

# Planning Committee

## Minutes of the meeting held on 4 April 2025

### Contents

1.	Apologies and welcome	2
	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014	2
2.	Declarations of interest and introductions	2
3.	Minutes of last meeting	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
8.	Enforcement update	3
9.	Beccles Article 4 Direction revision	3
10.	Local Plan for the Broads - Call for Sites	4
11.	Consultation Responses	11
12.	Local Plan - Preparing the publication version	11
13.	Notes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 21 March 2025	13
14.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	13
15.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	13
16.	Other items of business	13
17.	Date of next meeting	13
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 4 April 2025	15

## **Present**

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

## **In attendance**

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer (items 10-12), Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Steve Kenny – Development Manager, Kate Knights– Heritage and Design Manager (item 9) and Ruth Sainsbury – Head of Planning

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

No members of the public in attendance.

## **1. Apologies and welcome**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Martyn Hooton, Leslie Mogford, Vic Thomson and Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro.

## **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 7 March 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **4. Matters of urgent business**

There were no items of urgent business

## **5. Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking**

No members of the public had registered to speak.

## 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

There were no applications for consideration.

## 8. Enforcement update

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

Holly Lodge, Church Loke, Coltishall (Unauthorised replacement windows in listed building)

The DM advised that, following the serving of the Listed Building Enforcement Notice, an appeal had been lodged and the Planning Inspectorate of England had subsequently provided an appeal start date.

James Harvey joined the meeting.

## 9. Beccles Article 4 Direction revision

The Heritage and Design Manager (HDM) introduced the report, which proposed revisions to the Authority's Beccles Article 4 Direction (A4D).

An A4D provided a mechanism for restricting permitted development rights on residential properties in the context of particular sites and/or areas and, in the context of a Conservation Area, could be used to restrict works that may otherwise be detrimental to the amenity of an area. The Authority's A4D dated from 1997 and covered the area of the Beccles Conservation Area located within the Broads Executive Area. East Suffolk Council (ESC) had an equivalent A4D associated with Beccles, which bordered the Broads Executive Area. The Authority and ESC had reviewed their respective A4Ds to ensure that:

- The classes of General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) were consistent with current guidance.
- That the restrictions were still relevant and appropriate.
- They conformed with the latest National Planning Policy Framework guidance that required an A4D be applied to the smallest geographical area possible.

The review of the A4Ds had included annotating maps of the Beccles Conservation Area (CA) to show the locations of listed buildings, properties deemed to contribute to the character of the CA and properties that possessed original windows, doors and other features such as chimney stacks. The analysis of the Authority's A4D area had revealed a concentration of these categorised properties to the north of Puddingmoor while to the south, near to Waveney Meadow, there were not as many buildings that were considered to contribute to the character of the area.

The Authority proposed to reduce the area covered by its A4D which would see the removal of the southern part of Puddingmoor from the Article 4. Areas of the A4D to the north and west that covered open space would also be removed (a map was presented illustrating the truncated A4D area).

The review of the restrictions associated with the A4D had highlighted further changes. The installation of satellite dishes no longer posed the same risk as when this A4D was introduced in 1997. Given the proliferation of alternative digital broadcasting technologies this restriction would be removed. Under the current guidelines the wording of the restrictions associated with painting the exterior of a residential dwelling meant that any painting would require permission. This restriction would be removed as it was felt that requiring householders to secure planning permission to paint their properties was too onerous.

The HDM presented photographs of various properties associated with the Beccles A4D including those with river frontages as these were also included in the A4D.

The HDM confirmed that in order to revise an A4D the existing version would be cancelled and a new A4D would be created. These A4Ds would be available for public consultation from 14 April 2025 in conjunction with the equivalent revised A4Ds produced by ESC. The consultation period would be six weeks after which the A4Ds would be presented to the Planning Committee, at the 18 July 2025 meeting, for confirmation (subject to consultation responses). The A4Ds would come into effect on 4 August 2025 and the existing A4D would be cancelled.

In response to questions the HDM confirmed that the cancellation of the existing A4D and the creation of a new A4D covered a contiguous period of time with no gaps, that commercial properties and listed buildings were both covered by their own discrete permitted development rights and an A4D excluded new residential developments.

A Member, upon noting that the A4D's painting restrictions had resulted in at least one planning permission, wondered whether there was any merit to maintaining this restriction to ensure that proposed colour schemes were consistent and appropriate to the area. The HDM explained that the classes within the GPDO, which an A4D must follow, were prescriptive and did not allow the stipulation of a painting colour scheme.

Members welcomed the revised A4D for the added protection it afforded to the character of the Beccles CA.

Andrée Gee proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse the making of an Article 4 Direction to cancel the existing Beccles Article 4 Direction and the making of an Article 4 Direction in a smaller area of Beccles.**

## 10. Local Plan for the Broads - Call for Sites

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented the sites put forward during the December 2024 call for sites. An assessment of each site was provided by

the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) Part 2 (Appendix 1 of the report). Whether these sites would be allocated in the Local Plan or not was described in Appendix 2 of the report, From HELAA to the Local Plan Part 2.

The PPO proposed to discuss each site within the HELAA providing a summary of each site, a location map, photographs of each site and a summary of each site's assessment.

#### **Land south of Marsh Road, Halvergate**

The initial submission had proposed 43 dwellings on land south of Marsh Road, Halvergate which would have increased the size of Halvergate by 50%. A subsequent submission proposed reducing the number of dwellings on the site to four. The site was an arable field enclosed by a hedge boundary with a number of existing properties opposite its northern boundary and adjacent to its western boundary. A number of comments had been received during the consultation of which some could be addressed by policy (as detailed in the Overcoming Constraints section of the assessment). There remained a number of significant areas that could not be addressed by policy.

Following the HELAA methodology both proposals were red rated for the lack of sustainable transport, highlighted by the Highways Authority objection, both were amber rated on access to local services and facilities with the 43 dwellings proposal receiving additional amber ratings for its impact on both landscape and townscape. In conclusion this site was not suitable for residential development and both the 43 dwellings and 4 dwellings would not be allocated in the Local Plan.

Members supported this assessment.

#### **Land north of Thrigby Road, Filby**

The proposal was for five dwellings on grade 1 agricultural land north of Thrigby Road, Filby used for horse grazing. The site was adjacent to a property that marked the existing south-west extent of both residential development in Filby and the proposed Filby development boundary. Thrigby Road ran along part of the site's southern boundary which was demarcated by a hedge with the remainder of this boundary formed by an access track, from Thrigby Road, leading to a property on the site's western boundary

The Highways Authority had objected to the site due to its lack of footway provision, the significant tree removal required to create access to the site and the lack of visibility when accessing the site. Other factors raised during the consultation included the erosion of the gap between Filby and Thrigby and increased pressure to develop the site opposite. The HELAA assessment resulted in red ratings for both the Access to site and Transport and Roads categories. The conclusion was that the site was not suitable for residential development and five dwellings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### **Land at Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad (residential moorings)**

The site was located to the west of Tingdene Marina and consisted of fen, reedbed and wet woodland to the south and east of Oulton Broad, opposite Oulton Broad Conservation Area.

To the west of the site was Ivy House Farm, a local heritage asset, and beyond that was Carlton Marshes Nature Reserve. The site would be accessed from Ivy Lane which included crossing a rail bridge. The proposal was to create a new mooring basin for the provision of 15 residential moorings.

The proposal required excavation resulting in the removal of peat and likely loss of biodiversity. The moorings would replace an area of settlement fringe changing the character of the area resulting in a more urbanised landscape. Concerns had been raised regarding the ability of the rail bridge on Ivy Lane to support more traffic including construction traffic. To the north of the railway bridge, Ivy Lane narrowed with no footway provision and was bounded by mature hedgerows. The hedgerow would be at risk to accommodate the improved road and footway required to accommodate the increased traffic associated with this development.

The HELAA assessment provided red ratings for access, impacts to the landscape, townscape, habitat and historic environment given the site's proximity to a Conservation Area. The assessment concluded that the site was not deemed suitable for development and 15 residential moorings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### Land at Ivy Lane, Oulton Broad (residential caravans and dwellings)

The site was located to the south of the previously discussed residential moorings site, with Ivy Lane as its eastern boundary, a railway line along its southern boundary and an existing caravan park forming its eastern boundary. The site consisted of grassland split into three fields with a number of trees in the eastern field and the south-western field used by a dog training business. As per the residential moorings proposal the site would be accessed from Ivy Lane. Two proposals had been submitted for this site: one for 250 residential caravans and another for 80 residential dwellings.

Given this site's use of Ivy Lane for access it shared the concerns raised for access to the residential moorings proposal albeit with a noticeable increase in traffic associated with the proposed 250 residential caravans or 80 residential dwellings. The residential caravans or residential dwellings would replace an area of settlement fringe resulting in a more urban character and a likely loss of biodiversity. The assessment provided red ratings for access, landscape, townscape and habitat. Historic environment also rated red highlighting a substantial WW2 period defensive system located on the eastern part of the site and potential impact on the setting of Ivy House Farm. In conclusion this site was not suitable for development and both the 250 residential caravans and 80 dwellings would not be allocated.

A Member asked whether the site could be accessed from the existing caravan park to the east. The PPO believed providing access to the site from the east would not be straightforward and highlighted that access was just one of a number of significant issues that resulted in the conclusion to not allocate this site.

Members supported this assessment.

#### Land at Home Farm, The Street, Thurne

The site consisted of grade 2 agricultural land with an area of hard standing on its south-west corner where some farm buildings were located. The proposal was for three residential dwellings.

There were no key services within Thurne and it had poor transport links and these factors were included in the Parish Council's opposition to this site. The Authority's Ecologist had noted protected species on the site and highlighted the site's proximity to the Broadland Special Protection Area. The PPO explained that the site would need to be marketed in accordance with the Local Plan and indicated that this marketing had not been undertaken.

The assessment provided a red rating for the lack of access to key services and a number of amber ratings including for impacts to landscape, townscape and habitat. The assessment concluded that the site was not deemed suitable for development and three residential dwellings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### Land off Hall Lane, Postwick

The site was an area of grass land bounded to the north by Hall Road, opposite Oaks Lane to the east with open fields to the south and west. The proposal was for five dwellings.

The Parish Council had objected citing, amongst other things, that the proposal was in conflict with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and the accumulative impact when combined with another nearby development that had yet to be started. The Highways Authority had objected to the proposal indicating that the highway network was not capable of supporting further development.

The assessment provided red ratings due to the impacts on both landscape and townscape within the existing isolated area, the lack of access to key services, the unsuitability of existing road infrastructure and poor access. The site was concluded to be not suitable for development and five residential dwellings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### Land north of Marsh Road, Tunstall

The site consisted of grade 2 agricultural land with Marsh Road on its southern boundary, a Grade II\* listed church on its western boundary, a residential property on its eastern boundary and arable land to the north. The proposal was for three residential dwellings.

The development of this open field would have impacts on landscape and the setting of the neighbouring church. The Highways Authority had objected to this proposal indicating the highway network was not of a standard to support further development.

The assessment resulted in red ratings for Access to the site, Accessibility to local services and facilities, Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes, Townscape, Historic Environment and Transport and Roads. The site was concluded to be not suitable for development and three residential dwellings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### Land south of Marsh Road, Tunstall

This site consisted of a mix of farm buildings and grade 2 agricultural land with arable land to the site's east and south, a property to its west and to the north, beyond a wooded border, Marsh Road. The proposal was for four residential dwellings.

This site was opposite to the previous Tunstall site and the previous responses regarding access to key services, access to the site and highways applied here as well. The nature of the site and its location to the south of the road meant that the impacts on landscape and townscape were reduced. The PPO indicated that the site had not been marketed in accordance with the Local Plan.

The assessment flagged red ratings for Access to the site, Accessibility to local services and facilities and Transport and Roads. The site was not deemed suitable for residential development and four residential dwellings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### Land at Broad Lane, Filby

The site was an area of greenfield land with Broad Lane forming its northern boundary, with residential properties to the east and west of the site and greenfield land to the south. An initial submission had proposed four dwellings with a subsequent submission proposing two dwellings.

The site was located next to a Special Protection Area and a Site of Special Scientific Interest and the mature trees on site connected to a wildlife corridor. There was peat nearby and the site would likely require an associated survey. The majority of the site was within Flood Zone 2 and 3, with only the north-east corner of the site, adjacent to Broad Lane, within Flood Zone 1. Given the larger area required for four dwellings this proposal presented a higher flood risk. The Highways Authority had responded that adequate visibility between Broad Lane and the A1064 Main Road was not achievable.

The assessment of both proposals provided red ratings for Access to the site, Biodiversity and Geodiversity and Transport and Roads. The site was not deemed suitable for residential development and both the four dwellings and two dwellings would not be allocated in the Local Plan.

Members supported this assessment.

#### The Old Boatyard, Whitlingham Lane, Trowse

The Old Boatyard, Whitlingham Lane had previously been assessed in the original HELAA (September 2023) when the site consisted of an existing boatyard and former rowing club and it had been submitted to extend its permitted use to include Class E - Commercial businesses and services (the Preferred Options version of the Local Plan and the emerging Publication version of the Local Plan allocated this site for Class E uses). Subsequently the boatyard had ceased operating and the site was empty. The site consisted of a number of buildings



including two boatsheds. An initial submission had proposed eight dwellings with a subsequent submission proposing 4-6 dwellings.

The location provided access to key services and there were no concerns raised by the Highways Authority. The HELAA assessment provided no red ratings and concluded that the site was suitable for residential development. The larger development was not considered in keeping with the pattern of development in the immediate vicinity and the eight dwellings would not be allocated in the Local Plan. Given the density of housing on that part of Whitlingham Lane, the site was deemed suitable for four dwellings. The PPO indicated that the site had not been marketed in accordance with the Local Plan and, as a consequence, four dwellings would not be allocated in the Local Plan.

The PPO confirmed that the previous HELAA assessment would continue and the site would be allocated for Class E use. In response to questions the PPO confirmed that the site provider would receive copies of both the HELAA Part 2 and HELAA to the Local Plan Part 2, that the site had not been advertised in any capacity and that the Local Plan requires a minimum marketing campaign of 12 months.

Members supported this assessment.

#### **Land at Half Moon Barn, Upper Street, Horning**

The site was a mix of brownfield and grade 1 agricultural land adjacent to Upper Street. The proposal was for two residential dwellings.

The site was located within the Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre (WRC) catchment area. This WRC had no foul water capacity and, as detailed in the Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre Joint Position Statement, there was a presumption against developments that increased these flows. The Highways Authority had objected raising concerns regarding the access visibility and indicating that new access onto a corridor of movement was not supported. There was no footway on Upper Street and there were no services and facilities within a walking distance from the site.

The assessment provided red ratings for Access to site, Accessibility to local services and facilities, Utilities Capacity and Transport and Roads. The site was not deemed suitable for residential development and two dwellings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### **Land to the north of Upper Street, Horning**

The site consisted of grade 1 agricultural land with its southern boundary with Upper Street bounded by properties to the east and west. The land extended to the north and east and overlooked the River Ant to the north of the site. The proposal was for 45 dwellings.

The site was located to the north and west of the previous Horning site and the previous consultation responses regarding access to services, highways and the Horning Knackers Wood Water Recycling Centre also applied here. This development would alter the character of that part of Upper Street, would remove views over the Ant valley and impact the wider landscape.

The assessment provided red ratings for Access to site, Accessibility to local services and facilities, Utilities Capacity, Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes, Townscape and Transport and Roads. The site was not deemed suitable for residential development and 45 dwellings would not be allocated.

Members supported this assessment.

#### **Car Park at former Windboats site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham**

The site consisted of brownfield land, currently utilised as a car park, with boatyards to the north and residential properties to the south and west. The proposal was for two dwellings.

The Highways Authority had objected stating that the provision of adequate visibility from the existing access to the south on A1151 Norwich Road was likely to be unachievable. Concerns had been raised regarding the increased likelihood of illegal or inconsiderate parking arising from the closure of the car park. The PPO indicated that the site had not been marketed in accordance with the Local Plan. The assessment had provided a red rating for access to the site and concluded that the site was not suitable for residential dwellings. The two dwellings would not be allocated in the Local Plan.

A Member noted the traffic associated with its current use was greater than that associated with two dwellings and wondered whether the highways assessment was contradictory. The Head of Planning explained that the Highways Authority would have balanced the existing use and the proposed use when making their assessment. A Member added that the car park was associated with a local business and that the requirement to park in the vicinity would not be removed if the car park was replaced.

Members supported this assessment.

#### **Former Windboats site, Grange Walk, Norwich Road, Wroxham**

The site consisted of brownfield land with boatyards to the north and residential properties to the south and a car park to the west. The proposal was for 15 apartments.

The site was located to the east of the previous Wroxham site and the previous responses regarding highways applied here as well. The PPO indicated that the site had previously been marketed but not in accordance with the Local Plan. The assessment had provided a red rating for access to the site and concluded that the site was not suitable for residential dwellings. The 15 apartments would not be allocated in the Local Plan.

A Member noted the Parish Council's support for this site and was disappointed that the site had not been marketed in a manner consistent with the Local Plan.

Members supported this assessment.

#### **Land at Marlpit House, Belaugh Green Lane, Coltishall**

The site was within the grounds of an existing property that featured many trees with a Grade II listed building to the west, Wroxham Road to the south, Belaugh Green Lane to the east and arable land to the north. The site's boundaries to the west and south coincided with those of the Coltishall Conservation Area. The proposal was for two residential dwellings.

The proposed sub-division of the plot and the resulting loss of trees would be detrimental to the site's appearance and its contribution to the character and appearance of the area. There was a lack of services and facilities within a walking distance from the site. The Highways Authority had objected indicating that the provision of adequate visibility from access was likely to be unachievable. The assessment provided red ratings for Access to site, Accessibility to local services and facilities, Nationally and Locally Significant Landscapes and Townscape. The site was not deemed suitable for residential development and the two dwellings would not be allocated.

Having reviewed all the HELAA assessments, a Member was conscious that none of the proposed sites would be allocated in the Local Plan at a time when the government was focused on building more housing and asked how the Authority avoided the perception that it was blocking developments. The PPO explained that the Annual Monitoring Report provided evidence that the Authority permitted applications for new developments when they met local and national policy. The PPO reminded Members that a number of residential moorings had been allocated to the Local Plan following the earlier HELAA (September 2023) which demonstrated that the Authority would allocate sites when justified by the HELAA methodology and evidenced by the HELAA documents.

Tony Grayling proposed, seconded by Stephen Bolt

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse both the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Part 2 and the document From the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment to the Local Plan Part 2 as evidence for the Local Plan.**

## 11. Consultation Responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented the response to the regulation 16 version of the Postwick with Witton Neighbourhood Plan issued by Postwick with Witton Parish Council. The PPO had raised no objections to this neighbourhood plan and had suggested some improvements and repeated some feedback provided on the earlier regulation 14 version of the plan.

Andrée Gee proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse the nature of the proposed response to the Postwick with Witton Neighbourhood Plan.**

## 12. Local Plan - Preparing the publication version

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) presented the report which detailed two amended policies and two amended items of evidence for reference by the publication version of the Local Plan. The PPO proposed to discuss each section of the report in turn and welcomed members' feedback.

### **Safety by the water policy**

The December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), under the promotion of public safety, had included a consideration for the safety of children and other vulnerable users in proximity to open water. Given the proliferation of water within the Broads and the significance of water based recreation to people living and visiting the Broads, safety by the water was an important matter. The Safety by the water policy had undergone considerable review by various officers within the Authority before its endorsement by the Authority's Management Team. The policy encouraged relevant developments to produce Water Safety Plans, with guidance from suitably qualified consultants, that reflected the water conditions for a given site and identified and addressed the site's associated risks.

A Member asked whether there were any cost implications for the Authority associated with this policy. The PPO responded that the responsibility for the production of a Water Safety Plan fell to the applicant and, while doing so, they would be expected to access the necessary expertise.

Members welcomed this policy for the improved water safety it offered to new developments in the Broads.

### **Rural enterprise dwellings policy**

Policy DM38 (Permanent and temporary dwellings for rural enterprise workers) had been updated to include a change, consistent with equivalent policies produced by other Local Planning Authorities, that required temporary accommodation to be considered in the first instance.

A Member believed that item c of the policy failed to capture the scenario when a new role had been advertised that resulted in a new starter, with no previous experience, being recruited. The PPO agreed to review this section of the policy with any subsequent change to be approved by the Head of Planning.

Members supported this update believing it to be a sensible option.

### **Local Housing Needs Assessment addendum**

The December 2024 NPPF and updated National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) required housing stock data, rather than population projection data, to be included in the methodology used to derive housing need within areas like the Broads. To address these changes to the NPPF and NPPG the Authority had commissioned an addendum to the original Local Housing Needs Assessment (see Appendix 3 of the report). The updated methodology had calculated a local housing need of 1,077 dwellings, triple that of the previous assessment's 358 dwellings. Members were reminded that the Authority's housing need was not additional to the need identified by the Authority's constituent districts but was part of their need.

### **Affordable Housing Topic Paper**

Following the result of a viability assessment of the Local Plan, the Planning Committee had, on 8 November 2024, endorsed an amendment to the Local Plan to include lower thresholds for off-site affordable housing schemes: Brownfield schemes located on the waterfront: 3-9 dwellings, Other brownfield schemes: 5-9 dwellings and Greenfield schemes: 3-9 dwellings.

Following consultations with the Planning Inspectorate of England, the PPO had collated the evidence for the amended affordable housing thresholds into an Affordable Housing Topic Paper (Appendix 4 of the report). This paper demonstrated that the Authority did not receive many suitable sites for affordable housing and sought to justify the contributions for off-site affordable housing schemes and the associated thresholds.

Matthew Shardlow proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

**It was resolved unanimously to endorse the Safety by the water and Rural enterprise dwellings policies for inclusion in the Local Plan and both the Housing Needs Assessment addendum and the Affordable Housing Topic Paper as evidence to support the Local Plan.**

The PPO explained that a few more items for inclusion in the Local Plan would be presented to the Planning Committee at following meetings and confirmed that the completed publication version would be available for endorsement at the 18 July 2025 meeting.

### **13. Notes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 21 March 2025**

The Committee noted the minutes of the Heritage Asset Review Group (HARG) meeting held on 21 March 2025.

The Chair indicated that the next HARG meeting would be on Friday 13 June 2025 at Yare House, 62-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich. The meeting would be followed by a site visit to some of the historic bridges on the River Wensum in Norwich.

### **14. Appeals to the Secretary of State**

The Committee received a schedule of appeals to the Secretary of State since the last meeting. The Development Manager indicated that an appeal had been lodged for a refused permission to replace 110m timber quay-heading with steel at Riversdale House, Hall Road, Barton Turf.

### **15. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers**

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 21 February 2025 to 20 March 2025 and any Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

### **16. Other items of business**

There were no other items of business.

### **17. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on Friday 2 May 2025 at 10:00am at The King's Centre, 63-75 King Street, Norwich.

The meeting ended at 11:40am.

Signed by

Chair

## Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 4 April 2025

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Fran Whymark	10	Broadland District Councillor - other registerable interest.