

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 04 March 2022

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	3
6.	Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order	3
7.	Applications for planning permission	3
	(1) BA/2021/0145/FUL – Ludham Stores, Johnson Street	3
	(2) BA/2021/0490/FUL – former Bridge Hotel site, Potter Heigham	7
8.	Enforcement update	10
9.	Heritage – Bungay Conservation Area – Conservation Area Appraisal adoption	11
10.	Filby, Rollesby and Winterton-on-Sea Neighbourhood Plans – adoption	11
11.	Lound with Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Neighbourhood Plan – proceeding to referendum	12
12.	Bungay Neighbourhood Plan – Reg 16 – agreeing to consult	12
13.	Issue and Options bitesize pieces	12
14.	Consultation responses	12
15.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	13
16.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	13
17.	Date of next meeting	13
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 04 March 2022	14

Present

Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro – in the Chair, Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Bill Dickson, Andrée Gee, Gail Harris, Paul Hayden (items 1-7), Tim Jickells, James Knight, Vic Thomson and Fran Whymark

In attendance

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer (items 10-14), Kate Knights– Historic Environment Manager (item 9), Cheryl Peel – Senior Planning Officer, Cally Smith – Head of Planning and Sara Utting – Senior Governance Officer

Steven Bell (solicitor) of Birketts attended for items 1-8

Members of the public in attendance who spoke

Jac Wright (objector), Mr Gratton (agent) and Adam Varley (Ward Member) for item 7.1
Mr Mackmin (applicant) and Mr Hale-Sutton (agent) for item 7.2

1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Nigel Brennan, Leslie Mogford and Michael Scott.

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. She added that the law permitted any person to film, record, photograph or use social media in order 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 4 February 2022 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

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.

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/2021/0145/FUL – Ludham Stores, Johnson Street

Development of café and creation of holiday lets

Applicant: Mr N Guyton

The Senior Planning Officer (SPO) provided a detailed presentation on the application for the proposed demolition of the existing Ludham Stores and Wayfarers café for the erection of a replacement building and extension to accommodate a new café and store, alongside three proposed holiday lets to the rear at Johnson Street in Ludham. She advised that, in response to a concern raised by the occupant of the neighbouring property, the applicant had confirmed they would replace the fence between Willow Fen and the site, as part of the landscaping scheme.

In assessing the application, the SPO addressed the key issues of: the principle of development; design and landscape; neighbouring and future occupant amenity; accessibility to the site and flood risk associated with the proposed development. Other issues were also considered, including sewerage capacity and effect upon existing services.

In response to a question concerning the proposed screening of the new holiday accommodation building as seen from the river, the SPO advised that visualisations were included within the Design and Access Statement, but this was not something normally included within the committee report. Some planting along this elevation was proposed and so it would not appear as a blank façade, over time.

A member questioned the age of the building to be demolished and whether it had any architectural merit. The SPO responded that the Historic Environment Manager had not made a request in this case for any records of the building to be made.

Jac Wright provided a statement objecting to the application, commenting that she had lived adjoining the site for 9 years and strongly opposed the proposal. She appreciated that the

café and shop needed updating but the plan as a whole was completely out of character with Ludham. She considered the holiday accommodation building to be ugly and imposing, and would dominate the view for miles around both by road and river. There were no trees left on site to soften appearance, as a number had recently been removed. The building was brash, modern and imposing, too close to the dyke and too high. The dyke and its wildlife were of great importance and must be protected. There had already been significant damage in this area. She remained unconvinced there was a need for more holiday lets in this area particularly as people would be returning to overseas holidays and so, in a few years, it would be changed to residential. She did feel that a lot of her concerns could be answered by the proposed conditions, but there remained a lot of unanswered questions, all of which could have an adverse effect on surrounding area. She had concerns regarding the access road to both her property and Mill Croft, particularly as this was not included in the landscaping plan. The car parking area was currently an unsightly mess; the fence belonged to the applicant and he had dumped surface soil against it, causing it to fall down and become dilapidated. However, this had been mentioned by the officer. She concluded that the mess and noise of building works would be a great concern and she felt that, at the very least, the business should fence off their land from neighbouring properties before works commenced.

Mr Gratton provided a statement in support of the application, commenting that the proposals would enhance and protect the future of this incredible location for years to come. The proposals were for a high quality, modernised structure, in an extremely popular tourist location due to its proximity to St Benets Abbey. The design had been amended to overcome previous objections and they had sought to address the concerns regarding lack of information on viability and flood risk. The existing premises was showing its age and a thorough report by a specialist structural engineer had demonstrated that the building would be structurally unsafe in the next couple of years. At present, the works to restore this building were simply unviable and a redevelopment of this site would provide high quality and long-standing facilities as well as of a design more in keeping with what was expected in the Broads. The viability report demonstrated that the holiday lets were required in order to justify and support the redevelopment of this site along with the continued growth of the businesses. The increase of tourism in this area would increase visitors to the area and further afield than Ludham. The design not only enhanced the site's existing values but broader views to the river and across the Broads. Working closely with the Historic Environment Manager, they had a pioneering design which reflected the architectural vernacular along the river, using traditional materials and built upon strong local connections which the businesses had developed over a long period of time. He concluded that the site was well-suited for redevelopment given the condition of the existing building and the need to improve and enhance the existing business asset to ensure continued success at this location.

Mr Varley provided a statement expressing his concerns on the application and thanking the SPO her work on the report and with the Parish Council and residents on the application. He commented that he was not against development at this site and the applicant had clearly worked with the Planning Officer, which was evidenced by the use of materials appropriate to the local vernacular etc, especially when compared with the previous application. This was an

ambitious application which showed how this area could be transformed. However, he had concerns on the overall integration of these buildings into the local area, believing there was very little evidence of mitigation measures to resolve this matter. He would wish to see the landscape plans agreed prior to the application being approved, including mitigation and softening measures. He questioned how the application could be compliant with Policy DM13 when the relevant details were lacking, referring to the comments of the Landscape Officer. He also referred to Policy SP12 and his concerns that the application did not fully take into account accessibility, commenting that the site was outside of Ludham and there was a lack of safe or suitable footpaths from the centre of Ludham. The A1062 was described as a cycle route linking Hoveton and Wroxham railway stations and Horning, Ludham and Potter Heigham but he considered this to be unjust as it was a busy main road used by much larger vehicles. Therefore, there was no infrastructure to ensure safe walking or cycling from Horning to Ludham Bridge and improvements were needed to the cycle network, which were not included as part of this application and so the application should be subject to a Section 106 Agreement to help address the accessibility issues on the A1062. He concluded that the application had merits and the addition of holiday accommodation would sustain and make this venture thrive, encouraging more tourism to Ludham. However, the application needed more detailing to finely balance the impact on the local area.

In response to a member question on whether the access to adjacent properties would be safeguarded, the SPO advised that the right of access for both Willow Fen and Mill Croft would be retained.

A member questioned the agent why the accommodation was so tall and he responded that the Flood Risk Assessment required a certain height above sea level, based on a worst case flood risk scenario. The first floor (ground level) was at the lowest level it could be to comply, so with a worst case scenario flood, the water would lap approximately 20cm below the height of the finished floor level. The building was two full storeys but showed as a storey and a half.

Taking on board a comment made by the Ward Member, a member asked if transport links for cycling and walking could be improved, as part of a Section 106 Agreement. The Head of Planning responded that no objection had been received from the Highway Authority. In addition, for off-site improvements, the Local Planning Authority would need to be satisfied they were required in order to make the development acceptable. As there was no objection from the Highway Authority or any comment about the need to improve access via non-car modes to this site, it would be difficult to justify for non-car modes of transport, plus there were other routes between this site and the main village of Ludham via Hall Common Road and Staithe Road.

In moving on to the debate, members expressed differing views on the design but there was a general acceptance that the application would retain and improve an important riverside facility and the holiday accommodation was necessary to ensure the development was viable. Concern was expressed at the lack of detail on the landscape proposals to which the SPO responded that the agent was aware of the comments of the Landscape Officer and had tried

to address their concerns. However, until there was certainty that the proposal would be approved, they were reluctant to provide more detail (and incur additional costs). The agent added that the responses from the Landscape Officer and the Historic Environment Manager had proven difficult to resolve, as they both wanted different things which were sometimes at odds. The design had been strongly led by the Historic Environment Manager and it had been very difficult to address their requirements. Regarding the loss of trees, he stated that these had been removed by the Environment Agency and their removal was not within the applicant's control or at their request.

Addressing the comments and concerns raised, the Head of Planning confirmed that the issue of the access to Willow Fen and Mill Croft had been addressed earlier with the applicant's commitment to retain that access, together with the issue of the fence which would likely be resolved through the landscape plan. In terms of the holiday lets, she advised that the restrictions could be strengthened with an additional condition to restrict the duration of occupation and frequency of return to protect the accommodation from becoming permanent residential. Regarding the design and appearance, it was a question of acceptability, taking into consideration its setting within the local context, and not about personal preferences. The officer view was that it was acceptable in terms of scale and the materials reflected the local vernacular, and it satisfied the requirements of the Historic Environment Manager. In respect of the landscaping scheme, officers acknowledged the reasons given by the applicant and why he wished for an assurance of consent before preparing a detailed landscape plan. The proposed conditions did include a proposed landscaping scheme, and this could cover retention of planting, size of new planting to ensure appropriate screening at an early stage etc but this could also look at bio-diversity improvement etc. if members considered this necessary. Furthermore, the condition could be amended to ensure the scheme was approved prior to commencement of development. Officers would word the conditions accordingly to reflect what members required, but if members wanted more certainty around the landscaping scheme, the application could be deferred until the next meeting at which officers would provide a more detailed landscaping scheme.

In conclusion, it was considered that the proposal would provide an element of enabling development for the retention of the existing shop and café services and, on balance, the impact on the landscape would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape, subject to additional landscaping. Members also took into consideration the fact that the application was supported by a Flood Risk Assessment and measures had been introduced to the design, plus the proposal passed the Sequential and Exceptions Tests as required by the NPPF, in that there were wider sustainability benefits to the proposal which outweighed any harm. Overall, the proposal was considered to be acceptable, subject to appropriate conditions including a strengthening of the holiday occupancy condition and a pre-commencement landscaping scheme.

Paul Hayden moved, seconded by Tim Jickells and

It was resolved by 9 votes for and 2 against to approve subject to the following conditions:

- Time limit
- In accordance with amended plans
- Submissions of surface water management strategy
- Notwithstanding the Landscape Plan, a revised Landscape Plan will be submitted and agreed prior to commencement of development
- Notwithstanding signage shown on the drawings, this permission does not grant advertisement consent and a separate application shall be made in that regard
- Notwithstanding the details on the drawings, samples of materials shall be submitted
- Occupation of holiday units – no permanent residential or sole address of occupant
- Restrictions on duration of occupation and return period, plus records to be kept
- Shop and café hours 0800-1800 hrs Mon to Sat and 0900-1600 Sun & Bank Holidays
- Highways – parking layout
- Biodiversity enhancements (bat and bird boxes)
- Environmental protection condition relating to noise
- Water efficiency 110L/head per day

The Committee adjourned at 11am and reconvened at 11.10am.

(2) BA/2021/0490/FUL – former Bridge Hotel site, Potter Heigham

12 x holiday units, restaurant and car park

Applicant: Mr Nicholas Mackmin

The Senior Planning Officer (SPO) provided a detailed presentation on the application for the erection of eight one-bedroom and four two-bedroom flats for holiday use with restaurant and covered carpark at ground level on the site of the former Bridge Hotel in Potter Heigham. A similar application had been refused by the committee in June 2021 on the grounds of: flood risk; insufficient information regarding the impact on the historic environment and a lack of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. This new application sought to overcome these issues.

In assessing the application, the SPO addressed the key issues of: the principle of development; flood risk; design of the new buildings and the impacts on the historic environment, trees, biodiversity, amenity and highways.

In response to a member's request for clarity on the precise area which fell within the flood plain (i.e. flood zone 3b and not 3a) and whether this included the concrete base of the former hotel, the SPO advised that the area was flood zone 3 but the existing buildings were considered to be 3a as their presence already hindered the flow of water. In 3a it was possible to have overnight residential accommodation subject to the Sequential and Exceptions Tests

being met. As there were no structures on the application site, it was considered to be 3b and there was a fundamental objection to overnight residential accommodation in flood zone 3b as it was considered more vulnerable. In terms of what was on the site previously, the Head of Planning advised that 30 years had passed since the hotel had been present on this site and things had moved on considerably since then, such as the introduction of flood mapping and the application must be assessed against the current policy. If the hotel had remained, then the site would be classed as 3a. However, the concrete base remained which would not prevent the site holding water in the event of a flood and so the EA had classified the application site as 3b. Therefore, some development could be allowed in areas of the whole site but the hardstanding was included in flood zone 3b. It was worth noting that the EA areas of designation were not specific to sites but identified zones of flood risk within which sites sat.

Comments were made about the intention of the policy (POT1), as well as the meaning of the wording “former Bridge Hotel site” and the Head of Planning accepted that perhaps the naming of that part of the policy could be clearer. However, she reminded members this was the adopted policy against which the application should be considered, having been through two rounds of consultation and then examination by an Inspector to form part of the adopted development plan (for the last three years) based on the evidence at that time. The appropriate time to review the policy would be as part of the review of the Local Plan later that year and not at this meeting without having any of the evidence or supporting documentation available to take into consideration. She cautioned against speculating against what it might or might not have been intended by the policy three years ago.

In response to a question on what was the difference between the previously refused scheme and the current application, the SPO advised that a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment, landscape scheme and revised Heritage Statement had been submitted. However, the application site was still in flood zone 3b where the only suitable development would be “water compatible” (which excluded overnight accommodation) and where the application passed the exceptions test. She referred to the EA matrix (on screen) which identified the different permitted uses under each of the flood zones. “Water compatible” related to boat yards, water based recreation, amenity space, nature conservation, outdoor sports and recreation.

A number of comments were made regarding the potential for compensation, insurance liability and the grounds for a Judicial Review, should the application be approved, and the Solicitor reminded the committee that it should determine the application in accordance with the development plan unless there were material considerations to do otherwise, and when it was at the appropriate point in the meeting.

A member asked for the officer to quantify the flood risk and also indicate the likely timescale for notice of a flood event (eg 1 hour, 24 hours etc). The SPO stated that she was unable to answer the question but the applicant stated that it was a 1 in 100 year risk and the water level would be up to 11 feet, which would take the whole of Norfolk, Suffolk and the Thames Valley into a 3b area. His Flood Risk Assessment categorised this site as 3a, not 3b.

Mr Mackmin provided a statement in support of the application, commenting that the Flood Risk Assessment showed this site as a brownfield site and in flood zone 3a not 3b. The new building would be across the concrete footprint of the old hotel and so in 3a. This area near to the bridge was in dire need of investment and the application was in full keeping with the character and heritage of the Broads, using traditional materials. Planning permission had been granted in 1998 for redevelopment of the former hotel but this was a different scheme, on a smaller footprint and further back from the river than the old hotel. He had worked with both the Broads Authority and Environment Agency since March 2019, so a total of three years with four different schemes proposed to fully meet the pre-application advice. Planning officers had been very supportive until one week before the last committee in June 2021. He stated that POT1 specifically stated accommodation would be allowed on this site which was a full brownfield site for full redevelopment and leisure activities on the river. Looking at the EA predictions, all of Norfolk, Suffolk and the Thames valley would be in flood zone 3b and no planning would ever be approved. This scheme would not increase flooding as it would be built on pilings and the flood risk would not increase off-site as a result. The scheme would bring much needed investment to the Potter Heigham area.

At the Chairman's discretion, an extension of time in public speaking was granted to enable Mr Hale-Sutton to address the committee. He quoted from an email received from the SPO dated 24 November 2020, highlighting those comments which he considered expressed support for the application in terms of compliance with policy POT1.

In response to questioning from a member on how long they envisaged the building to be in existence, i.e. longer than 100 years, the applicant said yes it would.

A member asked the SPO to confirm whether the applicant was correct in stating the application site was within flood zone 3a or if it had been determined as 3b by the Environment Agency. To assist members' understanding, the SPO read out the response of the EA which concluded that it was within 3b of the functional flood plain, where there was a 1 in 20 year probability of flooding and the application should be refused.

In moving on to the debate, members discussed at length the flood zone designation by the EA and whether or not they agreed with it. A comment was also made about whether the site could be classed as brownfield or greenfield but it was acknowledged this was irrelevant; the issue was the site being in flood zone 3b. There was general consensus that the site was currently an eyesore and in need of development but it was not up to the Local Planning Authority to re-designate sites and caution was expressed at going against the advice of the EA. Members were also mindful that a hotel had existed previously on the application site but this was some 30 years ago and more than 100 years ago when it was first built, and new legislation and regulations in terms of flood risk had been enacted since then.

In conclusion, members noted that the proposal was for the erection of holiday accommodation in an area at a high level of flood risk which was contrary to both national and local policies. In addition, the submitted Heritage Statement was still considered to be insufficient, and this, together with the lack of information and the use of non-native plants in

landscaping scheme did not enable a full assessment of the impact on the historic environment, landscaping and existing vegetation.

Bill Dickson moved, seconded by Andrée Gee and

It was resolved by 8 votes for and 3 against to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- The application seeks permission for “more vulnerable” development in an area demonstrated to be Flood Zone 3b (the functional floodplain) which is not considered to be in accordance with Policy DM5 of the Local Plan for the Broads or the NPPF and NPPG guidance.
- Due to there being insufficient information about the impact of the proposed development on the historic environment, in particular on Potter Heigham Bridge, both a scheduled monument and a Grade II* Listed Building, the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 189, 193 and 194 and is contrary to Policy DM11 of the Local Plan for the Broads.
- The application includes the loss of significant trees and fails to include a suitable landscape scheme with native replacement planting included, contrary to Policies DM16, DM43 and POT1 of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Paul Hayden left the meeting.

8. Enforcement update

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

Land at the Beauchamp Arms PH: compliance period was now in effect. There was evidence of a further caravan being brought on site and possibly other work underway. Officers would be contacting the landowner.

Blackgate Farm, Cobholm: period for compliance had now ended. Officers would be visiting the site next week to check units were empty. Information from the local authority Council Tax department indicated that the units were still being occupied.

Land to east of North End, Thorpe next Haddiscoe: report to be presented at next meeting on whether to close the case or pursue further action for full compliance.

Land east of Brograve Mill, Waxham: officers were continuing to chase the outstanding appeal decision.

Land adj to car park at Swan Hotel, Horning: since the serving of the Temporary Stop Notices, officers had re-visited the site and noted that the contractors had ceased work; subsequently the unauthorised lights had been removed. Officers had been advised that the lights had been installed by the public house for safety reasons for their staff. In response to a question, the

HoP advised that the operators of the public house were in discussions with officers for alternative forms of lighting which would be acceptable, eg motion sensors, low lighting etc.

9. Heritage – Bungay Conservation Area – Conservation Area Appraisal adoption

The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) introduced the report informing members of the appraisal for the Bungay Conservation Area and Management Plan, carried out by East Suffolk Council. The Authority had a statutory duty to consider whether Conservation Areas, wholly or partly within its area, were worthy of designation and to publish up to date appraisals and management proposals, where appropriate in conjunction with neighbouring authorities.

It was considered that the assessment and document had been completed to a high standard and its adoption by the Broads Authority for those areas within its remit would ensure that the Local Planning Authority, building owners and others with an interest in the built environment could make use of this resource when developing proposals within the Conservation Area or assessing planning applications.

In response to a question on unlisted buildings which contributed to the Conservation Area and the existence of a Local List, the HEM advised that there was not a consistent approach for unlisted buildings as this varied between local authorities. East Suffolk Council, along with Broadland and South Norfolk District Councils, did not have a formal Local List but Norwich City Council did, as did the Broads Authority (for areas which it took responsibility for the Conservation Area). For example, in the case of Belaugh, the Authority had formally adopted buildings not listed as “locally listed” but which contributed locally to the character of the Conservation Area. Other authorities considered them as non-designated heritage assets or buildings which contributed to the character of the area. This inconsistency was an issue identified by the Government who had announced a pilot project last year, in which the Authority had applied to be part of, involving 20 local authorities looking at their local listing practices with the aim of achieving a consistent approach.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt and

It was resolved unanimously to adopt the Bungay Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan.

10. Filby, Rollesby and Winterton-on-Sea Neighbourhood Plans – adoption

The Planning Policy Officer introduced the report on the adoption of three Neighbourhood Plans: Filby, Rollesby and Winterton-on-Sea. She reported at the meeting that the referendum for each had been passed, with more than 50% of those voting being in favour of the plans.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Andrée Gee and

It was resolved unanimously to recommend to the Broads Authority that the Filby, Rollesby and Winterton Neighbourhood Plans be adopted.

11. Lound with Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Neighbourhood Plan – proceeding to referendum

The Planning Policy Officer introduced the report, which sought approval for the Lound with Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton Neighbourhood Plan proceeding to referendum. The Plan had been subject to an independent examination and endorsed, with some changes, for referendum.

Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt and

It was resolved unanimously to support the Examiner’s report and support the Lound with Ashby Herringfleet and Somerleyton Neighbourhood Plan proceeding to referendum.

12. Bungay Neighbourhood Plan – Reg 16 – agreeing to consult

The Planning Policy Officer introduced the report on endorsing the Bungay Neighbourhood Plan, REG16 version, for consultation. It was noted that the Broads Authority was a key stakeholder and able to comment on the Plan, and a report would be presented at a future meeting of the committee with suggested comments.

Gail Harris proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt and

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the Bungay Neighbourhood Plan, REG16 version, for consultation.

13. Issue and Options bitesize pieces

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which provided members with the Settlement Study as part of the emerging draft Issues and Options stage of the Local Plan, and inviting members’ thoughts and comments. The PPO explained that the Settlement Study was a piece of evidence base, which would inform the Development Boundary Topic Paper and the Development Boundary section of the Issues and Options. The parishes had been consulted on the document and any comments received had been taken on board.

The Committee’s general support was noted.

14. Consultation responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which provided a proposed response to consultations recently received from: Water Resources East (WRE) on its Emerging Water Resources Plan for Eastern England; North Norfolk District Council on its Local Plan and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport on “New Build Developments: Delivering Gigabit-Capable Connections”.

A member questioned if there was compatibility in terms of household water usage with the WRE plan with the Authority’s Local Plan or if this wasn’t an issue. The PPO responded that one of the questions proposed in the response was related to what WRE wanted Local Plans to do in terms of usage. As members were aware, the east was in a water stressed area so if

WRE urged us to restrict water usage, we would take this on board, be it 80 or 100 litres/h/day, to inform the water section of the new Local Plan, based on the available evidence. Also that Members will recall a section of the Issues and Options document will talk about water usage.

In response to a question on the mechanism for when the Authority's comments on the Local Plan were not accepted, particularly if there was a real difference of opinion, the PPO advised that she could provide feedback to members, similar to how she reported the result of the Examiner's report in terms of the Authority's comments for Neighbourhood Plans. She clarified that the comments on North Norfolk's Local Plan did not relate to the soundness of the plan but were more observational and supported by evidence in the NPPF.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Andrée Gee and

It was resolved unanimously to note the report and endorse the nature of the proposed responses.

15. Appeals to the Secretary of State

The Committee received a schedule of appeals to the Secretary of State since the last meeting.

16. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 24 January to 18 February 2022 and any Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

17. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on Friday 1 April 2022 at 10.00am.

The meeting ended at 12:53pm

Signed by

Chair

Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 04 March 2022

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Andrée Gee	9, 11 & 12	East Suffolk Councillor - other registerable interest.
Harry Blathwayt	7.1	Resident of Ludham. Non-disclosable non-pecuniary interest.
	7.2	Ward Member – other registerable interest.