

Planning Committee

12 September 2025

Agenda item number 12

Consultation responses

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

This report informs the Committee of the officer's proposed response to planning policy consultations received recently and invites members' comments and guidance.

Recommendation

To note the report and endorse the nature of the proposed response.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Appendix 1 shows selected planning policy consultation documents received by the Authority since the last Planning Committee meeting, together with the officer's proposed response.
- 1.2. The Committee's comments, guidance and endorsement are invited.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 29 August 2025

Appendix 1 – [Planning Policy consultations received](#)

Appendix 2 – [Planning Policy consultations submitted](#)

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Strumpshaw Parish Council

Document: Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan [Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan Review | Broadland and South Norfolk](#)

Due date: 26 September 2025

Status: Regulation 16

Proposed level: Planning Committee endorsed

Notes

The Strumpshaw Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led document for guiding the future development of the parish. It is about the use and development of land over a 20-year period, 2025-2045. Once the Neighbourhood Plan is 'made', it will form part of the development plan for Broadland District Council, the Broads Authority and Norfolk County Council, informing their determination of planning applications. Strumpshaw Parish Council will also use the Neighbourhood Plan to respond to planning applications.

Proposed response

Summary of response

The Neighbourhood Plan is welcomed. There are some detailed comments, but also objections.

Neighbourhood Plan

- Images need alt text
- 1.7 and 1.8 – I have not seen people named in a NP document before and not sure it is needed.
- Para 2.3, 2.7 – the Broads is not a National Park. The area is the Broads Authority Executive Area. When you describe the Broads, it has a status equivalent to a National Park and is a member of the National Park family.
- 2.9 – there is a random reference to 'and Broads Authority' which does not seem to fit.
- 2.9 – you need to mention the Broads Landscape Character Assessment.
- 2.19 – the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan was adopted in 2025.
- Social objective 2 refers to streetlights twice: 2. Resist the introduction of streetlights (including streetlighting) in order to maintain dark skies.
- Para 5.32 states that there are 12 LBs in the parish but earlier in the document (para 2.13) the document states that there are 8. As they are listed in the later paragraph I assume this is the correct figure so para 2.13 needs to be amended.
- 5.5 – does this information need to be made up to date as we are in August 2025 now?

- **Objection** – lack of clarity about whether this Neighbourhood Plan is amending the settlement boundary or not. We have raised this issue before. Figure 21 says in the key ‘revised settlement boundary’ and then in the title of the figure ‘Note, the settlement boundary has been extended to incorporate the Mill Meadow development and Strumpshaw Community Hall site on Mill Road, Strumpshaw’ – so has this Neighbourhood Plan amended the settlement boundary that was in the adopted GNLP? If it has, then where is this set out in policy? If it has now, then why is this phrasing used?
- Policy STR1 – what is the definition of ‘easy walking distance’? Isn’t it the case that dwellings need to be in the development boundary? If so, depending on the definition of ‘easy walking distance’, what if a dwelling is in the settlement boundary but not within ‘easy walking distance’? If the policy and Local Plan policies direct dwellings to settlement boundaries, is the criterion relating to ‘easy walking distance’ needed?
- Footnote 9 – says ‘infull’ – think that should be ‘infill’.
- Para 5.28 is not written well. ‘The NPPF, recognises that new employment or economic development should be sensitive to its surroundings and ~~does~~ not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area, the amenity of local residents and valued environmental assets. This is particularly important to Strumpshaw. ~~There is concern that~~ any new business development should not have an adverse impact on the quiet, natural and built environment of Strumpshaw’.
- Throughout – whilst reference to the current Neighbourhood Plan and also explanation of changes is useful for this consultation document, considering this new Plan will replace the 2014 Plan, in the final version of the new Plan, references to the 2014 plan could mostly be deleted. This would make the new Plan a bit more succinct.
- Page 42 – list of NDHAs – Buckenham Railway Station has group value with other stations on the line; Buckenham Ferry Drainage Mill has group value with other drainage mills in the Broads
- STR3 does not say anything about location criteria. Should the new businesses be in the settlement boundary of Strumpshaw for example? Or does the Plan defer to the Local Plans for location criteria?
- 5.36 – I am not sure what the last part of this para means. It says ‘This list is therefore not exhaustive’. But that is the list of assets that are identified in the Plan. Are you saying that more could be added in the future or more assets could be discovered through development proposals. The last para may need a bit more explanation.
- 6.5 – think in first sentence you mean ‘Broads Landscape Character Assessment’.
- Supporting text to STR5 needs to mention our policy and guide on biodiversity enhancement.
- STR5, last criterion, f. This does not seem to be a form of biodiversity enhancement. It is different. I wonder if it needs to not be listed as it is but perhaps moved to above

‘enhancing biodiversity’. Also, there is nothing really in the supporting text about a buffer. What kind of width should this buffer be? What sites does it relate to?

- STR6 – I am not sure what an applicant is meant to do to meet the requirements of this policy. I am not sure what a Development Management Officer, determining an application, is meant to do to help implement this policy. What are the actions that are needed to be taken?
- Figure 40 – I think the large yellow area in the middle of the map indicated the views from A1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Should this not be displayed as triangles like the other views?
- STR10 identifies areas that have surface water flooding at the moment. These come from suggestions from the public – has evidence been provided for these issues? Also, in the policy, there is no instruction related to the list of areas with surface water issues. What is an applicant or Development Management Officer to do if a scheme is near to or at one of these sites? Or should the list actually be a community action – in that the Parish Council will lobby or liaise with the landowner, or relevant authority to get the area of surface water improved? For example, if on a highway, it can be reported to Norfolk County Council via the online forms.
- The supporting text to STR10 does not talk about water recycling centre issues or SuDS.
- 7.1 and 7.2 – are there peak hour, weekday services serving these bus stops?
- STR11 – what are the risks that need to be reduced? Are there specific issues which development could address? Can development be expected to sort out current issue, or is it more that schemes are encouraged to address the specific issues in the Parish?
- **Objection STR12** – The Neighbourhood Plan Group, Broadland Council and Broads Authority had conversations prior to this consultation stage on some issues that a Member of the Broads Authority raised regarding the HRA and SEA screening. As a result of those conversations, it was agreed to amend STR12 so that it includes a requirement that any new access to open countryside avoids environmentally sensitive N2K sites. This amendment has not been made. The policy needs to be amended in line with this comment.
- 8.10, 8.11 and the policy itself – STR13 is highlighted in yellow.
- **Objection STR13** – part three that refers to proposals for change of use. The criteria there are different to Local Plan for the Broads policy DM44. DM44 says ‘Applications for the change of use or redevelopment of an existing community, visitor or recreational facility or service that meets a local need or contributes to the network of facilities through the Broads will only be permitted where: a) It can be proven that there is no community need for the service/facility; or b) It can be demonstrated through a viability assessment that the current use is economically unviable’. The Inspector changed the draft policy, which included a criterion along the lines of providing another facility elsewhere. See para 97 of [Broads-Authority-Local-Plan-Report-April-2019.pdf](#). We made this point at the last consultation stage.

- **Objection STR13** – final part of policy ‘proposals for the following...’. Suggest ‘subject to other policies in the Development Plan’ is added. This is because the design and location of such community infrastructure are important considerations and as worded, it is a sweeping statement implying that anything goes. We made this point at the last consultation stage.
- STR14 – typo – ‘Appropriate proposals to increased biodiversity value of the site’.
- 10.5 – this is not quite correct. The NPPF at para 34 says Local Plans should be *reviewed* every 5 years and then updated as necessary.

Design Guide

- Page 31, reference to 110I/p/d – not just the Local Plan for the Broads, but also the Greater Norwich Local Plan.
- As the Character Area Appraisal for Area 10 is combined with that for Area 1 at the beginning of this section, should there be a note between the Assessment of Area 9 and Area 11 that Area 10 is on page 39?

North Norfolk District Council

Document: Local Plan – Main Modifications consultation www.north-norfolk.gov.uk/localplanconsultation

Due date: 17 September 2025

Status: Main Modifications consultation

Proposed level: Planning Committee endorsed.

Notes

As part of the ongoing North Norfolk Local Plan Examination, the Council is inviting representations on the **Main Modifications** and **Policy Map Changes** that the Inspector considers will be required to make the North Norfolk Local Plan sound.

Proposed response

- E6 1 d i and E6 3 b i. Given that the Broads is a protected landscape and part of the family of national parks, it is not clear why the Broads is not included in the same sentence as the National Landscape. If you are relying on ENV1, then why mention the National Landscape; that is referred to in ENV1? The best thing, to meet the LUR Act 2024 provisions to further the purposes of the Broads, is to mention the Broads when the National Landscape is mentioned. This is a very simple amendment and it is not clear why this has not been done – we made this comment as part of the MIQs - [eh014-b-broads-authority-response-to-miqs-matter-8.pdf](#).
- E7 – given that the Broads is a protected landscape and part of the family of national parks, and that there is a presumption against touring caravan and camping sites not to be in the National Landscape, presumably because of concerns about the impact on the landscape (although there is no mention about this in the supporting text), it is not clear why the impact on the Broads is not mentioned in this policy. The best thing, in order to meet the LUR Act 2024 provisions to further the purposes of the Broads, is to mention the Broads in this policy. This is a very simple amendment and it is not clear why this has not been done – we made this comment as part of the MIQs - [eh014-b-broads-authority-response-to-miqs-matter-8.pdf](#).
- E8 – given that the Broads is a protected landscape and part of the family of national parks, and that there is a presumption against new tourist attractions and extensions not to be in the National Landscape, presumably because of concerns about the impact on the landscape (although there is no mention about this in the supporting text), it is not clear why the impact on the Broads is not mentioned in this policy. The best thing, in order to meet the LUR Act 2024 provisions to further the purposes of the Broads, is to mention the Broads in this policy. This is a very simple amendment and it is not clear why this has not been done – we made this comment as part of the MIQs - [eh014-b-broads-authority-response-to-miqs-matter-8.pdf](#).

- ENV1 – MM17 – footnote 79 in tracked change document and footnote 1 in MM document - if you refer to the special qualities of the National Landscape, you need to refer to the special qualities of the Broads. You can find the list here in the Broads Plan: [Introduction](#) or successor document. They are also listed in the Local Plan.
- ENV1 – MM17 – footnote 80 in tracked change document and footnote 2 in MM document – as this refers to major development in terms of protected landscape, and then refers to the footnote in the NPPF, then it should also refer to the fact that the Local Plan for the Broads has a policy relating to Major Development – DM1.
- Wind power section and maps (figure 5) – between the time the Local Plan was submitted to now, the requirements to identify land suitable for wind power is now no longer needed. That change is outside of the NPPF – it was put into place through a policy statement: [Policy statement on onshore wind - GOV.UK](#). This says the changes would take place immediately, from 8 July 2024. As such, does this Local Plan need to identify areas suitable for wind? This is in the context of our response to the MIQs [eh015-e-broads-authority-response-to-miqs-matter-9.pdf](#) where we query the appropriateness of identifying land right up to the Broads Authority Executive Area to be suitable for wind. Figure 5 now shows the Broads, but still says it is suitable for turbines up to the boundary; 1) why have our comments not been considered? 2) given the amended LUR Act 2024 which says that the purposes of the Broads should be furthered, how is enabling turbines up to the boundary of a protected landscape furthering this? 3) fundamentally, it seems identifying areas suitable for wind is no longer a requirement, so why do it? In terms of number 3, considering turbines on a case by case basis would enable impacts on the Broads to be considered. Identifying the entire area up to the boundary of the Broads means just that – NNDC thinks that turbines on the boundary of the Broads is acceptable.
- HC6 – There are no proposed changes to HC6. This policy covers telecommunications apparatus and infrastructure. These could have an impact on the Broads and its setting. This policy needs to refer to the impact on the Broads and its setting of some schemes. Given the amended LUR Act 2024 which says that the purposes of the Broads should be furthered, the absence of consideration of the impact of telecommunications infrastructure and apparatus on the Broads is not furthering the purposes. We raised this comment in the MIQs: [eh016-e-broads-authority-response-to-miqs-matter-10.pdf](#).

Appendix 2 – Planning Policy consultations submitted

South Norfolk District Council

Document: [South Norfolk District Council - Landscape Susceptibility in relation to Energy Generation, Storage and Transmission - SPD](#)

Due date: 01 September 2025

Status: Draft SPD

Proposed level: For information – proposed response was sent to Members by email for comment.

Notes

In 2024, South Norfolk Council commissioned The Landscape Partnership to undertake a study to assess the sensitivities and capacities of these various landscapes of South Norfolk district to accommodate energy-related NSIP and non-NSIP projects.

The aim of the study is to provide guidance for those seeking to identify suitable sites for the location of energy generation, storage and transmission projects. It will also be used to inform the council's responses to such proposals in the context of national and local planning policies and the need to reasonably minimise any adverse effects on the landscape and communities of South Norfolk.

The SPD plans positively for energy-related infrastructure but there is also high regard for the intrinsic beauty of the district and to safeguard it for generations to come. The study is written as an evidence document for protecting South Norfolk landscapes from inappropriate development that would harm that intrinsic beauty and character.

Proposed response

Summary of response

In general, the SPD does not refer to the Broads Authority or the Broads as much as it needs to. We have met with the Council to discuss our concerns, and they asked us to draft a section for inclusion. Please find below some detailed comments. Towards the end, we include some proposed text that relates to the impact of schemes on the Broads.

Detailed comments on proposed SPD

1.2.1 – needs to reference the Broads Landscape Character Assessment and the Broads Landscape Sensitivity Study – scheme proposals may be near to the Broads.

1.5.2 - this section sets out the study area and states 'excluding areas within the Norwich City administrative boundary'. Should it add 'and excludes the area within the Broads Authority Executive Area where the Broads Authority act as the Local Planning Authority', to make clear why the area to the east is excluded?

1.6.1 – landscape sensitivity study or landscape susceptibility study?

2.2 - need to refer to NPPF 2024 para 189. This refers to the setting of the Broads.

3.4.1 – there is no reference to the Broads Landscape Character Assessment or the Broads Landscape Sensitivity Study.

Throughout - lighting associated with proposals needs to be addressed in this section.

Justifying lighting in the first place and then if needed, well designed, on when needed.

4.5.8 – bullet point re agricultural land – could the land be used for grazing perhaps? If that is the case, is that worth mentioning? You mention that in 4.5.7...

4.5.8 – maybe not a landscape effect per se, but there could be potential for biodiversity enhancements. You could mention that.

In terms of solar, we have this criterion in our emerging policy, in case you wanted to mention it as well: Proposals within 300 m of a water body must demonstrate that they will not reflect polarised light that may attract aquatic insects or deceive them into laying eggs on the solar panels.

4.5.11 (and in other places) – what is ‘time depth’?

4.5.11 – is there an issue with shadow from planting, reducing the efficiency of some of the solar panels?

4.6.8 – a handy bullet on lighting, but that needs to be included in solar section as well. But it should begin with only install lighting that is justified.

Have you thought about adding images to show, for example, what an AD plant or battery storage facility look like?

4.7.6 – what does ‘a single scale of battery storage’ mean?

4.7.10 - cumulative effectiveness or cumulative effects?

4.8.30 says - ‘There is a presumption that underground cable routes are more appropriate than overhead powerlines within protected or more sensitive landscapes. The effect of overhead powerlines within the setting of the ~~National Park~~ **Broads** will also have to be carefully considered to avoid effects on the designated landscape’.

4.9.1 – you might want to mention that there have been some occasions where overhead lines have been put underground to benefit the landscape.

4.9.2 – what does a ‘single scale’ mean?

4.9.3 – are the 6 trenches temporary?

4.9.10 – are these projects underground? Maybe say that if that is the case.

4.10.11 – the description of a typical substation says it includes lighting. Yet this section says lighting is not considered, save for emergency attendance. So, do these schemes have lighting associated with them or not?

Throughout – it is not clear what is meant when it says: No external lighting, save that for emergency attendance

4.10.14 part 4 – a random number 4 in there

Comment on the Appendices

Heritage Designations map – should this show dots for listed buildings. Although it would only be indicative of their positions at this scale, it would give some idea of where they are concentrated?

Appendices 3 and 4 should be checked to ensure that they adequately have regard to the section 245 duty of the LUR Act¹. For example it is noted in some sections there are statements such as, ‘Views from the Waveney valley into the Broads increases its sensitivity’. Such statements should perhaps be amended to state ‘Intervisibility between this area and the Broads increases its sensitivity’, as it is views in both directions that need to be assessed.

General comments

This is the first round of engagement. Will you consult again on this SPD?

Currently no reference to the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, which should be included for things like planning planting to screen sites.

For the cables and pylons – I feel there should be a reference that the s.245 duty (Section 245 of the LUR Act amends the National Parks Act, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, and the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act, relating to protected landscapes) means that when a preferred route is being considered, the need to direct them away from the Broads should be considered – for instance the often floated alternative route for Norwich-Tilbury requires a Norwich – Coast connection that has to go through either the Broads or the Suffolk Coast National Landscape.

You should consider adding recognition that just because you can't see a proposal, it doesn't mean there isn't a landscape impact. We include this following text in the emerging Local Plan (see below in italics). A recent appeal decision highlights this – the appeal is not about energy infrastructure, but its findings about landscape character are relevant to all development types: Planning Inspectorate APP/E9505/W/25/3359289: Manor Gates Garden, NR29 5AB. Para 6 says ‘However, even if it were completely unseen from public land, the boat cover would detract from the special qualities of the Ludham CA and the Broads’.

In simple terms Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is a tool to identify the effects of change resulting from a specific development, and in the case of full LVIA's (EIA development) to assess the significance of the effects. The [Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment](#) (GLVIA3), clearly distinguishes between effects on landscape as a resource in its

¹ The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act, which received Royal Assent on 26 October 2023, included section 245 which amended Section 17A of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 1988 – placing a duty on certain bodies to further the purposes of the Broads.

own right, and effects on specific views and general visual amenity experienced by people. There are some common principles set out within chapter 3 of the guidelines that relates to both landscape and visual considerations. However, the guidelines have separate chapters (chapter 5 for Landscape effects, and chapter 6 for visual effects) to deal with the explanation of how these should be dealt with within the assessment. Furthermore, it is common and good practice for an assessment to provide the landscape baseline and visual baseline separately.

Landscape effects concern changes to landscape as a resource, the landscape fabric itself, landscape character, individual components of the landscape and the aesthetic and perceptual qualities.

Visual effects concern how people will be affected by changes in views and or visual amenity.

The Landscape Institute have recently published [Technical Guidance Note \(LITGN-2024-01\)](#) in relation to GLIVA3. One of the issues raised within the TGN provides a good reference point as an example of distinguishing between landscape and visual matters. In this instance in relation to mitigation, the statement item 4(3) of the document reads “Care should be taken to ensure landscape and visual mitigation is not confused. For example, it does not necessarily follow that screening a development from view would reduce its landscape effects, such as those on landscape character.”

Proposed new section

SPDs need to reflect amendments to the Broads Act. The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act, which received Royal Assent on 26 October 2023, amended Section 17A of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 1988. Section 17A creates a general duty of public bodies and this was amended to replace ‘shall have regard to’ with ‘must seek to further’ the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Broads, promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Broads by the public; and protecting the interests of navigation.

I would suggest there needs to be a section in the SPD that talks about this – how the impact on the Broads and its setting will be addressed through this SPD, similar to the section on the setting of Norwich. Particularly given that section 3.7.1 says ‘When assessing the susceptibility of a landscape to change, consideration must be given to the effects of the development as perceived in neighbouring LCAs (and potentially further afield), not just the LCA in which the development is proposed’.

Please see a proposed section below. We have made the section read like the section on Norwich. The second part (Considerations for the LSS) may or may not be needed or you may wish to amend it. We are happy to discuss this with you.

Landscape setting of the Broads

The Broads is an internationally important wetland and designated protected landscape of the highest order, with a status equivalent to that of a National Park and one of Europe’s finest and most important wetlands for nature conservation.

Part of the Broads lies within South Norfolk District area. The Levelling Up and Regeneration Act, which received Royal Assent on 26 October 2023, amended Section 17A of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 1988. Section 17A creates a general duty of public bodies and this was amended to replace 'shall have regard to' with 'must seek to further' the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Broads, promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Broads by the public; and protecting the interests of navigation.

Paragraph 189 of the 2024 NPPF says: 'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads⁶⁶. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas'. Footnote 66 says 'English National Parks and the Broads: UK Government Vision and Circular 2010 provides further guidance and information about their statutory purposes, management and other matters'.

South Norfolk District Council is not the Local Planning Authority for the Broads, and this SPD does not apply to the Broads. But there could be potential for some renewable energy schemes of the type discussed in this SPD within the South Norfolk administrative area to have an impact on the Broads and its setting.

When considering schemes that are near to or next to the Broads Authority Executive Area, the impact on the setting of the Broads and on the Broads will be a key consideration. South Norfolk District Council will consult and engage with the Broads Authority at an early stage in the consideration of such proposals.

The special landscape qualities of the Broads are set out in the Broads Authority's [Landscape Character Assessment](#) and the Broads' [Landscape Sensitivity Study](#) assesses the impact of renewable infrastructure on the Broads and these documents will also be used when assessing relevant planning applications.

Schemes near to the Broads will also be assessed against the special qualities of the Broads. These are listed in the Broads Plan, which is the Management Plan for the Broads. The current version can be found here: [Broads Plan 2022-27](#).

Considerations for the LSS

The following paragraphs provide commentary on how the various development scenarios identified at Section 4 would accord with the purposes of the Broads Authority.

Solar PV

Although Solar PV preserves the existing soils and vegetation cover beneath the panels it nonetheless represents a form of development and could result in the loss of land for other purposes more appropriate in this area (e.g. grazing). While it might be possible to screen

Solar PV to mitigate harm on the setting of the Broads, it is likely that there would still be some detrimental impact .

AD plants

AD plants include large structures and clamps, and these could have a substantial negative effect on the setting of the Broads. Whilst it may be possible to screen battery storage with planting, it is likely to still appear incongruous in the landscape

Battery Storage

Battery Storage represents a utilitarian form of development which could have a substantial negative effect on the setting of the Broads. Whilst it may be possible to screen battery storage with planting, it is likely to still appear incongruous in the landscape.

Overhead power lines

Overhead powerlines increase the sense of human influence and are a form of development. The scale of the structures and the topography of the Broads means that they are likely to have an adverse impact on the setting of the Broads.

Underground cable routes

Underground cable routes would have no perceived visual effect on the Broads.

Substations

A substation could have a substantial negative effect on the setting of the Broads. While it may be possible to screen a substation with planting it is likely to still appear incongruous in the landscape.

Department for Energy Security and Net Zero

Document: [Electricity network infrastructure: consents, land access and rights - consultation document](#)

Due date: 02 September 2025

Status: Proposed changes to Permitted Development Rights and consenting regimes.

Proposed level: For information.

Notes

The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero is consulting on changes to land access, rights and consents processes for electricity network infrastructure to support the transition to Net Zero and secure Clean Power by 2030. This follows an August-September 2022 Call for Evidence, which sought views and suggestions for improving current land access, rights and consents processes.

Proposed response

Summary of response

In general, the consultation document, PD rights and consenting regimes do not refer to the Broads or Broads Authority.

Comments

Q32. Do you agree that the proposed permitted development threshold of 45 cubic metres should be permitted in National Parks, National Landscapes or Heritage Coasts?

Agree/Disagree/Unsure

Disagree.

Q33. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

Firstly, there is an error with the current PD right ([The Town and Country Planning \(General Permitted Development\) \(England\) Order 2015](#)). Under 'development not permitted', this fails to refer to the Broads – see part B.1 (b) (i) – this seems purposefully to not refer to article 2(3) land but includes National Parks and AONBs (now National Landscapes) but omits the Broads which has a status equivalent to a National Park. It is not clear if other parts of this consultation seek to amend this particular part of the GPD Order 2015, as the consultation fails to cross refer to the GPD Order 2015 or include specific wording. But this section must be amended to include the Broads, especially considering the Levelling up and Regeneration Act 2024 amending the duty on certain bodies to 'seek to further' the duties of the Broads Authority.

Similarly, B.2 (d) (ii) must be changed to include the Broads Authority – it currently refers to National Parks, but not the Broads Authority.

It seems that this proposed change would be to B(d) – relating to a building solely for the protection of plant or machinery. But then it could also relate to B(a) (which amongst other things, refers to ‘stations’) – the consultation is not clear. The consultation talks of sub stations (see images at Figure 2), but the PD rights do not refer to the term ‘sub stations’ – so it is presumed that the buildings could be transforming or switching stations or chambers. Again, it is not clear.

The consultation document cross refers to the Scottish PD rights. If you go here [Annex B: Development by Statutory Undertakers - Planning circular 2/2024: non-domestic permitted development rights - gov.scot](#) and scroll down to electricity sub stations you would find some more detail. The Scottish PD right does not apply ‘in cases where electricity substation infrastructure is housed in a chamber with an overall capacity exceeding 29 cubic metres and would be located within 5 metres of a dwelling or within certain areas designated for their heritage or scenic value. These areas include National Scenic Areas, National Parks, conservation areas, historic gardens or designed landscapes, historic battlefields, World Heritage Sites, the curtilage of a listed building and the site of a scheduled monument’. So, the 45 cubic metres PD right in Scotland does not apply to National Parks. Yet this is not referred to in the consultation document – this is mis-leading. Instead, the consultation document wants to allow the 45 cubic metres PD right in National Parks, and presumably the Broads (but the Broads are not referred to).

If the Government are using Scotland’s approach as a template, then the PD right needs to not apply in National Parks and the Broads and National Landscapes. Furthermore, again, if Scotland’s approach is to be followed, then the 3m height and 5m of a dwelling may need to be included. Also, it needs to be clear that if more than one up to 45 cubic metre station or adding a second will need planning permission.

Q34. Do you agree that, for substations of 30-45 cubic metres in capacity, prior approval of the local planning authority on the siting and appearance of the substation should be required where the installation of the substation takes place in National Parks, National Landscapes or Heritage Coasts?

Agree, if the Government pursues allowing 45 cubic metres in protected landscapes, despite the comments made previously.

Q35. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

If the Government pursues allowing the 45 cubic metres PD right in National Parks and the Broads, then yes, we agree with this.

Q38. Do you agree that this exemption should also apply in National Parks and National Landscapes, so that LPA notification would no longer be required?

Q39. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

We have no objections to the change. Please note that the Broads Authority is a Local Planning Authority. But also note that the Broads Authority does not seem to be referred to in [The Overhead Lines \(Exemption\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2009](#) or related documents,

unlike National Parks and National Landscapes – the Broads Authority has the same status as a National Park.

Q46. Do you agree that upgrades from 6.6 kV to 11 kV should also be allowed in National Parks and National Landscapes without needing to notify the LPA? Agree/Disagree/Unsure

Q47. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

We have no objections to the change. Please note that the Broads Authority is a Local Planning Authority. But also note that the Broads Authority does not seem to be referred to in [The Overhead Lines \(Exemption\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 2009](#) or related documents, unlike National Parks and National Landscapes – the Broads Authority has the same status as a National Park.

48 Do you agree that overhead lines with a nominal voltage of up to 33 kV and up to four consumers should be exempt from requiring section 37 consent?

Disagree

49 Please explain the reasons for your answer.

We note that this is different to the other similar proposed changes in that this refers to the installation as well as maintenance of overhead electric lines. The other proposed changes in this section refer to changes to lines that are already in place. We also note there is not a question or section referring to protected landscapes in this part of the consultation. This one has the potential to have significant visual impact in protected landscapes – adding additional lines from a single pole without any consent in highly rural areas. The consultation document does not include any indication why these couldn't be undergrounded first in protected landscapes. We proposed that in protected landscapes, the Section 37 consent is required still. That being said, throughout this document, and it seems in documents relating to the Section 37 consent, only National Parks and National Landscapes are included. The Broads needs to be included as the Broads has the same status as a National Park.

Q50. Do you agree that the need to seek approval from LPAs should be removed for the replacement of open wire conductors with bundled conductors in National Parks and National Landscapes? Agree/Disagree/Unsure

Q51. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

Q52. Do you agree with the alternative proposal to amend regulation 3(1)(e) so that minor works such as the alteration or conductor type or replacement of existing poles are exempt from the need to seek approval from LPAs in National Parks and National Landscapes, subject to meeting the required conditions? Agree/Disagree/Unsure

Q53. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

In longer distance views, an unbundled wire construction is less visible. Therefore, the visual impact is not necessarily improved with a bundled wire. As such, proposals in protected

landscapes, including the Broads, need to consult with the relevant authorities – National Park Authorities and the Broads Authority.

Q54. Do you agree with the proposal to increase the allowable distance for permanent diversions to 60m for small supports and 100m for larger supports? Agree/Disagree/Unsure

Disagree

Q55. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

- *This proposal is different to other ones – it is about a new piece of infrastructure being introduced to an area.*
- *There is no mention of the impact on irreplaceable habitats. These are listed in the NPPF and could be affected by the construction of the parallel line. In the Broads, these are quite abundant.*
- *The consultation document (see para 3, page 28) refers to protected landscapes as designated areas. The consultation document seems to be breaking apart the designated areas for the permanent diversion of a line – saying that National Parks and National Landscapes are not designated areas. There is no clear reason given for this significant change.*
- *Also, it could be that lines outside the protected landscapes could be moved to within protected landscapes without due consideration.*
- *It is also not clear how the removal of the old line is secured and enforced.*
- *The consultation document does not include any indication why these diverted lines couldn't be undergrounded first in protected landscapes.*
- *We proposed that in protected landscapes, the Section 37 consent is required still and this needs to also include the Broads Authority.*

Q58. Do you agree that overhead line projects using 132 kV wooden poles should no longer be classified as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and therefore should not be consented under the NSIP regime? Agree/Disagree/Unsure

Q59. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

Q60. Do you agree that the distance threshold for classifying overhead line projects as NSIPs should be increased from 2km to 10km, based on the length of a single continuous line? Agree/Disagree/Unsure

Q61. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

Q62. If you believe that alternative thresholds should apply to electricity network overhead line projects, please specify what these should be. Q63. Please explain the reasons for your answer.

The only comment we have is to ensure that LPAs are consulted through the section 37 process – we presume this will remain as there is no reference to removing this requirement.

We also support single continuous lines rather than numerous such lines.