

# Planning Committee

## Minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2025

### 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	3
4.	Matters of urgent business	3
5.	Chair’s announcements and introduction to public speaking	3
6.	Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order	3
7.	Applications for planning permission	3
	(1) BA/2025/0079/COND & BA/2025/0141/OTHER Swallow Cottage, Horsefen Road, Ludham	3
	(2) BA/2025/0077/FUL Wherry Cottage, 50 Puddingmoor, Beccles	4
	(3) BA/2025/0120/FUL Broad View, Fleet Lane, South Walsham	7
8.	Enforcement update	9
9.	BA/2025/0002/TPO site visit 2a The Street, Geldeston	9
10.	Beccles Article 4 Direction - Confirmation	10
11.	Postwick with Whitton Neighbourhood Plan – Adoption	11
12.	Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework	11
13.	Local Plan – Regulation 19 consultation	12
14.	Consultation Responses	14
15.	Notes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 13 June 2025	16
16.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	16
17.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	16
18.	Other items of business	16
19.	Date of next meeting	16
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 18 July 2025	17

## Present

Tim Jickells – in the Chair, Harry Blathwayt, Andrée Gee, James Harvey, Gurpreet Padda and James Reeder

## In attendance

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer (items 11-14), Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Nigel Catherall – Planning Officer (item 7.2-7.3), Steve Kenny – Development Manager, Kate Knights – Heritage and Design Manager (items 9-10), Kayleigh Judson – Heritage and Design Planning Officer, Rob Rogers – Director of Operations, Ruth Sainsbury – Head of Planning and Rob Thomas – Head of Governance

## Members of the public in attendance who spoke

Gordon Hogg, agent for item 7.2 BA/2025/0077/FUL Wherry Cottage, 50 Puddingmoor, Beccles.

## 1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chair noted that this was James Reeder's first meeting as Suffolk County's appointee to the Broads Authority. Cllr Reeder replaced Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro who had stood down. The Chair thanked Cllr Vigo di Gallidoro for the grace, charm, thoughtfulness and kindness she brought to her roles as Chair of the Heritage Asset Review Group and Chair of the Planning Committee and as a Member of the Authority since 2017. The Chair welcomed Rob Rogers, Director of Operations, who would assume responsibility for the Authority's Planning Team from 1 August 2025 in his new role as Director of Delivery.

**Apologies** were received from Stephen Bolt, Tony Grayling, Martyn Hooton, Matthew Shardlow and Fran Whymark

### 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 30 May 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

No members of the public had registered to speak. The Chair announced that Kayleigh Judson, the Heritage and Design Planning Officer would be leaving the Authority on 6 August 2025 after nearly 17 years of service. The Chair thanked Kayleigh for her commitment to the heritage of the Broads, her professionalism to the work she undertook and her support to the Planning Committee.

### 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/2025/0079/COND & BA/2025/0141/OTHER Swallow Cottage, Horsefen Road, Ludham

**BA/2025/0079/COND - Removal of Condition 2, occupation of dwelling, of Planning Permission BA/2014/0220/COND**

**BA/2025/0141/OTHER - Discharge of planning obligation under S106 Agreement dated 11 May 1999**

**Applicant: Mr & Mrs Buttifant**

The Development Manager (DM) provided a detailed presentation of the two applications associated with Swallow Cottage, Horsefen Road on the southeast side of Ludham village. The first application, BA/2025/0079/COND, sought to remove a dwelling condition that restricted occupancy "to a person (and any dependants residing with such person) solely or mainly employed in the operation or management of Swallowtail Boatyard". The second application, BA/2025/0141/OTHER, sought to discharge a Section 106 Agreement that the owners had made with the Authority to ensure that future planning permissions associated with Swallow

Cottage would fulfil the restricted occupancy condition and confirm that the property would only be sold in conjunction with the boatyard.

The presentation included location maps, a site map, two aerial photographs with the site marked, a site layout diagram of Swallow Cottage and Swallowtail Boatyard, a photograph of the front elevation of the cottage and photographs of the site from various vantage points in the neighbouring area.

The DM indicated that the two applications were before the committee as they were contrary to the Local Plan development policies.

In assessing the applications, the DM addressed the associated material considerations demonstrating that they substantially weighed in favour of removing the occupancy restriction placed on Swallow Cottage despite this being contrary to Policy DM35 (Residential Development within defined Development Boundaries) and DM38 (Permanent and temporary dwellings for rural works) of the Local Plan for the Broads. The DM advised that the recommendation was that both applications be approved.

A Member asked whether approval of these two applications would set a precedent that other similar sites could exploit. The Head of Planning responded that a thorough review of previous applications and S106 Agreements had been conducted which had verified that this site was unusual within the Broads and the recommendation, if approved, would not serve as a precedent.

Members were supportive of the applicant's associated family business adjacent to the site and wanted to avoid jeopardising its continued operation. Members acknowledged the special circumstances associated with these applications and supported their approval.

Harry Blathwayt proposed, seconded by Andrée Gee

**It was resolved unanimously to approve application BA/2025/0079/COND for the removal of Condition 2 of Planning Permission BA/2014/0220/COND.**

Harry Blathwayt proposed, seconded by Andrée Gee

**It was resolved unanimously to approve application BA/2025/0141/OTHER for the discharge of planning obligation under S106 Agreement dated 11 May 1999.**

**(2) BA/2025/0077/FUL Wherry Cottage, 50 Puddingmoor, Beccles**

**Redevelopment of site with three new dwellings**

**Applicant: A T Bent Properties Ltd**

The Planning Officer (PO) provided a detailed presentation of the application that would involve the replacement of a derelict twin pitched and gabled roof building comprising a residential flat above a ground floor store with a similar twin pitched and gabled roof building albeit with a larger footprint to accommodate three new two storey dwellings. The wider site would be redeveloped to provide dedicated parking for the three new dwellings and demarcate this new development from its surroundings within an existing boatyard.

The presentation included a location map, a site map, two aerial photographs with the site marked, photographs of the north, east, south and west elevations of the derelict property, a photograph of the site from within the boatyard, multiple photographs of the site and the neighbouring area as viewed from vantage points on Puddingmoor, Ballygate, Stepping Hill and from the western bank of the River Waveney, a site plan juxtaposing existing and proposed plans, a diagram depicting the south elevation of both the existing and proposed buildings, a diagram depicting the north elevation of both the existing and proposed buildings and a diagram depicting the east/Puddingmoor elevation of both the existing and proposed buildings.

The PO indicated that this application was before the committee as the proposal was a departure from the Local Plan development policies and confirmed that no further consultation responses had been received since the report was written.

In assessing the application, the PO addressed the key issues of the principle of development; the design and impact on the landscape; amenity of residential properties; ecology and biodiversity and highways. The PO advised that the recommendation was to approve the application subject to conditions.

In response to a question the PO confirmed that objections had been received from four local residents.

Members noted the increased roof height and greater footprint of the new development and wanted clarification of the impact on amenity that these changes would have. The PO confirmed that the roof height would increase by 45cm and indicated that the new roof line would be located further to the west of the Puddingmoor boundary wall. The boundary wall on the western side of Puddingmoor was 1.8m high and prevented views across the site to the west. The roof and gables of the new development would be visible from Puddingmoor although their location at a greater distance from the Puddingmoor boundary would protect neighbour amenity. The PO then referenced a photograph taken from a raised vantage point on Ballygate, at the top of Stepping Hill, looking west over the site where the existing twin pitched and gabled roof was visible. The PO indicated that the new development being set further back, with a larger footprint and of greater height would obscure part of the boat dyke and part of the boatyard buildings when viewed from this vantage point. The Head of Planning (HoP) indicated that the view of the river and marshes beyond, from the aforementioned Ballygate vantage point, would be unimpeded by the development.

A Member asked whether approving this application would set a precedent that would prove advantageous to similar sites in the area. The PO reminded Members that each application would be considered on its merits on a case by case basis and stressed that the subject site was unusual in that it was replacing an existing dwelling within a boatyard. The HoP confirmed that there were no other comparable sites with a Section 78 Dangerous Building Notice in that area of Beccles.

A Member, noting agenda item 10 regarding the Beccles Article 4 Direction, wanted clarification on any impact the Article 4 Direction (A4D) might have on this site. The Heritage

and Design Manager (HDM) confirmed that the A4D currently applied to the existing residential property on the site, the commercial boatyard buildings in the wider site were excluded from the A4D and planning permission was still required for the demolition and replacement of the existing residential building.

The Member sought clarification regarding the demarcation between the replacement dwellings and the wider boatyard and possible impact on traffic within the site. The PO referred to the site plan indicating the walls introduced at both the front and rear of the development formalising the boundary with the boatyard. The PO indicated that this was not a large boatyard and that apart from the shared access to the site the residential traffic would be discrete to that of the boatyard.

A Member noted that wine tunnels may be present on the site and was keen that this heritage was preserved. The agent, Mr Gordon Hogg indicated that the wine tunnels were believed to be located to the east of the site extending into the slope leading up to Puddingmoor. The HDM explained that a Section 78 Dangerous Building notice prevented any entry into the building which precluded inspection of the wine tunnels at present. A condition had been included that, following the demolition of the building but prior to further redevelopment, a survey of the wine tunnels should be carried out, along with details of proposals to retain and repair them.

Members noted the strong feelings raised by local residents and the objection by the Broads Society. A couple of Members were concerned by the size of the development with one Member believing the doubling of the residential dwelling footprint was too large for this site. Another Member believed the development may be too large however this was not reason enough for their refusal of the application. Another Member's concerns regarding the changes to the Puddingmoor boundary wall had been assuaged by the PO's presentation. Members believed the location was sustainable, supported the design and believed the development was in keeping with the character of the area.

Gurpreet Padma proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

**It was resolved by 5 votes for and 1 against to approve subject to conditions:**

- **Time limit**
- **In accordance with plans and documents**
- **Details of Demolition Method Statement**
- **Details of Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP)**
- **Submission of full historic building recording**
- **Details of materials and large scale details of joinery**
- **Details and elevation of red brick boundary wall**
- **Details of BNG plan**
- **Details of electric vehicle charging infrastructure**
- **Archaeological watching brief**

- **Wine tunnels survey (drawings and photographic survey) and details of proposals to retain and repair them**
- **Landscaping retention**
- **Ecologist check if demolition during main bird breeding/nesting season**
- **Water consumption rate of no more than 110 litres/person/day**
- **Unexpected contamination process**
- **Noise assessment for all proposed plant and machinery**
- **No burning of waste**
- **Provision of areas for manoeuvring and parking of vehicles**
- **Provision of cycle storage**
- **Provision of bin storage**
- **No external lighting without prior written permission**
- **Roof membrane traditional type 1F bitumen only**
- **Provision of one integrated bat box & one soffit box**
- **Provision of nest boxes for house sparrow, robin and starling**
- **Removal of Permitted Development rights (Part 1 all relevant, and Part 2 Class A).**

**(3) BA/2025/0120/FUL Broad View, Fleet Lane, South Walsham**

**Demolish existing cabin and outbuildings. Replace with new dwelling house. Install canoe and dinghy pontoon along front for safe egress.**

**Applicant: Mr Alan Goodchild**

The Planning Officer (PO) provided a detailed presentation of the proposal, which was to demolish the existing cabin and shed, and to replace these with a 1.5 storey dwellinghouse. In addition, the application proposed a canoe and dinghy pontoon to the front of the existing hard engineered bank. At the eastern end of the site the concrete hard surface would be removed, with bound gravel hardstanding provided for access, parking and slipway use. To the south and west of the dwelling would be laid to lawn.

The presentation included a location map, a site map, an aerial photograph with the site marked, multiple photographs of the site as viewed from various vantage points on South Walsham Broad, a site plan, a diagram depicting the east and west elevations of the proposed dwellings, a diagram depicting the north and south elevations of the proposed dwellings and a diagram depicting the west elevation of both the existing and proposed buildings.

The PO indicated that this application was before the committee as the applicant was a Member of the Broads Authority and confirmed that no further consultation responses had been received since the report was written.

In assessing the application, the PO addressed the key issues of the principle of development; the design and impact on the landscape; amenity on neighbouring properties; flood risk and highways and public rights of way.

In response to questions the PO confirmed that the site was located in a category 2 Dark Sky Zone which required strict control on external lighting only and that a wastewater treatment system was located on the site.

A Member questioned the loss of the thatched roof on the replacement dwelling. The PO indicated that the choice of roofing material had been discussed extensively during pre-application. There was a balance to consider between the use of thatch and the installation of solar panels and on this occasion the sustainability of the building had taken priority. The loss of thatch had been offset by the use of a cedar shingle roof which would weather over time in a similar fashion to thatch.

Members asked for clarification regarding the increased size of the new dwelling and its impact within the wider landscape. The PO confirmed that the new building was taller and wider than the existing dwelling. The PO used photographs depicting the site as viewed from South Walsham Broad showing neighbouring properties to the north and south of the site of a similar, if not larger, size to that proposed for this development. The PO highlighted that the trees in the background of the images helped soften the existing buildings. The Heritage and Design Manager added that the dark timber cladding and thatched roofs of the neighbouring properties helped to reduce their impact on the landscape.

A Member questioned the impact of this development on waste water and the Authority's ability to control the proposed 110 litres per head per day water usage condition. The PO confirmed that the extra bedroom could lead to an increase in waste water in comparison with its existing use although this increase was compatible with the site's existing waste water permit. The proposed water efficiencies would need to be conformant with Building Regulations.

A Member noted that the proposed pontoon would reduce the water on the Broad although he acknowledged that there were other similar pontoons located on the Broad.

James Harvey proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

**It was resolved unanimously to approve subject to conditions:**

- **Time limit**
- **In accordance with plans and documents**
- **In accordance with Pollution Prevention Plan**
- **In accordance with materials**
- **Details of large scale details of joinery**
- **Water consumption rate of no more than 110 litres/person/day**
- **PROW to remain open and accessible**
- **Sign up to Flood Warnings**
- **Void beneath dwelling to remain unobstructed**
- **No external lighting without prior written permission**
- **Provision of bat boxes**

- **Provision of bird cup or box**
- **Pontoon to be used for dingy and canoes and not for large, beamed vessels**
- **Removal of Permitted Development rights (Part 1 all relevant).**

## 8. Enforcement update

Members received an update report from the Development Manager (DM) on enforcement matters previously referred to the Committee. Further updates were provided at the meeting for:

Land at the Beauchamp Arms Public House (Unauthorised static caravans)

The DM confirmed that sentencing at Norwich Crown Court had been scheduled for 25 July 2025. The DM would notify the Planning Committee of the Judge's decision.

## 9. BA/2025/0002/TPO site visit 2a The Street, Geldeston

The Heritage and Design Manager (HDM) presented the report to determine whether a site visit was required in relation to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for an oak tree and sycamore tree at 2a The Street, Geldeston. The applicant had submitted a tree works application to pollard both the oak and the sycamore to a height of 3-4m. The Authority's Arboricultural Consultant had advised that the proposed pollarding was inappropriate as it would compromise both the visual amenity of the trees and their future health. A provisional TPO had been served and the HDM indicated that this would need to be confirmed by 24 October 2025.

An objection to the provisional TPO had been received stating that:

- The TPO was unnecessary and asking why other trees in the local area did not have TPOs.
- The residents did not have any intention to fell the trees and had always managed the trees to the best of their ability.
- The Authority's budget could be better spent elsewhere.

The objection had been received within the 28-day consultation period and as per the Authority's Scheme of powers delegated to the Chief Executive and other officers, paragraph 50 (ii), this matter would need to be determined by the Planning Committee. In preparation for this determination the HDM explained that Members could undertake a site visit however, in this instance, a detailed photographic survey of the trees and their surroundings, in conjunction with information provided by the Authority's Arboricultural Consultant, would be adequate to determine the provisional TPO and the recommendation was not to undertake a site visit.

Members acknowledged the need for site visits under certain circumstances however, given the nature of the objection, Members agreed that there was no value in this instance.

Harry Blathwayt proposed, seconded by Gurpreet Padda

**It was resolved unanimously to not undertake a site visit before the provisional TPO BA/2025/0002/TPO was considered at a future Planning Committee meeting.**

## 10. Beccles Article 4 Direction - Confirmation

The Heritage and Design Manager (HDM) introduced the report, which sought the cancellation of the Authority's existing Beccles Article 4 Direction (A4D) and the confirmation of a new A4D covering a smaller area of Beccles and fewer development classes.

An A4D provided a mechanism for restricting permitted development rights on residential properties in the context of particular sites and/or areas and, in the context of a Conservation Area, could be used to restrict works that may otherwise be detrimental to the amenity of an area. The Authority proposed to reduce the area covered by its A4D which would see the removal of the southern part of Puddingmoor from the Article 4. Areas of the A4D to the north and south that covered open space would also be removed (a map was presented illustrating the truncated A4D area). A review of restrictions associated with the A4D had resulted in the removal of both a restriction relating to the installation of satellite dishes and a restriction associated with painting the exterior of a residential dwelling. The HDM presented maps of the survey work undertaken during the review of the A4D. Photographs of the properties within the existing and new A4D areas were shown to illustrate the different characteristics between areas remaining in the A4D and those that would be removed.

Since the revised Beccles A4D was previously discussed at Planning Committee on 4 April 2025, a public consultation on both the cancelled and new A4Ds had been conducted in conjunction with the equivalent revised A4Ds produced by East Suffolk Council (ESC). Three representations had been received and these and the Authority's responses were detailed in Appendix 6 of the report. None of the consultation responses were deemed of such significance that further changes to the A4Ds were warranted.

The HDM explained that having made both A4Ds at April's Planning Committee and following the completion of the consultation the recommendation was to confirm both A4Ds.

In response to questions the HDM confirmed that the review of the A4Ds included ensuring that they were compliant with current legislation. The Head of Planning added that the current criteria for an A4D was more rigorous and the Authority was expected to provide detailed evidence to justify an area for inclusion in an A4D. The HDM confirmed that commercial properties and listed buildings were both covered by their own discrete permitted development rights and an A4D excluded new residential developments. The HDM confirmed the remaining restrictions as stated in section 3.2 of the report (a full list was stated in Schedule 1 of Appendix 5 of the report).

A Member asked why the equivalent A4Ds produced by ESC were not ready to be confirmed. The HDM explained that the area covered by the existing ESC Beccles A4D was larger than that of the Authority's A4D and the proposed changes to the ESC A4D area had therefore been more extensive. The number of consultation responses received was greater and some of those responses required further investigation by ESC.

Andrée Gee proposed, seconded by James Reeder

**It was resolved unanimously to confirm both the Article 4 direction to cancel the existing 1997 Beccles Article 4 direction (Appendix 4 of the report) and the new Article 4 direction covering a smaller area and fewer development classes (Appendix 5 of the report).**

The meeting adjourned at 11:42am and Gurpreet Padda left the meeting. The meeting reconvened at 11:50am.

## 11. Postwick with Whitton Neighbourhood Plan – Adoption

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report on the adoption of the Postwick with Whitton Neighbourhood Plan. The PPO explained that the related referendum for this neighbourhood plan would be undertaken in August 2025. To ensure that the associated Neighbourhood Plan Group could benefit from Community Infrastructure Levy receipts from a development in the Parish, the proposal was to adopt the Postwick with Whitton Neighbourhood Plan before the referendum result was known, on the proviso that the referendum result returned more than 50% of the votes cast in favour of the plan.

James Harvey proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

**It was resolved unanimously to recommend to the Broads Authority that the Postwick with Whitton Neighbourhood Plan was made/adopted, subject to the Parish Council referendum. Any final changes prior to publishing would be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.**

## 12. Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented changes to the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (NSPF). The NSPF, Appendix 1 of the report, provided a statement of common ground for Norfolk Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) detailing effective and on-going work on strategic planning matters and addressing any key cross-boundary issues associated with this work. The PPO explained that this document had been updated to reflect the latest National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), released in December 2024. This document was key to the Authority meeting the NPPF's Duty to Cooperate and in particular agreements 10 and 11 that explained the responsibility of the Authority to meet its housing need where possible and the shared responsibility of the district LPAs to meet any of the Authority's unmet housing need.

A Member asked whether there was an equivalent document for Suffolk LPAs. The PPO responded that there was no direct equivalent document and that statements of common ground between Suffolk LPAs were agreed between the LPAs. A letter from East Suffolk Council stating similar to agreements 10 and 11 of the NSPF is included within the Duty to Cooperate Statement produced for this Local Plan.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Andrée Gee

**It was resolved unanimously to recommend that the Broads Authority endorse the updated Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework.**

### **13. Local Plan – Regulation 19 consultation**

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) presented the report which detailed an amended Local Infrastructure Study as evidence for the Local Plan, contained the Publication version of the Local Plan ready for consultation, the supporting consultation material (Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment) and the proposed consultation approach.

#### **Local Infrastructure Study**

The Local Infrastructure Study had been updated to reflect relevant changes made since the previous update in February 2024 which included the December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Authority's amended housing numbers and additional information regarding water supply provided by local water companies. These changes had been highlighted in the Local Infrastructure Study in Appendix 1 of the report.

Harry Blathwayt proposed, seconded by Tim Jickells

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse the updated Local Infrastructure Study as evidence for the Local Plan.**

#### **Local Plan for the Broads Regulation 19 version for consultation**

The PPO reminded Members that the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan had been previously reviewed by the Planning Committee on the 8 November 2024. The Local Plan was subsequently delayed by the publication of a revised NPPF in December 2024. Since then, the Local Plan had been updated to reflect the NPPF's revised calculation for assessing local housing need using housing stock data rather than population projection data. This amended calculation had tripled the Authority's housing need although this need was part of the need for the six constituent districts and not additional to that need.

Section 3.1 of the report summarised the changes applied to the Regulation 19 version since November 2024 which included new policies for safety by the water (PUBDM42A) and extensions (PUBDM52A), the inclusion of a development boundary at Filby and revised flood risk data. These changes were marked in the draft Regulation version of the Local Plan in Appendix 2 of the report. Members had also been invited in May to provide feedback on an earlier draft of the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan and subsequent changes to the draft document had been highlighted in blue. These changes included updates to future proof the Local Plan based on the Reforming Site Thresholds consultation (Appendix 3 of the report for item 14 Consultation responses) that proposed a new medium development site threshold and a corresponding revised definition for the major development threshold; improved referencing to the marine environment and further considerations of the environmental impact of treated timber.

Since the report was issued the PPO had applied further changes to the Regulation 19 version document that would be presented to the Broads Authority on 25 July 2025 as follows:

- A clarification had been added to the introduction confirming that once adopted this version of the Local Plan would replace the previous version adopted in 2019.
- The inclusion of a key to the abbreviations used in Section 11.
- Due to the length of time a site at Cobholm Island has been used for caravans, it was now immune to planning enforcement and would therefore count towards meeting the need set out in the Local Plan. Following advice from the consultancy firm responsible for the Gypsy and Traveller need assessment and colleagues at Norfolk County Council who have worked with the family who live on this site, it was agreed to reduce the five year need for the Broads part of Great Yarmouth from 12 to 10 pitches and to reduce the equivalent future need from five to four pitches.

The PPO clarified that accommodation need, in the context of the Local Planning system, referred to the projected additional accommodation required over and above the existing provision.

In response to a question the PPO confirmed that the technical decision to make a specific site at Cobholm Island lawful due to the passage of time did not impact the wider site. The Cobholm Island site was within Flood Zone 3 and was not a suitable location for a permitted site. The Head of Planning reminded Members of the investigation work previously carried out at this location that enabled an earlier revision to the Great Yarmouth Gypsy and Traveller need assessment as reported at the last meeting.

The PPO confirmed that the Governance Team had verified the hyperlinks within the document and subsequent corrections had been applied to version of the Regulation 19 document to be presented to the Broads Authority.

The Habitats Regulation Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, supporting documents to the Local Plan, were available in Appendices 3 and 4 respectively of the report.

The PPO explained the consultation approach detailed in section 6 of the report stressing the extended consultation period to cater for the consultation coinciding with school holidays, the drop-in sessions outside working hours and proposed efforts to engage with young people.

The PPO confirmed that the resulting consultation comments would be collated, reviewed and responded to. Any proposed changes would be listed in a schedule and included in the Local Plan submission to the Planning Inspectorate. As indicated in the Local Development Scheme, the intention was to bring the result of the consultation on the Local Plan and seek authority to submit the Local Plan for examination to Planning Committee on 7 November 2025 and Broads Authority on 28 November 2025.

To mitigate any delay that precluded endorsement and approval for the submission via the Planning Committee and Broads Authority, the recommendation included a scenario where the submission would be delegated. The PPO indicated that the delegation stated in the report was incorrect and differed to the recommendation in the equivalent report for the Broads Authority meeting on 25 July 2025. The corrected recommendation was to the

delegate the Local Plan submission to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair of the Broads Authority and the Chair of the Planning Committee.

Andrée Gee proposed, seconded by James Reeder

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse the following and recommend to the Broads Authority to do the same:**

- **The Local Plan for the Broads, Habitats Regulations Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal for consultation**
- **The consultation approach**
- **Any minor changes or amendments be delegated to the Head of Planning and Director of Delivery**
- **The fallback position, if required, for submitting the Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate to be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair of the Broads Authority and the Chair of the Planning Committee.**

The Chair thanked the Planning Team for their efforts to produce the Local Plan for the Broads and its supporting documentation.

## 14. Consultation Responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented the draft responses to the following consultations documented in Appendix 1 of the report:

- Defra consultation on Biodiversity Net Gain for nationally significant infrastructure projects
- Defra consultation on improving the implementation of Biodiversity Net Gain for minor, medium and brownfield development
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) technical consultation on reform of planning committees.

Appendix 2 of the report detailed consultation responses previously submitted. Appendix 3 of the report detailed a MHCLG consultation on reforming site thresholds which, on reading it, no response was proposed. The PPO proposed to discuss each section of the report in turn and welcomed members' feedback on the draft responses.

**Defra consultation on Biodiversity Net Gain for nationally significant infrastructure projects**  
The government was seeking views on the implementation of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs). These types of projects were not determined by Local Planning Authorities like the Broads Authority, however the proposal was to allocate some stages of BNG to Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) including the Broads Authority. The response sought clarifications on the scope of the proposal, on who pays the LPA's costs associated with the proposal and the mechanism for challenging BNG proposals on NSIPs.

### Defra consultation on improving the implementation of Biodiversity Net Gain for minor, medium and brownfield development

This consultation sought to address some of the issues with BNG since it was mandated in February 2024. The consultation included options around extending exemptions, simplifying the small sites metric, improving access to the off-site market and addressing specific challenges for brownfield developments and their associated open mosaic habitats. A proposal was to exempt all minor development from BNG and the response reflected concerns of the accumulative effect these exemptions would have on the Broads.

### Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government technical consultation on reform of planning committees

The Head of Planning explained that the (MHCLG) consultation sought feedback on proposed actions to reform planning committees: the introduction of a national scheme of delegation, specifications for the size and composition of committees and the introduction of mandatory training for all planning committee members. The government had heeded previous consultation feedback and agreed to exempt National Park Authorities from the proposals concerning a national scheme of delegation and the size and composition of committees. On the remaining proposal, mandatory training for planning committee members, the response agreed with the proposed national training scheme, suggested the need for further specialist training by LPAs and included an assumption on how this LPA training would be funded.

Harry Blathwayt proposed, seconded by James Harvey

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse the nature of the proposed responses to the Defra consultation on Biodiversity Net Gain for nationally significant infrastructure projects, the Defra consultation on improving the implementation of Biodiversity Net Gain for minor, medium and brownfield development and the MHCLG technical consultation on reform of planning committees.**

The PPO confirmed that three of the completed consultation responses in Appendix 2 of the report had been shared with Members via email prior to submission: MHCLG consultation on speeding up build out, Filby Neighbourhood Plan review 2024 and Broadland and South Norfolk district-wide Design Codes. A fourth completed consultation, MHCLG Implementing measures to improve Build Out transparency, was of a technical nature and had been responded to by the PPO.

The remaining Appendix 2 consultation was a call for evidence requested by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero on solar on car parks and electric vehicle charging. The PPO had engaged the Authority's Carbon Reduction Project Manager in the production of this consultation response.

The final consultation, in Appendix 3, was requested by the MHCLG on reforming site thresholds. The main changes proposed were to bring a medium category into the site thresholds for development. No response was proposed.

## 15. Notes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 13 June 2025

The Committee noted the minutes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 13 June 2025. The Chair thanked the Heritage and Design Team for their work organising the tour of the listed bridges on the River Wensum, Norwich.

The Chair indicated that the next HARG meeting would be held online on Friday 3 October 2025.

## 16. Appeals to the Secretary of State

The Committee received a schedule of appeals to the Secretary of State since the last meeting. The Development Manager highlighted that one appeal decision had been received which was a dismissal of the appeal regarding the replacement quay heading at Riversdale House, Barton Turf. The Head of Planning added that the Planning Inspector's decision supported the Authority's policies regarding "securing high quality design" and "expecting development to protect, preserve or enhance the significance and setting of heritage assets and the elements that contribute to the Broads' distinctive character".

## 17. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 16 May to 3 July 2025 and any Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

## 18. Other items of business

There were no other items of business.

## 19. Date of next meeting

Since the meeting, it had been agreed to cancel the meeting scheduled for 15 August 2025.

The next meeting would be on **Friday 12 September 2025** at the National Centre for Writing, Dragon Hall, 115-123 King Street, Norwich, NR1 1QE, commencing at 10:00am.

The meeting ended at 12:43pm.

Signed by

Chair

# Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 18 July 2025

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Andrée Gee	7.2	East Suffolk Councillor - other registerable interest.