

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 January 2026

Contents

1.	Apologies and welcome	2
	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014	2
2.	Declarations of interest and introductions	2
3.	Minutes of last meeting	2
4.	Matters of urgent business	2
5.	Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking	2
6.	Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order	3
7.	Applications for planning permission	3
	(1) BA/2025/0313/HOUSEH 12 Manor House, Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew	3
8.	Enforcement update	7
9.	Bungay and Ditchingham Dam Article 4 Direction review	8
10.	Consultation Responses	10
11.	Local Plan for the Broads- Regulation 19 first consultation responses	11
12.	Annual Monitoring Report	13
13.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	13
14.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	13
15.	Other items of business	13
16.	Date of next meeting	13
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 16 January 2026	15

Present

Tim Jickells – in the Chair, Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Andrée Gee, Tony Grayling, Gurpreet Padda, James Reeder, Matthew Shardlow, Vic Thomson and Fran Whymark

In attendance

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer (items 10-12), Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Kate Knights– Heritage and Design Manager (item 9), Callum Sculfor – Assistant Planning Officer (item 7.1), Ruth Sainsbury – Head of Planning, and Lorraine Taylor – Head of Governance

Members of the public in attendance who spoke

Christopher Cooper, the applicant, and Councillor Fraser Bowe, Thorpe St. Andrew South-East Ward Member, for item 7.1 - BA/2025/0313/HOUSEH 12 Manor House, Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew.

1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received from James Harvey, Martyn Hooton and Leslie Mogford.

Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

The Chair explained that the meeting was being audio-recorded. All recordings remained the copyright of the Broads Authority and anyone wishing to receive a copy of the recording should contact the Governance Team. The minutes remained the record of the meeting. He added that the law permitted any person to film, record, photograph or use social media to report on the proceedings of public meetings of the Authority. This did not extend to live verbal commentary. The Chair needed to be informed if anyone intended to photograph, record or film so that any person under the age of 18 or members of the public not wishing to be filmed or photographed could be accommodated.

2. Declarations of interest and introductions

Members provided their declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes and in addition to those already registered.

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Matters of urgent business

There were no items of urgent business

5. Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking

The Chair stated that public speaking was in operation in accordance with the Authority's Code of Practice for members of the Planning Committee and officers. Those who wished to

speakers were invited to come to the Public Speaking desk when the application they wished to comment on was being presented.

6. Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order

No requests to defer or vary the order of the agenda had been received.

7. Applications for planning permission

The Committee considered the following applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (also having regard to Human Rights), and reached the decisions set out below. Acting under its delegated powers, the Committee authorised the immediate implementation of the decisions.

The following minutes relate to additional matters of information or detailed matters of policy not already covered in the officer's report, which were given additional attention.

(1) BA/2025/0313/HOUSEH 12 Manor House, Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew Rebuild existing brick driveway piers and the installation of timber gates.

Applicant: Mr Jeremy Clarke

The Assistant Planning Officer (APO) provided a detailed presentation of the application to rebuild brick driveway piers and enable the installation of new timber gates.

The APO indicated that the application was before the committee as Cllr Bowe, the Ward member of Broadland District Council, had raised material considerations which warranted the application to come before the committee.

The APO provided a presentation which included location maps, a site map, aerial photographs with the site marked, photographs of the site from various vantage points along Yarmouth Road.

The APO explained that the application was in accordance with Policy DM11: Heritage Assets, DM21: Amenity, and DM43: Design of the Broads Local Plan. The area of concern related to Policy DM23: Access and Highways given that Yarmouth Road (A1242) was classified as a principal road within the Norfolk County Council route hierarchy and carried a high volume of traffic. The proposed gates would be positioned along the back edge of the pavement. In practical terms, this created a realistic potential for vehicles to have to stop and wait, either within the carriage way, or across or within the footway while the gates opened and closed. This would interrupt traffic and pedestrian movement and would be detrimental to highway safety and to the safe and efficient functioning of the local highway network. This was the harm that had been identified under Policy DM23. The APO said that in discussion with the applicant, it had been requested that various elements of the proposal could be conditioned by planning condition, these included automation, sensors, increased opening speed of proposed gates and keeping the gates open during the day, but closed at night. These points had been considered by the Highway Authority, however, this did not remove the fundamental issue of the gates' location at the highway edge. It was further noted that the

proposed controls were not a reliable or enforceable solution. As a result, the identifying harm could not be satisfactorily addressed through planning conditions.

The APO said that in order to be acceptable in highway terms, the gates would have to be set back a minimum of five metres from the highway's edge so that vehicles could wait clear of the highway for the gates to open. This mitigation was not provided in the proposal, and no alternative highway solution had been submitted to overcome the objection. Alternative example sites were provided in the submitted design and access statement provided by the agent on the planning application however, these examples did not add weight to the proposal as applications were assessed on their own merit. The provided examples were historic, and the history of the examples were not clear. As such the examples of the gates provided could have been completed without planning permission or would have been approved based on highway advice at the time which would have likely changed.

The APO acknowledged the anti-social behaviour and security concerns stated by the applicant as a material consideration. These concerns had to be weighed in the planning balance, however it did not justify an access arrangement, that as the Highway Authority advised, would create an unavoidable obstruction.

The APO said that planning system was not the primary mechanism for securing the range of measures that could otherwise be used to address anti-social behaviour which could be pursued through other routes without causing highway harm.

Consequently, the application was recommended to be refused as contrary to policy DM23 of the Broads Local Plan. The APO informed the committee that a separate listed building application had been submitted at the same time as the planning application, and was approved as listed building consent solely related to impact on the listed building. The APO emphasised that the approval of the listed building application did not grant approval for the development.

A Member sought clarification on the approximate location of the gate should it be set back five metres. The APO pointed out the approximate location of this on the site plan provided. If the gate were to be set back five metres the Highway Authority would not object to the application.

A Member asked if more information could be provided on a previously approved application that was referred to in the presentation given by the APO and its relevance. The APO advised it was not relevant to the decision of the current application before the committee but was relevant as the proposal was attached to a listed building. Listed building consent had already been approved for the present application, however, the acceptability for listed building consent would not impact on the decision of planning approval.

Mr Cooper provided a statement in support of the application commenting that the Highway Authority did not reject to the gate in principle but had rejected the application due to the five-metre set back rule. Mr Cooper stated that while Yarmouth Road was an A road, so too was the A11, and under real world conditions the two roads were wholly different. Due to this Mr Cooper believed that a 'one-size-fits-all' policy was not appropriate. Mr Cooper said

Yarmouth Road was not a fast-flowing A road but was an urban route that served a number of driveways and entrances. Many of these would cause delays but commented these would not cause an obstruction that would endanger satisfactory functioning of the local highway network. In relation to this Mr Cooper noted that a similar objection was not raised by the Highway Authority when commenting on the new housing development opposite. Mr Cooper believed any slowing of traffic associated with the proposed gate and driveway would be indistinguishable from everyday conditions and could not be characterised as harmful.

Mr Cooper asked Members to consider the origins and relevance of the five-metre set back guidance. Mr Cooper said this guidance had not been updated in a long time and said technology had improved since then. Mr Cooper addressed highways concern which stated the gate would take a long time to open by emphasising this was not the case. The gate opening time would be sixteen seconds and operated by a trigger with a range of fifty metres. Consequently, when the average slow-down time of a vehicle travelling at 30mph was considered with this remote range, the traffic wait period would be six seconds. Mr Cooper further emphasised this wait time would only be at night, when the gate was primarily closed.

Mr Cooper highlighted Norfolk County Council policy and guidance which recognised driver behaviour and speed were influenced by the surrounding environment, in which turning movement, parking activity and junction density would act as natural traffic calming. Mr Cooper said a number of areas around Norwich were introducing new speed limits and as such it was difficult to reconcile the objection of the local Highway Authority with their own acknowledgement that driver behaviour on the stretch of Yarmouth Road required moderation, following the installation of an electronic speed monitoring sign directly opposite the applicant's property.

Mr Cooper said there was difficulty in understanding the position that operational parameters could not be secured by condition as planning was often granted with conditions and highlighted a suggestion previously made in which the proposed gate would remain open from dawn and be closed at dusk. This was rejected due to the timing clash with rush hour traffic during winter months, however, believed that this could be remedied by providing clear opening and closing times of 8am and 8pm respectively. Mr Cooper asserted there was no desire to keep the proposed gate closed during the day and believed any future owners of the property would share this desire.

Mr Cooper believed that the Highway Authority had provided contradictions in its objection as it had stated the acceptance of existing gates along the highway and previous applications did not set a precedent. Mr Cooper said that the Highway Authority had used precedent in a variety of ways, to its advantage, in its submissions. Mr Cooper highlighted this in the insistence that gates along the highway caused significant delays and safety fears, while no evidence of this had been provided. Previous successful appeals researched by Mr Cooper had sighted proportionality in reality to the hypothetical delays and safety fears, which could not be substantiated or proven.

Mr Cooper said a gate was needed due to ongoing occurrence of drug dealing, attempted vehicle theft and public urination and defecation which had resulted in repeated involvement

of emergency services. Mr Cooper also raised concerns regarding the neighbouring property and expressed fears that a child living in the property may run into traffic.

Cllr Bowe provided a statement in support of the of the application commenting that the gate was necessary to enhance the security and safety of residents while maintaining the visual amenity of the local area. Cllr Bowe emphasised the primary purpose of the application was to address ongoing concerns regarding unauthorised access, antisocial behaviour and opportunistic crime in the vicinity of the property. Cllr Bowe acknowledged the concerns of the applicants, given the issues they had faced, which had increased their anxiety and eroded their sense of safety and wellbeing. Cllr Bowe commented these incidents had drained police resources and were inconvenient at best, and at worse disgusting.

Mr Bowe was disappointed that the issues around crime and disorder had not been addressed and stated it was important to frame the ongoing issue in the context of statutory responsibilities under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. This act placed a duty on all local authorities to consider the needs to prevent crime and disorder, substance misuse and reoffending in every decision made. Cllr Bowe said this was directly relevant to the situation faced by the applicants. Cllr Bowe emphasised the repeated anti-social behaviour, in combination with the increased risk associated with the nearby half-way house meant the applicants vulnerability to crime and disorder was tangible and persistent.

Cllr Bowe advised Section 17 compelled the Authority to seek solutions that both addressed and mitigated these risks and said it was a statutory imperative to approve the application for the proposed gate. Cllr Bowe was perplexed by the objection of highways when considering approval had been granted to relocate an existing bus stop that was set back in a layby to the main highway further down Yarmouth Road. The new location of this bus stop would be on a bend and a short distance before traffic lights. Cllr Bowe believed this was more likely to cause significant delay and congestion than the proposed gate and as such contradicted the reason for objection to the proposed application.

Cllr Bowe concluded the gate was a reasonable, proportionate and a necessary measure to improve security and reduce the risk of crime and urged the Committee to consider the issues faced by residents, the overall legal responsibilities the Committee held and the benefits that the proposal would bring.

A Member commented that the Highways Authority were a statutory consultee and as such needed to be given due understanding.

A Member queried what resources the Authority had to ensure any conditions relating to the opening and closing times of the gate were upheld and what responsibility the Authority had in monitoring this. The Head of Planning said the duty of enforcement would fall to the Planning Authority. There were limited resources to enforce this, and the APO further added that the Highway Authority would need to be satisfied that any such conditions could be enforced. This was seen as difficult to achieve as such monitoring would push the boundary of enforceability and did not believe this could be easily enforced.

A Member expressed sympathy with the issues faced by the applicants and had hoped the change in the nature of the property over time would improve the situation. The Member acknowledged there were other means by which the gate would be acceptable and said there may be other means to improve security and commented all of these factors would need to be considered in the decision-making process.

A Member queried the location of the gates, in relation to the residential property, if they were moved back the required five metres. The APO provided the location on an aerial image of the property and pointed out the current proposed gate location, the location of the property, the location of the property's garage, the courtyard area and the neighbouring property. The APO said there was a substantial drop in height from the highway.

A Member said they were sympathetic with the anti-social behaviour faced by the applicants but equally would not feel comfortable going against the advice of the Highway Authority.

A Member had sympathy for the application and said highways were a statutory consultee and commented that a recent successful appeal to an application that was rejected on the advice of the Highway Authority. This highlighted that inspectors did not consider objections from highways to be an absolute rejection.

A Member commented that Yarmouth Road was a busy road and believed the objection from highways deserved due consideration.

A Member asked if anti-social behaviour was the primary issue faced by the applicants. Mr Cooper confirmed this was the case and said they had looked at the proposed five metre set back however, this would not resolve the issues relating to anti-social behaviour as it would create an inlet on the driveway in which the anti-social behavioural issues would likely continue.

A Member commented that a compromise might be found in which the gate could be set back a distance shorter than five metres. The Head of Planning advised that the five-metre distance was a standard highway set back to allow a standard sized car to pull off the road without creating an obstruction.

A Member expressed sympathy with the antisocial behaviour issues raised but believed that the advice provided by the Highway Authority should be considered.

Vic Thomson proposed, Gurpreet Padda seconded

It was resolved by 9 votes for and 1 abstention to refuse the application.

8. Enforcement update

Members received an update report from the Head of Planning on enforcement matters previously referred to the Committee. Further updates were provided at the meeting for:

Land On The West Side Of River Waveney, Beccles (Unauthorised wooden decking structure)
An enforcement notice had been issued on 12 December 2025 for the removal of the unauthorised structure. A three-month compliance period was issued, and officers were in contact with the other party.

Land On The South-West Side Of Norwich Road, Gillingham (Unauthorised decking and raised platform area)

An enforcement notice had been issued on 12 December 2025 for the removal of the unauthorised structure. A three-month compliance period was issued, and officers were in contact with the other party.

9. Bungay and Ditchingham Dam Article 4 Direction review

The Heritage and Design Manager (HDM) provided a detailed presentation on proposed Article 4 directions. The presentation contained maps outlining the existing area covered by the current Article 4, maps outlining the proposed area to cover a new Article 4, and various images of properties in the area that had been considered during the review process. The Article 4 directions proposed would be non-immediate and would come into force on 22 April 2026.

It was explained that an Article 4 direction was a mechanism which enabled the removal of permitted development rights in order to protect the amenity of an area by protecting traditional features. These directions would only apply to residential houses and would not apply to flats, listed houses and commercial properties which had more limited permitted development rights. Article 4 directions would only apply to street facing or water facing elevations or those fronting public open areas.

The HDM advised the review had been prompted by the work East Suffolk Council had carried out. Historically, Article 4 directions had been applied area wide and covered large geographical areas. The recommendations of the Heritage and Design Manager reflected current best practice, as outlined in paragraph 54 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in that Article 4 directions were based on robust evidence and cover a limited geographical area.

The review process mapped the status of buildings in the conservation area to ascertain whether the buildings were listed, flats, commercial properties and if they were considered to positively contribute to the conservation area but were non-listed. Property features were also mapped. These features included appropriateness of front boundaries, chimney stacks, original roof forms, windows and doors. The extent of proposed Article 4 directions were determined using these criteria.

The HDM proposed three Article 4 directions. The first recommendation was an Article 4 Direction to cancel the existing Article 4 direction, dating from 1998, covering Bungay and Ditchingham Dam as shown in appendix 3. This Article 4 direction covered a large geographical area and a number of properties including listed buildings, flats, and commercial

properties which would be removed under the proposed direction as their inclusion was not necessary.

The second recommendation was to implement a new Article 4 direction that would cover a smaller number of non-listed houses which included two properties on Bridge Street and a number of properties on Staithe Road. These properties were deemed to have historic character that contributed positively to the conservation area and should be maintained under the proposed Article 4 direction.

The third recommendation was also a new Article 4 direction and proposed to cover a larger part of the Ditchingham Dam conservation area (as the conservation area was extended in 2013). This proposed the extension of an existing Article 4 direction to cover additional properties along Ditchingham Dam, whilst excluding a single property that did not front the street, a commercial property and buildings whose contribution to the conservation area was considered to be neutral. These neutral properties for exclusion included a number of late twentieth century buildings.

The HDM said there were circumstances in which homeowners could claim compensation for the imposing of new Article 4 directions where less than twelve months' notice had been provided. There were limited circumstances where compensation could be claimed which would arise if the local planning authority had refused planning permission for developments which would have been permitted if the Article 4 direction had not been introduced. Compensation for such cases could only be claimed within twelve months of the introduction of a new Article 4 direction. Items that could warrant compensation included professional fees on aborted work and the cost of complying with conditions that would not otherwise have been required. The HDM pointed out that this would only apply to the proposed extended area in Ditchingham Dam as all other properties were already covered by an existing Article 4 direction.

The HDM said that if the Committee approved the proposed Article 4 directions, properties in the proposed and existing Article 4 directions would be served with a notice on 26 January, a slight change to the date proposed in the report. A public consultation period would commence on 26 January and end on 9 March. Site notices would be displayed, various organisations consulted, and the Secretary of State would be informed. A drop-in session had also been arranged on 25 February in Bungay which would be jointly held with East Suffolk Council. The HDM confirmed any existing Article 4 directions would remain in place prior to the introduction of new Article 4 directions.

A Member acknowledged the risk outlined in the report was negligible but queried whether the new Article 4 directions could be introduced with the provision of a twelve month notice period to mitigate this risk. The HDM said this would create a potential risk as homeowners in the extended area could make amendments to their property within the notice period. It was also noted that the Authority was conducting the implementation of the new directions in conjunction with East Suffolk Council to ensure consistency in the area.

A Member asked if it would be easier for homeowners to modify properties removed from the Article 4 direction. The HDM confirmed there was potential for this, however, the properties remained in both the conservation area and the Broads Authority area. Due to this any material changes would still require planning permission. The removal of boundary fences under a metre in height and the painting of a property were provided as examples of alterations that could be carried out following the removal of an Article 4 direction, however, the HDM expressed the need to protect properties that contributed significantly to the area.

A Member asked if the removal of the neutral properties from the Article 4 direction would make it easier to install solar panels on the properties. The HDM said solar panels were not restricted by the Article 4 or by conservation areas and as such they could be installed on front roof sloping elevations.

A Member was disappointed that the proposal would remove a specific commercial property from the Article 4 direction. The HDM advised an Article 4 direction would not apply to the property as it was a commercial property and therefore had different permitted development rights. The property in question was not currently under the existing Article 4 direction and was not proposed to be included in the new Article 4 direction. The HDM acknowledged that the property remained in the conservation area and planning permission would be required to develop the property. The Member was pleased by this response and expressed admiration for the property's design.

A Member requested the Authority's commitment to heritage be emphasised during the consultation period. The HDM advised the letter sent out would be detailed and supplementary material would be provided.

Matthew Shardlow proposed, seconded by Stephen Bolt

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the Bungay and Ditchingham Dam Article 4 directions.

10. Consultation Responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented the response to the Acle Neighbourhood Plan produced by Acle Parish Council, the Reforms to the statutory consultee system proposed by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, and changes to electric vehicle charging permitted development rights proposed by the Department of Transport.

Acle Parish Council, Acle Neighbourhood Plan

The PPO advised Acle Parish Council were reviewing their existing Neighbourhood Plan. This review was welcomed; however, a number of comments and two objections were proposed. The first of these objections was a lack of clarity as to whether housing outside the development boundary would be permitted or not, and the second was the lack of mention regarding the need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) when seeking to improve access to the countryside. The PPO hoped these objections would enable improvement to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Reforms to the Statutory Consultee System

The PPO reminded members that the deadline for response had passed and responses were for information purposes only. The government had proposed the removal of three organisations as statutory consultees. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government presented a list of questions, and the Authority had provided responses to sixteen of these. The PPO produced these responses in collaboration with the Development Manager.

Department of Transport, Electric Vehicle Charging Changes to Permitted Development Rights
The proposal sought consultation on changes to permitted development rights (PDRs) to allow for multiple units of equipment housing or storage units for electric vehicle charge points in non-domestic, off-street carparks and the installation of cross-pavement solutions and associated domestic charge points.

The PPO raised concerns regarding the lack of key contextual information. Images had not been included in the consultation and as such the appearance of the units the Government was seeking consultation on were unknown. Consequently, the response was framed around an image search of the housing equipment, resulting in assumptions on the appearance of the equipment. The PPO's response requested greater clarity in future and expressed support for the proposal subject to conditions. It was suggested that the risk of fire should also be considered and included to the consultation response.

Fran Whymark proposed, seconded by Andrée Gee

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the nature of the proposed responses to:

- **Acle Parish Council, Acle Neighbourhood Plan**
- **Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Reforms to the Statutory Consultee System**
- **Department of Transport, Electric Vehicle Charging Changes to Permitted Development Rights.**

11. Local Plan for the Broads- Regulation 19 first consultation responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) presented the report which detailed the comments received as part of the first Regulation 19 consultation and responses to these comments. The PPO advised the second consultation would end on 16 January 2026 at 4pm.

The PPO said there was a lot of support expressed during the first consultation period in addition to some useful comments. While there were many objections, the PPO highlighted three more significant objections that had been received. These were objections to 20% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) on viability grounds, requests for 90 litres per head per day water usage and objections to the Chedgrave area being classified as a Settlement Fringe landscape type.

The PPO said they were producing a topic paper regarding the water usage request. This would involve cooperation from objecting parties and would be analysed by a viability consultant.

In response to the objections raised regarding settlement fringe classification, the Heritage and Design Manager had visited the area with our landscape consultant to provide further analysis. The assessment found the area could be classified as settlement fringe landscape character, but the boundary could be amended and updated.

The PPO made the Committee aware that the new NPPF would be released at some point in 2026. This presented challenges to BNG as the consultation version of the emerging NPPF states there would only be an allowance to exceed 10% BNG on specific sites rather than across a Local Plan area. As a result, it would not be possible to exceed this threshold areawide on local plans, as is proposed in the emerging Local Plan for the Broads. The Authority's local plan would be examined against the pre-existing NPPF, against which the Authority had commitment to 20% BNG. This could be invalidated by an emerging NPPF that would restrict BNG to 10%.

Announcements had also been made which would further impact BNG. Firstly, the minimum size threshold in which BNG would apply to an application would be an area of 0.2 hectares. Consequently, applications from the Authority would tend not to require BNG as applications typically were smaller than this. Secondly, the PPO advised the government was intending to consult to remove the need for BNG on brownfield land.

The Authority would await guidance from the Local Plan Inspector regarding its policy on water usage and BNG.

A Member commented it would be beneficial for the Government to consider an exemption for National Parks in relation to BNG.

A Member sought clarification on the water usage request. The PPO said the reduction in water usage was in relation to the area being in water stress and therefore the need for greater water efficiency. The need to reduce the use of water, as well as looking at ways of providing more water, is addressed in the Asset Management Plans of the water companies. A Member commentated this was in relation to long term forecasts of demand in which twin track approaches, that included water usage reduction, were presented and monitored by environmental authorities.

A Member commented it would be beneficial to specifically include Section 41 species when referring to protected species. The PPO said the NPPF introduced a new term, habitats and species of principal importance, in the glossary. This term included Section 41 species in the definition and so it may be that we use the emerging NPPF term in the Local Plan

Andrée Gee proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the Chedgrave Settlement Fringe Policy.

12. Annual Monitoring Report

The Members received the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) setting out planning data from the previous financial year. The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) noted that the Authority could not demonstrate a five-year land supply when either the Liverpool or Sedgefield approach was used. Highlighted in the report was the self-build exemption calculation. The Authority has had an exemption from the duty (Self Build and Custom Housing Act 2015) to give enough suitable development permissions to meet the identified demand.

There was no interest on the Authority's self/custom-build register over the last base period and the guidance on how to complete the necessary calculation to check if exemption to the duty is not clear. The PPO had previously used two different means of calculating this, however, after contacting the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) a third calculation was suggested. The PPO had requested further clarification from MHCLG and was awaiting response. The PPO had sought further clarification as the response received contradicted the National Planning Policy Guidance. The PPO intended to report the findings at a later date, as part of an addendum to this and other AMRs.

Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by Matthew Shardlow

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the Annual Monitoring Report.

13. Appeals to the Secretary of State

The Committee received a schedule of appeals to the Secretary of State since the last meeting. The Head of Planning advised the only update to the appeals received was regarding the refusal of changing 440 metres of timber quay headings to plastic headings at Hickling. An appeal had been submitted and was in progress.

14. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 24 November 2025 to 2 January 2026 and there were no Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

15. Other items of business

There were no other items of business.

16. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on Friday 13 February 2026 at 10:00am at The King's Centre, 63-75 King Street, Norwich.

The meeting ended at 11:45am

Signed by

Chair

Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 16 January 2026

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Gurpreet Padda	11	Works for Marine Management Organisation, a consultee on the Local Plan for the Broads - disclosable pecuniary interest
Fran Whymark	7.1	Member of Broadland District Council - other registerable interest