

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 December 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	3
6.	Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order	3
7.	Applications for planning permission	3
	(1) BA/2025/0238/FUL Land To West Of Clint Street, Ludham	3
	(2) BA/2023/0443/FUL Richardsons Boatyard, The Staithe, Stalham	4
	(3) BA/2025/0251/FUL Wayford Nurseries, Wayford Road, Wayford Bridge	7
	(4) BA/2025/0031/UNAUP2 Land On The West Side Of River Waveney, Beccles	8
	(5) BA/2024/0045/UNAUP4 Land On The South-West Side Of Norwich Road, Gillingham	8
8.	Enforcement update	9
9.	Consultation Responses	10
10.	Local Plan for the Broads - Supporting materials	11
11.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	11
12.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	12
13.	Other items of business	12
14.	Date of next meeting	13
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 5 December 2025	14

Present

Tim Jickells – in the Chair, Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Andrée Gee, Tony Grayling, James Harvey, Matthew Shardlow and Vic Thomson

In attendance

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer (items 9-10), Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Nigel Catherall – Planning Officer (items 7.2 & 7.3), Jane Fox – Planning Officer (item 7.1), Steve Kenny – Development Manager, Harry Mach – Carbon Reduction Projects Manager (item 7.1), Ruth Sainsbury – Head of Planning, Lorraine Taylor – Governance Officer and Rob Thomas – Head of Governance

Members of the public in attendance who spoke

Greg Munford, as applicant, for item 7.2 – BA/2023/0443/FUL Richardsons Boatyard, The Staithe, Stalham

1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chair noted that this was the Head of Governance's final meeting before leaving the Authority. The Chair thanked him for his efforts supporting the committee during his tenure. Lorraine Taylor would become the new Head of Governance.

Apologies were received from Martyn Hooton, Gurpreet Padda and Fran Whymark.

Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

The Chair explained that the meeting was being audio-recorded. All recordings remained the copyright of the Broads Authority and anyone wishing to receive a copy of the recording should contact the Governance Team. The minutes remained the record of the meeting. He added that the law permitted any person to film, record, photograph or use social media to report on the proceedings of public meetings of the Authority. This did not extend to live verbal commentary. The Chair needed to be informed if anyone intended to photograph, record or film so that any person under the age of 18 or members of the public not wishing to be filmed or photographed could be accommodated.

2. Declarations of interest and introductions

Members provided their declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes and in addition to those already registered.

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Matters of urgent business

There were no items of urgent business

5. Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking

No members of the public had registered to speak. The Chair noted that the Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee had attended the first meeting of the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GI RAMS) oversight board on 26 November 2025.

6. Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order

No requests to defer or vary the order of the agenda had been received.

7. Applications for planning permission

The Committee considered the following applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (also having regard to Human Rights), and reached the decisions set out below. Acting under its delegated powers, the Committee authorised the immediate implementation of the decisions.

The following minutes relate to additional matters of information or detailed matters of policy not already covered in the officer's report, which were given additional attention.

(1) BA/2025/0238/FUL Land To West Of Clint Street, Ludham

Installation of a 4 metre wind pump at north east corner of site to lift water from Internal Drainage Board drain to facilitate rewetting

Applicant: Broads Authority

The Planning Officer (PO) provided a detailed presentation of the application that involved the installation of a wind pump at land to the west of Clint Street, Ludham intended to pump water in support of the restoration of peat building conditions within Buttle Marsh.

The presentation included a location map, a site map, a site map depicting the footpaths and existing mills, an aerial photograph showing both the approved and proposed positions of the windpump, a site map showing the boundary of the applicant's land at Buttle Marsh, an indicative plan of the wind pump, a photograph of the proposed type of wind pump, a photograph of Boardman's Mill and photographs of various aspects of the site.

In assessing the application, the PO addressed the key issues of principle of development, the impact on the landscape, impact on ecology, design and impacts on heritage assets, flood risk and other issues. The recommendation was to approve the application subject to conditions.

A Member asked whether the sails would be reflective, as this could increase their visual impact when rotating, and whether there was any mitigation possible. It was agreed to condition the colour scheme to be black and white, as suggested in the Heritage and Design Manager's representation, and to include a matt finish.

A Member asked whether Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) was applicable to this development. The PO confirmed that this development was below the BNG threshold of 25m² and a Member noted that an owl box had been conditioned as an ecological enhancement.

A Member asked, given this development's purpose to support peat restoration within Buttle Marsh, whether a public information board, as suggested by the Authority's landscape consultant, should be conditioned. The Development Manager believed information boards were covered under permitted development rights and a board would be included in the plans.

Harry Blathwayt proposed, Andrée Gee seconded

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

- **Time Limit**
- **In accordance with plans**
- **Details of Pollution Prevention Plan**
- **Biodiversity Mitigation and A11 licence for water vole**
- **Observe biosecurity protocol 'Check, Clean, Dry'**
- **Displacement cutting outside of the hibernating season for reptiles**
- **If evidence of nesting birds found works to stop immediately**
- **One - A frame barn owl box**
- **Pump to be painted black with matt white sails.**

(2) BA/2023/0443/FUL Richardsons Boatyard, The Staithe, Stalham

Proposed redevelopment to provide new visitors' centre/reception, workshop extension, associated parking and landscaping etc., demolition of existing workshop buildings and excavation of basins to provide additional/enhanced moorings.

Applicant: Richardsons Leisure Ltd

The Planning Officer (PO) provided a detailed presentation of the application that involved the provision of a new visitors' centre/reception, associated parking and landscaping, an extension to an existing workshop, the demolition of existing workshop buildings and excavation of basins to provide additional/enhanced moorings at Richardsons Boatyard, The Staithe, Stalham.

The presentation included a location map, a site map, an aerial photograph showing the site map, a site map depicting the buildings to be demolished and the buildings to be retained, a proposed site plan (with an overlay of buildings for demolition), photographs of various aspects of the site, elevation diagrams of the proposed visitor centre/reception, floorplans of the proposed visitor centre/reception, plan diagram of the proposed visitor centre/reception including the outdoor play area and a diagram depicting the north and west elevations of the proposed workshop extension, a diagram showing the change in mooring numbers by type across the site, a proposed site plan for the extended basins in the centre of the site and a diagram showing side by side images of a photograph of the basins to the west of the site and the proposed site plan for the extended basins at the same location.

Since the report was issued, the Environment Agency had been provided with additional information which addressed its previous concerns and had subsequently confirmed it no longer had any objection to this development.

In assessing the application, the PO addressed the key issues of principle of development, the impact on the landscape, design and heritage, navigation, trees, ecology, impact on peat, amenity of residential properties, highways and public rights of way, flood risk. The PO advised that the recommendation was to approve the application subject to conditions.

In response to a question the PO confirmed that the Navigation Committee had been consulted on an earlier version of this application and following negotiations, the proposal had been revised to address the issues raised.

A Member asked whether this development would exacerbate the spread of floating pennywort. The PO indicated that a Construction Environmental Management Plan had been conditioned which would enable the Authority to ensure the relevant mitigations, such as the use of silt curtains during excavation, would be used.

A Member noted the reduced capacity of the proposed car park and asked whether this would result in an increase in parking offsite in the adjacent roads. The PO confirmed that the Highway Authority had reviewed the numbers in the context of the proposed facilities and raised no objections.

A Member asked whether it was correct that the elevation diagrams included Broads Authority branding. The PO confirmed that the branding related to the Broads National Park which was utilised in towns and villages within the national park and its usage in this development was encouraged.

In response to a question, Mr Greg Munford, the applicant, confirmed that the educational boat would be operated by Richardsons and, along with the play area, would be used to promote the heritage of the Broads.

A Member asked what constituted a biosecurity risk when disposing of the excavated peat. The PO explained that the excavation would be licenced which would require a plan to be submitted for addressing any contaminated material found when excavating the basins.

A Member noted the efforts undertaken to minimise the volume of peat to be excavated and the Head of Planning added that the use of the extracted peat had been conditioned.

A Member was disappointed that the intended use of the extracted peat was not consistent with minimising CO₂ emissions and suggested sending it to landfill as an alternative. The PO explained that ploughing the extracted peat into farmland was a last measure specified within a hierarchy of options suggested in Local Plan policy DM10 (Peats Soils) which was required as no other suitable schemes were available. The Head of Planning suggested amending condition 11 to include another suitable location consistent with policy DM10 which met with the Member's approval.

A Member noted that the erosion of peat both in the UK and Europe was a significant contributing factor to climate change compounded by peat's carbon sequestration properties. Another Member agreed with the intended use of the extracted peat believing it would have a benefit from an agricultural perspective.

Members supported the application for the improvements it brought to a Broads based business and the local economy.

Harry Blathwayt proposed, Andrée Gee seconded

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| i. Standard time limit | xv. Details of upgraded/widened vehicular access |
| ii. In accordance with approved plans | xvi. Details of provision for on-site parking for construction workers |
| iii. Details of method statement for piling and dredging works | xvii. Details of visitor mooring sign - position, size, and design |
| iv. Details of Construction Environmental Management Plan | xviii. Details of the play equipment |
| v. Details of Landscape and Ecological Management Plan | xix. Provision of silt curtains during all active works |
| vi. Details of Pollution Prevention Plan | xx. Follow mitigation for reptiles, birds, breeding birds, and bats as set out in 5.2.1 of the EIA |
| vii. Details of all external materials including solar panels | xxi. Habitat enhancement as set out in 6.2.2 of the EIA |
| viii. Details of Arboricultural Method Statement | xxii. Provision of nest boxes and cups, and bat boxes, as set out in 6.3.1 of the EIA |
| ix. Details of landscaping scheme including a landscape management plan | xxiii. No external lighting without agreement in writing |
| x. Replacement of trees or plants planted under landscape scheme | xxiv. No residential mooring |
| xi. Details of extracted peat use. Spoil to be deposited in flood zone 1 or another appropriate location consistent with policy DM10. Re-use within 7 days | xxv. Short stay moorings retained |
| xii. Details of phase 2 assessment of the risks posed by any contamination | xxvi. Provision of visibility splays |
| xiii. Details of remediation scheme following phase 2 assessment | xxvii. Access gates/bollard/chain/other means of obstruction - function and siting |
| xiv. Details of staging/piling/quayheading | xxviii. Works for on-site car parking/servicing/turning/waiting areas |

(3) BA/2025/0251/FUL Wayford Nurseries, Wayford Road, Wayford Bridge

Replace 8 polytunnels with single, large polytunnel

Applicant: Mr Nicholas Meale

The Planning Officer (PO) provided a detailed presentation of the application that would involve the removal of eight existing polytunnels and replaced by a single, large polytunnel.

The presentation included a location map, a site map, an aerial photograph with the site marked to provide context of the site and surrounding landscape, an aerial photograph of the site, an aerial photograph with an overlay of the plan diagram of the proposed development, a diagram of the proposed elevations of the development, a diagram showing the roof plan of the development, pictures showing the existing polytunnels and plant hardening areas, and photographs of the site from various vantage points.

The PO confirmed that there had been no new consultation responses since the publication of the report and indicated that a reference, in section 6.6 of the report, to a glasshouse was incorrect; it should read polytunnel.

In assessing the application, the PO addressed the key issues of principle of development, the impact on the landscape, amenity of residential properties, design and appearance, biodiversity net gain. The PO explained that additional information regarding Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) had not been received and the recommendation was to be revised; If Members were minded to approve this application, then approval would be delegated to the Head of Planning upon successful completion of the BNG assessment.

A Member asked how approval of this application would impact the extant permission for replacement of the eight polytunnels with a glasshouse (planning reference BA/2024/0066/FUL). The Head of Planning responded that once the development of either the single polytunnel or glasshouse commenced then the remaining extant permission would fall.

In response to questions the PO confirmed the extant permission BA/2024/0066/FUL predated the implementation of BNG, that the proposed development included the loss of a hedge, that the replacement polytunnel would provide a slight increase in surface area and the ground, formerly used for polytunnels, would be used as a plant hardening area.

A Member asked whether this development would create pesticide runoff into the Broads. The PO indicated that pesticide use was associated with the existing use of the site and was not a material consideration in the context of this application.

A Member wondered whether climate change had been factored into the choice of material for the polytunnel. The PO indicated that the existing polytunnels had been onsite for a number of years and the replacement polytunnel would be a more modern equivalent.

Harry Blathwayt proposed, Stephen Bolt seconded

It was resolved unanimously to delegate approval of BA/2025/0251/FUL to the Head of Planning, subject to BNG confirmation and the following conditions:

- i. **Time limit**
- ii. **In accordance with plans**
- iii. **Standard BNG condition**
- iv. **Biodiversity enhancement in form of provision of habitat for wildlife**
- v. **Vegetation clearance/demolition works outside of main bird breeding/nesting season or checked by ecologist prior to works**
- vi. **Follow biosecurity protocols**
- vii. **Use of polytunnel for growing/hardening of stock for sale on site only**
- viii. **External lighting plan**

(4) BA/2025/0031/UNAUP2 Land On The West Side Of River Waveney, Beccles

Unauthorised wooden decking structure

The Development Manager (DM) introduced the report seeking authority to serve an Enforcement Notice (EN) requiring the removal of the unauthorised structure on land on the west side of River Waveney, Beccles. The DM provided a detailed presentation, including photographs of the site.

The DM set out the planning issues making reference to the Authority's Local Compliance and Enforcement Plan and emphasising the consideration to be given to whether the unauthorised development was capable of being made acceptable and, if unacceptable, the expediency of taking enforcement action. The DM indicated that the recommendation was to serve an EN, any subsequent enforcement action deemed necessary would be brought to committee for approval (this was an alteration to that stated in the report).

In response to questions the DM confirmed that the platform was intended for leisure use, that no assessment regarding possible environmental damage had been undertaken although this would be considered once the structure had been removed and that Biodiversity Net Gain was not applicable as this development would not be granted permission.

Members believed this development detracted from its surroundings and welcomed the proposed enforcement action.

Andrée Gee proposed, Harry Blathwayt seconded

It was resolved unanimously to serve an Enforcement Notice for the removal of the unauthorised structure.

(5) BA/2024/0045/UNAUP4 Land On The South-West Side Of Norwich Road, Gillingham

Unauthorised decking and raised platform area

The Development Manager (DM) introduced the report seeking authority to serve an Enforcement Notice (EN) requiring the removal of the unauthorised structure on a mooring

plot on the south-west side of Norwich Road, Gillingham. The DM provided a detailed presentation, including photographs of the site.

The DM set out the planning issues making reference to the Authority's Local Compliance and Enforcement Plan and emphasising the consideration to be given to whether the unauthorised development was capable of being made acceptable and, if unacceptable, the expediency of taking enforcement action. The DM indicated that the recommendation was to serve an EN, any subsequent enforcement action deemed necessary would be brought to committee for approval (this was an alteration to that stated in the report).

In response to questions the DM confirmed that decking of no more than 2m in width would be acceptable on a mooring plot and that this structure had been in place for a couple of years.

Andrée Gee proposed, Matthew Shardlow seconded

It was resolved unanimously to serve an Enforcement Notice for the removal of the unauthorised structure.

8. Enforcement update

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

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

The three static caravans had been disconnected and moved from their original location in preparation for removal from the site.

The DM noted the entry in the report under Land at the Berney Arms, Reedham regarding "All statics have been emptied, disconnected and removed" was incorrect; this should have been included under Land at the Beauchamp Arms Public House (Unauthorised static caravans).

Land at the Beauchamp Arms Public House (Unauthorised operation development comprising erection of workshop, kerbing and lighting)

The lights had been disconnected and conversations with South Norfolk Council were ongoing regarding their removal from the site.

Land at Loddon Marina, Bridge Street, Loddon (Unauthorised static caravans)

One of the unauthorised caravans had been disconnected and moved to a storage area within the site. The other unauthorised static caravan was being used as accommodation for an employee at the site and the owner was preparing an application seeking permission for this usage.

The committee adjourned at 11:32am and reconvened at 11.42am.

9. Consultation Responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented responses to the Essex and Suffolk Water's Water Recycling, Transfer and Storage Project, the Greater Norwich Authorities Policy 2 Sustainable Communities and Draft Implementation of the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy Supplementary Planning Documents both produced by Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Councils and the Broadland and South Norfolk Design Code Supplementary Planning Document produced by Broadland and South Norfolk Councils.

Essex and Suffolk Water's Water Recycling, Transfer and Storage Project

The PPO reminded Members of the presentation provided by the Essex and Suffolk Water project team on 7 October 2025 regarding the Essex and Suffolk Water's Water Recycling, Transfer and Storage Project. This project could, as indicated in the map within Appendix 1 of the report, impact the Broads and the PPO had consulted with other officers when drafting this response. The response sought to clarify the impacts of this project and in particular those arising from the pipeline construction and its associated engineering works including impacts to the landscape once the pipeline had been completed and the time taken for the landscape to recover from this work. The Authority's Environment Policy Advisor had provided responses regarding the project's impact on peat soils and would be liaising with the project team to address these concerns. The PPO added that the Authority's GIS Officer was producing a constraints analysis for the various proposed pipeline routes and this would be included in the response submission.

The Head of Planning explained that, as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, the final decision rested with the Government, the project was still in the early stages and there would be further consultations.

A Member noted that during October's presentation the project team had indicated that the choice of route for the pipeline would not necessarily be the cheapest option but would be sensitive to the environment. The PPO agreed to include this in the response.

Greater Norwich Authorities Draft Policy 2 Sustainable Communities Supplementary Planning Document

The Policy 2 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was intended to support the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) Policy 2 with the aim of making sure that new developments contribute to the creation of resilient, inclusive, and sustainable communities. The PPO had provided some general comments on this SPD as well as seeking clarification on peat soils and improved referencing to the Broads.

Greater Norwich Authorities Draft Implementation of the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy Supplementary Planning Document

The Implementation of the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy SPD provided guidance for developers, planners and communities on how to use the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy in support of the GNLP. The PPO's response, in addition to some comments, sought clarifications regarding the purpose of the guidance, improved referencing

of the partner authorities' executive areas, better referencing to the Broads and inclusion of the heritage associated with the sites mentioned.

Broadland and South Norfolk Design Code Supplementary Planning Document

The PPO had consulted with other officers, including the Heritage and Design Manager, when drafting the response to the Broadland and South Norfolk Design Code SPD. The response sought more comprehensive referencing to the Broads and its status as a protected landscape and improvements to the character assessment.

Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by Tony Grayling

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the nature of the proposed responses to:

- **Essex and Suffolk Water's Water Recycling, Transfer and Storage Project**
- **The Greater Norwich Authorities Draft Policy 2 Sustainable Communities Supplementary Planning Document**
- **The Greater Norwich Authorities Draft Implementation of the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy Supplementary Planning Document**
- **The Broadland and South Norfolk Design Code Supplementary Planning Document.**

10. Local Plan for the Broads - Supporting materials

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) presented the report which detailed revised versions of the Local Development Scheme and the Duty to Cooperate Statement, both supporting documents for the publication version of the Local Plan.

The Local Development Scheme, the timeline for producing the Local Plan, had been revised to reflect the second ongoing consultation of the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. The PPO confirmed that the responses from the first consultation, held during the summer, would be brought to the next committee meeting.

The Duty to Cooperate Statement, which outlined how the Broads Authority worked with other local authorities to address strategic issues across boundaries, had been updated with the main change reflecting the endorsement of Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework.

Tony Grayling proposed, seconded by James Harvey

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the Local Development Scheme and updated Duty to Cooperate Statement.

11. 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 (DM) highlighted the recent appeal decision relating to a refusal to grant permission for works to TPO tree at River Green, Thorpe St. Andrew. The Planning Inspector had allowed the appeal sighting the "undisputed level of footfall on the open space" as the deciding factor in a finely balanced decision that weighed the moderate

harm to the character and appearance of the area that the tree works would cause against their justification which was “open to interpretation” and also carried “moderate weight”. The Authority’s Arboricultural Consultant had subsequently expressed disappointment in the decision as he believed the proposed tree works would reduce the lifespan of the subject tree.

The Authority had chased the Planning Inspectorate for progress on two longstanding appeals and they had responded to indicate that no case officers had been assigned to either appeal. Since the report was authored an appeal decision regarding Plot K, Crabbetts Marsh had been received dated 28 November 2025 in which the Planning Inspector had allowed the appeal. The Planning Team would consider the implications of this decision and report back at the next meeting.

A Member noted that the Planning Inspector had, given the limited scale and nature of the proposed development, removed the Authority’s suggested conditions in respect of biodiversity and ecology; If the Authority had concerns regarding the legal aspects of the appeal decision, for example should there have been an appropriate assessment under habitats regulations to ensure that pollution would not damage the site, then the Authority had six weeks from the date of the decision to initiate a Judicial Review.

Members noted that the next meetings of the Planning Committee and the Broads Authority were outside the six week period when a challenge to an appeal decision was permitted. Members wondered whether the committee needed to authorise further investigation and was there anything the committee could do to expedite this work.

The Head of Governance suggested that Members could express their support for challenging the Planning Inspector’s appeal decision if it was determined that there was a legal basis for such a challenge.

A Member asked for a challenge to the appeal decision regarding the TPO at River Green, Thorpe St. Andrew to also be considered.

Andrée Gee proposed, seconded by Matthew Shardlow

It was resolved unanimously to endorse Judicial Review(s) if it was determined that the Planning Inspector had made a legal mistake in appeal decisions APP/TPO/E9505/9846 River Green, Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew and APP/E9505/D/25/3370099 The Boat House, Plot K, Bureside Estate, Crabbetts Marsh, Horning.

12. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 24 October to 21 November 2025 and any Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

13. Other items of business

There were no other items of business.

14. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on Friday 16 January 2026 at 10:00am at The King's Centre, 63-75 King Street, Norwich.

The meeting ended at 12:20pm.

Signed by

Chair

DRAFT

Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 5 December 2025

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Tim Jickells on behalf of all Members	7.1	Applicant is the Broads Authority

DRAFT