noted the Solicitor's view that on the evidence provided the permission issued under reference W15372/3BA had expired and that there was no present planning permission for the development. The owners of The Croft had been given the opportunity of submitting a regularising planning application which, if approved, would enable the imposition of an appropriate "ancillary occupation" condition, but they had declined to do so, indicating that they wished to retain the building in its present, unauthorised form and layout.

Members confirmed that in keeping with the policies for the area, they considered that it was important for a condition to be imposed on any permissions granted to link the occupation of the converted building to the main dwelling of The Croft, restricting it to being ancillary to that property. Although they had previously indicated that they would be content if the building was restored to a condition similar to that previously approved under W15372/3BA, they noted and accepted, for the reasons given, that this could only be secured by a further planning application (which the owners had declined to submit) or by an Enforcement Notice in the terms already issued.

Members thanked the Solicitor for his legal advice and were supportive of the action taken.

RESOLVED unanimously

that the report be noted and the approach taken be endorsed.

12/10 Wroxham Conservation Area

The Committee received a report providing the summary responses from the consultation exercise on the Wroxham Conservation Area, following the carrying out of detailed appraisal work. It also received a copy of the appraisal, management proposals and proposed boundary. Strong support for the designation of a Wroxham Conservation Area had originally come from the Wroxham Parish Local Plan process. The consultation period had been extended as a result of an article in the parish magazine which had contained misleading information about the effects of conservation area designation. It was noted that all the statutory consultees were in favour of designation and that Broadland District Council had designated that part of the Conservation Area which fell within its boundary on 20 July 2010.

Given the above and the Authority's statutory duty to consider such areas and designate them as conservation areas and the limited additional restrictions for that part of the proposed area within the Broads, it was considered that this outweighed the limited objections received.

RESOLVED unanimously

- (i) that the designation of a Wroxham Conservation Area be agreed; and
- (ii) that the conservation area appraisal, management proposals and boundary for the Wroxham Conservation Area be adopted.

12/11 Heritage Asset Review Group: Note of Meeting held on 16 July 2010 including consideration of Local List Criteria

The Chairman of the Group introduced the notes of the Heritage Asset Review Group's second meeting held on 16 July 2010, commenting that good progress was being made in relation to properties on the Buildings At Risk Register being prioritised for attention. He drew members' attention to the draft Local List Criteria which had been considered by the Group and on which members comments were requested.

The Head of Cultural Heritage and Design gave a detailed explanation of the Local List and the possible examples of features which might be included. Preparation of such a list was in accordance with the Authority's Core Strategy and once features were included within this, government advice on PPS5 came into play. It was noted that a Local List which had been proposed at the Parish Council Forum meeting had been favourably received and that it was intended to hold further workshops with the parish councils to progress matters further.

A member referred to the heritage value of features associated with the navigation of the Broads, such as wherries or other vessels. It was considered that these might be considered separately and referred to the group for consideration.

Members supported the approach being taken.

RESOLVED

- (i) that the notes of the second meeting of the Heritage Asset Review Group held on 16 July 2010 be noted; and
- (ii) that the criteria for the preparation of a Local List of locally important heritage assets be adopted with a view to developing and adopting a strategy for their long/medium/short term future.

12/12 Update on Post General Election Changes and Prospective Changes to the Planning System

The Committee received a report outlining some of the prospective changes to the planning system proposed by the new Government, and the changes that have already taken place as well as the possible implications for the Broads Authority. It was noted that the Government intended to significantly reform the planning system as indicated in its "Programme for Government" agenda as based on the "Open Source Planning" Conservative green paper published in February 2010.

It was noted that the emerging proposed changes would have implications for the processes of the planning system and could have implications for the procedures in relation to the Authority's Policy and Development Management in the Broads. Officers would endeavour to keep the Planning Committee apprised of these and their implications.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

12/13 Consultation Documents: Update and Proposed Responses

The Committee received a report together with a schedule of consultation documents received by the Authority since the previous Planning Committee

meeting in June 2010 together with the nature of the response made or proposed. This related to:

Waveney District Council Site Specific Allocations and Development Management Policies DPDs (and proposals Map) Submission to Government of Documents for Examination.

No comments were required at this stage.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

12/14 Enforcement Update

The Committee received an updated report on enforcement matters already referred to Committee.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

12/15 Appeals to the Secretary of State: Update

The Committee received a table showing the position regarding appeals against the Authority since January 2010 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

The Head of Development and Regeneration further reported that the Enforcement Notice relating to the vessel Free Spirit had been withdrawn and therefore the appeal was now no longer valid. This had been confirmed by the Planning Inspectorate. The Enforcement Notice had been withdrawn on legal advice due to the Hearts Cruisers former office having been proven to be in use for residential accommodation for some years, (as per minute 11/11(1)), the curtilage for those premises being amended and in light of the review of policies concerning residential moorings as part of the Local Development Framework Development Management Policies procedures and the general 'tidying up' and improvements made to the area by the vessel occupiers. A detailed report would be submitted to the next Planning Committee Meeting.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

12/16 Decisions Made by Officers under Delegated Powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers up to 5 July 2010.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

12/17 Circular 28/83: Publication by Local Authorities of Information about the Handling of Planning Applications

The Committee received a report setting out the development control statistics for the quarter ending 30 June 2010.

Members congratulated officers on the targets being met and the speed of determination of applications.

RESOLVED

that the report be noted.

12/18 Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would be held on Friday 10 September 2010 at 10.00am at Dragonfly House, 2 Gilders Way, Norwich.

The meeting concluded at 13.30 pm

CHAIRMAN

Code of Conduct for Members

Declaration of Interests

Committee: Planning Committee

Date: 13 August 2010

Name	Agenda Item/Minute No(s)	Nature of Interest (Please describe the nature of the interest)	Please tick here if the interest is a Prejudicial interest √
G W Jermany	12/8(2)	General as member of Great Yarmouth Borough Council Lobbied	
N Dixon	All	General – as they affect Norfolk County Council	
A S Mallett	General 12/3 minutes	Regurgitation of previous interests declared	√
	12/14 (1)	Member of Norwich Frostbite Sailing Club (If item discussed will withdraw self from meeting if necessary)	√
	12/8(2) BA/2010/0113/FUL	I was invited to visit the site which I did. I took the precaution of ringing the case officer and hearing her views. I expressed no opinion, have formed none and this is a personal interest only. Also Applicant's agent is a prior BDC planner.	
	12/8(4) BA/2010/0234/FUL	Public speaker is personally known to me	
	12/10	Member of Broadland District Council Cabinet which approved the Wroxham Conservation Area within Broadland	
C Gould	12/8(2)Application BA/2010/0113/FUL	Lobbied	

M Gray	12/14 12/8(2)	Lobbied	
S Dorrington	12/8(2)	Toll Payer (Lobbied)	
C Sheridan	12/8(4) And 12/8(2)	Personal Interest – son works part time at Helska centre Lobbied	
S Johnson	12/8(2)	Lobbied	
S Blane	12/8(2)	Lobbied	
A Duce	12/8(2)	Lobbied	
M Broom	12/8 (2)	Lobbied	

Decisions on Planning Applications considered by the Planning Committee on 16 July 2010

District / Ref No / Parish	Situation	Applicant	Proposal
BA/2010/ 0232/FUL Potter Heigham	25a_North West Riverbank, Potter Heigham	Dr R H Alston	Retrospective application to clad existing stainless steel chimney with brick
<p>Decision unanimous</p> <p>Approve subject to conditions:</p> <p>(i) standard time limit; and</p> <p>(ii) in accordance with submitted plans.</p> <p>Reasons for Decision</p> <p>The proposal is considered to be in accordance with saved Policy B11 of the Broads Local Plan (1997) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007).</p>			

District / Ref No / Parish	Situation	Applicant	Proposal
BA/2010/0113/FUL Repps with Bastwick	Morse's Wind Engine Museum	Mrs D Nicholson	Retention of log/cabin/chalet for holiday cottage and retention of existing driveway
<p>Decision by 7 votes to 2 with one abstention</p> <p>(i) that the application be refused; and</p> <p>(ii) that authority be given for enforcement action to be taken as required to secure the removal of the mobile home; and for site of the mobile home and the track running from Staithe Road access to be reinstated to grass.</p> <p>Reason for decision</p> <p>The permanent retention of the mobile home on this site as holiday accommodation is considered to be contrary to saved Policies H2, , B11, TR11, TR21 of the Broads Local Plan (1997), Policies CS1, CS9, CS11 and CS12 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007), Planning Policy Statement 4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth, Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment and Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.</p>			

District / Ref No / Parish	Situation	Applicant	Proposal
BA/2010/0228/COND Horning	The Haven, Ropes Hill Dyke, Horning	Mr Andy Parker	Variation of Condition 2 of pp BA/2009/0234/FUL Addition of roof light and PVS panels and larger flue

Decision unanimous

Approved subject to conditions:

- (i) standard time limit; and
- (ii) in accordance with submitted plans.

Reason for decision

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with saved Policies B11, H11 and HOR1 of the Broads Local Plan (1997) and Policies CS1 and CS8 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007).

District / Ref No / Parish	Situation	Applicant	Proposal
BA/2010/0234/FUL Horning	Ferry Marina, Ferry Road, Horning	Ferry Marina Ltd	Extractor fan for food preparation area to satisfy condition 4 of ppBA/210/0125/CU

Decision unanimous

Approved subject to conditions

- (i) standard time limit; and
- (ii) in accordance with submitted plans.

Reason for decision

The proposal is considered to be in accordance with saved Policies B11 and EMP3 of the Broads Local Plan (1997) and Policy CS1 of the adopted Core Strategy (2007).

District / Ref No / Parish	Situation	Applicant	Proposal
BA/2010/0215/FUL Martham	Land off Damgate Lane, Martham	Mr K Parsons	Proposed retention of wildlife pond, replacement shed and proposed new shed

Decision by 8 votes with one abstention

Approved subject to conditions:

- (i) standard time limit;
- (ii) in accordance with approved plans;
- (iii) the pond hereby permitted shall be used for private use only and shall not be used in any commercial or club fishing activities; and
- (iv) the landscaping scheme as indicated on approved plan 10/12/1 and as detailed in the landscape management plan shall be carried out no later than the next available planting season or such further period at the Local Planning Authority may allow in writing. Thereafter, the site shall be maintained in accordance with the approved landscape management plan unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason for Decision

The proposal, by virtue of its size, scale, mass and materials, would have no significant adverse effect on the character of the Broads landscape and as such is in accordance with Local Plan Policy TR18 and protects the defining and distinctive qualities of the landscape particular to the application site and its immediate environs, in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS1.

Decision with regard to Unauthorised Decking on the site, by 6 votes to 2

That enforcement action be taken as required in respect of the unauthorised decking as this would be contrary to Broads Authority development policies, including Broads saved Local Plan Policies, and policies in the adopted Core Strategy, in view of its suburban nature in a rural setting.