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SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
PLANNING COMMITTEE 15 JANUARY 2015

Held at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre, North Street, Midhurst at 10:00am.

Present:
Andrew Shaxson (Chair)  Alun Alesbury  Jennifer Gray  Neville Harrison
Barbara Holyome  David Jenkins  Doug Jones  Tom Jones
Diana Kershaw  Charles Peck  Ian Phillips
Margaret Paren (ex officio)
SDNPA Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Rob Ainslie (Development Manager), Lucy Howard (Planning Policy Manager), Ray Drabble (Local Development Framework Policy Manager), Richard Ferguson (Planning Officer), Sally Stallan (Development Management Officer), Rory Moores (Assistant Development Management Officer), Michael Scammell (Historic Building Officer), Veronica Craddock (Landscape Officer), (Becky Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), and Stella New (Member Services Support Officer).

OPENING REMARKS
430. The Chair informed the Committee that a request had been made to the Authority to film the meeting from 1pm.

431. The Chair informed the Committee that item 17 had been withdrawn, and that on this occasion he had agreed to reorder the agenda: Items 16 and 18 would be considered after Item 10, and Items 11-15 would not be considered before 1pm.

APOLOGIES
432. Ex officio member Norman Dingemans.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS
433. Jennifer Gray declared a Public Service interest in items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 as a member of East Hampshire County Council.

434. Doug Jones declared a Public Service interest in items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 as a member of Buriton Parish Council and of a number of other local organisations who have submitted comments on these applications. He facilitated a public meeting on these applications and he heard a wide range of views being expressed. He did not support or oppose the proposals at this meeting. He took no part in the Parish Council’s subsequent discussions nor in their vote on the applications. In his role as a Parish Councillor he has met the applicant and knows all the people planning to address the committee on these agenda items. At the request of the applicant he also facilitated a meeting on 31 July 2014 bringing together the applicant with representative of the local community. He heard the range of views expressed but took no part in the meeting other than to explain his role and to bring the parties together.

435. Neville Harrison declared a Public Service interest in items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 as a member of the South Downs Society.

436. Charles Peck declared a Public Service interest in item 18 as a member of Wealden District Council.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 11 DECEMBER 2015
437. The Chair informed the Committee that the item pertaining to the Part II minutes from 11 December 2015 was now in the public domain and that the Committee could consider all the minutes from the meeting together as a whole.

438. The Part I and Part II minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2015 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

MATTERS ARISING
439. There were none.

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS
440. There were none.
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URGENT ITEMS

441. There were none.

STRATEGY & POLICY

PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: DRAFT POLICY LIST, INTRODUCTION AND VISION

442. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC1/15) and update sheet.

443. The officer verbally updated the Committee:
   - The Committee could consider the inclusion of the Ecosystems Services diagram from the Partnership Management Plan (PMP) in the Introduction.
   - Figure 1.1 would be redesigned to improve the colour.
   - Figure 1.2 would be corrected to include County Councils and LEPS.

444. The Committee commented:
   - Ecosystems Services was a complex concept and it would be very useful to include the PMP diagram in the Introduction.
   - ‘Ecosystems’ could be interpreted as a biodiversity approach, and the term ‘Ecosystems Services’ should be retained as this defined a broader technical approach.

445. In response to questions officers clarified:
   - The Local Plan Members Working Group (LPMWG) had agreed to address honey pot sites in policy SD16 Tourism & Visitor Economy.
   - Neighbourhood Plans would need to be consistent with the housing requirements and development policies set by the SDNPA in the Local Plan.
   - A footnote could be included in the Introduction referring to the State of the Park Report where the SDNPA’s Special Qualities were detailed in full.
   - The wording ‘natural beauty in Objective 1 of the Vision derived from Purpose 1; however the word ‘landscape’ could be included in Objective 4.
   - Regarding the ‘Ecosystems Services Approach’ outlined in the Introduction:
     - An Ecosystems Services approach to planning required an evidence base.
     - The distinction between the formal Ecosystems Services Approach as defined by Birmingham University, which formed the basis of good planning; and the process of embedding Ecosystems Services within core policies.
     - The Ecosystems Services Approach paragraph of the introduction could be reworded to make clear this distinction and ensure we embed an ecosystem services led method, to our robust plan making approach.
     - The final bullet point could be reworded to ‘robust evidence base and precautionary principle…’
   - Policy SD40 ‘Willingdon Levels Catchment’ had been largely replaced by newer, higher standards, and was considered by officers to be covered in Policy SD41 ‘Drainage and SUDs’. The Willingdon and Pevensea Levels could be referred to within SD41, and Eastbourne Borough and Wealden District Councils would be consulted.
   - The Ecosystems Services diagram highlighted water management as a key principle, and there were policies covering flood risk and sustainable drainage.
   - Officers were currently drafting water policies and the next LPMWG meeting would offer further opportunity for Members to debate these.
   - Figure 1.1 could be redesigned to show more clearly how policies and plans were linked to the Local Plan.
   - Tranquility was covered in the Landscape policy.
   - Waste handling would be covered by the Minerals & Waste policies, and anaerobic digesters would be covered by the Sustainable Economic Development and Agriculture & Forestry policies.
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- Minor corrections could be made including
  - Winchester City Council in the Duty to Co-operate section
  - ‘Local communities’ in the Public Consultation and Engagement with Parishes section
  - Policy SD48 re-titled as ‘Retirement and specialist housing’.

446. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation, subject to the comments made by the Committee being addressed. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

447. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1) Endorsed the direction of the Draft Policy List, Introduction and Vision as set out in Appendix 1 of Report PC1/15, for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the comments made by the Committee being addressed
2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority.

**PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY**

448. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC2/15).

449. The officer verbally updated the Committee regarding Policy XX:
- The word ‘and’ would be removed from the end of 2. b).
- 3. would be amended to ‘social, cultural and economic benefits’ and the wording ‘and supporting the rural economy’ added at the end.

450. The Committee commented:
- It was very helpful to have a summary of revisions following the most recent round of amendments.
- It would be useful to include clarification regarding infill plots within settlement boundaries that may have an impact on Green Infrastructure.

451. In response to questions officers clarified:
- Footnote 2 to the Introduction could be amended to refer to the National Ecosystems Assessment which was a Government approved study.
- Paragraph 16 could be amended to ‘new development should demonstrate how it would contribute to Ecosystems Services’.
- Paragraph 18 could be amended to ‘given the scale of future housing development’.

452. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation, subject to the comments made by the Committee being addressed. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

453. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:
1) Endorsed the direction of the draft policy, as set out in Appendix 1 of Report PC2/15, for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the comments made by the Committee being addressed
2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval by the National Park Authority.

**PREFERRED OPTIONS LOCAL PLAN: EQUESTRIAN POLICY**

454. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC3/15).

455. The officer verbally updated the Committee that SDNPA Member Jo Carr had expressed concerns regarding the tone and detail of the policy compared to other Local Plan policies
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and that the supporting text should be removed and included in a Supplementary Planning
Document (SPD).

456. The Committee commented:
  • This was a good report on an important policy document, and progress had been made
    with the Introduction.
  • Their desire to be sensitive to and inclusive of the equestrian community.
  • SDNPA Member Jo Carr had commented before the Update sheet with revised policy
    wording had been published.
  • The paragraph ‘When is Planning Permission Required’ contained helpful advice but
    could be more appropriately included in a SPD.
  • It could be helpful to include guidance on when planning permission was required, and
    case law was unlikely to change so significantly as to undermine the policy.
  • Dark Skies and light pollution impacts had featured in previous equestrian applications
    considered by the Committee, and the supporting text provided useful introductory
    guidelines for applicants and Parish Councils.

457. In response to questions officers clarified:
  • The word ‘sometimes’ could replace ‘unintentionally’ in the proposed second paragraph of
    the Introduction.
  • The second sentence from the proposed third paragraph of the Introduction could be
    removed.
  • Although it was rare to include detailed design guidance in policies, the supporting text
    provided useful detail and on balance served to strengthen the policy.
  • A SPD could provide more detailed planning and design guidance.
  • The paragraph ‘When is Planning Permission Required’ could be honed further,
    emphasising that planning advice should be sought.

458. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote,
the proposal was carried.

459. RESOLVED: That the Committee
  1) Endorsed the direction of the draft policy, as set out in Appendix 1 of Report PC3/15,
     for inclusion in the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document, subject to the
     comments made by the Committee being addressed.
  2) Noted that the draft Local Plan Preferred Options document will be reported to
     Planning Committee for consideration prior to publication for public consultation, and
  3) Noted that the Local Plan Preferred Options document will be subject to final approval
     by the National Park Authority.

460. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:29m.
461. The meeting reconvened at 11:38pm.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
462. The Chair introduced Rob Ainslie, the new SDNPA Development Manager, to the
Committee.

SDNPA (Arun)
APPLICATION SDNP/01665/FUL Premier Inn Crossbush Lane Crossbush Arundel
Sussex BN18 9PQ
463. The Case officer presented the application.
464. The Committee heard from the following public speakers:
  • Richard Wallis spoke against the application on behalf of Lyminster & Crossbush Parish
    Council
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• Mark Thackray spoke in support of the application as the agent.

465. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC9/15) and the public speaker comments, and commented:
• The proposal had been sensitively designed, and could present a more coherent street front and improvement to the street scene.
• The dilapidated appearance of the listed building.

466. In response to questions officers clarified:
• The hotel was not adjacent to any footpaths but was sited off the main road and provided visitor accommodation where there was no other existing hotel.
• The landscaping along the north of the development had been included to soften the appearance of the building.
• The discharging of the landscape Condition 6 could ensure an immediate screening function for neighbouring properties through the quality of design and size of planting.
• The Highways Authority was satisfied with the level of parking provided.
• Very little external lighting was required, and Condition 2 adequately covered concerns raised regarding this.

467. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

468. SDNP/14/04785/HOUS RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC9/15.

SDNPA (Wealden District Council)
SDNP/14/04785/HOUS 20 Michel Dene Road East Dean Eastbourne BN20 0JN

469. The Case officer presented the application.

470. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning and commented:
• East Dean was built as a new village that had been subject to tight controls and development rules.
• Planning permission could be overruled by covenants that were legally enforceable.
• East Dean was in the process of drafting a Village Design Statement.
• The proposed development was set well down a steep slope and presented minimal visual impact.
• No facing windows had been sited on the rear wall, protecting the privacy of the neighbouring dwelling.

471. In response to questions officers clarified:
• Any future conversion of an ancillary building to a dwelling would require planning permission, and a further condition to restrict such development was not strictly necessary.

472. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

473. SDNP/14/04785/HOUS RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PC11/15

474. The Chair adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:15pm.

475. The meeting reconvened at 1:03pm.

OPENING REMARKS

476. The Chair informed all present that a request had been made to the Authority to film the meeting from 1pm.

477. The Chair informed all present that Items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 would be heard together. The case officer would present all applications, the Committee would then hear from all the
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public speakers before debating all applications together and then taking each one for a decision separately.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

478. Jennifer Gray declared a Public Service interest in items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 as a member of East Hampshire County Council.

479. Doug Jones declared a Public Service interest in items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 as a member of Buriton Parish Council and of a number of other local organisations who have submitted comments on these applications. He facilitated a public meeting on these applications and he heard a wide range of views being expressed. He did not support or oppose the proposals at this meeting. He took no part in the Parish Council’s subsequent discussions nor in their vote on the applications. In his role as a Parish Councillor he has met the applicant and knows all the people planning to address the committee on these agenda items. At the request of the applicant he also facilitated a meeting on 31 July 2014 bringing together the applicant with representative of the local community. He heard the range of views expressed but took no part in the meeting other than to explain his role and to bring the parties together.

480. Neville Harrison declared a Public Service interest in items 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 as a member of the South Downs Society.

EAST HAMPSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

SDNP/14/04527/FUL, SDNP/14/03321/FUL & SDNP/14/03322/LIS, SDNP/14/02383/FUL AND SDNP/14/02384/LIS, SDNP/14/03328/FUL & SDNP/03329/LIS, SDNP/14/01599/HOUS & SDNP/14/01600/LIS, MANOR HOUSE, NORTH LANE, BURITON, PETERSFIELD GU31 5RT

481. The Case officer presented the application and referred to the Update sheet.

482. The Case officer gave the Committee a verbal summary of the information sent to Committee members by the applicant after the reports had been published.

483. The Committee heard from the following public speakers

• Maggie Johnston spoke against the applications on behalf of Buriton Parish Council
• Richard Marks spoke against the applications on behalf of St Mary’s Parochial Church Council
• Jonathan Jones spoke against the applications on behalf of The Buriton Village Design Statement
• Lynette Watson spoke against the applications on behalf of the Buriton Village Association
• Bob Camping spoke in support of the applications as the applicant
• Tom Lewith spoke in support of the applications as the agent
• Tom King spoke in support of the applications as the agent
• Sarah Guard spoke in support of the applications on behalf of herself.

484. The Committee considered the reports by the Director of Planning (Reports PC4/15, PC5/15, PC6/15, PC7/15 and PC8/15), the Update sheet and the public speaker comments, and commented:

• The Case officer was commended for his clear presentation of a complex set of applications.
• Buriton was a tranquil village and considered a jewel of the National Park.
• Buriton’s Village Design Statement was considered to be of a high standard, and importance of the green finger it had identified at the south eastern corner of the village.
• The manor house complex was an important group of buildings and sited in the heart of the village.
• Their awareness of the applicant’s desire to improve the site.
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- Their support in principle for the change of use of the buildings and development of the site, which could be suitable if appropriate regard was given to design, sensitivity of the site and listed building status.
- The development could represent economic benefits to the community.
- It was a shame there appeared to be a large divide between the applicant and the community, and the need for a coming together by all parties.
- Buriton village was not averse to change, and had already implemented a traffic calming scheme.
- The multiple applications were very complex, and a single application would have been preferable as the cumulative impact of piecemeal development can have a harmful impact. A holistic master plan would assist understanding of the intended development of the site.
- The stable buildings could be acceptably developed as residential units with the access as proposed.
- Whilst an increase in dwellings could be beneficial, the existing stable buildings could be better developed as parking/storage for the Monks Walk dwellings.
- The courtyard should ideally retain two entrances.
- The repair of the dovecote and removal of PVC windows were minor gains in view of the potential harm to the listed buildings and their setting.
- Their sympathy for the applicant’s concerns for safety; however other vehicles would still need to use the courtyard.
- Committee would not wish the repair of the dovecote to be included in any decision to refuse.
- Their concerns regarding the uncertainty surrounding the parking scheme, including:
  - The lack of designated parking for the Orangery cottages.
  - Whether there were adequate parking arrangements for the proposed developments.
  - The potential increase in traffic through the public car park which was used by residents, visitors, walkers and people with disabilities, and resulting conflicts.
  - The potential impact to users of the public car park with regard to safety and tranquillity.
  - The need for significant required maintenance of the car park.
  - The parking area outlined in the original permission included the area between the stables and Monks Walk.
- Their concerns regarding:
  - The appearance and serviceability of the proposed grasscrete, which had not weathered well on the existing field slope, and whether hard surfacing would eventually be required on the proposed access track.
  - The proposed glazing in the Monk’s Walk and stable buildings development could present a lack of privacy and increase in light pollution.
  - The juxtaposition of a new building to the existing outbuilding could change the nature of the courtyard complex and permanently close off the south east access.
  - The lack of garden amenity to the Orangery cottages.
  - The need for a second alternative access to the Orangery cottages.
  - The potential negative impact on the appearance, character and story of the historical courtyard where all buildings faced inwards, and on the setting of the group of buildings in the conservation area.

In response to questions officers clarified:
- The Committee had previously agreed to permit applications to convert listed buildings and re-use of buildings.
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- The retrospective elements of the applications were not a material consideration, and if the Committee were to refuse permission appropriate enforcement action could be taken.
- If the structure of the listed building was not adversely affected by a proposal, officers considered it reasonable to recommend the approval of listed building consent even when planning permission was recommended for refusal.
- It was legitimate for the Committee to refuse listed building permission that was recommended for approval as long as Committee identified the harm considered to the listed building, or its setting.
- The Committee were not able to approve some elements of an application and refuse others, but could give an indication of their view in the way any refusal may be framed.
- A holistic approach was required towards the parking scheme, including an overview of how the various proposals would affect parking and an assessment of any additional traffic impact over that already made by the operation of the tithe barn venue.
- The Orangery cottages had been altered significantly over time and the proposed changes were considered relatively modest. Any further changes would be subject to planning permission and listed building consent.
- The internal alternations to the Orangery cottages had not affected the building’s fabric or listed building status.
- The proposed changes to the Orangery gardens represented a localised impact hidden behind a wall, and whilst there was loss of amenity, it was the tenant’s choice whether to occupy the property.
- Metal staircases could appear more elegant than wooden versions.
- The dovecote was listed on the SDNPA’s Buildings at Risk register, and listed building consent was not normally required for repairs to listed buildings.
- Removal of the unauthorised PVC windows could be sought through enforcement.
- Regarding SDNP/14/04527/FUL
  - Saved policy T4 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan was relevant and could be included as a further reason for refusal.
- Regarding SDNP/14/03321/FUL & SDNP/14/03322/LIS
  - An additional reason for refusal could be added to both the planning and listed building application in order to reflect Members’ concerns regarding the poor design of the overall proposal, including glazing.
- Regarding SDNP/14/02383/FUL and SDNP/14/02384/LIS
  - If listed building consent was approved, the proposed changes to the building could be carried out, however if planning permission were refused, the building could not be used for the purpose being sought.
- Regarding SDNP/14/03328/FUL & SDNP/03329/LIS
  - The Members’ concerns regarding the potential impact of loss of access and parking implications could not be added as reasons for refusal as the applicant could close off access via different means if so minded.
- Regarding SDNP/14/01599/HOUS & SDNP/14/01600/LIS
  - It would not be unreasonable for the Committee to refuse the listed building application on the basis of harm to the character of the building and its setting. Refusal of the listed building consent would not strengthen refusal of the planning application.
  - Clarification would be sought regarding works proposed for the entrance outside the curtilage of the gardens, and whether this area of the site was within the red line.
  - Saved policy T4 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan was less relevant to this application as only a modest amount of additional parking would be required.
  - A correction was made to the reasons for refusal to exclude Policy CP27.
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486. Committee member Tom Jones left the meeting room at 15:07.

487. **SDNP/14/04527/FUL** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised recommendation as detailed in the Update sheet, and to include a further reason for refusal relating to saved policy T4 of East Hampshire District Local Plan, the wording of which to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. Following a vote, the proposal was carried.

488. **SDNP/14/04527/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the Update sheet with the addition of saved policy T4 of East Hampshire District Local Plan.

489. **SDNP/14/03321/FUL** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised recommendation including amended Reason 1) as detailed in the Update sheet, and to amend Reason for Refusal number 2 to reflect the proposed changes to the overall development, the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

490. **SDNP/14/03321/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.1 of Report PCS/15 and the Update sheet with an amended Reason for Refusal number 2 to reflect the proposed changes to the overall development the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

491. **SDNP/14/03322/LIS** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation for refusal with an amendment to Reason for Refusal number 1 to reflect the proposed changes to the overall development, the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

492. **SDNP/14/03322/LIS RESOLVED:** That listed building consent be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.2 of Report PCS/15 with an amendment to Reason for Refusal number 1 to reflect the proposed changes to the overall development the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

493. **SDNP/14/02383/FUL** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the revised recommendation as detailed in the Update sheet. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

494. **SDNP/14/02383/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the Update sheet.

495. **SDNP/14/02384/LIS** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

496. **SDNP/14/02384/LIS RESOLVED:** That listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.2 of Report PC6/15.

497. **SDNP/14/03328/FUL** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

498. **SDNP/14/03328/FUL RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the reasons set out in the Update sheet.

499. **SDNP/14/03329/LIS** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

500. **SDNP/14/03329/LIS RESOLVED:** That listed building consent be refused for the reasons set out in paragraph 10.2 of Report PC7/15.

501. **SDNP/14/01599/HOUS** It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer’s recommendation with the removal of policy CP27 and a further reason relating to the failure of the proposal to preserve or enhance the Conservation area and the harm presented to the listed building and its setting, to exclude the proposed repair of the dovecote, the
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502. **SDNP/14/01599/HOUS RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for
   i) The reason set out in Paragraph 10.1 of Report PC8/15, with the removal of policy CP27
   ii) A further reason relating to the failure of the proposal to preserve or enhance the Conservation area and the harm presented to the listed building and its setting, to exclude the proposed repair of the dovecote, the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

503. **SDNP/14/01600/LIS** It was proposed and seconded to refuse listed building consent for the reason that the proposal failed to preserve or enhance the Conservation area and the harm it presented to the listed building and its setting, to exclude the proposed repair of the dovecote, the wording of which be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee. Following a vote the proposal was carried.

504. **SDNP/14/01600/LIS RESOLVED:** That listed building consent be refused relating to the failure of the proposal to preserve or enhance the Conservation area and the harm presented to the listed building and its setting, to exclude the proposed repair of the dovecote, the wording of which is delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

505. The meeting closed at 3.42pm.