

SDNPA Planning Committee – 8 November 2018

Update Sheet



Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
7	17	10.1	<p>Insert additional condition:</p> <p>18. Prior to the installation of any glazing details of the glazing (which shall be of a specification that reduces light transmittance) shall be submitted to and agreed, in writing, by the South Downs National Park Authority. The glazing shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the agreed details.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the dark skies of the National Park in accordance with policy 8 of the submitted SDNPA Local Plan, the NPPF and the first statutory purpose of the National Park.</p>	Additional condition
7	7	Recommendation	<p>Reformatting of recommendation:</p> <p><u>SDNP/17/02862/FUL</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out at section 10.1 of this report and a legal agreement to secure one Estate Worker/affordable dwelling; and 2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if the legal agreement is not completed or sufficient progress made within 3 months of the Planning Committee meeting. <p><u>SDNP/17/02863/LIS</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out at section 10.2 of this report. 	Clarification
8	21	Headings	<p>Amendment</p> <p>Local Authority: East Hants District Council</p>	Amendment
8	29	5.1	<p>Additional representation received from the Hampshire Astronomical Groups Observatory objecting to both applications on the following grounds:-</p>	

Agenda Item	Page No	Para	Update	Source/Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Observatory is located high on the edge of the village of Clanfield, less than 5 miles from the application site and could be seriously compromised by this development. • The proposal includes many 'sky light' roof units which admit appalling light trespass with little or no control and risks damaging the hard earned dark sky status but the Clanfield Observatory's dark skies too. • Sky glow is a combination of upward reflected and refracted light from the atmosphere. The major effect of sky-glow at night is to reduce contrast in the sky. This is the most pervasive form of light pollution and can affect areas many miles from the original light source. • We would like to emphasise the importance of the amateur astronomy community in the UK, providing important data to professional astronomers. • Implore the Authority to seek to eliminate unnecessary outdoor light and to better design and manage that which cannot be eliminated, and also that efforts are made to retain or create and increase dark sky areas. • We object to the development and in particular, to the roof lighting units. 	
8	39	Condition	<p>Condition 8 – Amendment to wording:</p> <p>No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the archaeological site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 7 and that provision for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the archaeological and historical interest of the site is safeguarded and recorded to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	Amendment
8	42	Condition 24	<p>New Proposed Condition:</p> <p>The areas marked 2 & 3 on Approved Landscape Masterplan Drg No 8777-GA-07D (dated 6/9/2016) shall be retained as meadow grass paddock and meadow grass verge and shall be used for no other purpose whatsoever. No cars, vehicles, plant or machinery shall be placed on this land.</p> <p>Reason: In order to protect the landscape character and improve the appearance of the site and biodiversity in accordance with Policy CP20 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Joint Core Strategy (2014) and NPPF.</p>	New Proposed Condition

<p>8 Appendix 3</p>	<p>27</p>	<p>Amended Planning History</p>	<p>Amendment to Planning History as detailed on page 27 of Appendix 3.</p> <p>SDNP/14/01599/HOUSE- New entrances to the orangery and stables cottages with cast iron stairs, restoration of dovecote, internal alterations to master bathroom.</p> <p>Application Refused 15 January 2015(inadequate garden and amenity space for Manor Lodge: Harm to setting of heritage assets by way of properties turning their backs on the courtyard)</p> <p>Appeal Allowed – 15 December 2015 (in relation to majority of proposals, but dismissed in relation to provision of parking via the southern access)</p> <p>SDNP/14/01600/LIS - New entrances to the orangery and stables cottages with cast iron stairs, restoration of dovecote, internal alterations to master bathroom (Listed Building Consent Application).</p> <p>Application Refused 15 January (works to the 'west' elevation and addition of external staircases, together with the sealing of doors on the courtyard elevation essentially resulting in the properties turning their back on the courtyard and failing to preserve or enhance the historic setting of the listed buildings).</p> <p>Appeal Allowed - 15 December 2015 (For reason set out above)</p> <p>SDNP/14/03321/FUL - The extension of 1 building and the conversion of 2 other existing buildings on the Manor House Estate to provide a total of 6 dwellings (a net increase of 4 dwellings).</p> <p>Refused 15th January (Parking, loading, unloading, additional activity concerns: poor design: poor design of landscaping and subdivision; inappropriate in countryside outside settlement boundary; light pollution; no financial contributions)</p> <p>Appeal Allowed in relation to extension of Old Spot Cottage and removal of carport but dismissed in relation conversion of Monks Walk to 3 dwellings and the conversion of the garage buildings to 2 dwellings - 15 December 2015</p> <p><i>“I conclude that the proposed works to the buildings at the garages, Monks Walk and Old Spot Cottage would accord with the development plan policies and would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the curtilage listed buildings, the setting of the other listed buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the landscape beauty of the National Park”.</i></p> <p><i>“...given the proximity of the proposed dwelling at the northern end of the garages, it seems likely that there would be some noise from the venue. Future occupiers would be aware of the venue prior to occupation but would not necessarily be fully aware of its likely impact. Without further details of whether this can be adequately mitigated through noise attenuation measures, I cannot be certain that it would not cause harm to the living conditions of the future occupiers.”</i></p>	
-----------------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	---	--

			<p><i>“The car park provides a number of parking spaces and during my visit on a weekday lunchtime I noted that it seems to be well used by local residents visiting the village pond or church and by walkers who use the two nearby public footpaths. Access between parking spaces narrows at its central point, continuing around a sharp bend by the churchyard wall. Given these considerations, and although it appears that access to Monks Walk and Old Spot Cottage already takes place across this land, the increased use from the four existing Orangery and Stables Cottages (and cumulatively with the use of the new access track which I have allowed under appeal APP/Y9507/W/15/3023073) would unacceptable increase the danger to car park and footpath users”</i></p> <p><i>“The proposal would fail to secure appropriate financial contributions towards the provision of affordable housing and so would be in conflict with JCS policies CP13 and CP32 which seek to ensure such provision.”</i></p> <p><i>“The proposal would have some moderate benefit in providing a viable re-use of the historic buildings that would contribute to the viability of the estate. Also of moderate benefit would be the improvement to the setting of the listed church and the character and appearance of the conservation area and the wider area from the re-covering of the roof of the garages. Minor benefits would arise from the improvements to the Monks Walk building and the removal of the car port at Old Spot Cottage”.</i></p> <p><i>“However I have concluded that the proposed access for the four additional dwellings and for refuse collection would severely harm the safety of users of the car park and the public footpath. Furthermore the proposed conversions would result in significant harm by failing to make adequate provision for affordable housing in the District. The harm that would be caused to living conditions of the future occupiers of the northern dwelling in the garages adds further weight to my concerns. These harms are significant in totality and, in the absence of any financial information to show that the development is necessary for the continued viability of the estate, I am not persuaded that they are sufficiently outweighed by the moderate benefits.”</i></p> <p>SDNP/14/03322/LIS - The extension of 1 building and the conversion of 2 other existing buildings on the Manor House Estate to provide a total of 6 dwellings (a net increase of 4 dwellings) (Listed Building Consent Application).</p> <p>Refused 15 January (Poor design within a conservation area; poor design in relation to landscaping, subdivision etc.)</p> <p>Appeal Dismissed - 15 December 2015 (for reasons set out above on full application)</p> <p>SDNP/14/04527/FUL - Replacement and extension of access track to fields (Retrospective).</p> <p>Application refused 15 January 2015 (poor design and a fragmentation of the landscape setting presenting landscape harm and harm to the setting of the listed building and Conservation Area)</p> <p>Appeal Allowed - 15 December 2015</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><i>“Although the track would bisect the two grazing paddocks, I saw that part of the track which has been implemented is not clearly apparent within the landscape and can only be clearly seen when standing on it, being largely covered by grass”.</i></p> <p><i>“The gravelled parking area is adjacent to the rear elevation of the sixteenth century part of the Manor House and was formerly a secluded lawned area. Despite the change in surface, the new gravelled area has not harmed its setting which from here remains secluded and enclosed by the surrounding trees and estate boundary”.</i></p> <p><i>“...I conclude that the proposal would not harm the setting of the listed buildings or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the landscape and scenic beauty of the National Park”.</i></p> <p>SDNP/14/02383/FUL - Alterations and change of use of existing outbuilding adjacent to manor house to be utilised as a ceremony room in conjunction with the Tithe barn (amended description).</p> <p>Refused 15 January 2015. (Parking, loading vehicular activity; Amenity of adjacent properties) (NOT APPEALED)</p> <p>SDNP/14/02384/LIS - Alterations and change of use of existing outbuilding adjacent to manor house to be utilised as a ceremony room in conjunction with the Tithe barn (Listed Building Consent Application);</p> <p>Listed Building Consent granted 15 January 2015.</p> <p>SDNP/14/03328/FUL - Extension to previously extended Tithe Barn to provide improved kitchen facilities, office space and storage.</p> <p>Refused 15th January 2015. (Parking, unloading, activity; poor design; impact of extraction equipment; light pollution) (NOT APPEALED)</p> <p>SDNP/14/03329/LIS - Extension to previously extended Tithe Barn to provide improved kitchen facilities, office space and storage (Listed Building Consent Application.</p> <p>Refused 15 January 2015. (Poor Design in relation to Listed Building and Conservation Area) (NOT APPEALED)</p> <p>332088/015 - Detached Cart Shed. Approved 26 August 2008. This is the detached carport adjacent to the Old Spot Cottage which is to be demolished (following the appeal decisions above).</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>33208/012 - Conversion of redundant piggery to dwelling. Approved 2 May 2003.</p> <p>This is the original approval for Old Spot Cottage to be a dwelling.</p> <p>33208/011 - Retrospective use of barn as function room. Approved 12 August 2002</p> <p>This is the original approval for the use of the barn as a function room.</p> <p>21080/02 - Conversion of part of stables to grooms accommodation (Monks Walk)</p> <p>Approved 10 June 1985 (subject to S52 Agreement for occupation to be solely by employee of estate)</p> <p>21080/11 - Conversion of stable building to one dwelling (Monks Walk)</p> <p>Approved 21 November 1995 (Not subject to S52 Agreement restricting to employee)</p>	
9	50	41	<p>Summary of Landscape Officer's response to a Member of the Public dated 7th November 2018</p> <p>There was a misunderstanding with the re-consultation on this application as I thought that the applicant was proposing to create a surfaced turning area. In fact there was no change to the original application and therefore I did revert to my original comments.</p> <p>My understanding is that the track would be a maximum of 3 metres wide with two separate narrow wheel tracks and a grass area in the centre. This I consider would be acceptable as it would resemble a farm track and would not be out of keeping. The individual tracks should be no wider than 1m and the detailed design can be controlled by conditions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chalk would not be a stable surface as it would become slippery. Limestone would be acceptable if the track is constructed as described above as two narrow wheel tracks. The exact material and colour can be agreed by condition and there are a variety of suitable materials available. 2. My understanding is that the turning area would not need to be delineated as vehicles would turn on the grass as they do at present. 3. There are no proposals to fence the track and this can be controlled by condition. The reduction in use would allay any concerns about the need for passing on the track or vehicles wandering onto the field. 4. Should the planning authority be minded to grant consent it is recommended that the following conditions are required: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Tree or hedge plants to be removed are as advised in the arboricultural report and restricted to a single poor quality ash tree. b. Remaining trees and hedges are protected in accordance with BS5837: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction. 	Additional comments

			<p>c. The detailed design of the track is as described in the documents and drawings submitted with the application.</p> <p>d. The width of the track is limited to a maximum of 3m and no surfaced passing places are provided.</p> <p>e. The width and surface treatment of the track would not be upgraded in the future.</p> <p>It is recommended that the proposed development can be supported in principle subject to the imposition of conditions outlined above.</p>	
9	52		<p>Representation made by the National Trust on the 2nd November 2018</p> <p>The Trust has objected to the current proposal because we do not wish to see any form of turning circle, surfaced or unsurfaced on our land. Should a turning circle be required then it should be on the applicant's land. This could be achieved by bringing the route of the two wheeled track, where it meets the boundary of the applicant's land, to the south. The applicant currently has a licence for the land to the north where the two wheeled track is currently proposed to enter their boundary – however this is only on an annual basis and the land concerned is inalienable.</p> <p>Overall, the Trust feels that the two wheeled track as proposed is too wide and should be limited to something that would accommodate usual domestic traffic. The route should where possible follow the historic route where there is an existing gate out on to the lane.</p>	Additional representation
9	56	8.7	<p>Insert additional sentence to paragraph 8.7.</p> <p>“the assessment is therefore based on the approved lawful use of the dwelling and not any alleged use”.</p>	Clarification
9	53	Condition 7	<p>The condition should state:</p> <p>“The sub-base of the track hereby permitted shall be constructed from a Geotextile membrane and 200mm of crushed hardcore only. The surface of the track shall be made of crushed limestone with a depth of 100mm and shall be constructed as shown on submitted drawing titled Typical Section.”</p>	Typographical error
9			<p>Summary of email</p> <p>1) The Case Officer has omitted the fact that the landowner, i.e. the National Trust, has objected to this proposal (refer to point 3).</p> <p>2) The Landscape Officer representation dated 03/10/2018 has not been adequately considered.</p> <p>3) <u>Hammerhead for turning</u></p> <p>The National Trust has objected to this hammerhead and without anywhere for vehicles to turn it surely must follow that the planning application falls short of your requirements, otherwise you would not have felt the need to request this in the first place.</p>	Email from Robert Price dated 5 th November 2018 – local resident.

			<p>4) <u>Planning Assessment states</u> That the development would serve a residential property,....but in fact the owner, from the 18th October began the re-advertising of Crowlink Retreat for various hospitality business uses.</p> <p>Case Officer's response to email.</p> <p>1) The National Trust objected to the application on grounds of landscape impact and the presence of a turning circle. The Landscape Officer raised no objection to the application and as such it is considered to be acceptable on landscape grounds. The applicant does not now propose any works to the area to be used for turning and as such will be kept as grass. As no development has been proposed by the applicant on the area of field in which vehicles would turn, the turning area is a civil matter between the applicant and the National Trust, not a planning matter.</p> <p>2) The Landscape Officer's representation dated 3rd October 2018 was superseded by the representation dated 19th October. The representation dated 19th October explained that the track could be acceptable subject to conditions to ensure tree retention and protection, no fencing and the aggregate surface applied to the track only and not to any turning area.</p> <p>3) <u>Hammerhead for turning</u> The submitted plans show an indicative area in which vehicles currently turn and will continue to turn in the future. It is likely that vehicles will continue to turn on National Trust land regardless of whether or not planning permission for a track is granted.</p> <p>The turning area is not integral to the application which is for a two wheel access track and it should be noted that the applicant does not propose to do any works to the turning area and as it falls outside the boundary of the red line does not form part of the application. Whether vehicles should or should not turn on National Trust land is a civil matter, not a planning matter and should be resolved between the two parties.</p> <p>4) Suspected breaches in Planning Control should be sent to the South Downs National Park Authority for the Enforcement Team to investigate and enforce, if necessary. This does not alter the application which has been submitted. The assessment must be based on the approved lawful use of the dwelling and not any alleged use.</p>	
10	64	Section 4	<p>Additional consultee response:</p> <p>Drainage Officer: Comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The statutory consultee for surface water is Hampshire County Council who appear satisfied with the drainage scheme. 	Update

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any scheme for the treatment of foul drainage on site should accord with Building Regulations and be of an appropriate size and design. 	
10	65	4.7	<p>Additional response received from Hambledon Parish Council, as summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant local concern about the depositing of chalk spoil which has been undertaken in the area and inability to enforce against this. Concern about the same problem with spoil arising in the future if the current proposals are approved. Enforceable conditions needed to explicitly address this issue. Requirements for the management of noise not explicitly stated in the decision notice and the provisions in the Noise Management Plan are inadequate. If conditions regarding the above are not included in the Decision the Parish Council would have to review its position on the application. 	Update
10	66	5.1	<p>1 additional third party representation has been received from a neighbouring property, which outlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To date all vehicles using the existing eastern access are in violation of a 2016 covenant on the land. Intend that the covenant is adhered to and the access is only used for private or agricultural vehicles and other vehicles visiting the Vineyard will need to use Vineyard Lane. 	Update
10	74	8.25	<p>Amendment to paragraph: No objection has been raised by the Lead Flood Authority or Environment Agency in regard to the proposed surface water drainage scheme. The drainage officer has also not raised an objection. A Conditions is are proposed in respect of providing a more detailed scheme for the arrangements of managing foul water.</p>	Update
10	75	8.28	<p>Amendment to paragraph: Current annual visitor numbers are approximately 1,000 and this number could significantly increase up to 12,000 annual visitors, involving more frequent events. The proposals could create, as a maximum, approximately 130 vehicle movements daily (65 arrivals, 65 departures) on one day a week when a larger event is held (up to 100 people). The daily traffic numbers for the remaining days of the week are anticipated to be less than half of this. The Transport Statement outlines that a high proportion of visitors would likely arrive by car and there is an assumption that there would be a high degree of car sharing given the nature of the proposals. It is also anticipated that a proportion of visitors would also arrive by coach or minibus for pre-arranged tours which would help to partially mitigate vehicle movements. The presented figures are maximums, with an assumption that events are fully booked and daily traffic movements could be lower depending on bookings.</p>	Update
10	75	8.35	<p>The EHO has previously advised that at present the noise from these events is more harmful because weddings are held in marquees on site, whereas the proposed building would help to contain it and be an improvement. They are satisfied that a condition securing a the submitted Noise Management Plan in the Noise Assessment in regard to how the building and</p>	Correction

			verandah/terrace areas are managed would address their concerns. It is considered that through a managed regime for undertaking events and given that they would be accommodated within the building, with some use of the terrace, the impact upon surrounding properties could be satisfactorily mitigated.	
10	76	8.37	The amenity of the public rights of way have also been considered in regard to the visual impact and level of activity on site the proposals could generate. From the footpath leading out of the village and west of the site, when the vines either are in leaf they limit wider views of the site area. In winter there would be more filtered views of the site through the vines. It is likely that the proposals would be seen but arguably may not be significantly prominent. In views from further north of the site on the same footpath the proposals would be much less visible and screened by the trees on the eastern side of the building which are to be retained. Any views of the development would also be seen in the context of the fields planted with vines and it is of a satisfactory design.	Update
10	76	10.1	Amendment to condition 3: The building hereby approved shall only be used as a visitor centre in connection with the activities of the Vineyard, for the purposes of holding wine related events and tours and other private events, with an ancillary shop, café and offices. The building shall not be operated by any other separate business enterprise. The cellar shall also only be used in connection with the operations of the Vineyard. Reason: To ensure the facilities are related to their intended use and are sufficiently related to the Vineyard.	Update
10	77	10.1	Amendment to condition 5: No development above the slab level of the building shall be commenced until further details on the Scheme of Soft and Hard Landscape Works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include: a. Written specifications and planting methods (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment, b. Planting methods, tree pits & guying methods, c. schedules of plants and trees consistent with local landscape character and beneficial to biodiversity , noting species, planting sizes and proposed numbers/densities where appropriate, d. Retained areas of grassland cover, scrub, hedgerow and trees, e. A schedule of landscape maintenance for a minimum period of 5 years to include details of the arrangements for its implementation, including timetable. f. Details of all hard-surfaces, such as paths, access ways, terrace/verandah areas seating areas, patio areas and parking spaces, including their appearance, depth and permeability.	Update

			<p>g. All means of enclosure, including fencing, walls and gates, including the details of the estate railings and gates at the site frontage.</p> <p>h. A timetable for implementation of the soft and hard landscaping works.</p> <p>The scheme of Soft and Hard Landscaping Works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved timetable. Any plant which dies, becomes diseased or is removed within the first five years of planting, shall be replaced with another of similar type and size, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To achieve an appropriate landscaping scheme to integrate the development into the landscape and mitigate any impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.</p>	
10	77	10.1	<p>Amendment to condition 7:</p> <p>The building shall be managed in accordance with the submitted Noise Management Plan contained within Appendix C of the Noise Assessment dated June 2018, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To mitigate harmful noise and disturbance</p>	
10	78	10.1	<p>Amendment to condition 10:</p> <p>No development shall commence until a detailed drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. The means of surface water disposal shall be implemented in accordance with the details contained in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment & Surface Water Drainage Strategy prepared by OPUS Ltd, dated 12 June 2018.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure satisfactory provision of foul and surface water drainage.</p>	Update
10	78	10.1	<p>Remove condition 11 as not required given the approved plans would be cited in condition 2.</p>	Update
10	78	10.1	<p>Amendment to condition 12:</p> <p>No development shall commence until a revised Tree Protection Plan relating to the car parking area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby approved shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved protective measures, including fencing and ground protection, outlined in the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement (15729-AIA) by EcoUrban Ltd and approved revised Tree Protection Plan by EcoUrban Ltd. These measures shall be installed prior to any demolition, construction or groundwork commencing on the site. Any deviation from works prescribed or methods shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The Local Authority's Arboricultural Officer shall be informed once protective measures have been installed so that the Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) can be inspected and deemed appropriate prior to works commencing.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard existing trees to be retained.</p>	Update

10	78	10.1	<p>Amendment to condition 13.</p> <p>Additional criteria in condition:</p> <p>No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved plan shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not necessarily restricted to the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction, b. The method of access and routing of vehicles during construction, c. The parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors, d. The loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste, e. The storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development, f. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding, g. No burning of demolition or construction materials on site. h. The provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway (including the provision of temporary Traffic Regulation Orders), details of public engagement both prior to and during construction works. i. Details of managing spoil including the amount to be removed from the site and means of storage and disposal. <p>Reason: To ensure that all demolition and construction work in relation to the application does not cause materially harmful effects on nearby land, properties and businesses.</p>	
11	91	8.16	<p>Amended Paragraph</p> <p>1.1 The applicants have amended their scheme during the process and it is now considered to include an appropriate mix of properties to meet local housing need as confirmed by the Housing team at Chichester District Council. Policy H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan provides a Table (5.2) setting out an indicative mix of house types, in both the market element and affordable element. The proposed scheme is relatively close to the indicative mix and is considered to be acceptable in relation to Policy H3. (Required percentage of 1 & 2 bed market properties 40% - Actual 62%. Required percentage of 3 bed market properties 40% - Actual 24%. Required percentage of 4 bed market properties 20% - Actual 14%. Required percentage of 1 bed affordable housing 35% - Actual 31%. Required percentage of 2 bed affordable housing 35% - Actual 38%. Required percentage of 3 bed properties 25% - Actual 31%. Required percentage of 4 bed properties 5% - Actual 0%). Whilst the required provision of 4 bed houses is not met (either in relation to market or affordable dwellings) it</p>	Amendment

is difficult to achieve an exact match of the requirements of the policy in a scheme of this size. In addition, the general character of the development is predominantly smaller properties and flats and the introduction of an element of 4 bedroom properties might appear at odds with the generally smaller scale houses within the site. On this basis, it is considered that the mix of housing is acceptable, albeit not entirely in accord with Policy H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan. A table setting out what is required in Policy H3 of the Neighbourhood Plan alongside as to what is proposed in this scheme, is set out below to assist members

Type of Property	Policy Requirement	Proposed
1 & 2 Bed Market	40%	62%
3 Bed Market	40%	24%
4 Bed Market	20%	14%
1 Bed Affordable	35%	31%
2 Bed Affordable	35%	38%
3 Bed Affordable	25%	31%
4 Bed Affordable	5%	0%