

# Planning Committee

## Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2023

### 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/2022/0436/HOUSEH Hoveton - New mooring with boathouse, extend decking area and replace quayheading	3
	(2) BA/2023/0099/FUL Horstead with Stanninghall - dredging lagoon	8
8.	Enforcement update	10
9.	Local Plan - Preferred Options (bitesize pieces)	10
10.	Consultation responses	13
	Developing Local Partnerships for Onshore Wind in England from the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero	13
	Carlton Colville Town Council – Neighbourhood Plan	13
11.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	14
12.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	14
13.	Date of next meeting	14
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 23 June 2023	15

## **Present**

Harry Blathwayt – in the Chair, Stephen Bolt, Bill Dickson, Tony Grayling, Tim Jickells

## **In attendance**

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer, Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Kate Knights– Historic Environment Manager, Harry Mach – Carbon Reduction Projects Manager, Cheryl Peel – Senior Planning Officer, Adrian Sewell – Rivers Engineer, Cally Smith – Head of Planning and Sara Utting – Senior Governance Officer

## **Members of the public in attendance who spoke**

Brian Wilkins representing the applicant and Alan Irvine on behalf of Susan Cadamy (objector) both for item 7(1) – application BA/2022/0436/HOUSEH Hoveton - New mooring with boathouse, extend decking area and replace quayheading.

## **1. Apologies and welcome**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**Apologies** were received from Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro 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 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 26 May 2023 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 acknowledged that two members had not been re-appointed to the Authority since the local elections: Nigel Brennan and Andrée Gee. The Chair thanked them for their

contributions to the Planning Committee. The Chair confirmed that, as there were more than 4 members present, the meeting was quorate.

**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 speak 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/2022/0436/HOUSEH Hoveton - New mooring with boathouse, extend decking area and replace quayheading**

**Proposal to construct new mooring with boathouse, extend existing decking area and replace quay heading**

**Applicant: Mr Paul Rayner**

The Senior Planning Officer (SPO) provided a detailed presentation of the application that would involve the creation of a new mooring with a boathouse, the like for like replacement of the quay heading and walkway and an extension to an existing area of decking.

The SPO indicated that the application was before the committee at the request of two local councillors who had raised material planning considerations.

The presentation included a location map, the site marked within a map of Hoveton, a detailed map of Bure Court showing the site and adjacent land owned by the applicant, a site map showing the proposed boathouse and extended decking, an aerial photograph of Bure Court including the private dyke to the East and properties opposite (Birchwood, Sunway & Bide-a-Wee), photographs of Hickling House, various photographs of the site showing the tree and shed, existing quayheading, the existing decking and the quayheading along the river front plus a diagram showing front, rear and side elevations of the boathouse.

The design of the boathouse had been revised over the course of the application and it was proposed to use black timber weatherboarding, timber shingles for the roof, to increase the roof overhang and to recess the roller shutter door to achieve a more traditional design. The boathouse dimensions would be 8.9m in length, 4.4m wide and with a height to the roof ridge of 4m.

In assessing the application, the SPO addressed the key issues of the principle of development, the design of the proposed development and the impacts on neighbouring amenity as well as the impact on the natural environment.

The proposal for a boatshed at a domestic property, the replacement of the quayheading and the decking extension were deemed beneficial to and in keeping with the area and the principle of development was considered acceptable.

In terms of design, the comments of the Historic Environment Manager had been taken onboard and the boathouse plans and materials had been revised accordingly. The modest extension to the decking area, using matching materials, would create a more usable area and was considered acceptable in terms of policy DM43 (Design) of the Local Plan for the Broads.

A number of objections had been raised from the owner of the property on the opposite side of the private dyke. There was a concern that the boathouse would not fit and so officers had re-visited the site and measured the location and confirmed the boathouse would fit.

Concern had been expressed about the boathouse creating a terracing effect by filling the space between Hickling House and the neighbouring property, Bure Court House. The height of the boathouse was less than both these structures and the width and length of the boathouse had been reduced as part of the revisions and there would therefore still be some visual separation between Hickling House and Bure Court House.

The SPO noted that Hoveton was a built-up area with properties quite close together and there was already an impact on amenity due to overlooking although the boathouse would not increase this impact in any way. The proposal was deemed acceptable in terms of Policy DM21 (Amenity) of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Concerns had been raised regarding navigating a boat into the boathouse and the agent had indicated a maximum boat size in response. This and some other concerns regarding navigating the private dyke were not material planning considerations. There was no adverse impact to the main navigation on the River Bure and the application was acceptable in this regard.

Other considerations included a peat survey; peat mitigation methods will be employed if necessary although limited peat was found in the excavation site. There were no issues regarding biodiversity and a tree will be removed from the southern end of the site and a replacement tree planted at the northern end of the site.

The SPO concluded that the recommendation was for approval subject to conditions detailed in section 8 of the report.

A member asked for clarification on a number of points:

- That the dyke concerned was not part of the navigation. The SPO confirmed that this was a private dyke and was not part of the main navigable channel.

- That the boathouse did not encroach onto the dyke. The SPO showed the site plan that indicated the boathouse was setback from the dyke and showed a splay between the dyke and boathouse.
- That this application did not confer any new mooring rights to those already in existence at this location. The SPO confirmed that there would be no change to mooring rights.
- That the right to a view was not a planning consideration. The SPO confirmed that this was not a material planning consideration.
- Confirm the extent of the decking extension. The SPO referred to the site plan that demonstrated the extension would square off the decking area so that the frontage was in line with the existing decking line nearest the dyke.

A member asked for clarification on the scale of the boathouse in relation to the neighbouring property. The SPO showed a picture of the planned location of the boathouse including the neighbouring property's boathouse and indicated that the eaves of the neighbouring boathouse were 4m high.

The member also asked whether the line of the replacement quayheading would be in front of the existing quayheading. The SPO confirmed that the quayheading would be replaced on a like for like basis and this included maintaining the existing line of the quayheading.

Alan Irvine read a prepared statement on behalf of Susan Cadamy objecting to the application. Ms Cadamy had lived opposite the application site at Birchwood for 23 years and had been involved in the Broads holiday industry for 40 years. She managed holiday lets, day boats and broads cruisers and was one of 4 medium-large businesses that operated on the dyke. She believed 19 properties along the dyke were holiday lets and there was a total of 35 day boats that used the dyke especially during the summer. The dyke also housed a public slipway that was operated by Landamores boatbuilders. The dyke was a busy stretch of water and its narrowest point, of 6m/20 feet, was where the entrance to the proposed boathouse would be.

Ms Cadamy was pleased the applicant had revised the plans that reduced the size of the boathouse. However, it remained a substantial structure with a height of 4m above the quayheading which itself would be raised by about 50cm above its existing level when replaced. The boathouse would fill an important gap between the applicant's house and the property next door. Most of the properties in this location had gaps between the buildings which established the character of the local area. Ms Cadamy believed losing important gaps and consequently reducing light and causing shadowing would be detrimental to the character of the area and as such would be contrary to local planning policies.

Ms Cadamy was concerned about safe navigation on the dyke. She believed that the plans submitted indicating the ability to turn a 6.75m boat within the existing dyke were not accurate and misrepresented the location of the quayheadings on either side of the dyke. An image was shown indicating clearly marked lines, denoting a survey of the existing

quayheadings, overlaid onto the applicant's site plan. According to the surveyed dimensions of the existing dyke a boat of 6.75m would not be able to turn at the proposed location of the boathouse. An image was shown indicating day boats moored on the quayheading opposite the applicant's property and a day boat passing along the dyke. Ms Cadamy had the right to moor boats all along her quayheading in the manner shown and, in this situation, it was impossible for anything larger than a small row boat or dingy to manoeuvre in the remaining channel. With a larger boat with a beam of 2.3m plus fenders moored opposite the proposed boathouse there would be a maximum 3.8m of channel in which to manoeuvre a 6.75m boat. Ms Cadamy believed that siting the boat house at the narrowest point of the dyke would lead to hazardous manoeuvring of boats which would be contrary to policy DM31 (Access to the Water) of the Local Plan.

If members were minded to approve this application, Ms Cadamy asked for the imposition of two conditions:

1. That the replacement quayheading followed the line of the existing quayheading to ensure the current width of the dyke was not reduced.
2. That the noisy quayheading work be timed to fall between 1 November and 28 February to avoid the holiday season that ran from the beginning of March to the end of October.

The Chair thanked Mr Irvine for a clear presentation.

A member indicated that the manoeuvring of a boat in and out of the boathouse was a transitory event and was not the same as mooring a boat on the dyke itself, and asked if Mr Irvine agreed with this statement.

Mr Irvine agreed and acknowledged that the boathouse would reduce the need for a boat to be moored on the dyke. He clarified that the objection was not with the boathouse per se but its location at the narrowest point of the dyke. Given that this was a busy dyke there was an increased risk of boats colliding. Mr Irvine appreciated that this wasn't a planning matter however the size of the boathouse limited the setback and thus the ability to manoeuvre at this point of the dyke. He believed that for this reason the boathouse was not fit for purpose and questioned whether members should knowingly approve it.

Brian Wilkins spoke on behalf of the applicant and summarised that there were three areas of concern: the intensity of development, the size of the boathouse and the navigation. Mr Wilkins believed that the intensity of development had been addressed by the SPO's presentation and related members' questions.

Mr Wilkins presented a series of photographs that showed the plan area of the boathouse roof marked out on the site along with the line of the walls of the structure. These demonstrated the clearance between the boathouse and the boundary with the neighbouring property, the clearance between the boathouse and the applicant's property and the setback of the boathouse from the quayheading. Mr Wilkins indicated that the entrance to the

boathouse would be turned in at 45° to the dyke itself providing additional space to manoeuvre and to aid boats accessing or leaving the structure.

In addressing the navigation issues, Mr Wilkins indicated that the site location was within a congested area where boats were accordingly operated with care, at low speed, as demonstrated by the 4mph speed limit imposed on the main river through Wroxham. The dyke accommodated approximately 30 properties, a mixture of residential & boat related businesses, which implicitly had the right to navigate the dyke. Neither the applicant nor the property opposite had the right to block navigation of the dyke at the narrowest point. Mr Wilkins had manoeuvred a 5.2m boat at the narrowest point with approximately a foot of clearance at each end (a photo was displayed showing a boat at approximately 90° to the quayheading with clearance between the stern and the quayheading). He was confident that the boathouse could be accessed at this point by a launch of approximately 6m in length.

In response to a member's question Mr Wilkins confirmed that there were no boats moored on the opposite quayheading when he manoeuvred the boat in the dyke.

A member asked whether the applicant had the right to moor at the quayheading where the boathouse was to be situated. Mr Irvine responded that the applicant did not have the right to moor at this point, as dictated by a covenant and that there was a provision for mooring further north along the applicant's quayheading. The Head of Planning explained that no covenant regarding the applicant's right to moor had been viewed as part of this application. The HoP indicated that as the dyke is a private dyke and thus private 'land', if there was a covenant this was a private matter between the landowner and other interested parties who may wish to challenge the landowner for blocking the dyke (and preventing them from exercising their right to navigate the dyke). As such, this was a civil matter and was not a planning consideration.

A member asked whether this application conveyed any change to the mooring rights relating to the quayheading. The HoP confirmed that this application would replace the quayheading but that this quayheading was not proposed to be used as a mooring and the new mooring was within the boathouse.

A member asked what increase in height would result from the replacement of the quayheading. Mr Wilkins responded that it was usual to raise a quayheading to reflect predicted changes in sea level. He believed the quayheading height would increase by 150mm or a height required to prevent over-topping at high tide. The SPO showed a photograph depicting the relative heights of the applicant's quayheading and that of the neighbouring property and explained that it was expected the quayheading would be raised to a similar height as that of Bure Court House.

A member asked whether it was possible to condition the time of construction for this application. The SPO explained that this type of condition was usual when large construction machinery was required on a large development. It would not be reasonable to restrict the timing for a general householder application where the associated work could be a self-build development or beholden to the availability of contractors. The HoP added that there was

nothing to prevent the applicant from agreeing a timed building schedule as a gesture of goodwill and officers would raise this with the applicant were members minded to approve the application. The HoP confirmed that the other condition requested by Ms Cadamy, that the existing quayheading line was to be maintained, was covered by condition ii of the report.

Members were supportive of the application noting the revised design and the like for like nature of the replacement quayheading. A member supported any encouragement offered to the applicant to time the work in a sympathetic fashion.

Members recognised the concerns associated with the application but agreed these were not planning considerations. A member believed the objections raised by local councillors had been acknowledged but believed they did not outweigh the planning officer's assessment and recommendation.

Tony Grayling proposed, seconded by Bill Dickson and

**It was resolved unanimously to approve the application subject to the following conditions:**

- i. Three-year timeframe for commencement**
- ii. In accordance with the approved plans and material details**
- iii. Material details of the boathouse to be agreed**
- iv. Ecology condition for the placement of a bird box**

## **(2) BA/2023/0099/FUL Horstead with Stanninghall - dredging lagoon**

**Temporary construction of lagoon structure to hold dredged river sediment for drying**

**Applicant: Mr Adrian Sewell - Broads Authority**

The Senior Planning Officer (SPO) provided a detailed presentation of the application that involved the creation of a temporary holding lagoon on arable land for the drying of sediment dredged from the nearby River Bure.

The SPO indicated that the application was before the committee as the applicant was the Broads Authority.

The presentation included a location map, a site map, an aerial photograph of the site with the lagoon marked, a diagram showing an overhead view of the external and partition bunds of the lagoon, a cross section of the bund detailing the depth of removed topsoil, a map showing the access route from Burntwood Lane to the site, a map showing the disposal site and various photographs of the site.

The site was located to the west of Wroxham in an area known as Little Switzerland, part of the wider Trafford Estate. The site itself was part of a larger agricultural field that was not overlooked and was not accessible by the public. The eastern boundary was just 50m from the River Bure and was screened from the river by woodland. The subject field was only accessible via private farm track.



The lagoon would be semi-circular in shape with a length of 170m and a maximum width of 120m, with the curve following the eastern field boundary. The lagoon would be split into 4 compartments to ensure the structural integrity of the bunds and aid filling the lagoon in a uniform fashion. The lagoon capacity would be 20,000m<sup>3</sup> of wet sediment, the result of dredging 9.5km of the River Bure between Coltishall and Wroxham. The machinery used to construct and eventually remove the bunds would remain on site for the duration of the works.

The dredged material would be transported by wherry to a point on the river close to the subject site and pumped to the lagoon through a 150mm diameter pipe laid on the surface of the riverbank and through the wet woodland between the river and the lagoon area.

Once the dredging work ceased the lagoon would be left for approximately a year and then the sediment would be spread on nearby farmland and the bunds spread back into the field. The recipient farmland was accessed from the same private farm track used to access the lagoon and there was no need to transport this material via public roads.

The works were proposed to take place over a two year period with construction and dredging scheduled for year 1 ending October 2024 and final spreading and restoration planned for April 2025.

The proposed development was considered acceptable for the following reasons:

- Dredging the upper Bure was a priority and would provide a navigation benefit by restoring the river depth to waterways specifications.
- The reuse of the dredged material on arable fields would improve soil structure and organic content.

Given the remoteness of the site, the absence of public access, the surrounding woodland, and considering the temporary nature of the works and the proposed restoration of the site to its existing condition, it was considered that there would be no unacceptable impacts on the wider landscape character and appearance.

This application replaced a previous application that was withdrawn; the previous site was very close to Wroxham which raised some amenity concerns with neighbours close by. This provoked a search for a different site away from residential properties and removing the amenity concerns. An odour management plan had been submitted although, given the lack of nearby residents, this mitigation was not expected to be required.

Subject to conditions to ensure adherence to mitigation and restoration of biodiversity the BA Ecologist had no objections. The proposal was considered acceptable with regards to Policy DM13 (Natural Environment) of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Norfolk County Council Highways had no objection to the use of the private farm track and, given that the construction machinery would remain on site for the duration of the works, it was not considered that this would impact the public highway.

The SPO indicated that condition iii as stated in section 8 of the report was incorrect and should read “Lagoon construction and commencement of filling with dredging material must be undertaken outside of breeding bird season” and concluded that the proposal was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The Rivers Engineer confirmed that sediment monitoring was included in the works schedule.

Members spoke in support of the application recognising the benefits to the navigation and local farmland, the close proximity of the lagoon location and the recipient farmland and were pleased to note that this site location avoided impacting nearby residents.

Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by Bill Dickson and

**It was resolved unanimously to approve the application subject to the following conditions:**

- i. Time limit**
- ii. In accordance with approved plans and supporting documents**
- iii. Lagoon construction and commencement of filling with dredging material must be undertaken outside of breeding bird season**
- iv. Works to be monitored by suitably qualified ecologist**
- v. Long grass/reed habitat to be kept short and visual checks for nesting birds**
- vi. No external lighting**

The Committee adjourned at 11:09 am and reconvened at 11:13 am.

## **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 at the Berney Arms:** Appeal submitted against Enforcement Notice, 25 May 2023.

## **9. Local Plan - Preferred Options (bitesize pieces)**

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) presented the report which detailed eight new or amended policy areas that were proposed to form part of the Preferred Options version of the Local Plan. The PPO proposed to discuss each section of the report in turn and welcomed members’ feedback.

**Vision, objectives and special qualities**

This section was integral to the Local Plan and reflected the equivalent statement made within the Broads Plan. The PPO highlighted the inclusion of comments received on this section during the Issues and Options consultation. There had been some subtle changes to the objectives as marked in the document.

### Open space section of the Local Plan

This section was based on evidence supplied by six District Councils and aimed to protect the areas identified. Great Yarmouth Borough Council had re-assessed their open spaces in the last couple of years and had identified new areas for inclusion. South Norfolk and Broadland District Councils had also supplied new open space sites. Updates to this section sought to clarify the content and highlight support for proposals that enhance the amenity and biodiversity of these areas.

The recent biodiversity workshop that members attended had highlighted how pressurised water resources were within this region. The PPO asked whether this policy should be updated to encourage the sustainable use of water in the maintenance of play pitches, for example by using stored rainwater, or avoiding the use of water completely by the use of artificial pitches. Members were supportive of the proposed update and the PPO confirmed that any further changes would be reviewed by members.

A member questioned how the requirement to enhance biodiversity (stated in 2d) could be supported by the provision of a football pitch for example. The PPO confirmed that the enhancements would be sought from the wider area surrounding the pitch. The PPO highlighted that 2d was not prescriptive by indicating the provision of biodiversity enhancements “in an appropriate way”.

### Heritage DM policies

The PPO confirmed that the Historic Environment Team had been consulted on the changes to this section. The Historic Environment Manager (HEM) indicated that the policy regarding demolition had been updated to better reflect equivalent policies from other Local Planning Authorities. The intention was to ensure that a legal agreement was secured, before a heritage asset within a Conservation Area was demolished, to ensure the replacement of the building and avoid a vacant plot.

A member asked whether the increasing threat of flooding and the potential impact on heritage assets had been considered. The HEM responded that this area would be included in a later iteration of the policy and would be guided by the output from the Broadland Futures Initiative. Historic England did provide guidance relating to one-off flood events. The Head of Planning added that this was a shared problem across the region and a policy response would also be informed the local Conservation Officers Group. The PPO asked members to keep officers informed of any changes to related policy that they may be party to.

The policy regarding the re-use of historic buildings had been tidied up to encourage the re-use of these assets where appropriate.

### DM17 Land Raising and DM18 Excavated Material

This policy had been updated to stress possible impact on the archaeology of a site and possible need for a topographical survey to demonstrate the different heights between adjacent areas.

The Head of Planning provided members with a brief summary of land raising and when it might be appropriate, the possible implications on flood risk and alternatives that avoided or reduced the resulting flood risk.

#### **DM49 Advertisements and signs**

This policy had been updated to stress the use of colours and materials for signs/advertisements compatible with the building and area, for illuminated signs/advertisements to comply with the relevant light pollution and dark skies policy and to include the cumulative effect of signs/advertisements within an area.

#### **Thorpe St Andrew**

The policy relating to Cary's Meadow had been updated to encourage the provision of cycle parking. The policies relating to Thorpe island, Griffin Lane and Bungalow Low Lane had been updated to ensure consideration for light pollution and to include references to the Design Guide.

#### **Drainage Mills**

The Historic Environment Manager explained that apart from clarifications to the wordings the main change to this policy was intended to enable, where appropriate, the re-use of mills and their ancillary buildings. The policy detailed the criteria for assessing whether alternative use of these structures was acceptable. In all cases the policy sought to preserve the heritage value of these structures for the future.

A member noted that criteria 5g made reference to ensuring there was "no disturbance to breeding or wintering birds" however omitted to include bats. The PPO agreed to correct this omission.

#### **Electric Vehicle Charging Points**

The PPO reminded members that when this topic was discussed at the Issues and Options stage it was agreed to not prescribe a standard for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points and to defer to Building Regulations on this matter. The feedback from the public consultation had been broadly in agreement with this stance.

Since then, the Carbon Reduction Projects Manager (CRPM) had highlighted the problem of extinguishing a fire within a lithium-ion battery. The CRPM explained that he had attended a presentation by a leading battery safety expert organised by the Norfolk EV Group about the risk of fire from lithium-ion batteries. This presentation had highlighted that once a lithium-ion battery had ignited there was little chance of extinguishing the fire. The most likely times for when a battery fire could occur was in the event of a crash or while the battery was charging, and this policy had been drafted to address the latter scenario.

Given the uncontrollable nature of a lithium-ion battery fire, careful consideration was needed when determining the location of a charging point. Areas for consideration included the impact of fire at the location of the charging point, the surrounding area/properties and any means of escape. Similar consideration would be required for the charging of electric bikes and scooters. The intention was not to deter the use of these electric devices and the

CRPM highlighted that the overwhelming majority of these devices would not have this issue but there was still a potential for a catastrophic failure and to plan accordingly.

There was a discussion about the need to promote sustainable travel to/from and within the Broads and the charging infrastructure required to support this. The CRPM highlighted the work the County Councils (as Highways Authorities) were undertaking to provide on street charging point infrastructure. These would not be rapid charging units and the CRPM explained that these 7 kW units were more appropriate in tourist spots and reflected the most likely use cases, for example people parking at a boat yard to hire a day boat. The CRPM expected some existing filling stations to be retrofitted with rapid charging points. The PPO added that local tourism providers would also react to increasing demand for EV charge points at holiday properties as people switched to EVs ahead of regulatory change preventing the sale of new petrol and diesel cars by 2030. The CRPM indicated that the Authority had already started to engage with local tourism providers in this regard.

The PPO thanked members for their feedback and reminded them that if they had any further comments then they could email them to her. The Chair thanked the PPO, HEM & CRPM for their contributions.

**Members' comments were noted.**

## 10. Consultation responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented the responses to two consultations:

### Developing Local Partnerships for Onshore Wind in England from the Department for Energy Security & Net Zero

This consultation sought feedback on the development of onshore wind generation and in particular the topics of community engagement in and community benefits from these developments.

The PPO indicated that the key response regarding community engagement related to the guidance on this matter and ensuring that it would clarify what was expected from the planning policy and planning application stages.

A member was keen to ensure that wind power had a role to play in powering pumping stations within the Broads Internal Drainage Board's (IDB's) network. The PPO would liaise with the IDB to better understand what role the Local Plan could play in their sustainability aspirations.

### Carlton Colville Town Council – Neighbourhood Plan

The PPO explained that as this Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was at the regulation 16 stage any stipulated amendments would have to be indicated as objections. As well as seeking some clarifications the response contained two objections:

- i. The NP indicated that Design policy should be applied to new developments and excluded property extensions; the PPO believed that design of an extension was very

important and to not promote the importance of design for all types of development was contrary to Local Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- ii. The NP had weakened the policy stance regarding biodiversity by stating that all developments should aim to protect habitats and species. The response had asked for the stance on biodiversity to be strengthened to be consistent with Local Plan for the Broads policies SP6 (Biodiversity) and DM13 (Natural Environment).

Members were supportive of these objections.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Stephen Bolt and

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse the nature of the proposed responses.**

## 11. Appeals to the Secretary of State

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

## 12. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 15 May 2023 to 9 June 2023 and any Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

## 13. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on Friday 21 July 2023 10.00am at Yare House, 62-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich.

The meeting ended at 12:02pm

Signed by

Chair

## Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 23 June 2023

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Harry Blathwayt on behalf of all members	7.2	Broads Authority was the applicant.