

Planning Committee

Agenda 03 March 2023

10.00am

Yare House, 62-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich NR1 1RY

John Packman, Chief Executive – Friday 24 February 2023

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
3. **To receive and confirm the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 03 February 2023** (Pages 3-14)
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:**
 - 7.1. BA/2021/0456/FUL Horning - Extension to mooring basin (Pages 15-33)
8. **Enforcement update** (Pages 34-39)
Report by Head of Planning

Policy

9. **Oulton Neighbourhood Plan - adoption** (Pages 40-41)
Report by Planning Policy Officer

10. **Local Plan – Settlement Study update** (Pages 42-62)
Report by Planning Policy Officer

11. **Consultation Responses** (Pages 63-69)
Report by Planning Policy Officer

Matters for information

12. **Appeals to the Secretary of State update** (Pages 70-75)
Report by Senior Planning Officer

13. **Decisions made by Officers under delegated powers** (Pages 76-80)
Report by Senior Planning Officer

14. **To note the date of the next meeting – Friday 31 March 2023 at 10.00am at Yare House, 62-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich**

Planning Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 03 February 2023

Contents

1.	Apologies and welcome	2
	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014	2
2.	Declarations of interest and introductions	2
3.	Minutes of last meeting	3
4.	Matters of urgent business	3
5.	Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking	3
6.	Requests to defer applications and/or vary agenda order	3
7.	Applications for planning permission	3
	(1) BA/2022/0416/FUL – Postwick, Blackwater Carr - Yurt (retrospective)	3
8.	Enforcement update	8
9.	Issues and Options - Summary of consultation	8
10.	Local Plan – Preferred Options (bitesize pieces)	8
11.	Consultation responses	9
12.	Levelling up Bill, Planning and the NPPF, including proposed consultation response	9
13.	Notes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 16 December 2022	11
14.	Circular 28/83 Publication by Local Authorities of information about the handling of planning applications – Q4 (1 October to 31 December 2022)	11
15.	Appeals to the Secretary of State	11
16.	Decisions made by officers under delegated powers	11
17.	Date of next meeting	11
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 03 February 2023	12

Present

Harry Blathwayt – in the Chair, Stephen Bolt, Nigel Brennan, Andrée Gee, Tony Grayling, Gail Harris, Tim Jickells, James Knight, Leslie Mogford, Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro and Fran Whymark

In attendance

Natalie Beal – Planning Policy Officer, Jason Brewster – Governance Officer, Nigel Catherall – Planning Officer, Cally Smith – Head of Planning, Marie-Pierre Tighe – Director of Strategic Services (items 1-7) and Sara Utting – Senior Governance Officer

Members of the public in attendance who spoke

Steve Hooper (applicant) and Nicole Wright (agent) for item 7(1) – BA/2022/0416/FUL – Postwick, Blackwater Carr - Yurt (retrospective)

1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Bill Dickson and Vic Thomson.

Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

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

2. Declarations of interest and introductions

Members provided their declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes and in addition to those already registered. Members had been invited to a site visit by the agent associated with item 7(1) – BA/2022/0416/FUL – Postwick, Blackwater Carr - Yurt (retrospective), and members had been precluded from accepting this invitation by the [Code of Practice for members of the Planning Committee](#). A member asked for clarification on this matter and the Senior Governance Officer referred to section 6.3, relating to when a planning application had been submitted, item (i) states “A member’s involvement prior to consideration at Planning Committee will be limited to public meetings and committee site visits”. The member believed there was an inconsistency, as section 11.1 stated that “attendance at an informal site visit” must be declared before speaking at committee. The Senior Governance Officer indicated that this documentation would be reviewed under the aegis of the governance improvement work reported at the last full Authority meeting (20 January 2023).

3. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 09 December 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Matters of urgent business

There were no items of urgent business

5. Chair's announcements and introduction to public speaking

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

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

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

7. Applications for planning permission

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

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

Tony Grayling left the meeting.

(1) BA/2022/0416/FUL – Postwick, Blackwater Carr - Yurt (retrospective)

Retrospective consent for the retention of a yurt on a small, raised platform to be used in connection with the management of the site, securing a table and bench to the ground, the installation of a small staked and woven willow windbreak.

Applicant: Mr Steve Hooper and Ms Mary Alexander

The Planning Officer (PO) provided a detailed presentation of the application for retrospective consent for the retention of a yurt, table and bench, and willow windbreak within a site known as Blackwater Carr, which was land accessed from Ferry Lane, Postwick.

The presentation provided photographs of the yurt, table and bench, and windbreak within the site, in relation to a previously approved storage shed and from various points across the site and from a neighbouring plot of land. The presentation included maps showing the location of the site, a site map, the site map within the boundary of land owned by the applicant and an aerial photo showing the same information.

The site, the PO explained, was within an area of peat fen habitat to the east of the village of Postwick and accessed from Ferry Lane that leads to Surlingham Ferry. The 2.1-hectare site was privately managed for conservation purposes by the applicant. The boundaries of this land were predominantly tree lined, with areas of woodland to the north and west. To the south-west and south were further peat fen areas with a similar appearance to the subject site.

The yurt was a circular structure with a 5.5m diameter and an overall height of 4.35m (not 1.95m as previously stated in the report).

The planning history of the site was limited to two previous planning applications, both submitted by the applicant:

- In 2020 planning permission had been granted for access improvements and the siting of a storage shed.
- In April 2022 planning permission had been refused for retention of the yurt which had been on the site since March 2020.

The PO explained that the conservation work on this site had commenced around 2012 and the current owners had continued this work since they took ownership in 2019. The conservation work undertaken by the owners included planting trees, hedges, bluebells and daffodils, creating new habitat for birds, small mammals and reptiles and the management of invasive species. Since 2019, the species count on the site had increased from approximately 600 to well over 800. The site had been designated a Local Wildlife Site and the owners aimed to achieve County Wildlife Site designation.

The PO detailed the night-time activities, as stated on the current application, as feeding foxes and deer, checking for hedgehogs and bats, dealing with the moth trap, recording, record keeping, updating the species list, listening for owls and bitterns and an early morning observation walk. The application indicated that the yurt was used to store scientific equipment, reference books, a laptop, bird feed, a first aid kit and a telescope.

The PO clarified that the use of the land was not in question; what was before the committee was the provision of structures on an undeveloped natural site that, within the context of the Local Plan, was deemed to be a leisure plot. Local Plan Policy DM50 (Leisure plots and mooring plots) aimed to maintain the natural and undeveloped appearance of all leisure plots, including this site, from a starting point that structures would not normally be permitted. The policy provided some consideration for what would be deemed a reasonable exception and the storage shed was approved in 2020 as, in the consideration of that application, it was felt that it was justified in supporting the continued management of the site.

The PO agreed that the way the site was being managed was time intensive, however the management of a 2.1-hectare site did not justify the retention of the yurt providing overnight accommodation, particularly given the approved shed structure which provided storage. The PO confirmed that the landowners had not indicated whether the storage space provided by the shed was insufficient for their needs.

The PO indicated that the retention of the yurt to provide overnight accommodation was not justified and was not in accord with local and national planning policy. This represented further development on a leisure plot where the provision of structures would not ordinarily be permitted. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the Broads had shown support for the conservation work at the site by approving the storage shed. The LPA did not consider the yurt, in addition to the shed, to be reasonable or necessary or acceptable.

The Landscape Architect for the Broads Authority (BA), explained the PO, had maintained an objection citing the light-coloured canvas structure, in an unusual form, in a natural setting as undermining the landscape character.

The PO reported that the Environment Agency (EA) had confirmed that the site was located within Flood Zone 3b, the functional floodplain, and national policy dictated that uses classified as 'more vulnerable' should not be permitted within the functional floodplain and the EA had objected to the proposal on flood risk grounds.

The PO confirmed that the site was within a protected habitats catchment and therefore, was subject to a consideration of Nutrient Neutrality (NN). The application included an assessment that concluded that the development cannot be demonstrated to be nutrient neutral and Natural England (NE) had maintained an objection. The PO indicated that there may be a way forward but at present there was no agreed mitigation.

The PO concluded that the principle of development was not acceptable, there were landscape impacts, the site was within the functional floodplain, the EA had objected, and it had not been demonstrated that the development would be nutrient neutral and therefore the recommendation was to refuse permission.

Steve Hooper, the applicant, provided a statement and began by stressing the importance of the yurt as an essential workshop/laboratory space for the ongoing conservation work. Since 2019 this conservation work had resulted in a 46% increase in biodiversity.

With regard to NN, Mr Hooper indicated that further information relating to mitigation had been supplied to NE and that Dr Graham Hopkins had indicated that NN would not be a valid ground for refusal.

Mr Hooper confirmed that they had been onsite in January 2022, when the river reached a 10-year high, and the resulting flood water had not breached the yurt. They had a tested flood evacuation plan and Mr Hooper indicated that they received flood alerts from Floodline.

Mr Hooper indicated that the use of a yurt within the Broads was not unprecedented as evidenced by application BA/2022/0115/CU (referenced in section 3.28 of the report).

Despite the threat of planning refusal, Mr Hooper confirmed that they had continued to pursue their conservation work. This work and the resulting data had been praised by many local conservationists and Mr Hooper indicated that UEA students would be performing research at the site from February 2023.

Mr Hooper highlighted the overlap between the BA's educational and conservation remits and the work being undertaken at the site. They were willing to share their skills and knowledge with the BA and were discussing this with both the Authority's Ecologist and Education Officer. Mr Hooper indicated that they would be willing to enter into a Section 106 agreement.

Mr Hooper thanked Councillor Laming, The Broads Society and Tim O'Riordan for their support. Mr Hooper appealed to members to do the right thing and vote in favour of this planning application.

A member asked Mr Hooper to clarify the height of the yurt, and he replied 3.5m, with 80% of the structure being less than 2m.

The Chair thanked Mr Hooper for his statement.

Members were supportive of the conservation work being undertaken by the applicant and praised them for their efforts in this regard. However, a number of members were concerned by the objection of the EA and were unwilling to go against this advice given their role as a consultee in flood risk matters. Other members believed that given the reliability of flood alerts and the flood defence work undertaken on the River Yare, the flood risk was manageable.

A member was not impressed by the yurt and believed it was a wholly unsuitable structure for a peat fen within the Broads.

Other members spoke in support of the yurt, explaining that the discolouration of the canvas helped the structure to blend into its surrounding and softened its impact on the landscape.

A number of members believed the yurt was a temporary structure and one member made a comparison to a large tent, the dimensions of which he believed to be 5.5 x 6 x 20m, that had been erected at the Broads Authority's dockyard for a period of years, arguing that if that could be considered a temporary structure then they saw no reason why the yurt could not be considered as such. The member added that if a large tent could be installed at the dockyard that was visible to everyone driving over the River Yare then planning policy was hardly consistent if it chose to disapprove of a small yurt that might only be visible by peering through a hedge.

A member felt that describing this structure as a yurt was misleading as it implied the ability for it to be dismantled and moved at will. It would be better described as a canvas hut and given the need for it to be in-situ over a period of years it could not be considered a temporary structure. The member also indicated that alternative accommodation arrangements were available and suggested, given the proximity of the site to the River Yare, the use of a boat.

A member believed that given that each planning application was judged on its merits, approving this application was unlikely to set a precedent for future planning applications. Conversely, another member believed that by approving this application a precedent would be set that would result in similar structures being erected at similar sites in the Yare valley.

A member indicated that if it was deemed to be a temporary structure then it should be granted temporary permission. Another member indicated that they would be willing to approve this application subject to conditions being imposed on its usage and its duration on the site.

A member commended the conservation work being undertaken by the applicants and believed that this work outweighed the harm posed by the structure. For this reason, they proposed that this application be approved subject to conditions, thereby proposing overturning the officer recommendation.

The Senior Governance Officer drew the member's attention to section 7.4 of the [Code of Practice for members of the Planning Committee](#), that requires the reasons for a contrary decision to the officer recommendation to be clearly stated before a vote is taken. In addition, the officer should have the opportunity to explain the implications of the contrary decision.

The member stated that Councillor Laming's consultation response as detailed in section 3.25 of the report set out the reasons which they considered to cover the matter.

The Head of Planning (HoP) summarised the position to assist members, by stating that the proposal to approve the application was being made on the basis that whilst it was accepted that the application was contrary to development plan policy, the value and extent of the conservation work being done on the site was sufficient to override the policy. The member agreed that this was what they were proposing.

The HoP explained that by approving this application it would create a precedent whereby conservation work could be deemed to outweigh Policy DM50 that was intended to prevent the erection of buildings, enclosures or structures on leisure plots. She reminded members that the EA had objected to this application and that NE required more information on the NN mitigation strategy for this site.

With the permission of the Chair, the agent added that the applicant had consulted Dr Graham Hopkins, a NN specialist and a mitigation statement had been submitted to NE.

James Knight proposed, seconded by Leslie Mogford, that the application be approved subject to the following conditions:

- A time limited permission of 7 years.
- Overnight visits be restricted to a maximum of 72 days per year.
- That the yurt cannot be used for financial gain / can only be used in conjunction with the ongoing conservation work.

On being put to the vote, the motion was lost by 4 votes in favour, 5 against and 1 abstention.

Tim Jickells proposed, seconded by Stephen Bolt that the application be refused for the reasons given in the officer report.

It was resolved by 6 votes in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention that the planning application be refused as the proposal was considered to be contrary to Policies DM2, DM5, DM16,

DM43, and DM50 of the Local Plan for the Broads, the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and Planning Practice Guidance which are a material consideration in the determination of this application, and The Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (the Habitats Regulations).

The Committee adjourned at 11:40am and reconvened at 11:53am when Tony Grayling re-joined the meeting.

8. Enforcement update

Members received an update report from the Head of Planning (HoP) on enforcement matters previously referred to the Committee. Further updates were provided at the meeting for:

Land at the Beauchamp Arms (Two unauthorised static caravans): The operators and one caravan occupant had been interviewed under caution on 21 December 2022. The HoP confirmed that these interviews had been conducted by Broads Authority officers in accordance with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) code of practice on audio recording interviews with suspects.

Blackgate Farm, High Mill Road, Cobholm: The HoP confirmed that a further site visit was planned after 31 March 2023 to ensure the remaining two caravans had been removed.

Land east of Brograve Mill: The appeal had been dismissed 9 January 2023 and the Authority had informed both the landowner and agent that compliance was required by 9 October 2023.

Land at the Beauchamp Arms (Third unauthorised static caravan): The Enforcement Notice had been served 11 January 2023.

The report was noted.

9. Issues and Options - Summary of consultation

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) presented the report which provided a high-level summary of the consultation on the Issues and Options version of the Local Plan. The PPO explained that a more detailed analysis of the comments received during the consultation would be provided at the next meeting.

The report was noted.

10. Local Plan – Preferred Options (bitesize pieces)

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) presented the report which detailed five new or amended policies that were proposed to form part of the Preferred Options version of the Local Plan. The PPO reminded members that this stage of the Local Plan development was an opportunity to review existing policies and propose improvements.

The PPO reminded members that they were welcome to provide further comments on these policies. The PPO confirmed that Sustainability Appraisal (SA) objectives had been confirmed during the previous Issues and Options phase of the Local Plan. Each draft policy had been assessed against the SA objectives and this was stated in table form at the end of each policy.

The PPO proposed to discuss each section of the report in turn.

Draft Amenity policy

The PPO explained that this policy dealt with the impact of development on the amenity of existing or potential neighbouring properties or uses.

A member asked whether this policy would reference energy efficiency and the PPO responded that this requirement would be better served by other approaches, such as Building Regulations as well as in other sections of the Local Plan.

Draft Pubs policy

The PPO explained that this policy had been updated to include energy efficiency and address crime or the fear of crime (the latter following consultation with Secured by Design Officers).

Draft Railway stations/halts policy

A member asked whether this policy would be applicable to new stations or halts within the Broads. The PPO believed that the current policies in the Local Plan, although not specifically covering proposals for a new station/halt, would provide the necessary guidance, for example policies relating to regarding the relevant policy framework such as landscape, ecology, sustainable transport and good design. The PPO would update the policy in a later iteration to indicate support for appropriately designed and located new stations or halts.

Draft Trinity Broads and Upper Thurne policies

The PPO indicated that these policies were intended to protect these important areas of the Broads and as such were very similar to each other. The PPO highlighted the change to include possible Habitats Regulation Assessments for new developments within these areas.

Members' comments were noted.

11. Consultation responses

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) introduced the report, which documented the responses to the Trowse with Newton Regulation 14 version of the Neighbourhood Plan. The PPO indicated that the main feedback centred on the Design Guide where improvements were required to better assess development within the Broads in this context.

To note the report and endorse the proposed response.

12. Levelling up Bill, Planning and the NPPF, including proposed consultation response

The Planning Policy Officer (PPO) explained that as part of the Levelling Up Bill the Government was proposing changes to the planning system and the National Planning Policy

Framework (NPPF). These changes were out for consultation and, in conjunction to the consultation feedback, the PPO had reviewed existing literature and provided a summary of the changes for the benefit of members. The PPO highlighted a few of the proposed changes as follows:

- The reformed planning system would set a 30-month timeline to adopt a Local Plan. This seemed unreasonable to the PPO as it included the examination period, which was not under the control of the Local Planning Authority (LPA), could take up to 14 months to complete and therefore left too little time to produce the necessary Local Plan documentation.
- There was a proposal to remove the need for LPA's to continually demonstrate a deliverable 5-year housing land supply if a Local Plan was up to date.
- Measures had been proposed to tackle slow build out rates that involved referencing the past behaviour of applicants during the decision-making process. The PPO agreed that this would be of benefit and had asked how a developer or applicant could resolve their past 'poor' behaviour.
- Under onshore wind development footnote 63 it was proposed that a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) could be used to determine the location of wind turbines. The PPO had responded that this was a misuse of an SPD, as they are not intended for making policy. And the use of an SPD was inconsistent with the next proposed change...
- A proposal to remove SPDs and replace them with Supplementary Plans. These plans will be afforded the same weight as a local plan or minerals and waste plan. Existing SPDs will remain in force for a time-bound period; until the local planning authority is required to adopt the new-style plan.
- There was a proposal to group planning considerations that apply regularly in decision making within National Development Management Policies (NDMPs). The PPO had responded that it was important to factor in protected landscapes when deriving NDMPs.

A member asked why there was no comment in relation to attaching more weight to Social Rent in planning policies and decisions (question 22 of the consultation) given that the Broads was impacted by a lack of affordable housing. The PPO responded that the LPA for the Broads was not the Housing Authority and therefore responding to this question would mean collating possibly conflicting responses from the relevant LPA's that acted as Housing Authorities on behalf of the Broads.

Melanie Vigo di Gallidoro proposed, seconded by Leslie Mogford and

It was resolved by 10 votes in favour and 1 abstention to endorse the nature of the proposed consultation response on planning and the NPPF.

13. Notes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 16 December 2022

The Committee noted the minutes of the Heritage Asset Review Group meeting held on 16 December 2022.

The Chair indicated that the next HARG meeting would be on Friday 10 March 2023 at the Lowestoft Museum.

14. Circular 28/83 Publication by Local Authorities of information about the handling of planning applications – Q4 (1 October to 31 December 2022)

The Head of Planning (HoP) introduced the report, which provided the development control statistics for the quarter ending 31 December 2022. The HoP highlighted that all major and minor applications had been completed 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).

Members congratulated the Planning team on their successful performance.

The report was noted.

15. Appeals to the Secretary of State

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

16. Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

The Committee received a schedule of decisions made by officers under delegated powers from 28 November 2022 to 20 January 2023 and any Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

17. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Planning Committee would be on Friday 03 March 2023 10.00am at Yare House, 62-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich.

The meeting ended at 12:29pm

Signed by

Chair

Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests Planning Committee, 03 February 2023

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Harry Blathwayt on behalf of all members	7.1	Lobbied: Receipt of emails from agent
Tony Grayling	7.1	Director, Sustainable Business and Development for the Environment Agency. He had been granted a dispensation by the Monitoring Officer to speak but not vote on matters where he had a pecuniary interest by virtue of his employment with the EA. As the EA had objected to this planning application, he left the room for this item.
Tony Grayling	12	Director, Sustainable Business and Development for the Environment Agency. He had been granted a dispensation by the Monitoring Officer to speak but not vote on matters where he had a pecuniary interest by virtue of his employment with the EA. As his role with the Environment Agency requires him to respond to NPPF consultation, he chose to abstain from participating in this item.

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 7.1

BA/2021/0456/FUL Horning - Extension to mooring basin

Report by Planning Officer

Proposal

Extend mooring basin, replace existing buildings with new reception, workshop & open-sided wetshed.

Applicant

Horning Pleasurecraft Limited

Recommendation

Approval subject to conditions

Reason for referral to committee

Major application

Application target date

02 March 2022

Contents

1.	Description of site and proposals	2
2.	Site history	3
3.	Consultations received	3
4.	Representations	4
5.	Policies	9
6.	Assessment	10
7.	Conclusion	17
8.	Recommendation	17
9.	Reason for recommendation.....	18
	Appendix 1 – Location map	19

1. Description of site and proposals

- 1.1. The subject site comprises a boatyard and mooring basin located at the eastern end of the village of Horning, accessed by land via Ferry View Road, and by water from a narrow dyke leading northwards from the Rive Bure. It is a large site and covers approximately 4.25ha in area.
- 1.2. The site curtilage incorporates a mooring basin measuring approximately 110m x 45m, a derelict dwelling and its curtilage, two workshop buildings sited side-by-side, a car park, and large areas of hardstanding which at present are not utilised for any particular purpose.
- 1.3. The site also includes an area of fen habitat/carr woodland covering approximately 2.35ha in area. This extends broadly in line with the eastern bank of the access dyke as far north to a point in line with the boatsheds, before continuing northwards but set a further approximate 15 metres to the east. The adjacent area is hard surfaced and this follows the fen/woodland area including where the woodland boundary moves 15 metres to the east. It is noted that in aerial photographs from 1999, 2004, and 2010, the area covered by trees extends as far as the hard surfaced area. In the aerial photograph from 2014 it is clear that a sizeable area of trees has been removed, effectively along the line of the approximate 15 metre inset and as far south as the access dyke from the main river. The area in question now resembles carr fen.
- 1.4. This area is directly adjacent to Horning Marsh Farm SSSI, part of the Bure Broads and Marshes SSSI. The adjacent area is also part of the Broadland SPA and the Broads SAC which is located to the east of the subject site.
- 1.5. The derelict dwelling, formerly known as 'Broadmead' is sited at the southern end of the existing mooring basin, and to the west of the access dyke. The dwelling itself is located towards the south-eastern section of its site, close to the boundary with the adjacent dwelling to the south known as 'Ferry View'.
- 1.6. Approximately 14 metres north of the existing marina basin is a pair of workshop buildings sited side by side. These measure 26m x 14m with a maximum height of 5.4m and 53m x 19m with a maximum height of 8m, and are used as a base for boat hire and marine services, including boat repairs and the building of new craft to replace older boats. Between the buildings and the basin is the location of a travelling crane.
- 1.7. The site is not in a conservation area and there are no listed buildings.
- 1.8. The proposal is for an extension to the existing mooring basin at both its northern and southern ends. The northern extension is in essence the area of the two existing workshops and the hard surfaced area between the workshops and the existing basin. The southern extension is in essence the site curtilage of the derelict dwelling. The existing basin provides up to 48 mooring berths, the extension to the mooring basin

would provide an additional 30 moorings to the north and 23 further moorings to the south. The new moorings would be located off pontoons and finger jetties. A further 8 visitor moorings are proposed including 4 at the adjacent site to the west. The total additional mooring provision would be 61 berths.

- 1.9. The proposal includes the removal of the two workshop buildings (to facilitate part of the basin extension) and the provision of a new reception building measuring 13m x 10m with a maximum height of 5.8m, and a new workshop building measuring 18.3m x 18.3m with a maximum height of 7.1m, both of which would be sited north/north-east of the existing buildings. Between the new buildings would be a slipway, where the travelling crane will be re-sited. Adjoining the southern elevation of the new workshop is a proposed open-sided wetshed which is sited on the eastern side of the extended basin, and extends 51m from the side of the workshop and with a maximum height of 5.5m.

2. Site history

- 2.1. In 2016 planning permission was refused for a mooring basin extension (BA/2016/0174/FUL).

3. Consultations received

Parish Council

- 3.1. Please note that the Parish Council supports this application.

Norfolk County Council (NCC) Highways

- 3.2. Thank you for your recent consultation with respect to the above.

Whilst there are restrictions to the local highway network in terms of its varying width and lack of passing provision, the site is a large and well established marina development having a mix of private and public moorings and a hire fleet.

There is no information relating to traffic movements to and from the site, however, it is presumed this is primarily seasonal and that the predominant generator will be the hiring side of the business, and that attendance for private moorings will overall be less frequent.

Accordingly, whilst raising no objection, I would recommend the following condition be appended to any grant of permission your Authority is minded to make:

SHC 21 Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the proposed on-site car parking and turning area shall be laid out, demarcated, levelled, surfaced and drained in accordance with the approved plan and retained thereafter available for that specific use.

Reason: To ensure the permanent availability of the parking/manoeuvring areas, in the interests of satisfactory development and highway safety.

BA Ecologist

- 3.3. Following the submission and findings of the preliminary water vole survey 2022, the ecology team originally had an objection to the proposal at Horning Marina.

This was based on water vole signs being found extensively within the marina site, as well as along more traditional bank edge habitats in both the marina and receptor sites. The proposed scheme will result in both temporary and permanent impacts upon these protected species locally. Water vole, a priority species in England under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) (NERC Act (2006)) and a Norfolk priority (BAP) species, are afforded full legal protection under Section 9, Schedule 5, of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (hereafter “WCA 1981”), as amended.

Further detailed comments were provided on the preliminary ecological survey, including that a further survey should be carried out, a mitigation licence from Natural England would be required prior to any works being carried out and that this would require an overall conservation gain to be achieved in order for the development to be permitted. An update to the water vole survey has been submitted, along with a revised Preliminary Ecological Appraisal.

The final consultation response is awaited, this will be reported orally.

BA Landscape Architect

- 3.4. The preliminary comments raised a number of issues including the absence of an arboricultural report, questions around how the excavated peat would be dealt with, including how its drying out would be prevented and whether its spreading would have an adverse visual impact. There was also a query about the disposal of the non-peat arisings.

Further information was provided and the final consultation response is awaited. This will be reported orally.

BA Tree Officer

- 3.5. The majority of the works will have a limited detrimental effect on the existing vegetation to the east, however there are concerns about the loss of trees in the north west and south eastern corner of the site. Screening will be required to mitigate tree removal on the boundary with the properties to the north where the proposed parking abuts the boundary. The larger trees in the south western corner of the site should be retained and protected as part of any permitted development as whilst they are in varying condition they do have a high visual amenity on the boundary. A Tree Protection Plan in line with BS5837:2012 should be submitted, detailing how the retained trees on the site boundaries are to be protected during the proposed development and a landscaping scheme should be conditioned.

4. Representations

- 4.1. Dr S Bramer- Horning House, Ferry View Estate

We have sent a letter to the planning authority setting out in full our concerns and comments regarding this planning proposal, as the comments box does not allow sufficient characters for us to do so here. We summarise our points below.

- We do not believe that the boundary should directly abut the roadway.
- We are concerned about the removal of trees and spreading of peat alongside the road will increase subsidence.
- We believe that insufficient bat surveys have been completed including missing out an important potential bat roost as the ruined house has not been surveyed.
- Due to several inconsistencies in the report we believe that the ecological impact assessment is incorrectly informed regarding the area and impacts of the development, potentially resulting in missing important ecological impacts.
- As water voles have been found in the area and otters are known to frequently use the site and are cited in the adjacent Special Area of Conservation we hope that impacts on these species will be fully considered.
- We have two specific requests, firstly that we are informed prior to the start of any works on the ruined house and adjacent woodpile so that we can ensure the safety of our cats who hunt there, and secondly that any lighting is low level and subdued to avoid light pollution.

Having looked over the planning documents for the proposed development (BA/2021/0456/FUL) at Horning Marina, Ferry View Estate, Horning, Norfolk, NR12 8PT we have the following comments and concerns for your consideration.

The proposed site plan (Document 8061-P03E) appears to show the boundary to be directly adjacent to the roadway. We would question this as there is an old fence line that diverges several metres from the road.

We are concerned that the plan (Document 8061-P03E) shows the remaining trees being removed from the edge of the road and replaced with a peat spoil heap. This is worrying as the owners of the houses have spent a great deal of money maintaining the road on this unstable land. The tree roots consolidate the land and the extra weight of peat would probably increase subsidence.

The small area of planned planting (Document 8061-P03E) is of course welcome; however, we would note that 'landscaping' on the last development area consisted of two patches of grass, not one single tree as shown on prior plans. Therefore, we request that considerable planting be enforced.

The development 'proposed site plan' (Document 8061-P03E) shows the area at the southern end of the development with the ruined house being dug out and turned into moorings, but the ecological impact assessment (EIA) shows the ruined house (Building 3 on Figure 4 of the Ecological Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment) as not assessed for bats due to being "sufficiently distant from the proposed

development and not to be effected". As such we would question whether the bat surveys completed are sufficient to inform the ecological report and ensure that no wildlife crimes are committed. As the ruined house is an ideal potential roosting site, we would expect the bat survey to include this building.

Further to this, Figure 2 in the EIA seems to be incorrect. Based on these inconsistencies I must question whether the EIA has been incorrectly informed regarding the extent and impacts of the development. If so important ecological impacts on the protected species known to be present in the area may have been missed from the assessment, and as such there may be potential for wildlife crimes to be committed.

We note that as water voles have been identified in an area expected to be impacted by the development, that a water vole licence will be required. Also, as otters are included in the citation of the adjacent Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and are frequently seen utilising this site, we hope that thorough surveys have been completed, and that impacts on this species and the potential need for a licence has been carefully considered, in addition to other impacts on the SAC and SSSI, in consultation with Natural England as required.

Finally, we would make some requests:

For the safety of our cats, as these are their hunting grounds, we would like accurate notification of commencement of work both to demolish the ruined house and remove (preferably not burn) the large pile of logs that remains from when the wooded area was cleared prior to a previous planning application, so that we may lock them indoors.

That any lighting be low level and subdued, in line with guidelines as stated in "Guidance on Light Pollution" Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 31-003-20191101 [<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/light-pollution#where-light-shines>].

We look forward to observing the progress of the planning permission and any future works on this site, and hope that every effort will be made to proceed in a manner sensitive to the needs both of wildlife and those of us who live in the area.

4.2. Mrs And Mr H And S Means- Ferry View, Ferry View Estate

Initial comments

Thank you for discussing application BA/2021/0456/FUL with me this morning.

Title plans should not be scaled off as they are not exact documents, this is mentioned on the plan. It is known there was a rogue OS plan circulating in previous years, this has now been superseded and it's replacement is readily available.

As I outlined the existing & proposed site plans are plotted on the basis of an old OS plan, which has been superseded. I believe you have the most up to date OS version on your website which is clearly different. The plans submitted with the application show the suggested boundary line jutting around our garage. I attach a photo to show the area as it is and has been since the garage was built in 2006. There are also various

other photos and other plans submitted with the application which show the actual line.

The main concern regarding the inaccurate plans are that the proposed moorings would actually be much closer than indicated and I believe leave no room for the proposed screening which is most definitely required.

It would be most appreciated if the most up to date OS plan could be utilised and the proposal plotted on it so that we can fully appreciate the impact that the proposed development might have on us.

Further comments.

Firstly a point of clarification, we believe Land Registry plans are only "indicative" and Land Registry apply something called the principle of general boundaries. This means that the boundaries are not the red line on the title plan but the position of the boundary features on the ground.

Title plans should not be scaled off as they are not exact documents, this is mentioned on the plan. It is known there was a rogue OS plan circulating in previous years, this has now been superseded and it's replacement is readily available.

Points of objection are:-

- 1) Proximity of proposed basin extension to our boundary. It is difficult to establish how close it is at it's closest. We are presuming 2-3m which is too close.
- 2) Inaccurate and misleading documents which are causing distraction and muddying the waters. Please see point of clarification above. We have a telegraph pole (dated 1969), a mature willow (60 plus years old) and the remains of a 1960's fence all along our boundary line. May we suggest there is something not quite right with some recent digital documents? We tried to highlight this earlier in the process
- 3) Absence of a plan detailing any proposed structural landscaping. Is it even possible to plant anything meaningful in such narrow corridor?
- 4) The proposed basin extension is a residential area
- 5) Potential erosion of our property due to increased boat traffic down the dyke, there is no proposed quay heading to protect us
- 6) Loss of enjoyment of our property due to the close proximity of transient neighbours who will be extremely close.
- 7) Loss of neighbourhood amenity
- 8) Ecological impact. There will be unnecessary carbon release. If the site was used for its intended residential use this impact would not occur.
- 9) Even with recent clearing of the site, it is still home to protected species and could continue to be so if used for a sensitive residential use.

10) Trees - the site plan make reference to our existing trees. These should not be referred to reduce any "impact" on the proposed site.

Further comments

We object to the proposed basin extension on the following basis:

- 1) The site is residential. We would be happy with a residential dwelling which is a like for like replacement and in keeping with its surrounding residential dwellings.
- 2) The submitted existing site plan and proposed plan have not used the current OS site map. Hence there are inaccuracies along the boundary line between our property and the applicant site. Please see a screenshot of the current OS drawing attached. This is the same as that on the Broads Authorities. Due to the inaccurate boundary the proposed development will be much closer to us than indicated on the submitted drawings with no room for the proposed structural planting and wildlife corridor.
- 3) The finger of land that sits between the western bank of the river access and our property does not have quay heading. Over time it has eroded the peat bank and is now impacting on our property. We would like to see the proposed quay heading extend continuously along this bank to avoid further erosion of the peat and causing subsidence to our property. This will be especially important due to the increased boat traffic to and from the moorings.
- 4) We would like to see a plan showing the proposed planting along our boundary as we do not believe there will be space due to the inaccurate site plans. One of the mature trees retained for screening is on our property and not the applicant's. This should not be considered as part of the structural planting and wildlife corridor.
- 5) Loss of enjoyment of our property due to the close proximity of transient neighbours who will be extremely close.
- 6) Whilst the applicant has submitted various documents to try and offset the ecological impact, it will have one. There will still be unnecessary carbon release. If the site was used for its intended residential use this impact would not occur.
- 7) Even with recent clearing of the site, it is still home to protected species and could continue to be so if used for a sensitive residential use.

4.3. Mr Michael Neville- 112 Nottingham Road, Ravenshead

I own the property Cresta Cottage at the end of Ferry View Estate Road.

MY COMMENTS ALL RELATE TO THE WEST BOUNDARY OF THE PROPOSED SITE

Planning Docs

Figure 2 has boundary lines too far to the east

Figure 3 has site boundary too far west impinging on Ferry View road

Ecological Impact Assessment and Habitats Regulation Assessment

Appendix J Site layout Page 80

This drawing very faintly shows a border (dotted line) for the edge of Ferry View Road
And the site line some 2 meters away from the edge of the road.

This 2 meter gap must be preserved as it contains the mains sewer pipe for all the properties on the estate.

NO ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SHOULD BE PLACED OVER THE MAIN SEWER AREA

Peat stratigraphy survey

Appendix 2 Page 40

Alterations and Proposed Facilities to Existing Boatyard Proposed site plan

Again has site boundary too far west impinging on Ferry View road

ALL EXISTING MAJOR TREES MUST BE MAINTAINED IN THIS SITE TO CONSERVE THE STABILITY OF SURROUNDING SOIL AND PEAT

I have been told that there was a capacity issue at the Knackers Wood waste water treatment plant which serves Horning, has this problem now been solved?

This process does not allow for PDF or JPG files to be attached

I wish to send a PDF file showing the east border of Ferry View Road and the site of the Main Sewer - please advice.

5. Policies

- 5.1. The adopted development plan policies for the area are set out in the [Local Plan for the Broads](#) (adopted 2019).
- 5.2. The following policies were used in the determination of the application:
 - SP7 - Landscape Character
 - SP11 - Waterside sites
 - SP14 - Mooring Provision
 - DM5 - Development and Flood Risk
 - DM10 - Peat Soils
 - DM13 - Natural Environment
 - DM16 - Development and Landscape
 - DM21 - Amenity

- DM23 - Transport, highways and access
 - DM28 - Development on Waterside Sites
 - DM31 - Access to the Water
 - DM32 - Riverbank stabilisation
 - DM33 - Moorings, mooring basins and marinas.
 - DM43 – Design
- 5.3. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) are material considerations.

6. Assessment

- 6.1. The application is for an extension to the existing mooring basin, the replacement of existing buildings with a reception, workshop, and open-sided wetshed.

Background

- 6.2. The current application follows a previous proposal for a mooring basin at the Horning Marina site (BA/2016/0174/FUL) which was refused for the following reasons:
- The excavation of the proposed mooring basin would result in the loss of protected BAP Habitats and the peat soils resource.
 - The loss of the existing natural landscape, contributing to the erosion of the buffer to the adjacent Bure Broads and Marshes SSSI, Broadland SPA and Ramsar, and The Broads SAC, as well as introducing manmade obstructions into a previously unaltered landscape.
 - The proposal does not provide protected species surveys, ecological assessment, Habitats Regulations Assessment survey, impact assessment and mitigation proposals for Habitats and Species of Principal Importance.
 - The introduction of public moorings and associated access footpath would result in the unacceptable narrowing of the navigation channel, and the introduction of obtrusive features in a wholly natural section of the riverbank.
 - The proposed mooring basin would result in the ‘creep’ of the village of Horning into previously undeveloped land.
 - The proposed visitor moorings due to their siting in relation to nearby residential properties would result in the perception of loss of privacy and being overlooked.
- 6.3. The proposal under consideration has sought, through revisions to the scheme and submission of supporting information, to address the issues previously cited. The changes are centred around the re-siting of the basin extension to the north and south of the existing basin, not to the east as previously proposed. This maintains separation to the designated sites and provides landscape improvements over the previous

scheme. The proposal utilises previously developed areas so does not result in the loss of BAP Habitats. The proposed visitor moorings have been moved from river fronting to within an existing basin. Assessments in the form of ecological appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment, a water vole survey, and peat stratigraphy survey were submitted to support the current proposal.

- 6.4. There has been a number of delays with this application, primarily around the approach to the disposal of peat arisings. The applicant was required to submit a water vole survey for the receptor site, this found the presence of water voles, with no suitable land at the receptor site for translocation of the water voles. An amended proposal was received which looked at utilising land at the subject site, along with providing and managing fen habitat to the east of the proposed extended basin. A water vole survey of the site was submitted including proposals for the relocation of the water voles within the wider application site. Subsequent to this, amended documents were received updating the relevant documents which addressed the previous peat arisings strategy.

Principle of development

- 6.5. The principle of the proposed development is acceptable insofar as the enlarged basin will contribute to the network of facilities around the Broads system and would result in an improvement to the quality of the mooring provision. The mooring provision is existing and the improvement would increase the revenue stream which would help support the viability of the business at the site. In these respects, the proposal is considered to accord with the general thrust of Policy DM33 of the Local Plan for the Broads. This 'in principle' support, however, does not outweigh the site-specific landscape and ecological considerations and in order to be acceptable overall the proposals must demonstrate that there is no adverse impact on these elements, as well as being in accordance with all other policies in the development plan.

Landscape character

- 6.6. The previous application was refused on landscape grounds due to the loss of the existing natural landscape, which would contribute to the erosion of the buffer to the adjacent Bure Broads and Marshes SSSI, Broadland SPA and Ramsar, and The Broads SAC, as well as introducing manmade obstructions into a previously unaltered landscape.
- 6.7. The current application differs significantly in providing the extension to the south and north of the existing basin, whereas the previous application proposed an extension to the east of the existing basin into undeveloped land. The current proposal utilises previously developed land, in this case a derelict dwelling and its curtilage to the south of the existing basin, and the area of existing workshops and hard surfacing to the north of the existing basin.
- 6.8. The existing buffer between the basin and the designated sites to the east is 56.5 metres at its nearest point, and 60.5 metres at the main point of the basin. In the

previous application this buffer was reduced to 13.85 metres, whereas in the current application the reduction at the main point of the basin is by 2m to give a separation of 58.5 metres.

- 6.9. In addition to retaining the buffer to the designated sites, the area of the buffer allows for the natural landscape adjacent to the marina to be predominantly retained, thereby ensuring that the extended basin does not unacceptably encroach on the existing natural areas and the landscape appearance of the area is reasonably retained.
- 6.10. Of benefit to the buffer area is its proposed management, which is outlined in the application. This had previously been carr woodland, and was so at the time of the previous application. The majority of trees in this area were subsequently removed, and the land in part returned to fen habitat. The proposal includes the management of this area as fen habitat, this will provide landscape and habitat benefits and are considered to be beneficial to the buffer area and the wider landscape.
- 6.11. It is considered that the proposal overcomes the landscape reasons for refusal of the previous scheme and is considered to be acceptable in landscape terms with regard to Policy DM16 and criteria c) of Policy DM33 of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Impact on ecology and protected sites

- 6.12. As noted in the above landscape assessment, the current proposal is considered to maintain a suitable separation to the designated sites to the east which comprise the Bure Broads and Marshes SSSI, Broadland SPA and Ramsar, and The Broads SAC. The overall reduction in the buffer is approximately 2 metres which is minor in the context of the site and is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.13. Having carried out a water vole survey in the area of the site where the mooring basin extension would be provided, water vole populations were found and these would need to be moved in order to allow works in that area to take place. Initially it was proposed to translocate the water voles to an area of land downstream of the subject site, but this also was found to have water vole populations.
- 6.14. The current proposal is to provide fen habitat in the area of the buffer between the mooring basin and the designated sites. This is considered to be suitable water vole habitat and, subject to Natural England licencing approval, this would be where the water voles are moved to. In principle the BA Ecologist has raised no objection to the proposed habitat and water vole translocation.
- 6.15. It is considered that the proposal as revised has overcome the previous reasons for refusal in terms of impact on protected BAP Habitats, insufficient information and the loss of the existing natural landscape and is considered to be acceptable in ecology terms with regard to Policy DM13.

Impact on peat

- 6.16. The proposed excavation to the north of the mooring basin is an area where there are large workshop buildings and adjacent hardstanding. However, the proposed

excavation to the south of the mooring basin would predominantly be on soft landscaped areas, and requires consideration of the peat that would be excavated as part of the works.

- 6.17. Policy DM10 sets out a presumption in favour of the preservation of peat in-situ, with development proposals that will result in unavoidable harm to peat only being permitted subject to assessment against specific criteria, namely:
- i) There is not a less harmful viable option;
 - ii) The amount of harm has been reduced to the minimum possible;
 - iii) Satisfactory provision is made for the evaluation, recording and interpretation of the peat before commencement of development; and
 - iv) The peat is disposed of in a way that will limit carbon loss to the atmosphere.
- 6.18. Taking into account the nature of the application, which is to extend the mooring basin and therefore necessarily requires excavation, it is not possible to consider the preservation of peat in-situ. The applicants originally proposed utilising the extracted peat to make up areas of eroded land at a site downstream, and only abandoned this idea when water voles were found at each area where the peat was proposed to be deposited.
- 6.19. In considering how to address the suitable depositing of the excavated peat, a peat stratigraphy report was submitted, which noted that ‘the general condition of the peat resource within the area to be excavated is considered to be ‘Moderate’, reflecting the loss of a large proportion of the intact peat deposits on the site to turbarry, and substantial modification’. What this means is that the original peat was previously removed for fuel (turbarry is where land is used to dig for peat or turf for fuel) and the peat that is now present is of relatively recent creation.
- 6.20. The applicants have considered the issue of the peat extraction and have reduced the footprint of the basin to the minimum considered to be viable. Partly this has involved positioning the basin extension so that areas of made ground are utilised as much as possible to minimise peat removal and they also propose to use some of the excavated peat in reedbed restoration along the site frontage. However, despite considering and pursuing various alternative options, they have not managed to find a solution which will use the peat in such a way as to keep it wet and therefore propose using it to be spread on arable land. This does have some benefits, in that it will improve the quality of the receiving soil, and although it is not being disposed of in a way that will limit carbon loss to the atmosphere, it is considered on balance that this approach is not an unreasonable one given the constraints and the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the policy requirements have been met.
- 6.21. It is further noted that the applicants have included as proposed mitigation measures that local geodiversity specialists would be invited to undertake recording and sampling of geological features uncovered during development work. In addition, a Construction

Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be prepared to provide reassurance that the peat extraction and re-use is being correctly managed.

- 6.22. It is noted that concerns were raised by the Authority's Landscape Architect regarding the treatment of the arisings, including the peat, and that their comments on the further information provided are awaited. Subject to the Landscape Architect being satisfied, these matters can be covered by planning condition. However, it is noted that the applicant has been thorough in the exploration of options and the LPA is broadly satisfied with the approach proposed.
- 6.23. In conclusion, the proposed mooring basin extension is considered on balance to have overcome the reason for refusal in respect of peat and is considered to be acceptable with regard to Policy DM10 and criteria f) of Policy DM33 of the Local Plan for the Broads.

New buildings

- 6.24. The application proposes the removal of the two existing workshops, one of which includes a reception element, and their replacement with more modestly sized buildings to the north of the extended basin. The size and design of the proposed buildings are considered acceptable taking into account the commercial use and appearance of the site, along with similar development on adjacent sites to the west. The proposed open-sided wet shed would adjoin the southern elevation of the proposed workshop and effectively comprises a rear wall and cantilever roof, with an overall appearance which would complement the proposed workshop.
- 6.25. Views of the new buildings would be limited to from Ferry View Road and adjacent sites to its western side, and from the narrow dyke opening on the River Bure at the southern end of the site. The site is a well-established boatyard with existing workshop buildings, the new buildings would be sited to the north of the extended basin reflecting the existing site layout. There would be a reduction in scale of the buildings, and to the north of the proposed buildings is a tree lined boundary which provides a backdrop to the development. The proposed new buildings are therefore considered acceptable with regard to policies DM16 and DM43 of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Amenity of residential properties

- 6.26. The proposed mooring basin extension would bring site activity closer to residential properties to the south-east and south of the existing basin. Currently the distance between the basin and the nearest residential dwelling to the south is 68m and to the nearest residential dwelling to the south-east is 66m and these distances would reduce to 28m and 19m respectively as a result of the proposal. There are existing trees on the western boundary of the site towards the southern end and between the enlarged basin area and the residential properties. In addition, there is an access road between the trees and the residential sites.
- 6.27. To the south, the access road becomes an individual private driveway and this reinforces the separation for the properties south of the driveway. The property served

by the section of private driveway is to the south of the proposed basin and adjacent to the existing basin entrance, their land abuts the red line site boundary. There is a narrow band of planting proposed in this area, 3.5m at its narrowest point, this would provide some level of amenity protection. The footway within the application site which passes the other side of the proposed planting area leads to 7 finger pontoons off a jetty which heads directly north from the footway. Whilst people would walk along here to access boats, the use of the footway would be transient in nature and taking into account the number of moorings in this area, the additional foot traffic generated as a result of the extended basin is not considered to be significant.

- 6.28. Whilst there would be some impact on residential amenity, taking into account the location of the properties in a prominent location on the River Bure and their proximity to an existing working boatyard site, it is not considered that any additional impact on residential amenity through an increase in activity is sufficient to justify a refusal of planning permission, particularly given that some mitigation can be achieved through conditions to ensure suitable planting and a maintenance of the planted areas. The proposed mooring basin extension is therefore considered acceptable with regard to Policy DM43 and criteria k) of Policy DM33 of the Local Plan for the Broads.
- 6.29. With regard to the new building, it is noted that this would bring the built form approximately 16.5m closer to the residential sites to the north of the subject site. Separation from the closest residential boundary is approximately 18m, and the separation to the closest dwelling is approximately 27.5m. There is a reasonable provision of trees along the boundary which provides good screening between the two sites. Whilst the new buildings would be closer to the residential boundaries to the north, the separation between the two elements is considered reasonable taking into account the existing situation and the reduction in building size. There are large doors facing the residential boundaries, but it is noted that these replicate the existing provision on site. It is therefore considered that the proposed buildings would not unduly impact on the amenity enjoyed by residential neighbours to the north of the subject site, with regard to policy DM21 of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Trees

- 6.30. The Authority's Arboricultural consultant has visited the site and is satisfied with the proposal, subject to retention of the larger trees in the south western corner of the site should and screening being provided to the north west and south eastern corner of the site. This will need to include new tree planting to provide a green buffer between the residential plots and the marina. This can be covered by a landscaping scheme, which can be required by planning condition.
- 6.31. It is also recommended that a Tree Protection Plan in line with BS5837:2012 should be submitted, detailing how the retained trees on the site boundaries are to be protected during the proposed development and, again, this can be covered by planning condition.

- 6.32. The application is acceptable in terms of the way in which it deals with trees and meets the requirements of adopted Local Plan for the Broads (2019) policy DM16 of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Highways and public rights of way

- 6.33. The Highways Authority have no objection to the application, noting that whilst the public road to the site is of varying width with limited passing opportunity, the site is well established. A condition is recommended and this can be applied.

Mooring policy

- 6.34. Policy DM33 of the Local Plan for the Broads covers moorings, mooring basins, and marinas. Relevant to this specific planning proposal, and not covered in previous sections of this report, the following considerations are addressed.
- 6.35. The proposed moorings are sited within an off-river basin and do not encroach on the river channel thereby having no impact on navigation.
- 6.36. The existing basin would be enlarged to enable the mooring of an additional 53 boats, plus the provision for short stay moorings. Under policy DM33 proposed schemes are required to provide, manage, maintain and advertise new short stay moorings, which, for proposals of 30 or more new moorings, should amount to 15% of the new provision. In this case that would result in 8 short stay moorings. This number of moorings is shown on the proposed plan, 4 at the adjacent mooring basin to the west, and 4 within the enlarged basin. Their provision will be secured by planning condition.
- 6.37. In terms of services, boat servicing and maintenance is provided at the site along with a range of marine services. Other services such as pump-out, electric charging, and potable water are available at a number of sites in Horning including at the adjacent site.

Flood risk

- 6.38. The proposed scheme has benefits from a flood risk point of view in terms of the expansion of the area of water and the reduction in the footprint of buildings. The Environment Agency have not commented on the proposal, as the proposal would increase flood water capacity at the site it is considered acceptable with regard to policy DM5 of the Local Plan for the Broads.

Other issues

- 6.39. It is acknowledged that local residents have raised issues about the site boundary and land ownership, specifically the boundary along Ferry View Road and the boundary to the south adjacent to the property known as Ferry View. Land ownership matters are not a planning issue and cannot be taken into account in the assessment of this application. Where the resident of Ferry View has questioned whether there is sufficient space for planting between the moorings and their property, the responsibility would lie with the application site owner to ensure that the retained land for landscaping as shown on drawing no.P03 Rev.I is provided.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1. The proposed development would allow the applicants to expand the mooring provision at the Horning Marina site, and to consolidate the existing provision of workshop and reception services at the site. The proposed development would not have an adverse impact on either landscape character or appearance, and whilst there would be an impact on ecology through the presence of water voles in the works area and the extraction of peat, these are considered to have been acceptably considered and addressed. There would be no adverse impact on designated sites, and no undue impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. The proposed replacement buildings are considered to be acceptable in terms of size, design, and siting. Consequently, the application is considered to be in accordance with Policies DM5, DM10, DM13, DM16, DM23, DM28, DM31, DM33, and DM43 of the Local Plan for the Broads, along with the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. Recommendation

- 8.1. Subject to no new issues raised by consultees, to approve with the following conditions:
- i. Standard time limit
 - ii. In accordance with approved plans
 - iii. Details of method statement for piling and dredging works
 - iv. Details of Construction Environmental Management Plan
 - v. Details of materials
 - vi. Details of tree protection
 - vii. Details of replacement trees
 - viii. Details of landscaping
 - ix. Details of ecological mitigation method statement, and an ecological management plan
 - x. Details of extracted peat use. Spoil to be deposited in flood zone 1
 - xi. Details of visitor mooring sign - position, size, and design
 - xii. Water vole re-survey prior to works
 - xiii. No residential mooring
 - xiv. Short stay moorings provided and retained in perpetuity
 - xv. No external lighting without agreement in writing
 - xvi. Reuse of peat within 7 days of extraction
 - xvii. Timber preservatives

xviii. Highways condition as recommended

9. Reason for recommendation

9.1. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies DM5, DM10, DM13, DM16, DM23, DM28, DM31, DM33, and DM43 of the Local Plan for the Broads, along with the National Planning Policy Framework which is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

Author: Nigel Catherall

Date of report: 22 February 2023

Background papers: BA/2021/0456/FUL

Appendix 1 – Location map

Appendix 1 – Location map

BA/2021/0456/FUL - Ferry Marina, Ferry View Estate, Horning, NR12 8PT



© Crown copyright and database rights 2023 Ordnance Survey 100021573. 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

© Crown copyright and database rights 2020 Ordnance Survey 100021573. 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-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 8

Enforcement update Mar 2023

Report by Head of Planning

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	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation
14 September 2018	Land at the Beauchamp Arms Public House, Ferry Road, Carleton St Peter	Unauthorised static caravans (Units X and Y)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authority given to serve an Enforcement Notice requiring the removal of unauthorised static caravans on land at the Beauchamp Arms Public House should there be a breach of planning control and it be necessary, reasonable and expedient to do so. • Site being monitored. October 2018 to February 2019. • Planning Contravention Notices served 1 March 2019. • Site being monitored 14 August 2019. • Further caravan on-site 16 September 2019.

Committee date	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site being monitored 3 July 2020. • Complaints received. Site to be visited on 29 October 2020. • Three static caravans located to rear of site appear to be in or in preparation for residential use. External works requiring planning permission (no application received) underway. Planning Contravention Notices served 13 November 2020. • Incomplete response to PCN received on 10 December. Landowner to be given additional response period. • Authority given to commence prosecution proceedings 5 February 2021. • Solicitor instructed 17 February 2021. • Hearing date in Norwich Magistrates Court 12 May 2021. • Summons issued 29 April 2021. • Adjournment requested by landowner on 4 May and refused by Court on 11 May. • Adjournment granted at Hearing on 12 May. • Revised Hearing date of 9 June 2021. • Operator pleaded 'not guilty' at Hearing on 9 June. Trial scheduled for 20 September at Great Yarmouth Magistrates Court. • Legal advice received in respect of new information. Prosecution withdrawn and new PCNs served on 7 September 2021. • Further information requested following scant PCN response and confirmation subsequently received that caravans 1 and 3 occupied on Assured Shorthold Tenancies. 27 October 2021 • Verbal update to be provided on 3 December 2021

Committee date	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement Notices served 30 November, with date of effect of 29 December 2021. Compliance period of 3 months for cessation of unauthorised residential use and 4 months to clear the site. 6 Dec. 2021 • Site to be visited after 29 March to check compliance – 23 March 2022 • Site visited 4 April and caravans appear to be occupied. Further PCNs served on 8 April to obtain clarification. There is a further caravan on site. 11 April 2022 • PCN returned 12 May 2022 with confirmation that caravans 1 and 3 still occupied. Additional caravan not occupied. • Recommendation that LPA commence prosecution for failure to comply with Enforcement Notice. 27 May 2022 • Solicitor instructed to commence prosecution. 31 May 2022 • Prosecution in preparation. 12 July 2022 • Further caravan, previously empty, now occupied. See separate report on agenda. 24 November 2022 • Planning Contravention Notice to clarify occupation served 25 November 2022. 20 January 2023. • Interviews under caution conducted 21 December 2022. 20 January 2023
8 November 2019	Blackgate Farm, High Mill Road, Cobholm	Unauthorised operational development – surfacing of site, installation of services and standing and use of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delegated Authority to Head of Planning to serve an Enforcement Notice, following liaison with the landowner at Blackgate Farm, to explain the situation and action. • Correspondence with solicitor on behalf of landowner 20 Nov. 2019. • Correspondence with planning agent 3 December 2019. • Enforcement Notice served 16 December 2019, taking effect on 27 January 2020 and compliance dates from 27 July 2020.

Committee date	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation
		5 static caravan units for residential use for purposes of a private travellers' site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeal against Enforcement Notice submitted 26 January 2020 with a request for a Hearing. Awaiting start date for the appeal. 3 July 2020. • Appeal start date 17 August 2020. • Hearing scheduled 9 February 2021. • Hearing cancelled. Rescheduled to 20 July 2021. • Hearing completed 20 July and Inspector's decision awaited. • Appeal dismissed with minor variations to Enforcement Notice. Deadline for cessation of caravan use of 12 February 2022 and 12 August 2022 for non-traveller and traveller units respectively, plus 12 October 2022 to clear site of units and hardstanding. 12 Aug 21 • Retrospective application submitted on 6 December 2021. • Application turned away. 16 December 2021 • Site visited 7 March 2022. Of non-traveller caravans, 2 have been removed off site, and occupancy status unclear of 3 remaining so investigations underway. • Further retrospective application submitted and turned away. 17 March 2022 • Further information on occupation requested. 11 April 2022 • No further information received. 13 May 2022 • Site to be checked. 6 June 2022 • Site visited and 2 caravans occupied in breach of Enforcement Notice, with another 2 to be vacated by 12 August 2022. Useful discussions held with new solicitor for landowner. 12 July 2022. • Further site visited required to confirm situation. 7 September 2022

Committee date	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site visit 20 September confirmed 5 caravans still present. Landowner subsequently offered to remove 3 by end October and remaining 2 by end April 2023. 3 October 2023. • Offer provisionally accepted on 17 October. Site to be checked after 1 November 2022. • Compliance with terms of offer as four caravans removed (site visits 10 and 23 November). Site to be checked after 31 March 2023. 24 November 2022
8 January 2021	Land east of Brograve Mill, Coast Road, Waxham	Unauthorised excavation of scrape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authority given for the service of Enforcement Notices. • Enforcement Notice served 29 January 2021. • Appeal against Enforcement Notice received 18 February 2021. • Documents submitted and Inspector's decision awaited. September 2021 • PINS contacted; advised no Inspector allocated yet. 20 October 2022. • Appeal dismissed 9 January 2023 and Enforcement Notice varied. Compliance required by 9 October 2023. 20 January 2023.
13 May 2022	Land at the Beauchamp Arms Public House, Ferry Road, Carleton St Peter	Unauthorised operation development comprising erection of workshop, kerbing and lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authority given by Chair and Vice Chair for service of Temporary Stop Notice requiring cessation of construction 13 May 2022 • Temporary Stop Notice served 13 May 2022. • Enforcement Notice and Stop Notice regarding workshop served 1 June 2022 • Enforcement Notice regarding kerbing and lighting served 1 June 2022 • Appeals submitted against both Enforcement Notices. 12 July 2022

Committee date	Location	Infringement	Action taken and current situation
21 September 2022	Land at Loddon Marina, Bridge Street, Loddon	Unauthorised static caravans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authority given to serve an Enforcement Notice requiring the cessation of the use and the removal of unauthorised static caravans. • Enforcement Notice served. 4 October 2022. • Enforcement Notice withdrawn on 19 October due to minor error; corrected Enforcement Notice re-served 20 October 2022. • Appeals submitted against Enforcement Notice. 24 November 2022
9 December 2022	Land at the Beauchamp Arms Public House, Ferry Road, Carleton St Peter	Unauthorised static caravan (Unit Z)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Contravention Notice to clarify occupation served 25 November 2022. • Authority given to serve an Enforcement Notice requiring the cessation of the use and the removal of unauthorised static caravan • Enforcement Notice served 11 January 2023. 20 January 2023. • Appeal submitted against Enforcement Notice. 16 February 2023.

Author: Cally Smith

Date of report: 16 February 2023

Background papers: Enforcement files

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 9

Oulton Neighbourhood Plan – adoption/making

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Purpose

The Oulton Neighbourhood Plan has been examined. The Examiner made some changes to the Plan. The Plan was subject to a referendum on 2 February 2023 and was supported (more than 50% of those who voted in the referendum voted 'yes').

Recommended decision

To endorse Oulton Neighbourhood Plan and recommend to the Broads Authority that the Oulton Neighbourhood Plan be made/adopted.

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The submitted Oulton Neighbourhood Plan was approved by the Broads Authority's Planning Committee in April 2022. This was followed by a statutory publication period between 17 May and 24 June 2022, in which the Plan and its supporting documents were available to the public and consultation bodies online at the BA and East Suffolk consultation webpages.
- 1.2. During the publication period, representations were received from a variety of organisations and individuals. The representations may be viewed [here](#).
- 1.3. These representations were submitted, along with the Neighbourhood Plan and supporting information, to the independent Examiner, Christopher Lockhart-Mummery. The examination was conducted via written representations during late summer 2022 (the Examiner deciding that a public hearing would not be required).
- 1.4. Legislation directs that an Examiner considers whether:
 - a) the draft plan meets the [basic conditions of a Neighbourhood Development Plan](#);
 - b) the draft plan complies with the definition of a Neighbourhood Development Plan and the provisions that can be made by such a plan;
 - c) the area for referendum should extend beyond the neighbourhood area; and
 - d) the draft plan is compatible with the Convention rights.

2. The Examiner’s Report

- 2.1. The [Examiner’s Report on the Oulton Neighbourhood Plan](#) concluded that, subject to amendments (as set out in the report), the Plan can proceed to referendum. The Examiner also concluded that the area of the referendum does not need to be extended beyond Oulton Parish.

3. Referendum

- 3.1. The referendum for the Oulton Neighbourhood Plan¹ was held on 2 February 2023.

- 3.2. The question in the referendum was:

Do you want the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Oulton to help them decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?

- 3.3. The result of the votes cast is as follows:

Description	Votes
Number of votes accepted	535
Number cast in favour of “YES”	457
Number cast in favour of “NO”	78

The number of ballot papers rejected was as follows:	Number of ballot papers
(a) want of official mark	0
(b) voting for more answers than required	0
(c) writing or mark by which the voter could be identified	0
(d) being unmarked or wholly void for uncertainty	6
Total number of rejected votes	6

Electorate: 3,938

Ballot Papers Issued: 541

Turnout: 13.7 %

4. Next steps

- 4.1. If both the Broads Authority and East Suffolk Council make/adopt the Neighbourhood Plan, it becomes part of the Development Plan for the area. The policies have the same weight as Local Plan policies when making decisions.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 21 February 2023

¹ Here is the referendum version of the Plan: <https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Neighbourhood-Planning/Designated-Neighbourhood-Areas/Oulton/Oulton-Neighbourhood-Plan-Referendum-Version.pdf>

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 10

Local Plan- Settlement Study update

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

The Settlement Study was completed in June 2021. Comments were received as part of the Issues and Options consultation. The Settlement Study has consequently been updated and amended.

Recommendation

Members endorse the amendments to the Settlement Study.

1. Background

1.1. The production of a Settlement Study is an important part of the development of Local Plan. It identifies the facilities and services in the settlements of an area, which enables an assessment to be made of their suitability for further development or growth based on their sustainability. It is a particularly important process in the identification of areas suitable for a development boundary, as this is likely to result in new housing development.

2. The Settlement Study

2.1. The Settlement Study was completed in June 2021 and was considered by Planning Committee in March 2022¹. During the Issues and Options consultation, held October to December 2022, we received some comments on the study. These are included in this study at Appendix E.

2.2. The Study has been amended and updated as a result of these comments. The main change relates to assessing access to allotment provision.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 21 February 2023

Appendix 1 – Settlement Study (February 2023)

¹ [March Issues and Options Bite Size Pieces \(broads-authority.gov.uk\)](https://broads-authority.gov.uk)

Settlement Study

To support the Local Plan for the Broads review

[March 2023](#)

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Methodology	3
3. Scoring Criteria	4
4. Conclusion	7
Appendix A: Settlements in the Broads/in the Parishes of the Broads.....	10
Appendix B: Settlement Scoring Mechanism	14
Appendix C: Explanations – walking distance and public transport.....	16
Appendix D: Broads Settlement Analysis.....	18
Appendix E: Comments on Original Settlement Study, received as part of Issues and Options consultation.	19

1. Introduction

We have assessed all the settlements in the Broads Executive Area for their suitability for a development boundary. The first stage of this process is to assess the sustainability of settlements. This exercise will reflect what kind of service and facilities are within or nearby settlements.

The purpose of a development boundary is to consolidate development around existing built-up communities where there is a clearly defined settlement where further development, if properly designed and constructed, would not be incongruous or intrusive because of the size of the settlement. Development Boundaries have twin objectives of focusing the majority of development towards existing settlements whilst simultaneously protecting the surrounding countryside.

There are currently four areas in the Broads Executive Area that have Development Boundaries. These are detailed in Policy DM35: Residential development within defined Development Boundaries and are shown on the [adopted policies maps](#). The four areas are:

- A. Horning
- B. Wroxham and Hoveton
- C. Oulton Broad
- D. Thorpe St Andrew

There is currently no Settlement Hierarchy of the settlements in the Broads. Whilst there are some built up areas of the Broads, it is usually the case that the rural part of a Parish is within the Broads Executive Area, with the built up part in the neighbouring Local Planning Authority's area.

[This is an update to the February 2022 study, to reflect comments received as part of the Issues and Options consultation. The comments can be found in Appendix E. The main comment that has resulted in changes, is the suggestion to include access to allotments when scoring settlements. This has been done. Changes in the text of this document are shown by blue underlining.](#)

2. Methodology

The County Parishes in the Broads are well known. The settlements in each County Parish of the Broads Executive Area were then determined using GIS mapping. These settlements were then assessed, again using GIS, to ascertain the scale of development in the Broads part of the settlement or built up area.

The settlements with a significant built up area in the Broads were then taken forward to be assessed as per the scoring mechanism set out later in this document to determine the potential suitability of a settlement for a development boundary.

The full list of settlements and parishes can be found at [Appendix A](#). Please note that not all these settlements are in the Broads Executive Area, but they are within parishes which have part of the Broads in them and we acknowledge that some of these settlements are extremely small.

For smaller settlements (villages and hamlets) 'significant' was judged to be either all or a large proportion of the built up area of the settlement in the Broads. For larger settlements (larger villages, towns and Norwich), if there were around five or more buildings of that larger settlement in the Broads, that settlement was assessed.

Following this initial sieve, Broads Authority Officers used a desk-based/internet approach to rate the services in the vicinity of the settlement against the scoring mechanism as set out at [Appendix B](#). It is important to note that it did not matter if the services were outside of the Broads Authority Executive Area.

The draft table was then shared with the County Parishes (November and December 2021) who were asked to confirm or suggest amendments to the assessment. Their local knowledge also provided extra information.

Data was collected through a desk-based assessment using local knowledge as well as using the internet and checked with parish and town councils. Data was collected in 2021.

3. Scoring Criteria

The scoring criteria are shown in the following table. The scoring mechanism is shown at [Appendix B](#) with further explanation in [Appendix C](#).

It should be noted that not all of these facilities or services are considered as key/core services. But they are included, as together they make up a successful place and they are important to communities. Key/core services, as defined in the HELAA methodology¹ are as follows:

- A primary school
- A secondary school
- A local healthcare service (doctors' surgery)

¹ Norfolk HELAA, 2016: https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0025/253294/EB47-Norfolk-HELAA-Methodology.pdf

- Retail and service provision for day to day needs (district/local shopping centre, village shop)
- Local employment opportunities (principally existing employment sites, but designated or proposed employment area in a local plan will also be considered)
- A peak-time public transport service to/from a higher order settlement (peak time for the purposes of this criterion will be 7-9am and 4-6pm)

Theme	Indicator	Detail
Current Employment Provision	Employment Opportunities	Employment opportunities include areas safeguarded as local employment areas in neighbouring local plans/Local Plan for the Broads. Principally existing employment sites, but designated or proposed employment area in a local plan will also be considered. The availability of employment within close proximity to homes can reduce the need to travel.
	Seasonal employment opportunities	Such as hospitality, large areas of holiday accommodation and boatyards.
Educational Facilities	Further Education College	Access to further education is important for young people and in many cases may also provide educational/leisure facilities for the wider community. Further education in this instance is up to sixth form at a school or a college. School transport provision is a consideration.
	Secondary School	Access to a secondary school is essential for young people and in many cases they provide facilities for the wider community. This is for up to GCSE level. School transport provision is a consideration.
	Primary School	Access to a primary school is essential for families with young children and they play an important role in many communities
	Early Years Nursery	Early years nurseries are important for childcare provision and child development. All nurseries have been considered in this study.
Healthcare Facilities	Doctor's Surgery	Doctor's surgeries are important healthcare facilities. The presence of them in a settlement is especially useful for less mobile people as well as the elderly and infirm.
	Dentist	Dental surgeries are important for general healthcare. Any dentists have been considered in this study.

Theme	Indicator	Detail
	Pharmacy	Pharmacies are useful facilities for health care. The presence of them in a settlement is especially useful for less mobile people.
Retail/Shopping Facilities	Supermarket	A supermarket is a larger form of convenience store. Supermarkets offer a wide variety of food and household merchandise and are important to help meet the wider shopping needs of the local community. This category refers to larger supermarkets such as Sainsbury's and Tesco.
	Everyday Shops	Everyday shops such as butchers, bakers, greengrocers and newsagents are important to help meet the day-to-day shopping needs of the local community. To be included in the assessment, shops will be open year round. Local Convenience shops such as Budgens, Coop, Nisa etc are classed as every day shops for the purpose of this exercise. Petrol stations with a shop are also included. A village shop selling essentials is also included.
	Post Office	Post Offices are valuable community facilities that allow access to a number of financial and communication services.
	Bank or Cash Point	Banks and cash points are useful for day-to-day banking needs including cash withdrawals.
Community Facilities	Community Hall	Community/village halls are important community facilities, often providing a base for local organisations and community events
	Library (inc. Mobile Service)	Public libraries provide information resources for everyday use and support formal and informal education and lifelong learning.
	Place of Worship	Places of worship contribute to a sense of community and often provide a base for local organisations and community events.
	Public House	Aside from serving food and drink, pubs provide a meeting place for people and can contribute to a sense of community.
Leisure Facilities	Leisure Centre	Leisure centres are valuable facilities for health, fitness and social purposes.
	Open space, such as playing fields and parks (formal/informal sports pitches)	Open spaces are important to encourage outdoor sports and recreation and general health and wellbeing. They also often provide a home for local sports teams. Those open spaces identified and protected in Local and Neighbourhood Plans will be of relevance, as well as local knowledge.

Theme	Indicator	Detail
	Equipped play area	Children’s play areas are valuable for the physical development of young people. Those play areas identified and protected in Local and Neighbourhood Plans will be of relevance, as well as local knowledge.
	<u>Allotments</u>	<u>Allotments enable the growing of food. Users’ mental and physical health tends to benefit from keeping an allotment.</u>
Public Transport Services	Bus service to nearest higher order settlement	Higher order settlements tend to host facilities and services which the smaller order settlements do not. Bus services to these higher order settlements provide an alternative to single occupancy car use.
	Train service to nearest higher order settlement	Higher order settlements tend to host facilities and services which the smaller order settlements do not. Not all settlements have a train station and those that do have varied frequency of services to various places. Trains offer an alternative to single occupancy car use.
	Community Transport Scheme	Even the most rural area can be served by a Community Transport Scheme which are beneficial to their residents and provide an alternative to single occupancy car use.
Using the water	Free/private moorings	Access to/from settlements and facilities by water allows an alternative to road travel.
	Directly on a navigable waterway	These water based indicators also bring tourists to an area to spend money in shops and pubs which could assist in their viability and presence to serve the rest of the community.
	Water-side services	Such services (toilets, showers, water, fuel, litter disposal and sewerage disposal) can bring tourists to an area as explained above, but can also make an area suitable for residential moorings.

4. Conclusion

The following table shows the settlements that were assessed, what district they are in and the place in the Settlement Hierarchy. It is a summary of the findings of the study. More detail can be found at [Appendix D. The ‘new total’ includes the scoring for the allotment.](#)

Settlement	District/Borough	Place in District's Settlement Hierarchy.	Total	<u>New Total</u>
Norwich City	Norwich	City	66	<u>68</u>
Great Yarmouth	Great Yarmouth Borough	Main town	66	<u>68</u>
Beccles	Waveney	Market Town	64	<u>66</u>
Thorpe St Andrew	Broadland	Fringe Parish	62	<u>64</u>
Loddon	South Norfolk	Key Service Centre	61	<u>62</u>
Oulton Broad	Waveney	Main Town	58	<u>59</u>
Hoveton	North Norfolk	Small Growth Town	58	<u>58</u>
Brundall	Broadland	Key Service Centre	56	<u>57</u>
Bungay	Waveney	Service Centre	53	<u>54</u>
Trowse with Newton	South Norfolk	Fringe Parish	46	<u>48</u>
Coltishall	Broadland	Village cluster	45	<u>46</u>
Wroxham	Broadland	Key Service Centre	46	<u>46</u>
Reedham	Broadland	Village cluster	44	<u>45</u>
Ditchingham Dam	Waveney	Open Countryside	44	<u>45</u>
Ditchingham	South Norfolk	Village cluster	44	<u>45</u>
Chedgrave	South Norfolk	Key Service Centre	44	<u>45</u>
Horning	North Norfolk	Small growth village	43	<u>44</u>
Stalham Staithe	North Norfolk	Small Growth Town	39	<u>40</u>
Ludham	North Norfolk	Large Growth Villages	39	<u>39</u>
Cantley	Broadland	Village cluster	38	<u>38</u>
Filby	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	34	<u>35</u>
Burgh Castle	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	30	<u>30</u>
West Caister	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	29	<u>30</u>
Smallburgh	North Norfolk	Countryside	29	<u>29</u>
Dilham	North Norfolk	Countryside	28	<u>28</u>
St Olaves	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	27	<u>27</u>
Somerton (West)	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	27	<u>27</u>
Neatishead	North Norfolk	Countryside	26	<u>27</u>
Thimble Hill (near Dilham)	North Norfolk	Countryside	25	<u>25</u>
Runham (near Stokesby)	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	24	<u>24</u>
Burgh St Peter	South Norfolk	Village cluster	24	<u>24</u>
Wayford Bridge	North Norfolk	Countryside	21	<u>22</u>
Upper Street	North Norfolk	Countryside	21	<u>21</u>
Stokesby	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	21	<u>21</u>
Repps	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	21	<u>21</u>
Haddiscoe	South Norfolk	Village cluster	21	<u>21</u>
Ranworth	Broadland	Village cluster	20	<u>20</u>
Bramerton Common	South Norfolk	Village cluster	18	<u>19</u>
Ellingham	South Norfolk	Village cluster	18	<u>18</u>

Settlement	District/Borough	Place in District's Settlement Hierarchy.	Total	<u>New Total</u>
Wickhampton	Broadland	Village cluster	17	<u>17</u>
Johnson Street (near Ludham)	North Norfolk	Countryside	16	<u>16</u>
Belaugh	Broadland	Village cluster	15	<u>15</u>
Thurne	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	13	<u>13</u>
Limpenhoe (and Southwood)	Broadland	Village cluster	9	<u>9</u>
Irstead	North Norfolk	Countryside	7	<u>7</u>
Tunstall	Broadland	Village cluster	4	<u>4</u>
Dockney (near Geldeston)	South Norfolk	Village cluster	2	<u>2</u>
Nogdam End	South Norfolk	Village cluster	1	<u>1</u>
Dunburgh (near Geldeston)	South Norfolk	Countryside	1	<u>1</u>

Notes:

- Norwich: There are regular busses and trains out of Norwich, but for most services and facilities, Norwich itself is the higher order settlement.
- Great Yarmouth: There are regular busses and trains out of Great Yarmouth, but for most services and facilities, Great Yarmouth itself is the higher order settlement.
- Beccles: Scores 2 for sports facilities as the facilities at the School are only available out of school times.
- Hoveton: the library is in Wroxham.
- Wroxham: Slightly lower score for Wroxham than Hoveton for education as the schools are in Hoveton. Wroxham PC keen to emphasise that Wroxham is a different settlement.
- Chedgrave: To be consistent, Chedgrave has been considered as a separate settlement to Loddon.
- West Caister: To be consistent, West Caister is considered as a separate settlement to Casiter on Sea. They are linked by a footbridge over the main road that separates them.
- Stalham Staithe: To be consistent, Stalham Staithe is considered as a separate settlement to Stalham. They are linked by a pedestrian refuge in the main road that separates them.
- Stokesby: There is a shop in Stokesby that is run by the pub, but it is not open every day – it was closed from the start of January 2023 to 10 February 2023. As such, there is a zero score for shops.

Appendix A: Settlements in the Broads/in the Parishes of the Broads

Parish/Town Council	Settlement	District	Neighbouring LPA Category	'Significant' Built up Area in the Broads?	To be assessed?
Acle PC	Acle	Broadland	Key Service Centre	No	No
Aldeby PC	Aldeby	South Norfolk	Other Village	No	No
Ashby with Oby PC	Ashby and Oby	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	No	No
Barnby PC	Barnby	East Suffolk	Larger Village	No	No
Barsham and Shipmeadow PC	Barsham	East Suffolk	Rural areas	No	No
Barton Turf and Irstead PC	Barton Turf	North Norfolk	Countryside	Boatyard so no	No
Repps with Bastwick PC	Bastwick	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	No	No
Beccles Town Council	Beccles	East Suffolk	Market Town	Yes	Yes
Beighton PC	Beighton	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Belaugh PC	Belaugh	Broadland	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Belton with Browston PC	Belton	Great Yarmouth Borough	Primary Village	No	No
Fleggburgh PC	Billockby	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	No	No
Blundeston and Flixton PC	Blundeston	East Suffolk	Larger Village	No	No
Bradwell PC	Bradwell	Great Yarmouth Borough	Key Service Centre	No	No
Bramerton PC	Bramerton Common (near Bramerton)	South Norfolk	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Broome PC	Broome	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Broome PC	Broome Street	South Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Belton with Browston PC	Browston Green	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	No	No
Brumstead PC	Brumstead Grange	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Brundall PC	Brundall	Broadland	Key Service Centre	Yes	Yes
Bungay Town Council	Bungay	East Suffolk	Service Centre	Yes	Yes
Burgh Castle PC	Burgh Castle	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	Yes	Yes
Burgh St Peter and Wheatacre PC	Burgh St Peter	South Norfolk	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Neatishead PC	Butcher's Common	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Ingham PC	Calthorpe Street	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Neatishead PC	Cangate	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Cantley PC	Cantley	Broadland	Village cluster	Sugarbeet factory, but also around 5 or so houses	Yes
Upton with Fishley PC	Cargate Green	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Carleton St Peter PC	Carleton St Peter	South Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Carlton Colville PC	Carlton Colville	East Suffolk	Main Town	No	No
Catfield PC	Catfield	North Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Smallburgh PC	Cat's Common	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Chedgrave PC	Chedgrave	South Norfolk	Key Service Centre	Yes	Yes
Claxton PC	Claxton	South Norfolk	Other Village	No (farm buildings)	No
Coltishall PC	Coltishall	Broadland	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Crostwick Parish Council	Crostwick	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Honing and Crostwight PC	Crostwight	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Acle PC	Damgate	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Dilham PC	Dilham	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Ditchingham PC	Ditchingham	South Norfolk	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Bungay Town Council	Ditchingham Dam	East Suffolk	Open Countryside	Yes	Yes
Geldeston PC	Dockeney (near Geldeston)	South Norfolk	Village cluster	Yes	Yes

Parish/Town Council	Settlement	District	Neighbouring LPA Category	'Significant' Built up Area in the Broads?	To be assessed?
Geldeston PC	Dunburgh (near Geldeston)	South Norfolk	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Earsham PC	Earsham	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
East Ruston PC	East Ruston	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Somerton West/East PC	East Somerton	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	No	No
Ellingham and Kirby Cane PC	Ellingham	South Norfolk	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Filby PC	Filby	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	Yes	Yes
Upton with Fishley PC	Fishley	Broadland	Countryside	Some buildings associated with Fishley Hall	No
Fleggburgh PC	Fleggburgh	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	Some buildings such as farms, but no.	No
Blundeston and Flixton PC	Flixton	East Suffolk	Rural area	No	No
Freethorpe PC	Freethorpe	Broadland	Service Village	No	No
Fritton and St Olaves PC	Fritton	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	No	No
Geldeston PC	Geldeston	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Gillingham PC	Gillingham	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Great Yarmouth	Great Yarmouth	Great Yarmouth Borough	Main Town	Yes	Yes
Haddiscoe and Toft Monks PC	Haddiscoe	South Norfolk	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Halvergate PC	Halvergate	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Hales and Heckingham PC	Heckingham	South Norfolk	Service village/Countryside	No	No
Rockland St Mary with Hellington PC	Hellington	South Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Hemsby PC	Hemsby	Great Yarmouth Borough	Primary Village	No	No
Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton PC	Herringfleet	East Suffolk	Rural area	No	No
Hickling PC	Hickling	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Hickling PC	Hickling Green	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Hickling PC	Hickling Heath	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Hickling PC	Hill Common	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Honing and Crostwight PC	Honing	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Horning PC	Horning	North Norfolk	Service Village	Yes	Yes
Horse PC	Horse	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Horstead with Stanninghall PC	Horstead	Broadland	Service Village	No	No
Hoveton PC	Hoveton	North Norfolk	Secondary Settlement	Yes	Yes
Ingham PC	Ingham	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Ingham PC	Ingham Corner	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Barton Turf and Irstead PC	Irstead	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Ludham PC	Johnson Street (near Ludham)	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Kirby Bedon PC	Kirby Bedon	South Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Ellingham and Kirby Cane PC	Kirby Cane	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Langley with Hardley PC	Langley Green	South Norfolk	Countryside	No (residential on side of road not in the Broads)	No
Langley with Hardley PC	Langley Street	South Norfolk	Other Village	No (residential on side of road not in the Broads)	No
Cantley PC	Limpenhoe	Broadland	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Cantley PC	Limpenhoe Hill (near Reedham)	Broadland	Village cluster	A few buildings, but could be the farm.	Yes
Loddon PC	Loddon	South Norfolk	Key Service Centre	Yes	Yes
Thurlton PC	Lower Thurlton	South Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Ludham PC	Ludham	North Norfolk	Service Village	Yes	Yes
Martham PC	Martham	Great Yarmouth Borough	Primary Village	No	No
Mettingham PC	Mettingham	East Suffolk	Rural area	No	No

Parish/Town Council	Settlement	District	Neighbouring LPA Category	'Significant' Built up Area in the Broads?	To be assessed?
Bighton PC	Moulton St Mary	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Neatishead PC	Neatishead	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Norton Subcourse PC	Nogdam End	South Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
North Cove PC	North Cove	East Suffolk	Larger Village	No	No
Norton Subcourse PC	Norton Subcourse	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Norwich City	Norwich City	Norwich	City	Utilities Site, but not built out yet. Cremorne Lane.	Yes
Ormesby St Michael PC	Ormesby St Michael	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	Mostly the waterworks, so no	No
Oulton PC	Oulton	East Suffolk	Main Town	No	No
Oulton Broad Town Council	Oulton Broad	East Suffolk	Main Town	Yes	Yes
Woodbastwick PC	Panxworth	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
South Walsham PC	Pilson Green	Broadland	Countryside	No, although some buildings off Fleet Lane	No
Postwick with Witton PC	Postwick	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Potter Heigham PC	Potter Heigham	North Norfolk	Countryside	No (boatyards, chalets and retail only)	No
Woodbastwick PC	Ranworth	Broadland	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Reedham PC	Reedham	Broadland	Village cluster	Some development on the periphery of the village.	Yes
Repps with Bastwick PC	Repps	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	Yes	Yes
Rockland St Mary with Hellington PC	Rockland St Mary	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Rollesby PC	Rollesby	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	No	No
Mautby and Runham PC	Runham (near Stokesby)	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	Yes	Yes
Salhouse PC	Salhouse	Broadland	Service Village	No	No
Sea Palling and Waxham PC	Sea Palling	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Catfield PC	Sharp Street	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Barsham and Shipmeadow PC	Shipmeadow	East Suffolk	Rural area	No	No
Smallburgh PC	Smallburgh (near Dilham)	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Ashby, Herringfleet and Somerleyton PC	Somerleyton	East Suffolk	Larger village	No	No
Somerton West/East PC	Somerton (West)	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	Yes	Yes
South Walsham PC	South Walsham	Broadland	Service Village	No	No
Cantley PC	Southwood	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Fritton and St Olaves PC	St Olaves	Great Yarmouth Borough	Secondary Village	Yes	Yes
Stalham Town Council	Stalham Green	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Stalham Town Council	Stalham Staithe	North Norfolk	Secondary Settlement	Yes	Yes
Stokesby with Herringby PC	Stokesby	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	Yes	Yes
Strumpshaw PC	Strumpshaw	Broadland	Other Village	No	No
Surlingham PC	Surlingham	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Sutton PC	Sutton	North Norfolk	Countryside	Sutton Staithe Hotel, no	No
Smallburgh PC	Thimble Hill (near Dilham)	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Thorpe St Andrew PC	Thorpe St Andrew	Broadland	Fringe Parish	Yes	Yes
Neatishead PC	Threehammer Common	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Mautby and Runham PC	Thrigby	Great Yarmouth Borough	Countryside	No	No
Thurlton PC	Thurlton	South Norfolk	Service Village	No	No
Thurne PC	Thurne	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	Yes	Yes
Trowse with Newton PC	Trowse with Newton	South Norfolk	Fringe Parish	Yes	Yes
Halvergate PC	Tunstall	Broadland	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Horning PC	Upper Street	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No

Parish/Town Council	Settlement	District	Neighbouring LPA Category	'Significant' Built up Area in the Broads?	To be assessed?
Hoveton PC	Upper Street (near Bewilderwood)	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
Upton with Fishley PC	Upton	Broadland	Countryside	A few buildings, but not significant.	No
Sea Palling and Waxham PC	Waxham	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Stalham Town Council	Wayford Bridge	North Norfolk	Countryside	Yes	Yes
West Caister PC	West Caister	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	Yes	Yes
West Caister PC	West End	Great Yarmouth Borough	Countryside	No (mainly caravan site)	No
Burgh St Peter and Wheatacre PC	Wheatacre	South Norfolk	Other Village/Countryside	No	No
Freethorpe PC	Wickhampton	Broadland	Village cluster	Yes	Yes
Winterton-on-Sea PC	Winterton on Sea	Great Yarmouth Borough	Primary Village	No	No
Postwick with Witton PC	Witton	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Catfield PC	Wood Street	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Woodbastwick PC	Woodbastick	Broadland	Countryside	No	No
Neatishead PC	Workhouse Common	North Norfolk	Countryside	No	No
Worlingham PC	Worlingham	East Suffolk	Market Town	No	No
Wroxham PC	Wroxham	Broadland	Key Service Centre	Yes	Yes

Appendix B: Settlement Scoring Mechanism

It is important to note the following:

- When considering if the service is within a walkable distance from the settlement, the actual route is considered – in particular, is there a surfaced footway for the entire route or not. So a service may well be within walking distance of a settlement, but may not have a suitably surface route that can be used all year round.

Theme	Indicator	Detail	Score
Current Employment Provision	Employment Opportunities	Within settlement	3
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2
		Easily accessed by public transport from the settlement	1
	Seasonal 'visitor economy' employment opportunities (note that the maximum score is 2 because this employment opportunity is not all year round)	Within settlement	2
		Within a walkable distance or easily accessed by public transport from the settlement	1
Educational Facilities	Further education	Within a settlement	3
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2
		Easily access by public transport from the settlement	1
	Secondary School	Within settlement	3
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2
		Easily accessed by public transport from the settlement	1
Primary School	Within settlement	3	
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2
Early Years Nursery		Within settlement	3
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2
Healthcare Facilities	Doctor's Surgery	Within a settlement	3
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2
		Easily access by public transport from the settlement	1
	Dentist (note that the maximum score is 2 as a doctors is considered more of a key service than dentist)	Within settlement	2
		Within a walkable distance or easily accessed by public transport from the settlement	1
Pharmacy (note that the maximum score is 2 as a doctors is considered more of a key service than a pharmacy)	Within settlement	2	
		Within a walkable distance or easily accessed by public transport from the settlement	1
Retail/Shopping Facilities	Supermarket	2 or more in settlement	4
		1 in settlement	3
		Within a walkable distance	2
		Easily accessed by public transport	1
	Every day shops	3 or more in settlement	4
		2 in settlement	3
		1 in settlement	2
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	1
Post Office (note that the maximum score is 2 as a shop selling essentials/supermarket is more of a key service than a Post Office)		Within settlement	2
		Within a walkable distance or easily accessed by public transport from the settlement	1
Bank or cash point (note that the maximum score is 2 as a shop selling essentials/supermarket is more of a key service than cashpoint or bank)		Within settlement	2
		Within a walkable distance or easily accessed by public transport from the settlement	1
Community Facilities	Library (libraries have a maximum score of 3 as they offer a variety of things to the community)	Within settlement	3
		Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2
		Settlement is on a mobile library route	1

Theme	Indicator	Detail	Score
	Community Hall (Community Halls have a maximum score of 3 as they offer a variety of things to the community)	Within settlement Within a walkable distance from the settlement Easily accessed by public transport	3 2 1
	Place of Worship (note that the maximum score is 2 as a library is considered more of a key service than a place of worship)	Within settlement Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2 1
	Public House (note that the maximum score is 2 as a library is considered more of a key service than a pub)	Within settlement Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2 1
Leisure Facilities	Leisure/sports Centre	Within settlement Within a walkable distance Easily accessed by public transport	3 2 1
	Playing field (formal/informal sports pitches)	2 or more in settlement 1 in settlement	2 1
	Equipped play area	2 or more in settlement 1 in settlement	2 1
	<u>Allotments</u>	<u>2 or more in settlement</u> <u>1 in settlement</u>	<u>2</u> <u>1</u>
Public Transport	Bus service to nearest higher order settlement	For bus services/stops within the settlement only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Half hourly, or more frequent, throughout the day including the AM and PM peak (7-10am and 4-7pm) • Hourly service to a main centre throughout the day including the AM and PM peak (7-10am and 4-7pm) • Daily service – less than hourly but at least one in the AM and PM peak (7-10am and 4-7pm) Bus services, with peak hour service, that is walking distance from the settlement	3 2 1 1
	Train service to nearest higher order settlement	If train station within settlement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Half hourly, or more frequent, throughout the day including the AM and PM peak (7-10am and 4-7pm) • Hourly service to a main centre throughout the day including the AM and PM peak (7-10am and 4-7pm) • Daily service – less than hourly but at least in the AM and PM peak (7-10am and 4-7pm) Train station, with peak hour service, that is walking distance from the settlement	3 2 1 1
	Community Transport Scheme	Settlement served by a Community Transport Scheme Potential for nearby service to include a village that is not listed on the website.	2 1
Using the water	Free 24 hour moorings	Within settlement Within a walkable distance from the settlement	2 1
	Water-side services	Boatyard with most water-side services within settlement Boatyard with limited water-side services within settlement Within a walkable distance from the settlement (most or limited water-side services) Limited waterside services within settlements	3 2 1 1

Appendix C: Explanations – walking distance and public transport

Transportation Mode	Accessibility Criteria	Justification
Walking	800m/10 minute walk on a surfaced route, able to be used year round, to a primary/nursery school, supermarket/shop selling essentials, employment opportunities and to a doctor's surgery.	During the examination of the Local Plan, the Planning Inspector supported amendments to the residential moorings policy in relation to walking distance – the policy used 800m/10 minute walk and also qualified the quality of the route. As such, that wording is used. The types of facilities also reflect the residential moorings policy and the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment Methodology (Norfolk HELAA ² , 2016)
	2 mile walk on a surfaced routes able to be used all year round, to all other services as defined in Appendix B.	Whilst the statutory walking distance is 3 miles for pupils over 8 this study uses 2 miles as an acceptable distance to high schools. For the purposes of this study, it is also considered an acceptable maximum walking distance to other everyday services/ facilities.
Public Transport	45 minute bus journey (door to door) to access employment opportunities, FE college, secondary school/sixth form. Journeys must be during working/school hours (9-5) and must have at least 2 services to arrive before 9am.	These criteria are equal to or below the maximum journey times provided by Norfolk County Council (highway authority); 60 minutes to work or a job centre, 90 minutes to an FE college and 75 minutes to a high school with sixth form. This is door to door and therefore includes walking time.
	30 minute bus journey (door to door) to access a doctor's surgery, supermarket, post office or cash point (and other services listed in Appendix B).	This is door to door and therefore includes walking time.

Regarding public transport:

- It is not only the bus journey itself that is of consideration, but the walk to the bus stop and then from the bus stop to the destination. The Travel Line website has been used to ascertain bus services, length of bus journey as well as length of walk

² https://www.broads-authority.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0025/253294/EB47-Norfolk-HELAA-Methodology.pdf

to/from the bus. In order to be considered as 'easily accessible by public transport' a walking time to the bus stop of a maximum of 20 minutes has been used. The same length of time for walking from where passengers alight to the end destination is also assumed. The quality of the route for walking needs consideration – for example, it needs to be a surfaced route that could be used all year round.

- For FE Colleges and Secondary Schools, school transport officers at Suffolk and Norfolk County Councils provided advice as well as Travel Line East Anglia website information.

Regarding walking distance:

- Google maps were used to ascertain actual walking routes, distances and times to and from a destination.
- Google Street View was also used to check if suitable footways existed for the majority of the journey.

Appendix D: Broads Settlement Analysis

Settlement	District/Borough	Place in District's Settlement Hierarchy	Employment		Education				Health				Community Facilities					Leisure Facilities				Public/Community Transport			Using the Water		Total						
			Employment Opportunities	Seasonal 'visitor economy' Employment Opportunities	FE College	Secondary School	Primary School	Early Years Nursery	Doctor's Surgery	Dentist	Pharmacy	Supermarket	Everyday Shops	Post Office	Bank or Cash Point	Community Hall	Library	Place of Worship	Public House	Leisure Centre	Playing Field (formal/informal playing pitches)	Equipped Play Area	Allotments	Bus Services	Train Service	Community Transport		Moorings	Waterside Services				
Great Yarmouth	Great Yarmouth Borough	Main town	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	4	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	68
Norwich City	Norwich	City	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	4	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	68
Beccles	East Suffolk	Market Town	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	4	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	66	
Thorpe St Andrew	Broadland	Fringe Parish	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	64	
Loddon	South Norfolk	Key Service Centre	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	62	
Oulton Broad	East Suffolk	Main Town	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	2	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	59		
Hoveton	North Norfolk	Small Growth Town	3	2	1	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	58	
Brundall	Broadland	Key Service Centre	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	57		
Bungay	East Suffolk	Service Centre	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	1	2	1	3	0	2	2	2	0	0	3	54	
Trowse with Newton	South Norfolk	Fringe Parish	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	48	
Coltishall	Broadland	Village cluster	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	0	2	2	2	3	0	3	46	
Wroxham	Broadland	Key Service Centre	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	2	2	0	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	46		
Chedgrave	South Norfolk	Key Service Centre	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	3	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	45	
Ditchingham	South Norfolk	Village cluster	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	45		
Ditchingham Dam	East Suffolk	Open Countryside	2	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	45		
Reedham	Broadland	Village cluster	1	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	2	45		
Horning	North Norfolk	Small growth village	3	2	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	3	44		
Stalham Staithe	North Norfolk	Small Growth Town	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	0	2	2	2	3	40			
Ludham	North Norfolk	Large Growth Villages	1	0	0	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	0	1	2	2	1	1	39			
Cantley	Broadland	Village cluster	3	1	0	1	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	2	3	1	2	2	0	38			
Filby	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	1	1	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	1	2	1	35		
Burgh Castle	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	0	2	2	2	1	1	0	2	0	1	2	2	3	30			
West Caister	Great Yarmouth Borough	Tertiary Village	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	30			
Smallburgh	North Norfolk	Countryside	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	29		
Dilham	North Norfolk	Countryside	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	28		
Neatishead	North Norfolk	Countryside	0	0	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	27		
Somerton (West)	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	0	2	2	2	1	27			
St Olaves	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	3	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	2	2	27			
Thimble Hill (near Dilham)	North Norfolk	Countryside	3	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	2	2	2	2	2	25			
Burgh St Peter	South Norfolk	Village cluster	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	24			
Runham (near stokesby)	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	1	1	0	1	0	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	24		
Repps	Great Yarmouth	Secondary Village	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	22		
Haddiscoe	South Norfolk	Village cluster	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	21		
Stokesby	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	21			
Upper Street	North Norfolk	Countryside	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	21		
Wayford Bridge	North Norfolk	Countryside	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	21		
Ranworth	Broadland	Village cluster	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	20			
Bramerton Common	South Norfolk	Village cluster	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	19			
Ellingham	South Norfolk	Village cluster	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	18		
Wickhampton	Broadland	Village cluster	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	17			
Johnson Street (near Ludham)	North Norfolk	Countryside	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	16		
Belaugh	Broadland	Village cluster	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	15			
Thurne	Great Yarmouth	Tertiary Village	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	13			
Limpenhoe (and Southwood)	Broadland	Village cluster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	9			
Irstead	North Norfolk	Countryside	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	7			
Tunstall	Broadland	Village cluster	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4			
Dockney (near Geldeston)	South Norfolk	Village cluster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2			
Dunburgh (near Geldeston)	South Norfolk	Countryside	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1			
Nogdam End	South Norfolk	Village cluster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1			

Appendix E: Comments on Original Settlement Study, received as part of Issues and Options consultation.

During the Issues and Options consultation³, we asked the following questions:

Question 37: Do you have any comments on the development boundaries as they are currently drawn?

Question 38: Do you have any comments on the Settlement Study?

Question 39: Do you have any comments on the Development Boundary Topic Paper?

Question	Respondent	Comment	BA response	Action for Local Plan
Question 37, 38, 39	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	The Borough Council offers no comment in relation to the existing development boundaries as these lie outside of our planning administrative area. The Borough Council has noted the most recent Broads' Settlement Study (2022) evidence base, including scorings for settlements based upon their access to services and facilities and potential suitability for development boundaries as commented in Table 7 of the current consultation document.	Noted.	No further action.
Question 37, 38, 39	Great Yarmouth Borough Council	The Borough Council is also in the process of preparing an update to its Settlement Study to inform the potential hierarchy of settlements and approach to development limits for its own Local Plan review. The Borough Council would therefore be keen to liaise with the Broads Authority to ensure that approaches taken to identify and justify development boundaries in settlements which straddle the shared planning boundary are complementary to the aims of both emerging development plans.	Noted. We would be happy to be involved.	Contact GYBC re their work.
Question 38	Bradwell Parish Council	No comment	Noted.	No further action.
Question 38	Broads Society	The study solely assesses 'walking distance and public transport against bus routes and not train routes. The example of Brundall is such that Authorities have failed to provide adequate provision for public access to Brundall Station and hence the scoring within the Study is inaccurate.	The study includes access to a train station and therefore it is not clear how the scoring is inaccurate.	No further action.
Question 38	Broads Society	Improved links and access for pedestrians and cyclists to Brundall Station is embodied within the vision and policies of the Brundall Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2026 and is impacted further by approved housing developments and the inevitable population increase of Brundall and surrounding areas.	In general, we would support the access to the train station being improved, however it seems the comments implies this is about access from the side of the rail lines that is in Broadland Council's area.	No further action.
Question 38	Brooms Boats	The study solely assesses 'walking distance and public transport against bus routes and not train routes. The example of Brundall is such that Authorities have failed to provide adequate provision for public access to Brundall Station and hence the scoring within the Study is inaccurate.	The study includes access to a train station and therefore it is not clear how the scoring is inaccurate.	No further action.
Question 38	Brooms Boats	Improved links and access for pedestrians and cyclists to Brundall Station is embodied within the vision and policies of the Brundall Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2026 and is impacted further by approved housing developments and the inevitable population increase of Brundall and surrounding areas.	In general, we would support the access to the train station being improved, however it seems the comments implies this is about access from the side of the rail lines that is in Broadland Council's area.	No further action.
Question 38	East Suffolk Council	East Suffolk Council broadly welcomes the Settlement Study, however, there are some additional elements that the Broads Authority may wish to consider for inclusion in the Settlement Study.	Noted.	See actions for each comment.
Question 38	East Suffolk Council	Allotments are a valuable community resource, providing residents with the opportunity to grow their own food. This in turn enables allotment holders to exercise and socialise. Therefore there may be value in including them in appendix D of the Settlement Study. The East Suffolk Council: Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy Topic Paper provides an example of where this has been done, see https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/First-Draft-Local-Plan/Final-Settlement-Hierarchy-Topic-Paper.pdf	Noted and will add this as another consideration.	Amend study to assess provision of allotments.
Question 38	East Suffolk Council	Appendix D of the Settlement Study does also not include proximity to major towns as a consideration. The close proximity of a smaller settlement to larger settlement/market town provides access to a wider range of shops, employment opportunities, public services and other facilities and can therefore increase the sustainability of the smaller settlement and increases the feasibility of sustainable modes of transport. Again, the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy considered this. See https://www.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/assets/Planning/Suffolk-Coastal-Local-Plan/First-Draft-Local-Plan/Final-Settlement-Hierarchy-Topic-Paper.pdf	This is considered. The facility or service considered might be in another settlement.	No change to study.
Question 38	East Suffolk Council	In addition to the comments above, please note that appendix D of the Settlement Study still refers to Beccles, Oulton Broad and Bungay as being located in Waveney. This should be updated to refer to East Suffolk.	Noted and will amend.	Amend study to say ESC rather than Waveney.

³ [The Local Plan for the Broads: Review - Issues and Options Consultation \(broads-authority.gov.uk\)](#), section 29.

Question	Respondent	Comment	BA response	Action for Local Plan
Question 38	Sequence UK LTD/Brundall Riverside Estate Association	2.90 No specific comments on the findings of the Settlement Study, which reflect our views on Brundall as a Key Service Centre with a good range of services and facilities.	Noted.	No further action.
Question 38	South Norfolk Council	The approach appears to be generally consistent with Agreement 3 of the NSPF. In respect of question 38, it is important to recognise how services and facilities are distributed across the broads authority area. Careful consideration needs to be given to ensuring that important services and facilities are maintained, and it may be the case that some of these may not be in the best served villages. In this regard, when determining the location of new development consideration should be given to paragraph 79 of the NPPF which sets out that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a nearby village.	Noted.	Consider these sections of the NPPF when producing housing sections of the Preferred Options.
Question 38	Broadland Council	The approach appears to be generally consistent with Agreement 3 of the NSPF. In respect of question 38, it is important to recognise how services and facilities are distributed across the broads authority area. Careful consideration needs to be given to ensuring that important services and facilities are maintained, and it may be the case that some of these may not be in the best served villages. In this regard, when determining the location of new development consideration should be given to paragraph 79 of the NPPF which sets out that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a nearby village.	Noted.	Consider these sections of the NPPF when producing housing sections of the Preferred Options.

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 11

Consultation responses

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

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

Recommendation

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

1. Introduction

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

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 21 February 2023

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Great Yarmouth Borough Council

Document: Local Plan – Issues [Great Yarmouth New Local Plan \(arcgis.com\)](#) with interactive map here: [Local Plan Options Consultation - 'Call for Sites' Potential Sites for Development \(arcgis.com\)](#)

Due date: 27 February 2023

Status: Issues consultation

Proposed level: Planning Committee Endorsed

Notes

The current Local Plan for Great Yarmouth is split over two documents, the Core Strategy (adopted in 2015) and the Local Plan Part 2 (adopted in 2021).

Great Yarmouth Borough Council is currently progressing a review of the whole Local Plan. The new Local Plan will eventually replace the Core Strategy and the Local Plan Part 2. It is intended the new Local Plan will be a single document, rather than being separate local plans covering strategy, allocations and detailed policies.

The new Local Plan will cover the period to 2041.

This consultation aims to get your views on some of the key matters the new Local Plan will need to address.

Proposed response

Summary of response

Please note that at the time of preparing the report, the comments from the Landscape Architect had not been received and these will be reported verbally at Planning Committee.

Please also note that as the deadline for comments is before the 3 March Planning Committee meeting, the comments have been sent in with a note saying that we will be in touch to confirm the comments once discussed at 3 March Planning Committee.

This is an early stage of plan making. GYBC have included all sites put forward for consideration. We make comments on some sites that are near to or next to our boundary. There are also some other observations and suggestions and areas of support.

Vision

- We would welcome reference to the Broads and setting of the Broads in the vision.

Urban and Waterfront Regeneration

- As part of these sites border with the Broads Authority, please ensure in policy that working at an early stage with the Broads Authority is required.
- There could also be potential for schemes to make appropriate use of the water.
- Is there scope for the water area out of the Broads Authority Executive Area, but next to the allocated areas to have moorings, in particular residential moorings?

Affordable Housing sub areas

- It is not clear why these stop at the BA boundary. You are aware that we have regard to/defer to your affordable housing policies and also that you are the housing authority for the entire borough, including that which is the Broads Authority area. Perhaps for the purposes of your policies maps, the boundaries could stop at the BA boundary, but for your Housing Team and our purposes, is there a map that can be shared that covers the entire Borough, including the Broads Authority area?

Question 32

- Given the impact of travel on carbon emissions, given the cost of car fuel and the cost of living crisis as well as the potential for social isolation, within or close to settlements whereby the services can be walked or cycled to or a bus used, seems logical.

Biodiversity section

- Don't forget Local Nature Recovery Strategies as these are not mentioned in this section.

Landscape section

- Don't forget about the setting of these protected landscapes as that is not mentioned. See NPPF 176.

Question 68

- We would welcome the dark skies of the areas near the Broads being protected. We are happy to work with you on this issue.

Site S62

- This site sits on (relatively) high ground to the north of the low-lying marshes, Breydon Water and the Halvergate Marshes Conservation area beyond. As such it is highly visible across a wide area and acts as an important visual 'buffer' between the marshland and the residential development to the south of Market Road. As such further housing development here would have a significant visual impact and could cause harm to the landscape character of the area to the north.
- The site also immediately adjoins two grade II listed buildings: Bradwell Hall and the Barn at Bradwell Hall Farm. It is characteristic of many historic Norfolk farms that they are

accessed via a long drive between fields and the development of this area would therefore have a detrimental impact on the setting of these buildings. The barn, being located on the northern boundary of the proposed site, could be particularly affected, with its rural setting being essentially lost, which is likely to cause some harm to the building's significance.

Site S65

- I have concerns regarding development on this very significant site. The western half of the site is within the scheduled area and any development on the remainder would affect the setting of the adjoining scheduled monument. A large area to the west is also covered by the scheduling and includes the grade I listed and scheduled Burgh Castle. The site is also immediately adjacent to the grade II listed Old Rectory and grade II* listed Church of St Peter and St Paul.
- The Burgh castle scheduled monument contains the very important Saxon Shore fort, as well as evidence of medieval use of the site as a monastery and the adaptation of the fort for use as a motte and bailey castle by the Normans. It is clearly very significant.
- As well as there being the potential for archaeological remains, the setting of all of the above designated heritage assets need to be taken into consideration and as such I think it is unlikely that development of the site could be considered acceptable. Certainly, housing is very unlikely to be considered an acceptable option.
- It is noted that renewable energy generation is one of the proposed uses and this is likely to be less contentious given that it would presumably be more reversible and would not require excavation. However, this would only be on the eastern, non-scheduled part of the site and the impact on the setting of the SAM would still need to be considered and could potentially be found to be harmful, depending on the scale and details.

Site S69 and S43

- There are three grade II listed structures position close to the north-east boundary of the site (the ruins of St Peter's Chapel; and the relocated cross base and font from the church). The relatively isolated location of the remains of St Peter's Chapel contributes to its significance and there are views across the fields from the High Road towards the tower.
- I would have some concerns regarding development of this whole site, bounded by High Road to the west and Tower Road to the east. There could perhaps be some scope for limited development fronting the High Road, retaining some substantial gaps in the frontage to allow the open aspect and views of the listed church tower to be retained.
- There are also historic buildings such as The Nest in the south-east corner of the site, that may be considered a locally identified heritage assets, the setting of which would also need to be considered.

South Norfolk District Council

Document: Village Clusters Local Plan [South Norfolk District Council - OpusConsult \(oc2.uk\)](https://www.opusconsult.co.uk) with interactive map being here: [South Norfolk Council – Local Plan: South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan - Reg. 19 Publication \(opus4.co.uk\)](https://www.opus4.co.uk)

Due date: 06 March 2023

Status: Regulation 19

Proposed level: Planning Committee Endorsed

Notes

The South Norfolk Village Clusters Housing Allocations Plan (The Village Clusters Plan) aims to deliver sustainable growth within the villages of South Norfolk. The Village Clusters Plan has been developed alongside the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) and in accordance with Government's national planning policies and guidance. The Plan allocates a series of smaller sites, typically within the range of 12 to 50 homes, across the 48 Village Clusters in South Norfolk, to accommodate at least 1,200 new homes in total. The Plan also defines the Settlement Limits for the villages within these clusters, making provision for further smaller sites and incorporating revisions to reflect development that has occurred, or has been permitted since the boundaries were last updated.

There are 48 Village Clusters in South Norfolk. Some contain a single parish, whilst others contain multiple parishes. In line with the approach set out in the GNLP, each one is centred around the local primary school. Where that primary school is within a larger settlement outside of a Village Cluster, the remaining rural parishes still form a cluster in the Village Clusters Plan e.g. Brockdish, Needham, Wortwell and Starston are within the catchment of Harleston Primary School, but those four parishes form a cluster in this Plan. The primary school catchment has been taken as a proxy for social sustainability, however the Council also recognises that many other facilities are important to local communities and has therefore undertaken an audit of other facilities and services within the clusters, to inform the Site Assessment process (see details below).

The sites within the Village Clusters are split into two categories

- new Allocations, these are sites typically proposed for between 12 to 50 dwellings, which will go to meeting the 1,200 dwelling requirement in the GNLP, noted above; and
- Settlement Limit Extensions, for sites smaller than 12 dwellings, these will not count towards the 1,200 dwelling requirement, but will help ensure that the 'windfall allowance' in the GNLP is achieved.

The threshold of 12 dwellings is consistent with the GNLP and reflects the fact that sites smaller than this are less likely to achieve the required element of affordable housing. Settlement Limit extensions also offer the opportunity for 'self-build' development, as

required through Government policy, particularly where those sites have been proposed by the site owner who wishes to build or commission their own home.

Proposed response

Summary of response

Please note that at the time of preparing the report, the comments from the Landscape Architect had not been received and these will be reported verbally at Planning Committee.

As written below, there are only a few comments proposed currently. The following identifies sites that are near to or next to the Broads. We await landscape comments which will be fed back verbally at the Committee meeting.

13. **Ditchingham**, Broome, Hedenham and Thwaite

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

14. **Earsham**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

16. **Gillingham, Geldeston, and Stockton**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment
- Policy VC GIL1: South of Geldeston Road and Daisy Way
 - await Landscape comments
 - 5th bullet point needs to mention assessing potential impact on the Broads, as is written in para 16.10.
 - Mention need for LVIA.
- Policy VC GEL1: North of Kell's Way
 - 2nd bullet point of the policy needs to mention assessing potential impact on the Broads, as is written in para 16.17.
 - Mention need for LVIA.

17. **Hales and Heckingham, Langley with Hardley, Carleton St Peter, Claxton, Raveningham and Sisland**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

22. **Kirby Cane and Ellingham**

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment
- Policy VC ELL1: South of Mill Road. – extending the settlement closer to the Broads
 - await Landscape comments
- Policy VC ELL2: Land at Florence Way – extending the settlement closer to the Broads
 - await Landscape comments.

- ELL2 is very close to ELL1 and therefore needs to include the criterion in ELL1 that refers to the Broads. And also in the relevant supporting text. It is no clear why this wording is in one policy and not the other. It needs to be in both.

29. Rockland St Mary, Hellington and Holverston

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment
- Policy VC ROC1: Land south of New Inn Hill – extending the settlement closer to the Broads
 - await Landscape comments

36. Surlingham, Bramerton and Kirby Bedon

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

40. Thurlton and Norton Subcourse

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

43. Toft Monks, Aldeby, Haddiscoe, Wheatacre and Burgh St Peter

- settlement limits – not changing. No comment

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 12

Appeals to the Secretary of State update Mar 2023

Report by Senior Planning Officer

Summary

This report sets out the position regarding appeals against the Authority.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Application reference number	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
APP/E9505/W/22/3291736 BA/2021/0244/FUL	Messrs T.A. Graham	Appeal received by the BA on 31 January 2022 Appeal start date 22 June 2022	The Shrublands, Grays Road, Burgh St Peter	Appeal against refusal of planning permission: Proposed retention of timber tepee structure and use as glamping accommodation as farm diversification scheme.	Delegated Decision 31 August 2021 LPA statement submitted 27 July 2022

Application reference number	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
APP/E9505/W/22/3291822 BA/2021/0253/COND	Mr P Young	Appeal received by the BA on 1 February 2022 Appeal start date 1 July 2022	Marshmans Cottage, Main Road A1064, Billockby Fleggburgh	Appeal against refusal of planning permission: Revised width of building and change use of loft space, variation of conditions 2 and 7 of permission BA/2020/0083/HOUSEH	Delegated Decision 7 December 2021 LPA statement submitted 5 August 2022
APP/E9505/W/22/3292450 BA/2021/0239/FUL	Mr Gavin Church	Appeal received by the BA on 9 February 2022 Appeal start date 30 June 2022	Priory Cottage St. Marys Road, Aldeby	Appeal against the refusal of planning permission: Use of land for siting 4 No. Bell Tents and 4 No. wash sheds with compostable toilets (retrospective)	Delegated Decision 24 August 2021 LPA statement submitted 2 August 2022
APP/E9505/W/22/3294205 BA/2021/0211/FUL	Mr Alan Gepp	Appeal received by the BA on 8 March 2022 Appeal start date 1 July 2022	Broadgate, Horsefen Road, Ludham	Appeal against the refusal of planning permission: Change of use to dwelling and retail bakery (sui generis mixed use) including the erection of a single storey extension.	Committee Decision 8 February 2022 LPA statement submitted 5 August 2022

Application reference number	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
APP/E9505/W/22/3295628 BA/2022/0022/FUL	Mr Matthew Hales	Appeal received by the BA 28 March 2022 Appeal start date 22 July 2022	Clean & Coat Ltd, 54B Yarmouth Road Thorpe St Andrew	Appeal against Condition 4, imposed on planning permission BA/2022/0022/FUL	Delegated decision 25 March 2022 LPA statement submitted 25 August 2022
APP/E9505/C/22/3301919 BA/2022/0023/UNAUP2	Mr R Hollocks	Appeal received by the BA on 27 June 2022 Appeal start date 14 July 2022	Beauchamp Arms, Ferry Road Carleton St Peter	Appeal against Enforcement Notice - lighting and kerbing	Committee Decision 27 May 2022 LPA statement submitted 25 August 2022
BA/2022/0021/UNAUP2 APP/E9505/C/22/3301976	Mr R Hollocks	Appeal received by the BA on 27 June 2022 Appeal start date 14 July 2022	Beauchamp Arms, Ferry Road Carleton St Peter	Appeal against Enforcement Notice - workshop	Committee Decision 27 May 2022 LPA statement submitted 25 August 2022

Application reference number	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
BA/2021/0490/FUL APP/E9505/W/22/3303030	Mr N Mackmin	Appeal received by the BA on 13 July 2022 Appeal start date 2 December 2022	The Old Bridge Hotel Site, The Causeway, Repps with Bastwick	Appeal against refusal of planning permission: 8 one-bedroom & 4 two-bedroom flats for holiday use with restaurant & covered car-park at ground level.	Committee Decision 7 March 2022 LPA statement submitted 6 January 2023
BA/2021/0193/HOUSEH APP/E9505/D/22/3307318	Dr Peter Jackson	Appeal received by the BA on 22 September 2022 Awaiting start date	4 Bureside Estate, Crabbetts Marsh, NR12 8JP	Appeal against refusal of planning permission: Erection of fence	Delegated Decision 29 July 2022
BA/2021/0295/FUL APP/E9505/W/22/3308360	Trilogy Ltd	Appeal received by the BA on 5 October 2022 Appeal start date 13 February 2023	Morrisons Foodstore, Beccles, NR34 9EJ	Appeal against refusal of planning permission: Coffee Shop with Drive Thru Facility	Delegated Decision 8 April 2022 LPA statement to be submitted by 20 March 2023

Application reference number	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
BA/2022/0112/HOUSEH APP/E9505/D/22/3309270	Alan and Joyce Hobbs	Appeal received by the BA on 18 October 2022 Awaiting start date	Bridge Farm, Main Road, Acle Bridge, NR13 3AT	Appeal against refusal of planning permission: Erection of a dormer window and external balcony to domestic outbuilding including external staircase (Retrospective).	Delegated Decision 26 July 2022
BA/2017/0006/UNAUP1 APP/E9505/C/22/3310960	Mr W Hollocks, Mr R Hollocks & Mr Mark Willingham	Appeal received by the BA on 11 November 2022 Start date 16 November 2022	Loddon Marina, 12 Bridge Street Loddon	Appeal against enforcement notice- occupation of caravans	Committee decision 14 October 2022 LPA statement submitted 21 December 2022
BA/2022/0309/COND APP/E9505/D/22/3311834	Mr B Parks	Appeal received by the BA on 23 November 2022 Awaiting start date	Shoals Cottage, The Shoal, Irstead	Appeal refusal of planning permission to change approved roof materials.	Delegated decision 15 November 2022

Application reference number	Applicant	Start date of appeal	Location	Nature of appeal/ description of development	Decision and dates
BA/2022/0144/FUL APP/E9505/W/22/3313528	Mr B Wright	Appeal received by the BA on 20 December 2022 Awaiting start date	East End Barn, Annexe, East End Barn, Aldeby	Appeal against refusal of planning permission to change the use of a residential annex to holiday let.	Delegated decision 5 July 2022
BA/2023/0001/ENF APP/E9505/C/23/3316184	Mr R Hollocks & Mr J Render	Appeal received by the BA on 6 February 2023 Awaiting start date	Beauchamp Arms, Ferry Road, Carleton St Peter	Appeal against enforcement notice- occupation of caravans	Committee decision 9 December 2022

Author: Cally Smith

Date of report: 16 February 2023

Background papers: BA appeal and application files

Planning Committee

03 March 2023

Agenda item number 13

Decisions made by officers under delegated powers

Report by Senior Planning Officer

Summary

This report sets out the delegated decisions made by officers on planning applications from 23 January 2023 to 17 February 2023 and Tree Preservation Orders confirmed within this period.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Barsham And Shipmeadow Parish Council	BA/2022/0490/HOUSEH	Hill Crest The Hill Shipmeadow Suffolk NR34 8HJ	Mr Peter Albon	Proposed infill to form a room/balcony/hot tub (with flue) and staircase to the rear elevation, retrospective.	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Coltishall Parish Council	BA/2023/0016/HOUSEH	Sunny Bank 41 Wroxham Road Coltishall Norwich Norfolk NR12 7AF	Mr J Waterman	14 PV panels on roof	Approve Subject to Conditions
Dilham Parish Council	BA/2022/0493/HOUSEH	2 The Street Dilham Norfolk NR28 9PS	Mr B Burgoyne	Front, rear and side extensions, internal alterations and relocation of driveway.	Approve Subject to Conditions
Filby Parish Council	BA/2022/0489/COND	Filby Sailing Base Main Road Filby Norfolk NR29 3AA	Mr Phil Munnings	Removal of requirement for bitumen-type underlay and use Kent bat boxes rather than bat access tiles, variation of condition 6 of permission BA/2022/0248/FUL	Approve Subject to Conditions
Fleggburgh Parish Council	BA/2023/0026/HOUSEH	Carr View Farm Marsh Road Fleggburgh Norfolk NR29 3DE	Mr & Mrs Paul Roper	Single storey side & rear extension. Extension to front garage.	Approve Subject to Conditions
Geldeston Parish Council	BA/2022/0468/FUL	Bridge On Locks Lane, Geldeston At Northwest Entrance To The Locks Inn Community Pub	Mr Simon Squibb	Repair and strengthening of bridge	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Horning Parish Council	BA/2022/0473/HOUSEH	2 Grebe Island, Box End Lower Street Horning Norfolk NR12 8PF	Mr Jonathan Foster	Replacement garage, quay heading and new mooring	Approve Subject to Conditions
Horning Parish Council	BA/2022/0474/HOUSEH	Grebe View & Mallard View Grebe Island Horning NR12 8PF	Mr Jonathan Foster	New mooring & quay heading replacement	Approve Subject to Conditions
Hoveton Parish Council	BA/2022/0425/FUL	Part Plot A 4 Brimbelow Road Hoveton Norfolk NR12 8UJ	Mr Mark Boyer	Replace derelict wooden shed with day cabin.	Approve Subject to Conditions
Oulton Broad Parish Council	BA/2022/0418/COND	Study Centre Burnt Hill Lane Carlton Colville Suffolk NR33 8HU	Mr Steve Aylward	Changes to approved landscaping, variation of condition 10 of permission BA/2018/0314/COND	Approve Subject to Conditions
Oulton Broad Parish Council	BA/2022/0360/FUL	Mere House Broadview Road Lowestoft Suffolk NR32 3PL	Mr R Warner	Replacement boathouse. Re-position pontoon.	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Oulton Broad Parish Council	BA/2022/0406/FUL	Kilgreggan Broadview Road Lowestoft Suffolk NR32 3PL	Mr & Mrs Kay	Front & rear single storey extensions, replacement windows, landscaping, shed & seating area, equipment store & pontoon	Approve Subject to Conditions
Oulton Broad Parish Council	BA/2022/0421/FUL	17 Pegasus Mews Caldecott Road Lowestoft Suffolk NR32 3PH	Mr S Jones	single storey rear extension, mooring provision and installation of a buoy	Approve Subject to Conditions
Thorpe St Andrew Town Council	BA/2022/0481/LBC	Thorpe House 4 Yarmouth Road Thorpe St Andrew Norwich Norfolk NR7 0EB	Mr Robert Chalmers	Replacement of sliding gate with gates opening inwards	Approve Subject to Conditions
Thorpe St Andrew Town Council	BA/2022/0491/COND	34 Yarmouth Road Thorpe St Andrew Norwich Norfolk NR7 0EF	Mr Tristan Gordon	Amended apartment & balcony layout, variation of condition 2 of permission BA/2022/0236/FUL	Approve Subject to Conditions
Thorpe St Andrew Town Council	BA/2022/0471/HOUSEH	Thorpe House 4 Yarmouth Road Thorpe St Andrew Norwich Norfolk NR7 0EB	Mr Robert Chalmers	Replacement of sliding gate with gates opening inwards	Approve Subject to Conditions

Parish	Application	Site	Applicant	Proposal	Decision
Wroxham Parish Council	BA/2022/0432/HOUSEH	Holly Cottage 22 Church Lane Wroxham Norwich Norfolk NR12 8SH	Mr Alastair Clayton	Part retrospective replace timber quay heading and decking.	Approve Subject to Conditions

Tree Preservation Orders confirmed by officers under delegated powers

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

Author: Cheryl Peel

Date of report: 21 February 2023