

Planning Committee

Agenda 9 October 2026

10.00am

National Centre for Writing, Dragon Hall, 115 – 123 King Street,
Norwich, Norfolk, NR1 1QE

Sarah Cowley, Chief Executive – Friday 2 October 2026

Under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations (2014), filming, photographing and making an audio recording of public meetings is permitted. These activities however, must not disrupt the meeting. Further details can be found on the [Filming, photography and recording of public meetings](#) page.

Introduction

1. To receive apologies for absence
2. To receive declarations of interest (see [Appendix 1](#) to the Agenda for guidance on your participation having declared an interest in the relevant agenda item)
3. **To receive and confirm the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 7 August 2026** (Pages 4-14)
4. To note whether any items have been proposed as matters of urgent business
5. Chairman's announcements and introduction to public speaking
Please note that public speaking is in operation in accordance with the Authority's [Code of Practice for members of the Planning Committee and officers](#).
6. Request to defer applications included in this agenda and/or vary the order of the agenda

Planning and enforcement

7. **To consider applications for planning permission including matters for consideration of enforcement of planning control:**

There are no applications for consideration.
8. **Enforcement update** (Pages 15-17)
Report by Development Manager

Tree Preservation Orders

9. **BA/2026/0001/TPO Woodland To The North Of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge**
(Pages 18-29)
Report by Heritage and Design Manager

Policy

10. **National Planning Policy Framework - 2026 version** (Pages 30-49)
Report by Planning Policy Officer
11. **Suffolk Water Recycling, Storage and Transport Project update** (Pages 50-60)
Report by Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects Officer

Matters for information

12. **Appeals to the Secretary of State update** (Pages 61-62)
Report by Development Manager
13. **Decisions made by Officers under delegated powers** (Pages 63-70)
Report by Development Manager

Other matters

14. Other items of business
Items of business which the chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B (4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972
15. **To note the date of the next meeting – Friday 6 November 2026 at 10.00am at National Centre for Writing, Dragon Hall, 115-123 King Street, Norwich NR1 1QE**

For further information about this meeting please contact the [Governance team](#)

Appendix 1 – Extract from the Local Government Association Model Councillor Code of Conduct



Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 7 August 2026

Contents

1.	Apologies and welcome	2
	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014	2
2.	Appointment of Chair	2
3.	Appointment of Vice-Chair	2
4.	Declarations of interest and introductions	3
5.	Minutes of last meeting	3
6.	Matters of urgent business	3
7.	Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking	3
8.	Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order	3
9.	Applications for planning permission	3
	(1) BA/2026/0116/FUL Maltings Meadow Sports Ground, Pirnhow Street, Ditchingham	3
10.	Enforcement update	8
11.	BA/2026/0001/TPO Woodland To The North Of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge - site visit decision	9
12.	Norfolk Community Safety Partnership: Norfolk Heritage Watch - Strategic Delivery Plan 2026-2029	9
13.	Circular 28/83 Publication by Local Authorities of information about the handling of planning applications – Q2 (1 April to 30 June) 2026	10
14.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	10
15.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	10
16.	Other items of business	11
17.	Date of next meeting	11

Present

Tim Jickells – in the Chair, Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Tom Daly, Tony Grayling, James Harvey, Leslie Mogford and Matthew Shardlow (from item 10).

In attendance

Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Sarah Cowley – Chief Executive, Jack Ibbotson – Planning and Heritage Officer (item 12), Kate Knights– Heritage and Design Manager (item 11), Callum Sculfor – Assistant Planning Officer (item 9.1), Rob Rogers – Director of Delivery, Ruth Sainsbury – Head of Planning and Lorraine Taylor – Head of Governance.

Steven Bell (solicitor) of Birketts attended for item 9(1).

Members of the public in attendance who spoke

Sandra Forder, an objector, Oliver Pennington, the agent, and Councillor Chris Brown, councillor for Ditchingham & Earsham ward, for item 9(1) - BA/2026/0116/FUL Maltings Meadow Sports Ground, Pirnhow Street, Ditchingham.

1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Gary Champion and Martyn Hooton.

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. Appointment of Chair

Tim Jickells was proposed by Tony Grayling and seconded by Harry Blathwayt.

There being no other nominations, Tim Jickells was appointed Chair of the Planning Committee for the forthcoming year 2026/27.

3. Appointment of Vice-Chair

Tony Grayling was proposed by Tim Jickells and seconded by Harry Blathwayt.

There being no other nominations, Tony Grayling was appointed Vice-Chair of the Planning Committee for the forthcoming year 2026/27.

4. Declarations of interest and introductions

Members indicated that they had no further declarations of interest other than those already registered.

5. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 July 2026 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

6. Matters of urgent business

There were no items of urgent business

7. Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking

Public Speaking: The Chair stated that public speaking was in operation in accordance with the Authority's Code of Practice for members of the Planning Committee and officers. Those who wished to speak were invited to come to the Public Speaking desk when the application they wished to comment on was being presented.

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

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

9. 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/2026/0116/FUL Maltings Meadow Sports Ground, Pirnhow Street, Ditchingham

Creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights, access footpath, landscaping bund and overflow grasscrete parking area.

Applicant: Mr Jon Fuller

The Assistant Planning Officer (APO) provided a detailed presentation of the application that proposed the creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights, access footpath, landscaping bund and overflow grasscrete parking area at Maltings Meadow Sports Ground, Pirnhow Street, Ditchingham.

The presentation included location maps, a site map, an aerial photograph equivalent of the site map, various photographic views of the site taken from points along Pirnhow Street and from the application site itself, a plan diagram depicting the AGP, the overflow parking and the bund (with shortest distances marked to the nearest property and house), a plan diagram of the AGP depicting the planting scheme, a diagram depicting the elevation plans of the fencing, lighting and storage container, a diagram depicting a plan view of the bund plus an elevation view and two cross sectional views, a plan view of the AGP detailing the fencing, infill containment barriers and hard standing areas, a diagram showing the predicted light spill for various combinations of the site's lighting infrastructure, a diagram of the predicted AGP noise emissions plus an inset image of a noise mitigation measure and a diagram depicting the lifecycle of an AGP from end of life to its replacement showing various steps to reclaim and re-purpose the existing materials.

In assessing the application, the APO addressed the key issues of the principle of development; the design, the impact on landscape, the impact on the environment, neighbour amenity and highways.

The proposal would replace an open grass pitch with a more developed facility, introducing visible fencing and lighting columns that reduced the openness of the immediate area. These additions would facilitate more frequent and later use which would affect the experience of the immediate neighbours.

The development would take place on an existing established sports ground which would retain the land for recreational use and was supported by the relevant Local Plan policies for protecting and enhancing sports, recreation and community facilities. The proposal would provide an all-weather facility that delivered a number of public benefits including improved grassroots sports provision, reduced cancellations due to poor pitch conditions, improved opportunities for children and young people, physical and mental health benefits, and wider community access to sports facilities.

The technical consultees, including the Environment Agency, Environmental Health, Highways, Natural England, the Authority's Landscape Consultant, Ecologists, Arboricultural Consultant and Historic Environment Advisor, had not objected. No Habitats Regulation Assessment was required.

The identified impacts could be mitigated through the revised layout and through enforceable planning conditions. On balance, the Authority considers that the policy support and significant public and community benefits outweighed the identified localised harms subject to the recommended conditions. The proposal was in accordance with the Local Plan for the Broads and the recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions detailed in section 8 of the report.

A Member, noting that the EU was proposing to ban the material used in the proposed artificial grass pitch, asked what alternative materials had been considered. The APO confirmed that no alternative materials had been considered. He reminded Members that the

planning process was predicated on assessing the application presented, that no objections to the material had been raised and that the proposed mitigations were considered sufficient.

In response to questions the APO confirmed that various physical measures to prevent micro-plastics leaving the site could be conditioned including the maintenance of this infrastructure and there would be no monitoring of drainage water for possible leaching of plastic. The APO reminded Members of recent discussions regarding plastic leachate in the context of plastic piling where the long term impacts of these materials were unknown and beyond the scope of the planning system. He added that Natural England and the Authority's Ecologists had raised no objections.

Mrs Sandra Forder spoke as an objector to the application believing the mitigations proposed were insufficient to address the harms to the amenity of the neighbouring residents. She believed the noise levels for the existing pitch already exceeded on occasion the 50dB, deemed a "moderate community annoyance" by the World Health Organisation, with levels up to 70dB having been measured (a slide was presented showing various meter readings above 50dB). The intensification of the site would exacerbate these noise problems with an increase in shouting, the screaming of foul language and whistles. Not to mention the slamming of car doors and car alarms which were already prevalent on the site. She believed the bund would have no impact on reducing the noise levels.

Mrs Forder believed the site was too close to her property which was less than the 45m, as stipulated in the environmental consideration survey, and that other councils were more considerate as demonstrated by the 45m measured, using Google Earth, between the nearest property and the AGP at Beccles.

She highlighted that some of the proposed lights would be taller than the neighbouring properties and would, she believed, shine directly into neighbouring resident's windows. She noted that the application stated that there were three existing lights when in reality there were five. If the application was approved the result would be seven sets of lights in a concentrated area which would cause unacceptable light intrusion for nearby residents.

Mrs Forder suggested there were more suitable locations for this development, including near the tennis courts away from neighbouring properties or at an entirely different location such as Skinner's Meadow, Bungay.

The site was regularly used as a car park as indicated by a slide depicting three photographs of parked cars taken over three consecutive weekends. Residents had previously contacted the local council regarding traffic calming measures along Pirnhow Street without the additional usage proposed by this development.

With the five minutes allocated for speaking completed, Mrs Forder ended her statement with a slide depicting a computer generated image of the completed development as viewed from an upstairs window in her property. In response to a question, she confirmed that the image had been produced using artificial intelligence.

Mr Oliver Pennington, as the agent working on behalf of the sports club and the Football Foundation spoke in support of the application. This development would provide modern training and playing surfaces with year round access which would avoid the postponements or cancellations that the club had experienced historically due to water logged pitches. It would serve not just the sports club but the wider community with partner groups and other organisations being able to benefit from the AGP.

This revised application had incorporated a number of comments raised on the previously withdrawn application. As a consequence, the parking had been reduced and additional planting introduced on both the northern and eastern boundaries improving the site's biodiversity net gain. The bund would be created from top soil excavated on site reducing the number of HGVs visiting the site during construction. A low-level fence and signage would be used to prevent spectators from accessing the bund.

The addition of an overflow car park, in conjunction with the existing car park, would reduce on street parking and improve road safety during peak periods of use. The overflow car park would be constructed with grasscrete, a more sustainable material.

The flood lighting met recognised industry standards and was designed to minimise the light spill experienced by both the nearby residents and ecologically sensitive surroundings.

Mr Pennington stated that this sustainable development supported the continued and enhanced use of the Maltings Meadow sports ground and would deliver significant public benefits.

In response to questions, Mr Pennington explained that other pitch materials, constructed using olive pips and cork, had been assessed within the industry. These more sustainable materials did not provide as good a playing surface and rubber crumb remained the most effective, lifelike material available. He confirmed that the planting scheme was consistent with the representations from both the Authority's Ecologists and Norfolk Wildlife Trust (NWT). He added that the planting would aid the site's Biodiversity Net Gain and help soften the impact of the development within the surrounding area. He indicated that the AGP's location at the Maltings Meadow Sports Ground reflected demand analysis undertaken by the Football Foundation.

A Member asked why the AGP was necessary and, given the size of the sports ground, why this location was chosen. Mr Pennington explained that the AGP addressed the existing problem of water logged pitches. This all-weather surface and its improved drainage would eliminate the need for cancellations. The increased capacity of the facility would provide local sports clubs and the local community with greater opportunities to use it. The siting of the AGP reflected the greater flood risk at other areas within the wider sports ground and minimised its impact on the visual amenity within the surrounding area.

Given the increased risk of heavy rainfall events, a Member asked whether the proposed infill retention and drainage systems' capacities would be sufficient to ensure no pollution entered the river. Mr Pennington explained that there was no regulated discharge from the site

currently. The new drainage system would regulate the movement of surface water from the site to the river in a controlled fashion.

The Member, noting NWT's representation, asked what steps would be taken to change people's behaviour to help minimise the transfer of microplastics off-site. Mr Pennington explained a number of measures to control microplastics as detailed in the conditions including boot cleaning stations and kick boards. He added that access to and from the AGP was via hard standing areas to minimise the spread of the infill.

A Member asked whether there was scope to choose an earlier time for closing at weekends. Mr Pennington suggested it was possible to consider 6pm as a closing time, given a reduction in bookings after that time.

Cllr Brown provided a statement in support of the application commenting that he had been approached by the sports club following the withdrawal of the previous application. Cllr Brown believed the current application was a vast improvement on the previous one, and he had called it in to enable the committee to fully weigh up the benefits and concerns associated with this proposal. With over 100 positive representations, including from both the Parish and Town Councils, there was strong support for this development which equated to a £1 million plus investment in the area. This facility would satisfy unmet demand in the area as demonstrated by the difficulty in booking training time at the Beccles AGP when the existing pitch was unavailable. The councillor was pleased to see the mitigation taken to address the potential noise and light impacts. He believed the landscaping and the bund were an improvement on the current situation where cars could park right up to the boundary fence. The facility would support the physical and mental wellbeing of hundreds of local adults and children and was consistent with East Suffolk's leisure strategy.

A Member asked, given the unknowns regarding the long term impacts of microplastics, whether the infill retention measures were sufficient. Cllr Brown indicated that, with over 2000 pitches of this type in England, there was a lot of experience of managing this type of facility. He acknowledged that effort would be required to change people's behaviour to ensure the mitigations were fully effective.

In response to a question, the solicitor for the Authority reminded Members that the determination of this application must be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. The committee had to be guided by expert opinion and that planning law indicated that great weight was to be given to those expert views as Members were potentially not qualified to challenge them.

Members welcomed the mitigation to reduce the development's impact on the amenity of the local residents. Despite this, one Member had reservations regarding the noise levels and believed that further respite should be afforded the neighbouring residents at weekends. Members supported a change in the condition restricting the operating hours of the AGP.

Leslie Mogford proposed, Harry Blathwayt seconded

It was resolved unanimously to amend the site-wide hours restriction to impose a closing time of 18:00 for weekends only (the 20:00 closing time would remain for bank holidays or public holidays).

A number of Members acknowledged the need for this development however they were concerned by the veracity of the technical fixes required to mitigate the harm from the rubber crumb. Given the environmental significance of the Broads, one Member wanted greater certainty regarding the risk of this material leaching into the water course. Other Members recognised these concerns but believed the mitigations would be adequate and any residual harm would be outweighed by the benefits offered by this development.

Leslie Mogford proposed, Harry Blathwayt seconded

It was resolved by five votes for, one against and one abstention to approve the application subject to the following conditions:

- | | |
|---|---|
| i. Time Limit | xii. Landscaping and bund planting. |
| ii. Approved plans | xiii. Biodiversity Gain Plan and HMMP. |
| iii. Site-wide hours restriction as amended above. | xiv. Ecological mitigation. |
| iv. Automatic lighting shut off. | xv. Tree and Hedgerow Protection and Replacement Planting |
| v. No additional external lighting. | xvi. Infill retention and microplastic control. |
| vi. Lighting installed as approved. | xvii. End-of-life recycling plan. |
| vii. Site-wide Management Plan and Code of Conduct. | xviii. Surface water drainage and maintenance. |
| viii. No amplified sound or PA system. | xix. Construction Environmental Management Plan. |
| ix. Parking Management Plan. | xx. Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation. |
| x. Highways | |
| xi. Grasscrete parking delivered before first use. | |

The committee adjourned at 11:35am and reconvened at 11.43am when Matthew Shardlow joined the meeting.

10. Enforcement update

Members received an update report from the Head of Planning on enforcement matters previously referred to the Committee. No further updates were provided at the meeting.

The report was noted.

11. BA/2026/0001/TPO Woodland To The North Of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge - site visit decision

The Heritage and Design Manager (HDM) presented the report to determine whether a site visit was required in relation to a woodland Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for mixed deciduous woodland, including oak, ash, willow, alder and birch trees, located to the north of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge. The condition of the trees was considered to be fair, with a retention span of between 40-100 years. The woodland was not large in size, with limited views of it but it was considered to contribute to the amenity of the area within which it sat. A parcel of woodland at the eastern end of the woodland had been sold and the new owner had carried out significant felling and clearing of the understory. It was considered there was a risk of further felling in this area and the potential for further erosion of the woodland should other parcels of it be sold. A provisional woodland TPO had been served on 11 June 2026 which protected everything that could become a tree including the understory. The HDM indicated that this TPO would need to be confirmed by 11 December 2026.

Two objections had been received, one from the new owner and the other from the previous owner who continued to own the wider woodland.

Both objections had been received within the 28-day consultation period and as per the Authority's Scheme of powers delegated to the Chief Executive and other officers, paragraph 50 (ii), this matter would need to be determined by the Planning Committee. In preparation for this determination the HDM explained that Members could undertake a site visit however, in this instance, a detailed photographic survey of the woodland and its surrounds, in conjunction with information provided by the Authority's Arboricultural Consultant, would be adequate to determine the provisional TPO. The recommendation was therefore not to undertake a site visit.

Members agreed that there was no value to a site visit in this instance.

Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by James Harvey

It was resolved unanimously to not undertake a site visit before the provisional woodland TPO BA/2026/0001/TPO was considered at a future Planning Committee meeting.

12. Norfolk Community Safety Partnership: Norfolk Heritage Watch - Strategic Delivery Plan 2026-2029

The Planning and Heritage Officer (PHO) presented the report which detailed the aims of the newly formed Norfolk Heritage Watch and supporting Heritage Crime Partnership in responding to heritage crime in Norfolk. The PHO explained that this initiative had been arranged by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) for Norfolk and the Norfolk Community Safety Partnership. The intention was to bring together the Norfolk Community Safety Partnership, police, fire and other stakeholders including members of the public in an effort to tackle heritage crime using preventative measures in conjunction with improved monitoring and reporting.

The Authority would be engaged via the Norfolk Heritage Crime Partnership which would provide a forum for all the various stakeholders to share their knowledge and experience within three delivery areas: Crime prevention & Security measures; Communications & Engagement and Children & Young People. This partnership would meet biannually and the Authority, represented by the Planning and Heritage Officer or Heritage and Design Manager, would participate but was not expected to lead on this activity. This forum was consistent with the Authority's commitment to actively tackle and promote awareness of heritage crime as stated within the National Parks Joint Statement for Historic Environment.

In response to questions, the PHO confirmed that the bodies that endorse this strategic delivery plan may change due to Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) however LGR was not expected to impact the agencies responsible for delivering this plan. He indicated that this strategic delivery plan was not expected to change with the recent election of a new PCC for Norfolk and that the Norfolk Heritage Crime Partnership would consider LGR's replacement of PCCs as and when it was necessary.

Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by Harry Blathwayt

It was resolved unanimously to endorse the Norfolk Community Safety Partnership - Norfolk Heritage Watch - Strategic Delivery Plan 2026-2029.

13. Circular 28/83 Publication by Local Authorities of information about the handling of planning applications – Q2 (1 April to 30 June) 2026

The Head of Planning (HoP) introduced the report, which provided the development management statistics for the quarter ending 30 June 2026. The HoP highlighted that all minor and other applications had been determined within statutory timescales or within an agreed extension of time as shown in table 2 (of the report) and exceeded the national performance indicators as shown in table 3 (of the report).

The report was noted.

14. Appeals to the Secretary of State

The Committee received a schedule of appeals to the Secretary of State since the last meeting. The Head of Planning highlighted an appeal relating to the site of the TPO discussed during item 11 of the agenda. An Enforcement Notice had been served in regard to an unauthorised container/storage unit located at 18 Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge which the site's owner had appealed.

15. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 19 June to 23 July 2026 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 9 October 2026 at 10:00am at the National Centre for Writing, Dragon Hall, 115-123 King Street, Norwich.

The meeting ended at 12:10pm.

Signed by

Chair

Planning Committee

9 October 2026

Agenda item number 8

Enforcement update

Report by Planning Officer (Compliance & Implementation)

Summary

This table shows the monthly updates on enforcement matters. The financial implications of pursuing individual cases are reported on a site-by-site basis.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Committee date & Case number	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation [date of update]
31 March 2023 BA/2023/0004/ UNAUP2	Land at the Berney Arms, Reedham	Unauthorised residential use of caravans and outbuilding	• Authority given to serve an Enforcement Notice requiring the cessation of the use and the removal of the caravans. • Enforcement Notice served 12 April 2023. • Appeal submitted against Enforcement Notice [25/05/2023]. • Appeals dismissed and notice upheld with variations [22/04/2025]. • This site will be discussed further with the owner, once the proposed action at the other sites is taken.
2 February 2024 BA/2022/0007/ UNAUP2	Holly Lodge, Church Loke, Coltishall	Unauthorised replacement windows in listed building	• Authority given to serve a Listed Building Enforcement Notice requiring the removal and replacement of the windows and the removal of the shutter. Compliance period of 15 years • LPA in discussions with agent for landowner [10/04/2024]. • No resolution achieved through discussion. Legal advice sought [29/08/2024] • Case review – Listed Building Enforcement Notice to be served, in process of content being considered and drafted. • Listed Building Enforcement Notice served by hand on Friday 24th January. • Appeal submitted and valid – start date 19/03/2025. Will be dealt with by compliance officer [21/03/2025]. • PINS contacted about delay, await response [19/11/2025]. • PINS confirmed no case officers available [25/11/2025]. • PINS Site visit carried out Tuesday 16th June, approx. 2 weeks for decision [22/06/2026]. • Appeal dismissed – Notice Upheld [21/09/2026]

Committee date & Case number	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation [date of update]
12 December 2025 BA/2024/0045/ UNAUP4	Land on the South-West Side of Norwich Road, Gillingham, Beccles	Unauthorised fence and development of mooring plot	- Authority given to serve an Enforcement Notice requiring removal from the site all wooden boarding from the floor area including the raised stepped seating area to the rear of the plot, leaving a walkway with a width of no more than 2 meters from the edge of the quay heading. - Enforcement Notice served 12 December 2025 - compliance period 3 months [26/01/2026]. - Works have not been completed, owner warned of possible direct action. [12/04/2026] Enforcement officer in discussion with owner [21/09/2026]
BA/2026/0019/ NFENF	The Thaiway Church Road Hoveton Norfolk NR12 8UG	Unauthorised siting of storage unit	- Enforcement Notice served 28/05/2026. Compliance period 28 days. [21/08/2026] - Appeal submitted 23/07/2026 awaiting validation. Appeal has been turned away and closed by PINS – fee for Ground (a) not paid. Enforcement officer is chasing compliance [21/09/2026]
BA/2025/0063/ NFENF	18 Long Dyke Wayford Bridge Norfolk	Unauthorised siting of shipping container	- Enforcement Notice served 29/06/2026. Compliance period 28 days. [26/08/2026] - Appeal submitted and valid. - Start date 20/07/2026. Will be dealt with by the compliance officer. Two appeals now submitted – see Appeal Update for further information. LPA statements submitted, awaiting site visit [21/09/2026]

Author: Steve Kenny

Date of report: 21 September 2026

Background papers: Enforcement files

Planning Committee

9 October 2026

Agenda item number 9

BA/2026/0001/TPO Woodland to the north of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge

Report by Heritage and Design Manager

Summary

A Provisional Tree Preservation Order (TPO) has been served on an area of woodland to the north of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge.

Two objections to the TPO have been received.

Recommendation

To consider whether to confirm the TPO. The Authority's recommendation is that it is confirmed.

1. Background

- 1.1. As part of its obligation as a Local Planning Authority (LPA), the Broads Authority is required to consider the serving of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on trees which are considered to be of amenity value and where it is expedient to do so. The Town and Country (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations) 2012 sets out the procedure relating to TPOs and government guidance (Tree Preservation Orders and trees in conservation areas, 2014) provides further information.
- 1.2. This report explains how this process has been carried out in respect of an area of woodland to the north of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge (BA/2026/0001/TPO).

2. Tree Preservation Order procedure

- 2.1. There are two prerequisites which must be met for a tree to be considered for protection through a TPO. Firstly, the tree must be of amenity value, and secondly the expediency of serving the order. There are many trees in the Broads (and elsewhere) which are of sufficient amenity value to qualify for TPO status, but which are not protected as it is not considered expedient to do so. When considering expediency, one of the factors considered by the LPA is whether the trees are under threat. The TPO process is not a designation like, for example, a conservation area which is made following an assessment of particular character but is effectively a response to a set of circumstances.

- 2.2. Typically, the consideration of a tree for a TPO designation will arise in connection with either a Section 211 notification, notifying the authority of proposed works to trees within a conservation area or a development proposal, either through a formal planning application or a pre-planning application discussion. At a site visit or when looking at photos or other visual representation, a case officer may see there is a tree on the site which is potentially of amenity value and under threat from the proposed development. The case officer will consult the Authority's Arboricultural Consultant, who may need to investigate further and will visit the site and make an assessment of the tree under the 2012 Regulations. If the tree is considered to meet the criteria in the Regulations then the LPA will consider whether a provisional TPO should be served.
- 2.3. After a provisional TPO has been served there is a consultation period, which gives the opportunity for the landowner and other interested parties to comment on it.
- 2.4. The Regulations require that a provisional TPO must be formally confirmed by the LPA within 6 months of it being served; if it is not confirmed then it will automatically lapse.
- 2.5. The Authority's scheme of delegation allows provisional TPOs to be served and for non-controversial TPOs (i.e. where no objections have been received) to be confirmed by officers under delegated powers.
- 2.6. Where an objection has been received as part of the consultation process the decision on whether or not to confirm the provisional TPO is made by the Planning Committee.

3. The potential Tree Preservation Order at the land north of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge

- 3.1. The woodland is roughly triangular in shape and is located to the east and south of the A149 and north of the river Ant at Wayford Bridge. Agricultural land sits between the A149 and the woodland. The southern end of Nobbs Loke forms the eastern boundary, while the northern end of Long Dyke and the boatyard of Wayford Marine Ltd runs along its southern edge, between the woodland and the river Ant.
- 3.2. The woodland comprises a mixed deciduous woodland, including oak, ash, willow, alder and birch and as a woodland group the trees are important for their cohesion. The condition of the trees is generally considered to be fair, with a retention span of between 40-100 years. The trees are medium-sized trees. The woodland is not large in size and as such, there are limited wider views of it but it is considered to contribute to the amenity of the area in which it sits, with it being visible in views from Wayford Bridge itself, from the A149, from the river and marina.
- 3.3. A parcel of the woodland at its eastern end has been sold and the new owner has carried out significant felling. We became aware of the felling following several complaints to the Authority in December 2025. Our Arboricultural Consultant visited the site and at that time considered that was insufficient felling to warrant action. However, as it was tree felling within a woodland the Forestry Commission were

informed, as that is their statutory area. The Forestry Commission visited the site and advised the owner to immediately cease felling, as otherwise he would be likely to exceed the calendar quarter felling allowance of 5m³ and the penalties for doing so were explained. Following reports that the owner wanted to extend his moorings into the woodland, the Broads Authority then wrote to the owner to make clear that any widening of the dyke or ground works in the area would require planning permission.

- 3.4. In late April / early May further complaints were received of tree felling on the plot and the Forestry Commission also received complaints. The Forestry Commission visited site and found evidence of further tree felling and advised that a TPO would be appropriate to protect the woodland. The Broads Authority's Arboricultural consultant visited the site and a Tree Evaluation Method for Protection Orders (TEMPO) was undertaken, which found that a TPO would be appropriate.
- 3.5. Consideration was given as to whether the TPO should be solely on the parcel of land where the felling had taken place or cover the whole woodland. It is considered that despite ownership boundaries, the woodland should be seen as a single entity. In terms of how the woodland functions and its amenity values, it is the whole woodland that is of significance, rather than individual parts of it. Given that there was considered to be a risk of further felling in the woodland, which would further erode its overall value and the potential for other parcels of the woodland to be sold, a TPO for the whole of the wooded area was considered most appropriate.
- 3.6. On 11 June 2026 a provisional TPO was served on the woodland. This must be confirmed by 11 December 2026.
- 3.7. On 7 July 2026 a letter objecting to the TPOs was received and on 8 July a further objection was received. Three letters of support have also been received. Please see details in the Statement of Case attached as Appendix 1.
- 3.8. At the Planning Committee meeting on 7 August 2026 members decided that a site visit for Members was not necessary.

4. Next steps

- 4.1. At Planning Committee on 9 October 2026 there will be a presentation with photographs of the site for Members' consideration.
- 4.2. The Authority's Arboricultural Consultant considers that the woodland detailed in this report is worthy of a TPO due to the cohesion of the trees as a woodland group and the contribution it makes to the area in which it is located. The condition of the medium-sized trees is generally considered to be fair, with a retention span of between 40-100 years. The TPO will protect the cohesion of the woodland as single entity, with the individual trees, saplings and understorey being protected. Should there be any further tree felling or removal of the understorey when a TPO is in place, the Authority will be able to take enforcement action as this would be a criminal offence and we would also be able to ensure that replacement tree planting takes place.

- 4.3. Objections have been received from the owners of the site and the following Statement of Case sets out those objections formally, along with the response from the Arboricultural Consultant. Three letters of support have also been received and are summarised.
- 4.4. Members should consider this Statement of Case when considering whether to confirm the TPO.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1. It is recommended that the provisional Tree Preservation Order at the woodland to the north of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge is confirmed.
- 5.2. Documents relating to the TPO are attached to this report.

Author: Kate Knights

Date of report: 22 September 2026

Background papers: TPO (BA/2026/0001/TPO) file

Appendix 1 – [Statement of Case](#)

Appendix 2 – [Location map](#)

Appendix 1 – Statement of Case – Provisional TPO at Woodland to the north of Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge

1. Introduction

- 1.1. It is the Authority's practice to provide Members with a Statement of Case, outlining the issues under consideration.
- 1.2. Two objections have been raised to the provisional TPO.
- 1.3. Three letters of support have been received.
- 1.4. As well as the points raised by the objectors and the Authority's response which are set out in the table below, there are other considerations. The woodland contains a mix of trees and as such will have some longevity of life; it is considered to contribute to the visual amenity of the area and is therefore of some benefit to the general public; the trees increase resilience to climate change and improve air quality in the area, aid biodiversity and encourage wildlife.

2. Representations and responses

- 2.1. The issues raised by the objectors, the supporters and the Broads Authority's Tree Consultant's response are set out below:

No.	Representation	Response
1.	Many of the remaining trees (on the land where works have taken place) have water-logged and unstable root systems as a result of persistent flooding. There is a risk that these trees could fall, potentially causing damage to the public ROW and any nearby structures.	The trees in question have established within the woodland with root systems adapting to the woodland environment and associated waterlogging. The remaining trees are more at threat of failure due to exposure following the clearance that has taken place rather than the annual waterlogging. In order to protect these and ensure their replacement should they fail, it is essential that the trees are protected. If the trees are deemed a risk then an application to remove them can be made and if appropriate, permission given alongside a tree replacement notice. The remaining trees are more at threat due to the recent works than waterlogging.

No.	Representation	Response
2.	There is no intention of removing healthy, established trees that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area and we believe that a blanket TPO on all remaining trees may be excessive and could hinder the management of those that present a genuine safety risk.	It is considered that healthy trees that positively contribute to the amenity of the area have been removed and would continue to be removed. A woodland TPO recognises the value of the woodland as whole, including this area, and dead and dangerous trees can continue to be managed appropriately. The TPO will allow The Broads Authority to work with the owner(s) to ensure future appropriate management of the woodland.
3.	The owner of the larger area of woodland sold a portion of the land within the TPO and the clearance of trees in this area has occurred solely within that plot so the responsibility for it lies with the new owner. Therefore the owner of the wider woodland should not be “punished” by the BA with additional restrictions when they have done nothing wrong.	We agree that the actions of the new owner of the plot that has been sold are not the responsibility of the land owner of the rest of the woodland. However, the plot is part of the wider woodland and the works that have taken place therefore represent an erosion of it. The TPO is not a punishment, applications are free and the application process will not hinder the continued good management of the rest of the woodland.

No.	Representation	Response
4.	Since an incident where a whole oak tree was cut down by a mooring plot owner on Long Dyke, any request from plot owners to cut branches which extend over their mooring plots has been refused and the land owner now employs a tree surgeon to cut down branches along the dyke if they are considered dangerous.	The incident with the neighbour is a private matter. The employing of a tree surgeon to remove dangerous branches over the moorings is good arboricultural management and would not be restricted by the TPO as it is exempt. Gov.uk guidance states: ‘What is the exception for work to prevent or abate a nuisance?’ The authority’s consent is not required for carrying out the minimum of work on a tree protected by an Order that is necessary to prevent or abate a nuisance. Here ‘nuisance’ is used in its legal sense, not its general sense. The courts have held that this means the nuisance must be actionable in law – where it is causing, or there is an immediate risk of it causing, actual damage. When deciding what is necessary to prevent or abate a nuisance, tree owners and, where applicable, their neighbours and local authorities, should consider whether steps other than tree work might be taken. For example, there may be engineering solutions for structural damage to buildings.’ See here for further details.

No.	Representation	Response
5.	The Internal Drainage Board (IDB) is responsible for the annual dredging / clearing of the land drains within the TPO area. Would it be practical for them to get planning approval to cut overhanging branches prior to dredging the drains? This will not happen, dredging will not be carried out properly and the land will be left with an increased risk of flooding, resulting in further damage to all the trees in the area.	There is no requirement for the BA to consult the IDB or EA on this provisional TPO. The IDB is a statutory undertaker and is therefore permitted to undertake works required to fulfil their statutory function without obtaining permission from us, although it should notify the Local Planning Authority of such works. It is very unlikely that the TPO would prevent it from effectively managing the drains on the land.
6.	The BA is in contravention of the TPO due to a lack of enforcement against a neighbouring land owner, who has raised ground levels and does not have a sewage disposal system, which will cause damage to this woodland and contribute to its complete destruction.	This is not of relevance to this TPO. The EA was consulted on the planning application mentioned by the objector and did not object in terms of flood risk.
7.	The extent of the TPO area is not proportionate to the extent of felling work that has been undertaken which is wholly in the area of land that has been sold. The BA has not justified why the area within the larger woodland area is at any greater risk of clearance than the many other sites in the BA's jurisdiction. As a TPO can be issued in 24 hours, there is no need for a blanket TPO, as they can be issued quickly as and when tree clearance is reported.	The woodland is valuable as a whole and the works that have been undertaken have eroded it. As such it is considered that the whole woodland should benefit from the same level of protection and this should reduce any potential future tree removal should further parcels be sold or a precedent be set by the works that have taken place. The potential risk to the whole woodland is what results in a TPO being appropriate here. Unfortunately, we do not have an out of hours service and have a small team so cannot therefore always serve TPOs within 24 hours.

No.	Representation	Response
8.	The TPO has been ineffective in preventing significant tree clearance. The objector was notified months ago by people living at Wayford Marine Ltd that some tree clearance had taken place and she assumes the BA were also notified. Why did the BA wait until June to serve a TPO? It is assumed the BA allowed the trees on the plot to be cleared in a desperate attempt to prevent any further portions of the land being sold (by discouraging potential purchasers and devaluing the site). There is no planning policy that prohibits the splitting of land.	The BA was notified of some tree felling in December 2025. A site visit was carried out and at that point there was not enough felling to warrant any action, but as it was tree felling within a woodland the Forestry Commission was notified. The FC visited the site and explained to the site owner that a certain amount of timber can be felled in each calendar quarter and he was advised to stop felling so this amount was not exceeded. In the middle of May we were contacted again by the FC who had received a complaint about further tree works at the site and the FC requested that a TPO be served. This was investigated further and the TPO was served in early June. We are aware that there is no policy that prevents land being sold and the intention of the TPO is not to discourage future purchasers or devalue the land. The TPO will ensure that even if the woodland is divided into different ownerships it is protected. Any reasonable tree works would gain permission. It is not an onerous application process and there is no fee for advice or an application. The Broads Authority will always work with applicants and owners to seek the best and most appropriate management of trees.

No.	Representation	Response
9.	No objection is raised to TPOs when they are used to protect the Broads landscape and character and to protect the habitat which trees and woodland provide. It is obvious this order was not applied for this purpose.	The TPO was served because there is a threat to the woodland as a whole and it has amenity value, as well as providing habitat and other biodiversity benefits.
10.	The BA has two options: 1) to re-issue the TPO covering only the area that has been sold and where tree clearance has taken place. 2) Carry out enforcement action on the adjoining land owner in relation to various issues listed.	It is considered that point 2 is a separate issue to the serving of the TPO and not of relevance to whether or not the TPO should be confirmed. The BA considers it appropriate for the TPO to be confirmed as it is covering the whole woodland which is seen as a cohesive unit, rather than modified to only cover the area of land that has been sold.
11.	We are in full support of the application and greatly appreciate the saving of the habitat and trees. We have an abundance of wildlife, especially the pipistrelle bats, newts, and recently seen a swallowtail butterfly. The trees create a natural barrier from the road, filter fumes and suck up the flood water. They also form a natural wind break to the surroundings....we urge you to make this TPO a permanent order to avoid further environmental damage.	Noted.
12.	I wish to add my support to this preservation order. I do not believe that the current owner is carrying out this site clearance work with any consideration to the natural habitat that the woodland has been providing up until now.	Noted.

No.	Representation	Response
13.	We have noted that you have taken vital action to stop the further felling of what was a wonderful woodland area. We hope you will continue to protect what is left. It's sad to see as there were bats that roosted there, an owl, numerous kingfishers that would settle, as well as otters etc. The heavy machinery must have compacted the peat bed and the flora and fauna too. The woodland didn't just serve the animals; it allowed the dyke to retain its privacy and reduced road noise (and CO2 too).	Noted.

- 2.2. Members should consider this Statement of Case when deciding whether to confirm the TPO.

Appendix 2 – Location map

BA/2026/0001/TPO - 18 Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge

Scale: 1:5,000



© Crown copyright [and database rights] 2026 OS AC0000814754. You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub-license, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form. © Bluesky International Limited and Getmapping Limited 1999-2023. © Bluesky International Limited 2024 and onwards.

Planning Committee

9 October 2026

Agenda item number 10

National Planning Policy Framework – 2026 version

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

A new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published 17 August. This new version is now a material consideration in determining planning applications. It is also of relevance to parts of the Authority's emerging Local Plan. This report provides a briefing to Members on the changes to national policy.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members note the report.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Background	2
3.	About the new NPPF 2026	2
4.	92 things you need to know about the final version of the new NPPF	3
5.	Commentary and parts of the NPPF 2026 to note	17
6.	Protected landscapes	18
7.	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	19

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This report provides an overview of the revised NPPF.
- 1.2. The new NPPF came into force from the day it was published. With all the changes that are now in place, it will take some time for all involved in the planning system to digest the full detail of the new NPPF provisions and consider their implications.

- 1.3. The new NPPF is here: [National Planning Policy Framework.pdf](#). The Government response to the NPPF consultation is here: [National Planning Policy Framework consultation - government response](#).
- 1.4. The 2024 NPPF is referred to in this report and, noting that it is not in place anymore, it is archived and accessed here in case Members wish to cross refer: [archived pdf version - December 2024](#).

2. Background

- 2.1. The NPPF is a key national policy document governing plan making (e.g. preparation of local plans) and decision making (e.g. determination of planning applications). First published in 2012, the NPPF has been updated a number of times to varying degrees between 2018 and 2026. This latest NPPF is a significant re-write.
- 2.2. Consultation on the proposed NPPF took place between December 2025 and March 2026. A briefing note and proposed response relating to that consultation came before Planning Committee in February 2026: [National Planning Policy Framework consultation and changes to Biodiversity Net Gain](#).

3. About the new NPPF 2026

- 3.1. The NPPF is deliberately encouraging growth. It has not changed much since the March draft.
- 3.2. The NPPF now comprises national plan-making policies and national decision-making policies. This brings the structure of the NPPF into closer alignment with local plans and neighbourhood plans which are principally structured around planning policies.
- 3.3. Despite the new national **decision-making policies** being non-statutory they remain critically important to the decision-making process. Annex A of the NPPF notes that any development plan policies that are materially inconsistent with national-decision making policies 'should be given very limited weight'. Officers are reviewing existing local plan policies against the new national decision-making policies to identify areas of inconsistency.
- 3.4. **Plan-making policies** apply to the preparation of development plans, including spatial development strategies (SDS), local plans, minerals and waste local plans, neighbourhood plans, and supplementary plans.
- 3.5. While the statutory 'duty to co-operate' has been abolished, the importance of maintaining and demonstrating effective cooperation between plan-making authorities and key stakeholders is retained in the NPPF to ensure strategic cross boundary matters are identified and appropriately addressed through the preparation of plans.
- 3.6. Spatial development strategies (SDSs) are development plans that address planning matters of strategic importance over a sub-regional area and will be prepared by strategic planning authorities (i.e. the future Norfolk and Suffolk Combined County Authority). The

NPPF plan-making policies address SDSs, including – that they set out a positive vision for growth and change at the sub-regional scale providing a clear framework for investment and growth; focus on strategic matters, leaving other parts of the development plan to address more detailed matters; identify broad locations for a sustainable pattern of growth covering at least 25 years; set out the type, extent and broad location of strategic infrastructure needed to enable development and support existing communities; and that SDS preparation must commence no later than 7 years after the adoption of the previous SDS.

- 3.7. Procedural plan-making policies also address supplementary plans, which are expected to be targeted at specific issues not addressed by other parts of the development plan. Supplementary plans should be limited to setting out locally specific design standards, or situations where a positive response to unanticipated changes in the local area would quickly put in place policies to shape or direct development of a site or a group of nearby sites

4. 92 things you need to know about the final version of the new NPPF

- 4.1. This assessment is taken from this Planning Resource Article from 20 August 2026: [92 things you need to know about the final version of the new NPPF | Planning Resource](#).

General principles

1. The [new NPPF](#) contains both revised plan-making policies and decision-making policies in one document. As trailed in the consultation draft document in 2025, the new framework has a radical new structure compared to previous versions. In its consultation response document, the government says the proposed format and structure are “integral to establishing a comprehensive set of national policies on general planning matters, and to making policy more rules-based and certain”.

2. The policies are non-statutory – for now. The government says it has considered the arguments for and against statutory national development management policies (NDMPs), and the matter will be kept under review. “Should a decision be taken to progress statutory NDMPs, the government will ensure that their scope is clearly defined, supported by guidance and transitional arrangements, and that their role in relation to development plans is set out clearly to provide certainty for decision-makers and communities,” the consultation response document states.

3. According to plan-making policy PM6 on general principles, plans should not “duplicate” nor “substantively restate” what is contained in the NPPF’s decision-making policies – but the government has deleted the draft’s instruction that they should not “modify” such policies. The government says it recognises concerns that seeking to prevent the modification of decision-making policies “could impose an inappropriate degree of rigidity”. Instead, the instruction is that plans should not include policies that are “inconsistent” with national policies.

4. The transitional arrangements for the new NPPF have been softened from those outlined in the draft. The implementation section of the framework says policies, or parts of policies, that are “materially inconsistent” with the policies in the new document should be given very limited weight. The draft had proposed that as soon as the document is live, local development plan policies that are “in any way inconsistent with the national decision-making policies” outlined in the NPPF should be given “very limited weight” in decision-making. The change was made in response to concerns that the policy as drafted was “too hard-edged and could apply too broadly”, according to the consultation response document.

5. Plans being prepared today under the existing plan-making system can continue to be judged against the 2024 version of the NPPF, subject to the transitional arrangements set out in the 2024 document. However, any plans being brought forward under the new system as introduced by the 2023 Levelling Up and Regeneration Act should use this new framework.

6. The updated NPPF includes a series of new annexes holding key technical reference information, including the methodologies by which to calculate housing need and the housing delivery test, and to conduct green belt reviews. However, the government has decided not to take forward a technical annex to include standardised inputs in viability assessment. “While we understand the need for a consistent framework for evaluating development proposals and certainty in the viability assessment process, we consider that further engagement is needed with local planning authorities (LPAs), developers, development surveyors and other key stakeholders,” it says in the consultation response document.

7. As outlined in the draft document, the new NPPF includes some decision-making policies that indicate how much weight the government would expect a particular consideration to be given. These include cases where, it says, it is appropriate to give substantial weight to certain benefits, and the limited circumstances in which it is expected that permission would be refused. The government says this standardised approach will provide greater clarity, while the weight to be given to specific considerations “remains a matter for decision-makers, to be determined on the facts of individual cases”.

Achieving sustainable development

8. Policy S1 says development plans should seek to meet the development needs of their area as a minimum. Plans should provide for new development and improvements of the environment in a way that promotes a sustainable pattern of growth and seeks to mitigate climate change and adapt to its effects, the policy maintains.

9. Policy S3 takes forward the long-established “presumption in favour of sustainable development” for decision-making. It retains the existing principle that proposals which accord with the various development plans should be approved without delay.

10. Policy S4 says development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, including impacts in relation to other policies in the framework. This might be where the proposal would have a “substantial adverse impact” in relation to the allocation or safeguarding of land

for particular uses in the development plan, or to the application of the certain policies in the framework, the draft adds.

11. Policy S5 proposes a new ‘tilted balance’ to assessing development proposals outside settlements, including modifying the definition of “well-connected” rail stations to include the top 80 travel-to-work areas – the draft suggested the top 60. The document adds that only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements. These include:

- Rural businesses and services that need to be located outside settlements.
- Development “within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station”.
- Development that would address “an evidenced unmet need” (including where the council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply) and where development would be “physically well related” to an existing settlement or would comprise major development for freight and logistics purposes.

These developments should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, the document states.

12. Policies S4 and S5 state that the benefits of development are likely to be outweighed by harm in situations where proposals “fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances”. The previous presumption in the 2024 NPPF explicitly listed a series of policies that should be considered in concluding whether a proposal’s benefits were likely to be outweighed by its adverse impacts – including those in relation to sustainable locations, design quality and making the most effective use of land.

Strategic planning: Spatial development strategies

13. Policy PM1 introduces the new system of strategic planning. The NPPF says spatial development strategies (SDSs) are required to be produced by strategic planning authorities and the mayor of London. They should set a positive vision for future growth and change at a subregional scale, and should be “genuinely strategic in nature”, allowing for more detailed issues to be considered through other parts of the development plan.

14. SDSs should set out a strategy for a sustainable pattern of growth covering a period of at least 25 years – up from the 20-year period stated in the draft. The minimum period has been adjusted upwards “to support long-term certainty for planning, infrastructure delivery and investment”, the consultation response document states. SDSs should include an apportionment to those LPAs within its area of objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, the new NPPF says.

15. Strategic planning authorities should commence preparation of a replacement or altered SDS no later than seven years after the current version is adopted, or earlier where there have been significant changes. This is an adjusted period from the draft, which had instructed that a replacement should be adopted no later than ten years after the current version was adopted, or earlier if there had been significant changes. “This approach maintains up-to-date

plans by ensuring that no SDS should be more than approximately ten years old, while supporting stability and reducing unnecessary burden,” according to the government.

16. Only housing requirement figures from SDSs that are under five years old can be used in the housing delivery test or five-year housing land supply calculations. The government says it has decided to maintain the current approach because it considers that a five-year period “strikes an appropriate balance between providing stability for plan-making while ensuring that the housing requirement figures used for calculations remain responsive and reflect local need”.

17. Tests of soundness are applied to the examination of SDSs. The tests applied to such documents are “positive”, “appropriate”, “effective” and “consistent with national policy”, as set out in policy PM14. The positive test states that a strategy that does not provide for objectively assessed needs “should be considered an exception”.

Local planning

18. Local plans should cover a minimum ten-year period, down from the current 15 years, which was also proposed in the draft document. This is despite 69 per cent of respondents supporting the retention of the 15-year minimum plan period. The government says it “notes the overall support for longer plan periods”. However, it notes comments suggesting shorter periods would have benefits of flexibility and adaptability, evidence being more relevant and up to date, and reduced resource burdens on local authorities. “For these reasons we consider that plan periods should allow for both long-term planning and local flexibility to be able to be responsive to local circumstances,” it explains. The document makes it clear that longer time periods continue to be appropriate “where this supports, for example, the delivery of strategic development and infrastructure”.

19. Local plans should be prepared and adopted within 30 months of publishing a “Gateway 1” self-assessment. Authorities must start on the preparation of the next local plan no later than five years after adoption of the current plan. But the government says this should be earlier where an inspector at examination of the current plan has made a recommendation to do so or where there has been a significant change in local circumstances (including an increased housing requirement). The government acknowledges concerns about the 30-month local plan preparation timeframe. However, its position “remains that this strikes the right balance between speed and deliverability”, the consultation response document says. The wider package of plan-making reforms, it adds, “will support authorities in meeting these timescales”.

20. Statements of common ground should be used to demonstrate that relevant cross-boundary matters have been addressed, including by distributing and providing for unmet needs across neighbouring and/or nearby areas. Where it has not been possible to fully address cross-boundary matters, plan-making authorities should demonstrate that they have taken all reasonable steps to address them.

21. The soundness tests for local plans remain, and the draft NPPF’s proposal to introduce a “realistic” test in the draft has been withdrawn in favour of retaining the current “effective”

test. As trailed in the draft, a new test stating that the plan should be in general conformity with any adopted SDS for the area is introduced.

22. Local plans should identify “appropriate sites” for development, the NPPF says in a revision to the draft’s text, which said authorities should identify “the most appropriate sites” for development. The government says the tweak was made “to respond to concerns this would place significant burdens on plan-makers and would be inconsistent with the tests of soundness”.

23. The government has opted not to bar local authorities from setting energy-efficiency standards for new housing that exceed national building regulations. Instead, a new paragraph in policy PM13 outlines the circumstances in which LPAs can set out local energy-efficiency standards. The response document says the government has backed down on this issue following concerns that the draft’s approach “could hinder local authorities’ ability to address climate change in their areas”. The government also says it will not commence section 43 of the Deregulation Act 2015, which would have legally barred LPAs from setting higher energy-efficiency standards than Building Regulations.

24. The use of supplementary plans should be limited to setting locally specific design standards and responding to changes in the area, the NPPF says. In the latter case, this should be where it is important to put in place policies “for a site or group of sites which the authority considers to be nearby to each other”.

Decision-making policies

25. The new NPPF says proposals for major development should be informed by early engagement with stakeholders to identify and seek to resolve key planning matters prior to the submission of a planning application. It states that such proposals should be accompanied by a “concise” planning statement. Proposals for other types of development should be supported by the minimum necessary information requirements to enable a decision, it adds.

26. Policy DM5 on development viability sets out a range of scenarios where viability tests might be appropriate to reduce planning contributions from a site to levels below that expected in local policy. The policy says viability tests are reasonable where:

- The development proposed is different from that envisaged during the local plan examination.
- The site characteristics “differ substantially” from those assumed during the plan process.
- The site is burdened by unforeseeable costs.
- Economic circumstances have changed significantly.

27. Policy DM6 on planning conditions and obligations makes clear that “model” planning conditions “should be used unless there are strong reasons for using a different

condition”. Conditions requiring discharge prior to development commencing “should be avoided unless there is a clear justification”, it proposes.

28. Local authorities and mayoral authorities are “strongly encouraged” to make use of local development orders (LDOs) to provide certainty to applicants about the prospects of permission, policy DM9 states. The current framework does not extend to mayoral authorities – authorities are merely “encouraged” to use LDOs.

29. The NPPF endorses the use of Article 4 Directions to remove permitted development rights where it is necessary to protect local amenity or the well being of the area, such as supporting the vitality and viability of parts of town centres. It drops the instruction of the previous NPPF that where such directions relate to changes from non-residential to residential use, they should be limited to situations where they are “necessary to avoid wholly unacceptable adverse impacts”.

Urban and suburban densification

30. Decision-making policy L2 on making effective use of land calls for “substantial weight” to be given to various types of proposals that reuse existing sites. It specifically encourages schemes that:

- Remediate land.
- Make better use of under-utilised land.
- Provide temporary uses.
- Make use of airspace above existing development.
- Provide “sensitive redevelopment or additional development within existing plots”, including (but not limited to) mansard roof extensions.

31. While opening up the possibility of “additional development within existing plots”, policy L2 also places limits on the scale of redevelopment within “residential curtilages”. It says schemes should “not occupy more than twice the footprint of all the existing buildings on the site and, following development, would retain at least 50 per cent of the non-developed area within the building curtilage”.

32. Residential or mixed-use developments within settlements should increase the density in the area where they are proposed, according to decision-making policy L3. New text added since the draft clarifies that the only exception to this should be “where there is a clear justification that this is either inappropriate or not possible”. The policy says that while an area’s character should be taken into account in decisions, this “should not preclude development which makes the most of an area's potential”.

33. A policy in the draft proposing that plots around all train stations should be built out at a density of at least 40 dwellings per hectare (dph) has been scrapped. Draft policy L3 had also proposed that plots around “well-connected” stations should be built out at 50dph, but the final version has lowered this to at least 35dph, with a higher threshold of at least 45dph

reserved strictly for high-frequency transit nodes. In its consultation response document, the government says some respondents argued that the density targets could “create viability and market demand challenges in some locations”, while others claimed that imposing minimum density standards around stations with irregular or infrequent services “could lead to inappropriate development and undermine wider efforts to support sustainable patterns of growth”. The removal of density requirements around stations with lower service levels, it adds, will “support a more gradated approach to density”. The new density requirements “enable a more responsive approach, reflecting that high-frequency stations are usually in major urban areas and town centres, and can therefore support higher densities”.

Design and healthy communities

34. The instruction in the draft framework and previous NPPF to refuse development proposals that are not well designed has been dropped. Policy DP3 of the final document says instead that proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with key elements of the design policy, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan. Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals, it adds.

35. The design policy includes a specific reference to women and girls in its instructions for designing public spaces. The government says the addition was made in response to calls for “explicit recognition of the safety of women and girls in public spaces”.

36. LPAs should encourage the appropriate use of design reviews and take into account their outcomes, including any design recommendations made by review panels, the framework specifies. It adds that councils should not allow the quality of approved development to be materially diminished between permission and completion.

37. The final NPPF confirms the draft’s move to direct authorities to refuse hot-food takeaways within walking distance of schools, albeit omitting the term “fast-food outlets”. Policy HC5 of the document says such proposals should be refused near places where young people congregate and in locations where there is evidence that a concentration of such uses is having an adverse impact on local health, pollution or antisocial behaviour.

Natural environment

38. The government has backtracked on a more permissive approach it took in the draft to development in protected landscapes (defined as national parks and national landscapes), reinserting the instruction that proposals for major development in such areas should be “refused” other than in exceptional circumstances. The draft had said such proposals “should only be supported” in exceptional circumstances. The final version also clarifies that the public interest test should be separate, whereas the draft version had implied that it was part of the same test. The changes were made following concern in the consultation that protections had been weakened through changes to the wording.

39. However, the instruction that “substantial” weight should be given to the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of these areas, replacing the “great weight”

that the previous NPPF said should be given, is retained. The government states that the change is “not intended nor considered to diminish the actual weight which would be given to the importance of these areas in policy terms”.

40. Decision-takers should consider landscape character and “existing natural features” when looking at the impact of development proposals. Under decision-making policy N2, development proposals should consider these factors and minimise biodiversity impact that, where it cannot be avoided nor mitigated, should result in permission being refused. The previous version of the NPPF had instructed planning policies and decisions to protect and enhance “valued landscapes”.

41. The new document instructs proposals to take into account the quality of agricultural land. If “significant development of agricultural land is necessary”, it adds, schemes should “use areas of poorer-quality land where possible”.

42. Local authorities should not attempt to levy higher biodiversity net gain requirements than the statutory level, except on specific site allocations where fully justified and deliverable. The stipulation comes in draft plan-making policy N1 on identifying environmental opportunities and safeguards.

Green belt

43. Housing and mixed-use development around stations defined as “well-connected” will not be considered inappropriate, provided it is of an appropriate scale, does not prejudice long-term development proposals and complies with the NPPF’s “golden rules”. The government says the objective of this policy is to support high-density development in sustainable locations. The golden rules were [introduced in the December 2024 NPPF](#) and apply to all residential development on green belt, requiring higher levels of affordable housing, among other things (see points 49 and 50).

44. Policy GB2 says the preparation of SDSs should be informed by an assessment of the strategic role of green belt land in the area. The assessment should take into account the five purposes of the green belt, it adds. The strategic assessment should be used to help develop the SDS and identify whether there are areas where green belt boundaries may require further consideration through the preparation of local plans. The preparation of local plans should be informed by an assessment that identifies green belt land, the policy notes.

45. “Exceptional circumstances” are still required for altering green belt boundaries in local plans, according to policy GB3 of the document. These include an LPA being unable to meet its identified need for development in full, having examined all other reasonable options for doing so, it adds.

46. However, where a development plan’s spatial strategy has identified suitable land around well-connected stations for development, exceptional circumstances do not need to be demonstrated to justify altering green belt boundaries.

47. The NPPF drops an instruction in the draft version for development plans to set out ways that the impact of green belt releases could be offset through compensatory

improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining green belt land. The draft had reinstated a requirement that had been dropped in the 2024 version of the framework, but the government has now once again dropped the policy. It now considers that the wider policy, including the golden rules, “already provide an appropriate framework for securing compensatory improvements”.

48. The definition of grey belt in the glossary of the document now removes the exception of areas where footnote 7 designations would restrict development. “The government is satisfied that separate policy protection for footnote 7 areas remains in place and does not consider that substantial changes to the grey belt approach are necessary,” the consultation response document states.

49. Policy GB8 states that major housing developments in the green belt should be subject to the NPPF’s golden rules regarding affordable housing and infrastructure provision. It adds that the importance of complying with the golden rules should be given substantial weight.

50. The policy sets out the three circumstances in which a site-specific viability assessment may be justified to allow contributions expected by the golden rules policy to be adjusted. These are where a proposal is on brownfield land, where it is for a strategic site, or for a development “which is of a wholly different type to that assumed in the viability assessment that informed the development plan”. In these cases, it says, development should still “make the maximum possible contribution” to affordable housing and infrastructure. Development proposals that provide contributions significantly below the requirements “will only be acceptable in exceptional cases where fully evidenced and justified”, it adds.

Economy and town centres

51. Substantial weight should be given to the economic benefits of proposals for commercial development, according to policy E2. When assessing whether there is an unmet need for such development, considerations should include whether market signals indicate an undersupply of specific types of land or premises, and whether a proposal’s specific locational requirements are met by existing allocations in the development plan, it explains.

52. Policy E3 sets out criteria for assessing freight and logistic uses. It says such proposals should have good access to transport networks, be sited and designed to limit environmental impact and provide sufficient and secure parking for lorries and other vehicles to cater for the anticipated use.

53. The framework retains the town centre-first principle, including the sequential and impact tests for retail developments. Policy TC1 is amended from the draft framework to make it clearer that residential development is appropriate only where it would not undermine the vitality and viability of the town centre. The framework retains the core principle that “main town centre use” should be located in centres and says a sequential test should be applied to proposals for main town centre uses when planning permission is required.

54. But a proposal in the consultation draft to require developers to consider whether a single, large-scale scheme comprising retail or other town centre uses can be split up across multiple smaller, separate sites in town centres (under draft policy TC3), has been dropped. The MHCLG says it has removed the wording on “disaggregation” policy following consultation feedback warning that including it in national policy could create “undue rigidity” in the operation of the sequential test. [More](#)

Housing

55. Under policy HO1, the preparation of strategic-level SDSs, where those exist, and local plans should be based on a housing need assessment that establishes the overall minimum number of homes needed in the area over the plan period, using the standard method. The new plan-making policy for housing also changes existing policy to specifically reference the need to accommodate travellers.

56. Policy HO2 says that where SDSs are not in place, the housing requirement figure should be higher than the identified local housing need level “where appropriate”. This would include situations where more homes are required to meet the needs of neighbouring authorities, or where authorities have “significant growth ambitions”. The housing requirements for individual local authorities should be taken from SDSs, where those exist, and “should not be retested” during local plan formation unless there has been a “significant change in circumstances”.

57. Local authorities will be required, under policy HO5, to set a minimum level of homes that should be built to accessible standards on major developments in their area, against a national baseline of 40 per cent. This marks a change from the draft framework, which applied the accessible housing requirement to all kinds of development, not just major ones.

58. On allocated sites, councils should use their local plan to set expectations for tenure mix “where this would be appropriate and deliverable”. The government [scrapped proposals in the draft framework](#) for local plans to mandate a minimum level of social rent housing and to set expectations for a mix of tenures in 150-home-plus schemes

59. The framework introduces a medium-size site category into the planning system. This will cover developments of between ten and 49 homes, with an area of up to 2.5 hectares in size.

60. A proposal in the draft NPPF to allow developers of medium-sized sites to provide cash contributions instead of on-site affordable housing provision is dropped. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) says consultation respondents had raised concerns that “it could have a detrimental impact on the manifesto commitment to deliver the biggest increase in social and affordable housebuilding in a generation”. [More](#)

61. The government scrapped proposals in the draft framework for local plans to mandate a minimum level of social rent housing. The department says many respondents argued it “could reduce local flexibility, fail to reflect site-specific viability constraints and risk slowing overall delivery of both affordable and market housing”, urging for social housing targets to

remain locally set. The MHCLG says it will instead “continue to require authorities to identify the proportion of social rent needed in their areas and set out requirements clearly in local plans”. [More](#)

62. Under policy HO6, local plans should allocate at least ten per cent of the housing requirement to medium-sized sites of between one and 2.5 hectares. The policy also retains the existing requirement for plans to allocate a further ten per cent to smaller sites of one hectare or less.

63. Under decision-making policy HO8, proposals for military affordable housing should not be required to meet local plan requirements that stipulate a mix of affordable housing tenures. This includes where military housing is delivered on its own or alongside other forms of affordable housing.

64. New policy HO13 on the build-out of residential and mixed-use development encourages local authorities to impose planning conditions on applicants “requiring that development begins within a timescale shorter than the relevant statutory default period”. However, it says this should be done only where it would speed build-out “without threatening its implementation or viability”.

65. The fact that an up-to-date calculation of local housing need is higher than the local housing requirement should not be considered evidence of unmet housing need for a period of five years from adoption of a plan, as long as certain conditions are met. These are that the planning authority can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer) and where the housing delivery test indicates that the delivery of housing is more than 75 per cent of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

Climate change

66. Local authorities should consider the risk of wildfires when drawing up local plans and should propose development patterns that “contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions”. The plan-making policy CC1 on climate change says local plans “can” be informed by an assessment of baseline carbon emissions and the potential effect of development options on future emissions.

67. New decision-making policy CC2 on the mitigation of climate change states that projects should, “where relevant”, deliver a variety of sustainability benefits. These include:

- Being located close to local facilities and amenities.
- Conserving energy through design approaches.
- Reusing existing materials.
- Connecting to decentralised heat networks.
- Contributing to habitat restoration.

68. Under CC2, substantial weight should be given to improving the energy efficiency of existing buildings through a development proposal. Likewise, substantial weight should be given to the use of renewable or low-carbon sources or heat networks.

69. Policy CC3 addressing adaptation to climate change requires decision-makers to consider the “potential impacts of climate change over the lifetime of the scheme”. Previously, policy did not specify that it has to go further than considering existing impacts.

Heritage

70. The new NPPF has overhauled the long-established test for assessing the impact of development proposals on heritage assets, which now includes consideration of the potential positive heritage effects of the scheme. The framework introduces four “tiers” for assessing impact on heritage assets, from “having a positive effect” to causing “the total loss”. Revised policy HE5 on assessing effects on heritage assets states that it is the effect on an asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that should be considered by decision-makers. [More](#)

71. The new framework revises the weight given to the consideration of the potential effect of a development on a designated heritage asset from “great” to “substantial”. In the consultation, the MHCLG says the change “is intended to improve consistency in how weighting is applied [...] rather than to signal any change in weighting to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets”. However, a blog on the new NPPF by consultancy Bidwells points out that “even if intended as standardised language, ‘substantial’ is presented as the highest tier of weight available”. [More](#)

72. A new paragraph (3) has been added to policy HE6 since the consultation draft, pointing out that “any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight” when considering proposals. The addition is “to make the importance of designated heritage assets absolutely clear”, the consultation response says.

Viability

73. A proposal in the draft framework for a national benchmark land value to be used by development plan-makers when assessing the viability of greenfield sites on green belt is scrapped in the final document. The government’s consultation response said that the approach “could provide greater transparency”, but the risks outweigh the potential benefits. It acknowledged “strong opposition to the proposal” from consultation respondents. [More](#)

74. The government has decided not to take forward a technical annex that was included in the draft that set out standardised inputs in viability assessment. “While we understand the need for a consistent framework for evaluating development proposals and certainty in the viability assessment process, we consider that further engagement is needed with local planning authorities (LPAs), developers, development surveyors and other key stakeholders,” it says in the consultation response document. These standardised inputs will instead remain in the non-statutory Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Community assets

75. The document introduces stronger protections for pubs and music venues at threat of closure. Under decision-making policy HC6, developers seeking to convert such facilities will need to prove there is “no reasonable prospect of the use being retained”. The draft framework had proposed only applying the protection to such facilities if they are the last of their kind in a local area, but that restriction has been removed. [More](#)

76. Decision-making policy HC7 retains the previous framework’s principle that development proposals should not result in the loss of open space, sports and recreational buildings and land. Whereas the previous framework only stated that this includes playing fields and “formal play spaces”, the new policy extends this by also citing “informal play spaces and allotments”.

Enforcement and unauthorised development

77. Policy DM8 states that “intentional unauthorised development” should be given “substantial weight” in determining retrospective applications. A 2015 written ministerial statement only made deliberate development without permission a “material consideration”. [More](#)

Travellers

78. The new NPPF incorporates the government’s planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS). The PPTS was formerly a separate document that had needed to be considered alongside the framework. This aims to “reduce unnecessary duplication”, “support equitable outcomes within the planning system” and provide “greater clarity on how traveller sites should be planned for and delivered”, according to the consultation response. [More](#)

79. The new framework requires plan-makers to consider the needs of travellers in the preparation of SDSs and local plans, where SDSs are not in place. Policy HO1 states that requirements for SDSs should be informed by an assessment of traveller site need. This approach recognises that such needs “are best planned for at the strategic level”, the consultation document says. Policy HO2 says that pitch and plot requirements in plan-making should reflect the extent to which permanent and transit site needs of travellers in the area can be “accommodated as fully as possible”.

80. Plan-making policy HO3 requires plan-makers to identify a supply of specific deliverable traveller sites for five years after the intended plan adoption date. Policy HO5 requires plans to identify traveller sites that are “suitable for mixed residential and business uses”.

81. Policy HO12 says that proposals for traveller sites should be located to “provide a settled base”. Requirements in the draft framework for traveller site locations to limit “the need for long-distance travelling and potential environmental damage caused by unauthorised encampment” are removed in the final document. The government noted in the consultation response that responders had said the “long-distance travelling” wording “could be clearer”. [More](#)

82. Green belt boundaries should only be altered to meet the need for a traveller site if that site is allocated in a development plan. Policy GB3 in the new framework states that if councils wish to make an “exceptional, limited alternation” to a defined green belt boundary “to meet a specific, identified need for a traveller site, it should be specifically allocated in the development plan as a traveller site only”.

Vision-led transport approach

83. Sustainable transport considerations should form part of early engagement with local communities when drawing up local plans, under plan-making policy TR1. The policy also says that plan-makers “may” set thresholds for what constitutes a significant amount of movement arising from new development, against which to make planning decisions.

84. Policy TR2 states that local plans should set local parking standards. The previous NPPF suggested this as an option.

85. The government will revise its PPG on transport to provide further information on the “vision-led” transport approach to support its “consistent application” in plan-making, the consultation document revealed. The guidance will include clarification on when the vision should be established and how authorities may set local thresholds for significant movement, it said.

86. In the final NPPF, electric vehicles have been added to the indicative list of transport facilities that may need to be planned for.

87. The final version of the framework also removes ultra low and zero emission vehicles and car-sharing from the definition of sustainable transport modes. This, the consultation response says, “aligns more fully with what the government regards as sustainable transport”.

Mineral extraction, including coal, oil and gas

88. The development plan should provide for a “sufficient and timely” supply of minerals of national and local importance. The word “timely” has been added to plan-making policy M1 since the consultation draft to clarify that plans should “ensure minerals supply is both adequate in overall terms and responsive to changes in market demand”, the consultation response says.

89. Minerals are “essential” to provide infrastructure, buildings, green energy and goods. The word “essential” was added to the final framework “to reflect established terminology and to recognise the importance of minerals in delivering wider government objectives”, the response document says.

90. Local authorities’ development plans should not identify new oil and gas sites outside licensed areas, and should not identify any sites at all for coal or peat extraction. Plans should distinguish between the exploration, appraisal and production phases of oil and gas developments.

91. “Substantial weight” should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction and processing in decision-making, including works that facilitate the exploration and extraction

of a new category of “critical and growth minerals”. These are defined in policy M3 as minerals that support either the green energy transition, net zero, national security or the government’s industrial strategy.

92. In decision-making, applications for peat extraction should be refused, while proposals for new coal mines or onshore oil and gas extraction should only be approved in limited circumstances. Decision-making policy M5 says proposals involving surface or underground coal workings, or for onshore oil and gas extraction, must facilitate the exploration or production of oil and gas in areas where the North Sea Transition Authority has granted petroleum rights; be necessary for public safety; or target the capture and use of methane from coal mines. The final NPPF adds that such proposals could also be approved if it is necessary for the extraction of other minerals of national or local importance, or for the purpose of ground stabilisation or to enable other development. These amendments seek to avoid “unintended constraints on development while maintaining the overall policy approach to coal extraction”, the consultation response says.

5. Commentary and parts of the NPPF 2026 to note

- 5.1. It is a different format.
- 5.2. **CC3 1 e** – this is about design response to potential impacts of climate change. It is about wildfires and not providing fuel for fires (such as timber fences) and incorporating firebreaks.
- 5.3. **DM8 2** – enforcement: if a breach is proven to have been intentional, that fact should be given substantial weight when considering whether to grant permission or not.
- 5.4. The term ‘walking distance’ is defined in the glossary.
- 5.5. **CC2 1 f** – protects peatlands in a stronger way.
- 5.6. **CC2 2** says ‘Substantial weight should be given to the benefits of improving the energy efficiency of existing buildings... *inter alia*... where this would be achieved through proposals for development’. We tried to look at improving the energy efficiency of existing buildings in the emerging Local Plan but could not make it work.
- 5.7. **CC2 2** and **DP 1 2 b** – refers to overheating – stronger emphasis.
- 5.8. **CC3 2** – 2 says ‘Substantial weight should be given to the benefits of improving the resilience of existing buildings and public spaces to anticipated climate change impacts where this would be achieved through proposals for development’.
- 5.9. Climate resilience and wildfire mitigation are new, explicit considerations under Policy **CC3**.
- 5.10. **HC4 2** – says to engage local communities in the design of community facilities and public infrastructure.
- 5.11. The term ‘physically well-related’ appears a lot but is not defined.

- 5.12. Major development (as in numerical) has the same definition as now. But medium development is 10 to 49 dwellings.
- 5.13. BNG can only be above 10% for certain sites allocated in the Local Plan and not area wide.
- 5.14. **HO2 1** – SDS will establish a housing requirement for each LPA in the SDS area – so that includes us.
- 5.15. **Section 10** in relation to renewables/low carbon is very light. We have lots more considerations in our renewable energy policy.
- 5.16. There is mention of women and girls in terms of design. But will there be guidance as to what makes something safe for women and girls?
- 5.17. **PM13 1 b ii** – talks about going beyond building regs for water use – would support our 90l/h/d proposed for the emerging Local Plan.
- 5.18. **HO9 1 a i** and **b ii** – supports our policy on elderly and specialist housing needing to be in development boundaries.
- 5.19. **HC6 a** – this uses a marketing period of 12 months, like we do for our marketing periods set out in our Local Plan.
- 5.20. **P3 2 d** – generally supports protecting tranquillity.
- 5.21. **N policies** support biodiversity enhancements.
- 5.22. **Annex C** sets out information requirements. This will be of importance when various parts of the NPPF are used. This will take some getting used to.
- 5.23. On occasion, the term ‘should be refused’ is used but on occasion wording along the lines of ‘should only be supported if’ or ‘should not be supported unless’ are used.

6. Protected landscapes

- 6.1. Generally, Protected Landscapes still have protection. Some wording changes are helpful; some not so much.
- 6.2. One of the key asks by Protected Landscapes in response to the consultation was the restoration of the NPPF presumption to refuse major development. This has happened (**Policy N4**). This is important as presumption to refuse policies, unless certain criteria met, are rare. They are referred to throughout the NPPF as representing special circumstances to counter saying yes as default.
- 6.3. There is reference now to natural rather than scenic beauty.
- 6.4. Another ask from Protected Landscapes to keep the wording ‘highest level of protection’ in relation to Protected Landscapes and their purposes, has not happened. This is disappointing but matches overall approach of the NPPF in relation to only two levels of weight– normal and substantial weight.

- 6.5. **N1 c** – says ‘This should include limiting the scale and extent of development within Protected Landscapes...’
- 6.6. Special qualities of protected landscapes are referenced in **N4**. Previously it was our purposes and duty that were engaged in the planning system via the NPPF.
- 6.7. The loss of the reference to the DEFRA Circular 2010 is disappointing but it remains a key document as it has not been withdrawn.
- 6.8. There is reference to the seek to further duty early on in the NPPF (**footnote 2**). In addition, there is mention of mitigating adverse impacts on special qualities and statutory purposes.
- 6.9. Policy **S1** on positive plan making continues to acknowledge the special status of National Parks through footnote 24 and our ability to look differently at housing need and supply. This is similar to the previous NPPF’s approach.
- 6.10. It is now explicitly stated development plans should have regard to protected landscape management plans (Policy **N1**), which is helpful as are the multiple references to LNRS’s, enabling them to have spatial dimension in plans (e.g. allocations).
- 6.11. The former “great weight” is replaced with “substantial weight” for conserving and enhancing natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. The Government’s response states this is not intended to diminish the weight given to these areas.

7. Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

- 7.1. The main change lies in the interaction between **Policies S3 to S5**, which introduce a wider presumption in favour of sustainable development, and policies that set out circumstances where it may not apply, including **Policy N4** on protected landscapes and **Policies HE6/HE7** on heritage assets. This approach seems to replace the use of footnote 7 in the previous 2024 NPPF.
- 7.2. The presumption is effectively a “default yes”: development should be approved without delay unless its benefits are “substantially outweighed by any adverse effects” when assessed against the national decision-making policies.
- 7.3. **Policy S3** sets out the presumption and when it applies.
- 7.4. Within settlements (**Policy S4**) the presumption is always applied.
- 7.5. Outside settlements (**Policy S5**) it applies in specified circumstances, including (non-exhaustively):
 - a) Agriculture and forestry development
 - b) Development for nature conservation, restoration and enhancement
 - c) The re-use of buildings of permanent and substantial construction

- d) Limited infilling within group of houses (not currently supported by the Authority outside settlements in the Local Plan's hierarchy)
 - e) Development on land close to busy railway stations
 - f) The redevelopment of previously developed land
 - g) Development on the edges of settlements where there is no up to date development plan or insufficient housing supply.
- 7.6. Policy **S4** names Policy **N4** (the “Protected Landscapes” Policy) as a possible reason to disapply the presumption; Policy **S5** instead refers to any national decision-making policy requiring refusal in specific circumstances. Under the 2024 NPPF the presumption only applied where there was no up-to-date plan or insufficient housing supply, and National Park designation could form a ‘strong reason for refusal.’

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 2 September 2026

Planning Committee

9 October 2026

Agenda item number 11

Suffolk Water Recycling, Storage and Transport Project update

Report by Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects Officer

Summary

This report provides Members with an update on the latest position with Suffolk Water Recycling Transfer and Storage project proposed by Essex and Suffolk Water.

The Preferred Options for the Project were announced in July 2026. In August 2026 a formal application was made to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) for an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Opinion accordance with Regulation 8(1)(b) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

The EIA Scoping Opinion is the subject of consultation by PINS, and the Broads Authority is a consultee. Due to the regulatory timescales associated with the EIA Scoping Consultation and the timing of its submission it has not been possible to bring comments to Members prior to the formal deadline. Officers have therefore submitted officer level comments, and these are set out in Appendix 1 of the report, which Members are asked to endorse.

Recommendation

Members are asked to note the contents of the report and endorse the Officer level comments in Appendix 1.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The East of England is among the driest regions in the UK, a view supported by the Environment Agency assessment that classified the region as a 'Serious Water Stressed Area'.
- 1.2. To ensure that there is enough water for now and for future generations, Essex and Suffolk Water (ESW) are developing the Suffolk Water Recycling and Transfer and Storage (SWRTS) project. SWRTS seeks to develop a new Advanced Water Recycling Plant, capable of producing 11 million litres per day of purified recycled water, together with strategic network enhancements which will support a more reliable and resilient water supply for the region.
- 1.3. The two main project elements are outlined below:

- a) Advanced Water Recycling Plant: The Project will divert treated recycled water from Anglian Water's existing Lowestoft Water Recycling Centre (WRC) to the proposed Essex & Suffolk Water Advanced Water Recycling Plant to be located to the north of Lowestoft.
 - b) Strategic Network Enhancements: These take the form of service reservoirs and new pipelines. Water will be drawn from the River Waveney and treated to meet drinking water standards. To ensure a reliable supply, the water will be stored in two new service reservoirs and will be delivered to homes and businesses through a newly built network of pipelines. The prospective locations of both the central service reservoir (at Sibton) and the western service reservoir (in the Eye area) are outside of the Broads Executive Area.
- 1.4. However, the potential location of the pipeline which will carry water from the River Waveney to the proposed Advanced Water Recycling Plant near Lowestoft will cross into the Broads Executive area in the Somerleyton and Geldeston areas. Further details of the potential route of the preferred pipeline corridor are shown on the SWRTS interactive Map: [Suffolk Water Recycling, Transfer and Storage Project \(suffolkwaternetwork.co.uk\)](https://suffolkwaternetwork.co.uk)
- 1.5. Furthermore, the outfall of the proposed pipeline corridor which seeks to return treated water to the River Waveney also falls within the Broads Executive Area.

2. Statutory and Non-Statutory Process

- 2.1. Due to the scale of the project, it will require a Development Consent Order to be approved. Therefore, the project forms a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and will be dealt with by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State. The Development Consent Order process is a streamlined consent route for major infrastructure projects and was established to provide a faster and fairer process for interested parties, such as landowners, organisations and members of the public.
- 2.2. The process puts emphasis on early engagement with communities and stakeholders to allow for the opportunity to influence a project before an application is made for development consent
- 2.3. There is a prescribed process for such applications, and this is being followed by ESW. The Broads Authority is a consultee in this process, and your officers have actively participated in early consultation exercises helping to shape the project.
- 2.4. The Stages in the DCO process for this NSIP can be summarised as follows:
 - Stage 1: Non- Statutory Consultation October 2025
 - Stage 2: Announcement of Preferred Options July 2026
 - Stage 3: Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Submission August 2026
 - Stage 4: Public Consultation (Statutory) Mid 2027

Stage 5: DCO Application Submitted – Early/Mid 2028.

- 2.5 Members may recall receiving a presentation on the Project from the Planning Policy Officer at the Non-Statutory Consultation Stage in the Autumn of 2025.
- 2.6 Since that time there have been a series of regular monthly meetings between the ESW team and the relevant affected local planning authorities (LPAs) to discuss the scheme. The LPAs have also met as a collective group on regular occasions. The ESW team has held several thematic workshops and meetings covering issues such as landscape, highway/access, heritage/archaeology, ecology, climate change and trees. Broads Authority Officers have also had bespoke meetings with the ESW team to discuss additional specific BA matters of concern such as landscape impact, navigation issues, dark skies and the treatment of peat.
- 2.7 In April 2026, ESW held a comprehensive workshop attended by a range of interested parties and LPAs to discuss the potential options for the scheme. The key matter for the Broads Authority is the proposed pipeline corridor within the Broads Executive Area and the return outfall pipe to the Waveney.
- 2.8 Following the April workshop, the ESW consultants produced the Broads Feasibility Study which sought to ensure that the proposed Broad Pipeline and the delivery of it through horizontal directional drilling (HDD) was technically feasible. It is recognised that the installation of a pipeline within the Broads is a difficult proposition however the study concluded that it was technically feasible. That being said, using the method of open trenches will also probably be difficult given the water levels in the area. Your officers have examined the report and agree with the methodology used to arrive at the report's conclusions. Two specific meetings with the report authors and BA officers were held in August 2026.
- 2.9 Members will note from the introduction above that the Preferred Options for the Project were published in July 2026. These are published for information; they are not currently the subject of consultation although informal comments have been fed back which reinforce issues previously raised in liaison meetings. The Preferred Options for the pipeline corridor are now the subject of further technical development and informal consultation feedback with BA Officers which will continue to shape the statutory consultation due to take place in 2027.
- 2.10 The EIA Scoping submission to PINS is subject to a formal consultation process and there is a prescribed 28-day period in which this must happen. That period initially ran from 2nd September to 30th September but has been extended to 2nd October due to an administrative error on the part of PINS. Your officers and retained consultants have examined the documentation and the collated comments are shown in Appendix 1. It should be noted that a consultation on the EIA Scoping is essentially a consultation on what information should be included or 'scoped in' to the Environment Statement that will be produced to support the full Development Consent Order application

anticipated to be in 2028. The comments in Appendix 1 have had to be submitted to PINS in advance of this meeting due to the statutory timescales.

3. Financial implications

- 3.1. The financial implications of the SWRTS project relate to the Officer time taken to assess and comment on proposals and to participate in project feedback as it progresses. ESW have established a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with the relevant local planning authorities to enable them to recover costs associated with this. The Broads Authority is a participant in the PPA.

4. Risk implications

- 4.1. While the relevant Secretary of State will decide if development consent should be granted for a NSIP application it is in the local authority's interests to: proactively engage with the applicant on their proposed scheme, particularly during the pre-application stage and take part in all the stages of the NSIP process. [Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice for Local Authorities - GOV.UK](#)
- 4.2. Therefore, there are risks to the Authority associated with not participating at this stage and a scheme coming forward which could damage the Broads. The potential damage relates to a negative impact on the landscape, ecology, dark skies, loss of/impact on peat resources, impact on highway safety both in the short and long term.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. As outlined above Members are asked to note the progress of the SWRTS project and endorse the comments set out in Appendix 1.

Author: Andrea Long

Date of report: 23 September 2026

Background papers:

[Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice for Local Authorities - GOV.UK](#)

[Suffolk Water Recycling Transfer & Storage Project website](#)

Broads Feasibility Study

[Broads Plan](#) strategic objectives:

B2: Promote best practice water capture and usage across the Broadland Rivers Catchment and reduce point and diffuse pollution into the floodplain and water courses.

Appendix 1 – [Combined BA Response to EIA Scoping Consultation](#)

Appendix 1 – Combined BA Response to EIA Scoping Consultation

BA/2026/0252/SCOCON

Application PINS ref: WA0210003

Proposal/Description

Proposal/Description: Proposed application by Essex and Suffolk Water (the applicant) for an Order granting Development Consent for the Suffolk Water Recycling Transfer and Storage (the proposed development) Suffolk Water Recycling Transfer and Storage - EIA Scoping and Consultation and Regulation 11 Notification under the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (The EIA Regulations) – Regulations 10 and 11

Detailed comments

1. Landscape

- 1.1. As expected, a full Landscape and Visual Assessment has been scoped in to accompany the planning application to address potential significant landscape character and visual impacts on the landscape and to inform the scheme design and preservation and restoration of the landscape. The application is supported by an EIA Scoping Report (August 2026) prepared by Essex and Suffolk Water. Chapter 10 covers Landscape and Visual issues with supporting figures.
- 1.2. Currently no Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) has been prepared. Study areas of 3km radius for landscape and a 5km radius for views from the boundary of the EIA Scoping Area proposed, and at this preliminary stage are considered appropriate. The Figures showing the Landscape Character Areas (LCA) is incomplete within the scoping document due to time restrictions. For clarity, all affected and nearby neighbouring LCAs need to be scoped in.
- 1.3. In terms of Baseline data, this generally appears to be what we would expect to be scoped in. In addition, the following need to be scoped in:
 - [Design Guide and Code for the Broads Supplementary Planning Document:](#)
 - [Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Document \(SPD\)](#)

Significant Effects

- 1.4. We would expect to see proposed changes of topography to be included as a potentially significant landscape impact during the Construction Phase and the Operational Phase.

Night-time/Daytime and Assessment

- 1.5. We advise that we need to see residential receptors within 500m of above ground components where the daytime effects during operations and construction phases are likely to be significant needs to be both be scoped in.
- 1.6. Considering the intrinsic nocturnal character of the Broads, Adopted Local Plan Policy DM22 ([Local-Plan-for-the-Broads.pdf](#)), Local Plan Policy POSP7: Tranquillity in the Broads, we expect night-time assessment of likely significant visual effects within the Broads Authority Executive Area to be scoped into the ES.

Mitigation

- 1.7. Tertiary (Inexorable) Mitigation (Construction Phase): The inclusion of soils management needs to be in line with Defra soil handling guidance as provided via the Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites and the updated Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings, which set out practical standards for stripping, storing, and restoring soils sustainably.

Assessment Methodology

- 1.8. Assessment Methodology: The assessment methodology is broadly consistent with the principles set out in GLVIA3 and accords with established best practice. We welcome confirmation that the assessment of the Proposed Development's effects during the construction phase and in Year 1 following completion will adopt a precautionary worst-case approach, assuming winter conditions when existing vegetation is not in leaf. This approach is consistent with the Planning Inspectorate's NSIPs: Pre-Application Advice on Environmental Impact Assessment (July 2026).

2. Local Planning Policy

- 2.1. The list of Local Planning Policy documents appears relatively comprehensive; however, the Diss and District Neighbourhood Plan must be scoped in (adopted by South Norfolk Council and Mid-Suffolk District Council on 16 October 2023).
- 2.2. The proposals need to scope in the following policies from the Local Plan for the Broads 2015 – 2036 [among others]:
 - Policy DM8: Green infrastructure
 - Policy DM13: Natural Environment
 - Policy SP7: Landscape character
 - Policy DM16: Development and landscape
 - Policy DM22: Light pollution and dark skies
 - Policy SP11: Waterside sites
 - Policy DM28: Development on waterside sites in employment or commercial use, including boatyards

- Policy SP13: Navigable water space
- Policy DM31: Access to the water
- Policy SP14: Mooring provision
- Policy DM33: Moorings, mooring basins and marinas
- Policy DM43: Design
- Policy DM46: Safety by the water

2.6. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)

3. Ecology

- 3.1. The information submitted as the EIA Scoping Information appears comprehensive. However, a list of the protected species that the survey will be focusing on is required. It is assumed that this includes the invertebrates, for example the Fen Raft Spider *Dolomedes plantarius*, the Little Whirlpool Ramshorn Snail *Anisus vorticulus* and Desmoulin's whorl snail *Vertigo moulinsiana*, but we need to have this confirmed.
- 3.2. As part of the scheme progression, we still need to look at the core data and the solution as the pipeline crosses the marshes and side valleys. Useful discussion has taken place in terms of the HDD (Horizontal Directional Drilling) for the main Broads crossing but have not fully resolved the final crossing before the outflow which will be part of ongoing discussions.

4. Trees

- 4.1. The Environmental Statement for the proposed water recycling transfer and storage project needs to include sufficient arboricultural information to identify and assess the likely significant effects on trees, tree groups, hedgerows and woodlands, including those within or adjoining the Broads Authority. The information needs to meet the requirements of Regulations 10 and 11 and Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, while remaining proportionate to the current stage of the project. It needs to establish a reliable strategic baseline rather than duplicate the detailed tree-by-tree work that will be required once the design is sufficiently developed.

Arboricultural Baseline

- 4.2. Maps, plans or suitable spatial data needs to identify the presence, location and general distribution of trees, tree groups, hedgerows and woodlands within the project area and, where relevant, immediately adjoining it. The Broads Authority boundary needs to be clearly shown where the scoping area overlaps or approaches it. The baseline needs to indicate the principal species, approximate age or maturity, general condition and arboricultural or ecological value, with particular attention to important individual trees, linear features, field boundaries, roadside vegetation and areas where proposed infrastructure may interact with established vegetation. Targeted arboricultural and

hedgerow survey work needs to therefore be undertaken to a level sufficient to characterise the existing resource, identify sensitive locations and inform route selection. A detailed survey of every individual tree is not necessarily required at the Environmental Statement stage, provided the information is robust enough to identify likely significant effects and areas requiring further assessment.

Potential Effects

4.3. Potential effects include:

- Direct removal, severance or fragmentation of trees, hedgerows and woodlands during site clearance or construction.
- Damage to retained roots, stems or crowns from excavation, changes in ground levels, access arrangements, temporary compounds, storage or construction activity.
- Soil compaction, altered drainage, contamination, pollution, increased exposure and other changes to the growing environment.
- Effects where roads, working corridors, HGV routes, rights of way, cycleways, pipelines or other infrastructure cross or run adjacent to field boundaries, roadside verges or other linear vegetation.
- Loss of landscape, ecological, screening or connectivity functions associated with important trees and hedgerows.

4.4. The assessment needs to identify the likely scale, duration, reversibility and significance of these effects at an appropriate level. It needs to distinguish locations where impacts are unlikely to be material from those where route refinement, specialist construction methods or more detailed arboricultural assessment will be required.

Legal Protections and Constraints

4.5. The Environmental Statement needs to identify known statutory and planning protections affecting trees and woodland, including Tree Preservation Orders, conservation areas and other relevant designations or constraints. Ancient woodlands, veteran trees, important hedgerows and other features of particular arboricultural, ecological or landscape value needs to be clearly identified. The assessment needs to explain how these constraints have influenced route selection, design, construction methods and mitigation.

Detailed Design and Implementation

4.6. Once the detailed design is brought forward, fully detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessments needs to be commissioned in accordance with BS 5837:2012. These assessments need to examine the relationship between proposed works and retained trees, including root protection areas, access, excavation, service installation, drainage, changes in levels, construction methodology and tree protection measures. Project-specific arboricultural method statements need to be prepared where works are proposed within or close to sensitive rooting environments. This detailed stage needs

to build on, rather than duplicate, the strategic information supplied with the Environmental Statement.

Omissions

4.7. The following omissions to be addressed:

1. Clearly map the Broads Authority boundary together with trees, tree groups, hedgerows and woodland that could be affected.
2. Prepare a proportionate strategic arboricultural baseline covering distribution, principal species, maturity, condition, value and known protections.
3. Assess both direct and indirect effects and state their likely significance.
4. Demonstrate application of the mitigation hierarchy, supported by practical route, construction, protection, compensation and monitoring measures.
5. Undertake targeted hedgerow and arboricultural surveys where current information is insufficient.
6. Commission detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessments and method statements at the detailed design stage in accordance with BS 5837:2012.
7. Consult the Broads Authority and other relevant stakeholders as the assessment and design develop.

4.8. A comprehensive Environmental Statement cannot properly address trees and arboricultural matters without a sufficiently reliable baseline and a clear assessment of the likely significant effects. At this stage, that information may remain strategic and proportionate, but it needs to be specific enough to identify sensitive features, demonstrate that avoidance has been prioritised and show that remaining effects can be appropriately mitigated or compensated. Detailed assessment during design development will then be required to translate those commitments into workable route alignments, construction controls and long-term planting and monitoring proposals.

4.9. Section 10.6.1 of the Scoping Document with regard to ancient and veteran trees which states as follows:

“Landscape features such as ancient woodland, veteran trees and trees subject to tree preservation orders (‘TPOs’) located at distances of greater than 15m from the Order limits are proposed to be scoped out of the assessment in the ES, as it is unlikely that the root protection zones of these will be directly impacted by the Proposed Development’s construction, operational or decommissioning activities.”

4.10. Government advice on making planning decisions for ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees states that for ancient woodland, a buffer zone of at least 15 metres needs to exist from the boundary of the woodland (it does not define boundary so I have always taken this as the edge of the canopy), whilst for ancient or veteran trees the buffer zone needs to be at least 15 times larger than the diameter of the tree. The

point being with both these sets of advice is that these are just the minimum requirements. If an assessment shows that impacts from the development are likely to extend beyond these standard distances, a larger buffer zone will be required.

Moreover, with ancient and veteran trees, the buffer is not capped so a tree with a trunk diameter of 2 metres would require a 30 metre buffer zone. This size of tree is not at all unlikely for a veteran – a statistical analysis of Hayden’s (the arboricultural consultants for the Broads Authority) tree inspections going back over 15 years shows (i) the largest veteran oak trees up to 2.39 metres in diameter – thus requiring a buffer zone of almost 36 metres – and (ii) an average stem diameter of 1.36 metres – requiring buffer zones in excess of 20 metres.

- 4.11. For this reason, it is advised that the proposed scoping out of ancient woodland and veteran trees at 15 metres provides inadequate protection, and instead the scoping out boundary needs to be increased to at least 30 metres.

5. Historic Environment

- 5.1. Section 11.3.1: The Broads Authority also have responsibilities relating to the historic environment as the Local Planning Authority for the Broads Authority Executive Area. The Broads Authority needs to be added to this list and will be engaged throughout the process as a stakeholder in the Historic Environment.
- 5.2. Please refer to Norfolk County Council’s advice relating to the historic environment, including archaeology.

6. General and Detailed Observations

- a) ‘Broads National Park’ –the term ‘National Park’ is used for marketing. In planning terms, the Broads is not a National Park. We are a member of the National Parks family or have status equivalent to a National Park. Using the ‘The Broads’ and when referring to our area ‘Broads Authority Executive area’ would be acceptable.
- b) Figure 9 and Figures 11 Superficial Geology – the colours used are not easily distinguishable.
- c) Figure 20-2 Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) August 2026 Sheet 4 of 14 and so on – I see there is a lot of predicted grade 3a. I cannot see in the document what data source or methodology they used for predicted ACL. Will they confirm the ACL through tests?
- d) Figure 15-1 Air Quality Baseline Environment August 2026 Sheet 3 of 14 and 4 of 14 says the grey is LPA area – that is not the case as it does not segregate out the BA area. It might be Local Authority area – that might be what they mean.
- e) Appendix 6.1 could reference the BA [Peat development guide](#).
- f) Appendix 8.1, 12.1 – are the East inshore and offshore Marine Plans of relevance?

- g) Some maps (Figure 10-1 Landscape Character Areas August 2026 Sheet 9 of 14 and so on) show South Norfolk and Broadland Landscape Character Area but they do not show the Broads Landscape Character Assessment Area. Sheets 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 need to show this.
- h) Noise and vibration: Species need to also be identified as receptors.
- i) The transport section of the final ES (environmental Statement) needs to reflect the landscape impacts of the potential access trackways across the Broads that may be needed. Due regard needs to be had to the Broads Protected Landscape Status.
- j) The climate change section of the Final ES needs to refer to adaptation to the effects of climate change? Resilience and mitigation, are referenced in the scoping but not but not adaptation and this needs to be scoped in.
- k) Peat: Due regard needs to be had in the final ES to the importance of peat in respect of climate change and heritage – specifically the potential of the Broads for exceptional waterlogged archaeology as referenced by Historic England.
- l) Navigational effects 17.1.5 and navigation impact assessment. The ES will require further detail on both. Any potential navigation impacts or impediments will need to be scoped into the Final ES. Where will navigation impacts potentially occur? The pipes are to go under the river.
- m) Page 772 – reference to the Broads and tourism is required.
- n) Chapter 17 – communication to businesses and people in the area will be key
- o) Chapter 18 – should there be reference to the safety of the workers constructing the site included in this section?
- p) Chapter 20 – peat soils – HDD will result in the removal of the soil that is displaced by the drilling and the pipes. The ES mitigation section will need to reinforce the need to maintaining the peat as wet and what will happen to peat spoil. It is unclear if excavated peat will be considered a waste. The Broads Authority's [Peat development guide \(PDF\)](#) needs to be scoped into the ES.

Planning Committee

9 October 2026

Agenda item number 12

Appeals to the Secretary of State update

Report by Development Manager and Head of Planning

Summary

This report sets out the position regarding appeals against refusals of planning permission by the Broads Local Planning Authority.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Application reference Appeal reference PINS reference	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
BA/2022/0007/UNAUP2 BA/2025/0001/ENF APP/E9505/F/25/3361103	Mr Richard Howlett	Appeal start date 19 March 2025 Written reps PINS confirmed no case officers available 25 November 2025	Holly Lodge Church Loke, Coltishall, Norwich	Appeal against Listed building enforcement notice - Installation of UPVC windows	Committee Decision 2 February 2024 PINS inspector visited on 16 June 2026. Appeal Dismissed 7 August 2026

Application reference Appeal reference PINS reference	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
BA/2026/0034/FUL BA/2026/0002/REF 6011930	Mr John Atkins	Appeal start date 14 July 2026 18 August 2026 Awaiting site visit	Driftwood 104 Lower Street Horning Norfolk NR12 8PF	Change of use of to allow short term holiday let accommodation	Delegated Decision 14 May 2026
BA/2025/0063/INFENF BA/2026/0001/ENF 6012694	Alice Brown	Appeal start date 20 July 2026	18 Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge	Unauthorised siting of a shipping container	Delegated Decision 29 June 2026
		21 September 2026 NB. Appellant sold land before notice served, but land registry was not updated. She has appealed on Ground (e) – That the notice was not served on persons correctly. We have informed PINS that we concede this appeal and we expect it to be allowed.			
BA/2025/0063/INFENF BA/2026/0003/ENF 6013649	Mr D Rothwell	Appeal start date 18 August 2026	18 Long Dyke, Wayford Bridge	Unauthorised siting of a shipping container	Delegated Decision 29 June 2026
		21 September 2026 This is a separate appeal for the same notice served on the land. The appellant is now the sole and registered owner of the land. The appeal is ongoing. Comments can be made until 30th September 2026.			

Author: Steve Kenny

Date of report: 21 September 2026

Background papers: BA appeal and application files

Planning Committee

9 October 2026

Agenda item number 13

Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

Report by Development Manager

Summary

This report sets out the delegated decisions made by officers on planning applications from 24 July 2026 to 25 September 2026 and Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Bradwell Parish Council	BA/2026/0170/COND	Marsh Farm Cottage Sandy Lane Bradwell Norfolk NR31 9EA	Mr Laurie	Removal of existing barn and amendments to approved plans, variation of condition 2 of permission BA/2024/0215/HOUSEH	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Brundall Parish Council	BA/2026/0202/HOUSEH	38 Riverside Estate Brundall Norwich Norfolk NR13 5PU	Mr David Thompson	Replace timber windows with uPVC casement windows	Approve Subject to Conditions
Bungay Town Council	BA/2026/0060/FUL	Homestead Farm Beccles Road Bungay Suffolk NR35 1HX	Mr David Utting	Bridge over the River Waveney for cattle to cross	Approve Subject to Conditions
Burgh St Peter/Wheatacre PC	BA/2026/0192/CLEUD	Waveney Inn And River Centre Staithe Road Burgh St Peter Norfolk NR34 0DE	Mr Paul Spriggins	Lawful Development Certificate for excavation works, laying of foundations and concrete slab, and drainage works for Lodge 7. BA/2023/0074/FUL	CLUED Issued

Burgh St Peter/Wheatacre PC	BA/2026/0184/CLEUD	Waveney Inn And River Centre Staithe Road Burgh St Peter Norfolk NR34 0DE	Mr Paul Spriggins	Lawful Development Certificate for excavation works, laying of foundations and concrete slab and drainage works for Chalets 5 and 6 constitute a lawful commencement of permission BA/2023/0076/FUL for the siting of seven twin unit chalets (fourteen chalets) and associated parking spaces. Construction of new access road adjacent to the north western boundary, to create one-way access arrangement. Extension and reconfiguration of existing car parking areas serving the River Centre and Marinas. Erection of new shower/toilet facilities. Removal of existing storage building and shower/toilet.	CLUED Issued
--------------------------------	--------------------	---	-------------------	--	--------------

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Burgh St Peter/Wheatacre PC	BA/2026/0193/CLEUD	Waveney Inn And River Centre Staithe Road Burgh St Peter Norfolk NR34 0DE	Mr Paul Spriggins	Lawful Development Certificate for excavation and construction of section of access roadway, BA/2023/0075/FUL & BA/2026/0073/APPCON	CLUED Issued
Fleggburgh Parish Council	BA/2026/0086/HOUSEH	South Cottage Hall Road Clippesby Fleggburgh Norfolk NR29 3BL	Mrs Charlotte Thurnell	Proposed single storey side extension and detached garage and ancillary residential accommodation linked to main dwelling.	Approve Subject to Conditions
Haddiscoe PC	BA/2026/0162/COND	Toft Monks Mill Haddiscoe Island Haddiscoe	Mr & Mrs Singer	Variation of condition 2, amended design and materials, and details of conditions 3, 4, and 5 of permission BA/2023/0214/FUL.	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Horning Parish Council	BA/2026/0181/HOUSEH	The Boathouse Plot K Bureside Estate Crabbetts Marsh Horning Norfolk NR12 8JP	Mr Kev Monk	Removal of timber hinged boatshed doors and replace with electric roller shutter door, satin black in colour. Removal of timber balustrade and replace with safety glass in satin black frame.	Approve Subject to Conditions
Horning Parish Council	BA/2026/0133/FUL	1B Bureside Estate Crabbetts Marsh Horning Norfolk NR12 8JP	Mr Richard Green	Replacement of day cabin	Approve Subject to Conditions
Oulton Broad Parish Council	BA/2026/0189/NONMAT	Broadlands Residential Home Borrow Road Lowestoft Suffolk NR32 3PW	Mr William Moffat	Amendment to reduce the scope of external terracing works. Non-material amendment to previous permission BA/2025/0075/COND.	Approve

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Repps With Bastwick Parish Council	BA/2026/0163/PN	Land At Hall Farm Staithe Road Repps With Bastwick Great Yarmouth Norfolk	Cornerstone	Proposed installation of a 25m lattice tower supporting 3 no. antennas, 3 no. transmission dishes 1 no. equipment cabinet, 1 no. electric meter cabinet and ancillary development thereto including 12 no. Remote Radio Units and a 1.8m chainlink fence.	Prior Approval not Required
Smallburgh Parish Council	BA/2025/0296/HOUSEH	White Chimneys Thimble Hill Wayford Road Smallburgh Norfolk NR12 9LP	Millar	Demolition of existing garage and workshop. Construction of rear extension and new double garage.	Approve Subject to Conditions
Stokesby With Herringby Parish Council	BA/2026/0157/HOUSEH	Manor Farm Mill Road Stokesby With Herringby Norfolk NR29 3EY	Mr Philip Crane	Installation of ground mounted solar panels.	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Thorpe St Andrew Town Council	BA/2026/0187/APPCON	Land To The South Of Griffin Lane Thorpe St Andrew Norwich	Mr Peter Smith	Details of Conditions 3: Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and 4: 10-year Habitat Management Plan of permission BA/2023/0304/FUL	Approve
West Caister Parish Council	BA/2026/0115/LBC	Caister Hall Caister Castle Lane West Caister Norfolk NR30 5SN	Mr John Hill	Repair & refurbish existing non-sash windows with bespoke aluminium secondary windows fitted inside to windows GFW3 and FFW5. Repair & refurbish existing non-sash window with removal of existing glazing and replaced with new slimlite double glazing to window FFW6.	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Woodbastwick Parish Council	BA/2026/0203/NONMAT	Malthouse Cottage Broad Road Ranworth Norwich Norfolk NR13 6HS	Mr & Mrs Martyn	Add solar panels to rear and side elevations, stone cills to front elevation, change to window and door styles and approved enclosed lobby change to open port, non-material amendment to permission BA/2023/0390/HOUSEH	Approve

Tree Preservation Orders confirmed by officers under delegated powers

Parish	Address	Reference number	Description
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Author: Steve Kenny

Date of report: 29 September 2026