

## **SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY**

### **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Held at: 10.00am on 20 January 2022 at The Memorial Hall, South Downs Centre.

Present: Alun Alesbury, Heather Baker (Chair), Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, Robert Mocatta, Vanessa Rowlands, Andrew Shaxson, and Diana van der Klugt.

Officers: Tim Slaney (Director of Planning), Robert Ainslie (Development Manager), Rebecca Moutrey (Senior Solicitor), Robin Parr (Head of Governance and Support Services), and Sharon Libby (Governance Officer).

Also attended by: Richard Ferguson (Development Management Lead), Rafa Grosso-MacPherson (Senior Development Management Officer), Heather Lealan (Development Management Lead) and Kelly Porter (Major Projects Lead).

### **OPENING REMARKS**

279. The Chair welcomed Members to the meeting and informed those present that SDNPA Members had a primary responsibility for ensuring that the Authority furthered the National Park Purposes and Duty. Members regarded themselves first and foremost as Members of the Authority, and would act in the best interests of the National Park as a whole, rather than as representatives of their appointing body or any interest groups.

### **ITEM 1: APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

280. Apologies were received from Thérèse Evans.

### **ITEM 2: DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

281. Gary Marsh declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 9 as a neighbouring property was owned by a member of his family, and that he would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item.

282. Barbara Holyome declared public service and personal interests in Agenda Item 10 as a member of Bramdean & Hinton Ampner Parish Council and confirmed that she had not taken part in any discussions or decisions on this application, and as she was acquainted with one of the public speakers, Matthew Morton.

283. Robert Mocatta declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 8 as a Hampshire County Councillor as he had been involved in discussions with regard to the site, and that he would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on this item. He also declared public service and personal interests in Agenda Item 9 as an East Hampshire District Councillor and a Hampshire County Councillor and as he was acquainted with two of the public speakers, Councillor Paul Milner and John Palmer.

284. Diana van der Klugt declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 as she was acquainted with one of the speakers, David Coldwell, who was a former Horsham District Councillor.

285. The Chair declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 on behalf of herself, Alun Alesbury, Janet Duncton, Barbara Holyome, Robert Mocatta and Andrew Shaxson as they were all acquainted with one of the speakers, David Coldwell, who was a former Member of the SDNPA.

### **ITEM 3: MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11 NOVEMBER 2021**

286. The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11 November 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendment:

- Page 1, Item 5 para 236 – the application reference number should read “SDNP/19/06024/FUL”.

### **ITEM 4: MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

287. There were none.

### **ITEM 5: UPDATES ON PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

288. An appeal was received for SDNP/20/04118/FUL The Queens Hotel Selborne, which would be dealt with by written representations.
289. The decision notice had been issued for SDNP/20/04766/CND King Edward VII Hospital, Kings Drive, Easebourne.

**ITEM 6: URGENT ITEMS**

290. There were no urgent items.

**ITEM 7: SDNP/21/04615/FUL – The Grange Development Site**

291. The planning application for this agenda item had been withdrawn, so there was no live application at this point.

**ITEM 8: SDNP/21/03755/FUL – Bulmer House**

292. Robert Mocatta relocated from the committee table to the public gallery.
293. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet.
294. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:
- James Scott spoke against the application representing himself.
  - Sarah Brooks spoke against the application representing herself.
  - Mark Slater spoke in support of the application on behalf of WWA-Studios, as the agent, representing the applicant.
  - Councillor Paul Milner spoke in support of the application on behalf of Petersfield Town Council.
295. Robert Mocatta left the meeting at 10:20am
296. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-34), the updates and the public speaker comments and requested clarification as follows:
- Due to the increase of units within the building was visitor parking increased?
  - Was it possible to see a photograph from a distance to see the building in the context of the overall townscape?
  - Was more planting on the walls planned to increase biodiversity?
  - What was the BREEAM rating?
  - The report highlighted several objections from both the Design and Landscape Officers, could this be expanded upon?
  - The new condition referred to in the update sheet included the phrase “substantial completion” which was a legal term. What did this mean in reality, when would it be triggered and how would it be monitored?
  - Would Condition 18, which referred to the Landscape Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), be submitted prior to the work being commenced? Would the same also apply to Condition 17?
  - What was the impact on the neighbouring listed building (Cliff Cottage) as raised by one of the public speakers?
  - Can the surrounding listed buildings be clarified as there was reference to a chapel and church?
  - What was the definition between extra care and rented ownership?
  - The public speaker, Mr Scott, advised that Ramscote was not a care home, please could this be clarified?

- How was the BREEAM expectation going to be achieved as there was no guarantee that it could be met?
- What was the impact on the other two listed buildings close to the site?
- Potentially many of the residents could be vehicle owners, had consideration been given to this?
- Had consideration been given for the storage of disability scooters or similar vehicles?
- Could further clarification be given with regard to SuDs as referred to by the Design and Landscape Officers in the report?
- What was the viability for the provision of extra care?
- In relation to Cliff House what was the difference in height between the existing building and the proposed building?
- Condition 10 referred to the Construction Management Plan (CMP); generally a CMP would only refer to the actual site. Could confirmation be given that lorries would not block the entrance to the cemetery?

297. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- There were currently 19 car parking spaces which would be increased to 23, which included minibus parking and delivery bay.
- The Officer showed the committee a diagram which highlighted the view of the building from Tor Way to demonstrate how it would affect the townscape. There was further information available in the Design and Access Statement.
- A new green roof was planned along with additional landscape planting with climbing plants on the lower storey wing of the property as additional planting and use within the overall surface water drainage scheme.
- The BREEAM rating for the building was categorised as Very Good, 70% was needed to be achieved to reach Excellent, and the current scheme was at 64/65%. This was a reasonably high score in the Very Good category. The credits targeted within this BREEAM score were those that would achieve the most environmental benefits in terms of energy efficiency for example. Condition 8 in the recommendation sought to meet the BREEAM expectation to try and meet Excellent rating.
- The views expressed by the Design and Landscape Officers in the report were addressed within the assessment section of the report regarding design matters. This outlined a balance in assessing the design concerns. There had been attempts throughout to address some concerns regarding the outdoor amenity space, the footprint of the building and creation of the courtyards and the mansard roof which allowed for accommodation in the roofspace to help reduce the heights of the building for example. A contemporary form of architecture gave more flexibility in the design process than a traditional form where it was likely its height would increase.
- The phrase “substantial completion” referred to the completion of the shell of the building ahead of more internal works in the Officer’s view, but it can be a matter of judgement. The Certification of timber to be used in the cladding would likely be sourced and installed at later stage of the construction process, rather than prior to reaching slab level. Condition 8, however, required this evidence at a much earlier stage which wasn’t feasible following further discussion with the agent. Therefore, an additional condition as per the Update Sheet proposed that this requirement be prior to the substantial completion of the building. Monitoring of compliance with conditions could cover this.
- The LEMP referred to in Condition 18 was not required as a pre-commencement condition because it would not be until the landscaping had been agreed and implemented that the LEMP would come into effect.

- The impact on the setting of the listed building (Cliff Cottage) was not significantly harmful as the site was behind a belt of protected trees and the building had a closer relationship with Ramshill (facing onto it) than the application site. Although no Heritage Statement had been submitted, the impact upon listed buildings was covered in the Design and Access Statement.
- Extra care was about people needing varying degrees of care but who wanted to lead an independent life. The shared ownership properties would be managed through a registered provider and the affordable (rented) units would be managed by Hampshire County Council.
- It was the Officer's understanding that Ramscoate was a care home, rather than sheltered housing. In any event, an assessment on the relationship and impacts between the proposals and Ramscoate would be the same.
- Condition 8 sought to maximise the BREEAM score to try and reach Excellent. A lot had been achieved to reach a high Very Good rating such as no fossil fuels were proposed to be used for the heating and hot water, good energy efficiency and air tightness, use of renewables and more sustainable materials for example. A variety of options had been explored in line with the Sustainable Construction SPD and Policy SD48 and it was felt the policy requirements were largely met.
- The presentation highlighted the other two properties, a Church and a Chapel, to the North West of the site which were grade II listed. It was considered that the proposals fell outside of their setting.
- The scheme was for people of varying abilities and health concerns and included age restrictions. The building's use would be secured in a legal agreement as per the recommendation. Regarding parking, the Parking SPD was not explicit for this type of use but adopted a flexible approach on a case by case basis and this site was in a sustainable location. A S106 would include an obligation for a Travel Plan to seek to reduce reliance on cars.
- It was confirmed that storage of disability scooters was included and shown on the ground floor plan near the entrance to the building where it would be accessible.
- SuDs were part of the overall sustainability of the scheme. The existing building used traditional SuDs, and sustainability was being improved by the proposed drainage strategy, including green roofs, which would help with surface water management. Further details on drainage and landscaping via conditions could seek to integrate these to try to deliver a 'softer' and more holistic engineering approach at the discharge of condition stage.
- 60 units was the minimum threshold for these schemes from knowledge and experience. The pre-application proposals included a larger scheme that was scaled down to 56 units. The 100% affordable tenure and the provision of the day centre does affect the viability and the scheme was at the viable/unviable threshold.
- In relation to Cliff House, the lowest point of the proposed building was 9.8m high, and Bulmer House was lower.
- It was confirmed that the Construction Management Plan could manage the parking of construction/delivery vehicles in order to not block the entrance to the cemetery. The Highways Authority would be consulted on the CMP before it was approved.

298. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:

- The scale and design were issues and considered unacceptable. The site was however in an accessible and sustainable location for users of the site given it was close to Petersfield town centre. A lot of care homes had 60+ units but this smaller scheme did reduce numbers of residents and help with some better amenities.

- To make the site work financially the building needed to be a minimum of 56 units. The previous building had 44 units. A mix of one and two bedroom flats significantly increased the number of users on site and the building had to reflect this. There was a concern over the scale, bulk and massing of the building as well as its architecture. The Landscape Officer in the report expressed a view of the restricted areas for the users and lack of outdoor amenity space where, for example, there were few sunny aspects for people to enjoy.
  - Insufficient parking was a concern, the increase from 19-23 spaces was insufficient, given this would also include vehicles for visitors, staff, deliveries, medical and other visitors. Whilst an Extra Care scheme was in line with the allocation policy for this site, the large size of the building was a concern.
  - Whilst it was a 100% affordable scheme, the amount of two bedroom flats was a concern and more one bedroom flats would be better which could help to reduce the scale of the building. The rear of the building looked institutional and the Landscape and Design Officers objections were relevant and correct. This application needed to be revised and re-addressed, there were too many objections from the Design and Landscape Officers.
  - The scheme had a lot in favour as an Extra Care scheme and was 100% affordable with a day care facility. Whilst there was no in principle objection from Petersfield Town Council, reservations were expressed due to the design and the neighbouring listed buildings and that the design should be more Landscape Led(LL). There was concern on the scale, mass and bulk of the building and the reservations from the Design and Landscape Officers needed to be taken into account. It was a privilege to be able to develop and build within the SDNP, but the required standards needed to be met, which this application did not reach at this point. A more modest building would be more appropriate.
  - The scale of the development was a concern, and Design and Landscape Officers objections to this scheme were summarised in paragraph 4.3 of the report.
  - Specifically on the design, concern was raised about 3 storeys, albeit the mansard roof helped to reduce its height, there was a 'monotonous' roof line to the building, its architecture was incoherent, and its repetitive a-symmetrical fenestration was a concern. Also, the architecture needed more vertical emphasis in its design.
  - It was challenging to design a building for people with specific needs, it seemed this building was designed from the inside out. To meet the needs of the town (including day care facilities) balanced with the considerations of the park was a difficult challenge.
  - The lack of outside space was a concern and particularly parking could prevent users wanting to go out, mainly due to lack of parking spaces upon their return. The travel plan would need to be 'cutting edge' and robust in order to manage the parking demands effectively.
  - There were three areas of concern to consider for this application:
    - a. Mass/Bulk/Scale of the building and the impact of this on the landscape.
    - b. Design specific to the building.
    - c. Car parking provision, although this could be addressed through a travel plan.
  - The project needed to have a robust and cutting edge travel plan supported by another public body.
  - It was acknowledged that if this application was refused (based on 56 bedrooms) there may be no further option to be considered regarding less units.
299. It was proposed but not seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation.
300. It was proposed and seconded that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The scale, bulk and massing of the building and the associated issues including amenity space and landscape impact.
- 2) The design of the building.

The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

301. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be refused for the following reasons

- 1) The scale bulk and massing of the building and the associated issues including amenity space and landscape impact.
- 2) The design of the building

The final form of words to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

#### **ITEM 9: SDNP/21/03545/OUT – Land North & West of Windward, Reservoir Lane**

302. Janet Duncton joined the meeting at 11:35am.

303. Rob Mocatta returned to the meeting at 11:35am.

304. Gary Marsh relocated from the committee table to the public gallery.

305. The Case Officer presented the application, reminded Members of the report content and referred to the update sheet. The Officer highlighted a typographical error on the front page of the report under the proposal which read: "...for up to 10 dwellings..." and should have read "... for up to eight self-build dwellings and two for affordable dwellings for rent".

306. Gary Marsh left the meeting at 11:55am

307. The following public speakers addressed the Committee:

- Councillor Paul Milner spoke in support of the application on behalf of Petersfield Town Council
- John Palmer spoke in support of the application on behalf of Petersfield Community Land Trust
- Jamie Oarton spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Petersfield Community

308. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-35), the updates, and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:

- As this was a self-build proposal, a management plan would be more of a challenge than it would be for a developer. The layout plan indicated a number of neutral spaces to be delivered. At what stage would the management plan be implemented?
- The update sheet referred to paragraph 4.2 of the report and mentioned a requirement for non-plastic windows/materials. As this was an outline application had the Design Officer gone beyond what was expected at this point?
- Why did the application only include two bedroom houses up to 100sq meters, when small houses within the SDNP could go up to 120sq metres? If these houses were 120sq meters this would allow for an additional room, for example, an en-suite bathroom.
- Did the application require the committee to consider the actual number of dwellings applied for?
- Was sustainability included in the Design Code, as it was hoped these houses would be made as efficient and sustainable as possible?
- If the Petersfield Land Trust ceased to exist would an opportunity be opened for another developer to present a different plan; was the decision to be made; (a) that the land could be built upon, or (b) only sustainable self-build/custom build properties could be built on the land?.

- Was there a definition of a self-build property?
309. In response to questions, Officers clarified:
- The management plan would be discussed with the applicant at the reserved matters stage with landscaping matters, and the applicant is aware that a management plan will be needed to be in place to maintain and manage the open spaces, road, etc.
  - A range of materials have been put forward in the submitted Design Code, that are so far acceptable. The Design Officer would have preferred more on sustainability criteria, such as a ban on plastic windows in the Code, but that was not an LPA sustainability requirement and suitable conditions could be stated.
  - The reference in the report was based on plans submitted by the applicant and annotated approximate floors paces. Floor spaces are not fixed rigidly and the SDNPA will retain control over number of rooms.
  - The number of dwellings to be applied for is a fundamental element in the assessment of this application.
  - Sustainability was included in the Design Code and the minimum requirements included in the Code were based on the Sustainable Construction SPD CO2 reductions in energy efficiency and renewable energy. Condition 13 also includes requirements on sustainability.
  - The principle of the development was acceptable if another developer submitted another application for self or custom build as in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). There would be nothing beyond the framework and an S106 to ensure this. Whilst this was applicable to the current NDP a future NDP revision may not include the same allocation/requirements. This was an inherent risk albeit control measures were in place to limit this.
  - It was confirmed that there is a legal definition of a self-build property, the NPPF also included a definition of a self-build property, which was read to members
310. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:
- This was one of two sites identified in Petersfield for self-build, and the Petersfield Community Land Trust should be encouraged to continue this application. If permission was not granted the Petersfield Community Land Trust would cease and this was a crucial issue.
  - As an edge of settlement site this was a sensitive location that had been allocated for low density housing in the Petersfield NDP. In comparing this application with the Petersfield NDP, the density of the development seemed to be too high. If the proposed density in the NDP was followed, this application should have been for no more than 8 dwellings.
  - This was a good community site with adequate spaces and demonstrated people working together and easily integrated within the town of Petersfield without being over developed.
  - Reservoir Lane needed to be a concern with Highways, if this had been a developer for the whole site, alternative options for Reservoir Lane would have been considered, but as this was for self-build, options for Reservoir Lane would not be addressed. If CIL payment was collected, this could support issues surrounding Reservoir Lane.
311. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, as per the Update Sheet, including a correction to a typo to reflect the referenced dates as 2022, not 2021 and the additional conditions in the update sheet.
312. **RESOLVED:**
- I. That outline planning permission be granted subject to:

- The conditions at paragraph 10.1 and the update sheet
  - The completion of a Section 106 legal agreement, the final form of which is delegated to the Director of Planning, to secure the delivery of the following:
    - a. Five affordable dwellings in accordance with paragraph 3.3 of this report;
    - b. Occupancy restrictions for the self-build dwellings in line with policy HP7 PNDF.
    - c. A phasing plan for the development
  - The completion of a preliminary feasible drainage layout supported with an additional groundwater assessment.
  - The completion of an acceptable detailed scheme of mitigation for reptiles.
2. That authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to refuse the application with appropriate reasons if:
- The Section 106 agreement is not completed or sufficient progress has not been made within 6 months of the 20 January 2022 Planning Committee meeting.
  - Drainage proposals are not demonstrated to be feasible with a supporting additional groundwater assessment within 6 months of the 20 January 2022 Planning Committee meeting.
  - A detailed scheme of mitigation is not submitted or found acceptable to mitigate impacts on reptiles within 6 months of the 20 January 2022 Planning Committee meeting.

#### **ITEM 10: SDNP/21/05479/FUL – Bramdean Farm**

313. Gary Marsh returned to the meeting at 12.30 pm
314. The Officer summarised the recent judicial review which was relevant to this application, reminded Members of the report content, referred to the update sheet and referred to two further letters of representation; (1) Friends of the South Downs which advised that the proposed building still presented an intrusion into the landscape and expressed concern with regard to highway impact (2) Owners of Woodcote Manor Cottages who advised of the ruination of unspoilt countryside and increased traffic, noise and pollution.
315. The following public speakers addressed Committee:
- David Coldwell spoke against the application on behalf of Friends of the South Downs
  - Matthew Morton spoke in support of the application representing himself as the applicant
316. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-36), the update sheet and the public speaker comments, and requested clarification as follows:
- Would the proposed building be in conflict with the existing overhead power cable and is this an issue that the Planning Committee should concern itself with?
  - Paragraph 8.26 of the report referred to choice of materials with full details of planning materials to be defined. Could the materials be confirmed as it would be difficult to make a decision, without knowing the detail of the materials
  - If this application went to Judicial Review again was the Officer confident, particularly with regard to Ground 2 Heritage Impact, Ground 3 Noise Impact and Conditions, that there would be no further concerns?
  - The 2018 application for two buildings was considered a major development. The 2019 application was not considered as major development which was inconsistent. Was the Officer confident that the current application recommendation was not inconsistent with the 2018 decision?



- Had the principle of development on this site been established due to this committee's previous decision or had that been quashed? Was this a material consideration?

317. In response to questions, Officers clarified:

- The exact location of the existing power cables in relation to the proposed building is not known, however this was a building control issue and not a matter of planning consideration.
- Officers advised that the building would be timber clad, with a condition that required the detail of the exact materials, colour and roofing. The report and the update sheet provided sufficient information on the materials for Members to make an informed decision on general appearance.
- With regard to any future Judicial Review, the Officer was confident that previous matters of concern had been addressed. The committee report had been reviewed by legal Counsel. Furthermore the Conservation Officers comments had been taken on board and balanced against the economic, social, environmental and heritage benefits of the scheme. Additionally environmental health were content that noise pollution issues had been addressed and could be controlled through the proposed planning condition.
- The Officer was confident that this application was not inconsistent with the 2018 decision and that the previous concern had been thoroughly addressed and that the proposal did not constitute major development for the purposes of paragraphs 176 & 177, footnote 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This was addressed in the committee report.
- Although this committee's previous decision in regard to this site was a material consideration, as the assessment was quashed in the High Court and no decision was ever issued, it was advised that the weight given to this consideration should be very modest.

318. The Committee discussed and debated the application, making the following comments:

- It was acknowledged that the concerns around a major development had been addressed for this application.
- This building had a visual impact on the landscape, therefore it was left to Officers to finalise the detail of the appearance of the building with landscaping being of key importance. Conditions 13 and 14 would need to be amended to ensure the landscape was protected.
- This type of development was an acceptable requirement for current times within the Park. This was the way forward to support sustainable agriculture..
- The scale of the proposal had been reduced considerably from the 2019 submission.
- There had been serious concerns regarding traffic on this stretch of the A272 including on a recent nearby application which was refused due to traffic issues, which holds the national speed limit and there had been previous near misses by Woodcote Cottages. The safety of staff, lorries and moving vehicles had not changed, from a highways safety aspect this was unacceptable.
- The farming industry had faced huge challenges; support and resources was required to change business models and encourage diversification.
- Roads had been a hazard in many applications; however this application was vastly improved.
- Committee Member advised that Hampshire County Council had confirmed that an average speed camera would be installed outside of Bramdean Farm later in the year.
- It was confirmed that Permitted Development rights would be removed as included on the Update Sheet

319. Members were further advised that conditions 13 and 14 could be amended to protect the landscape for up to 10 years.
320. It was proposed and seconded to vote on the officer's recommendation, subject to the extra condition on the update sheet and the amendment of conditions 13 and 14 to ensure the protection of the landscape for 10 years.
321. **RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10.1 of the report, the update sheet, and the amendment of conditions 13 and 14 to ensure the protection of the landscape for 10 years.

#### **ITEM 11: Summary of Appeal Decisions received from 19 August 2021 – 29 December 2021**

322. The Officer presented the report and referred to the update sheet
323. The Committee considered the report by the Director of Planning (Report PC 21/22-37) and requested clarification as follows:
- Page 122 SDNP/19/06024/FUL of the report references how the Inspector considered officers and Committee were incorrect in considering in such fine detail the design, scale and layout of the site and water. Was there any implications moving forward when discussing small rural sites?
  - In the report at the top of page 112, it stated; "all are delegated decisions unless otherwise stated". Could it be confirmed who the decisions were delegated to (i.e. were they delegated to SDNPA officers or to delegated to officers across host authorities as well?
  - When an NDP was presented to the Committee, should guidelines be issued to communities, surrounding the allocated sites which further explained that illustrative plans could not be finalised until all evidence has been assessed.
324. In response to questions officers clarified:
- It was thought that the Inspector advised that the policy itself was not wrong, and that the scheme was broadly policy compliant, but that through allocating the site there should be an expectation for some harm. Where officers consider the Inspector was incorrect was in suggesting the Authority should be saying what a landscape-led scheme would look like; this is not for us to do. It has been a recurring issue in neighbourhood planning where communities rightly want to understand what an allocated site may look like, however given the stage the NDP developed and resources available, it is very tricky to produce illustrative plans that are realistic. The local community installed a huge amount of time and effort into creating an NDP, to find at the end of the process what was allocated was not as they had originally envisaged. This needed to be highlighted at the beginning of the neighbourhood plan development process.
  - Delegated decisions were delegated to Officers at the relevant Authority; the SDNPA or the Host Local Authority.
  - The Policy Team had been putting together advice on how to produce NDPs and other community led plans. This would include guidance on how to define site (e.g. red line, numbers, density), use of illustrative plans and the use of robust caveats. This was an issue to be discussed further outside of this meeting.
325. The Committee made the following comments:
- It was interesting to note two similar appeals; one which was dismissed and one which was approved;
    1. SDNP/20/03081/LIS Page 113 of the report, Post Cottage, referenced replacement windows (dismissed).

2. SDNP/20/01960/LIS Page 128 of the report, ffowlers Bucke, referenced double glazed units allowed in place of single place units.

326. **RESOLVED:** The Committee noted the outcome of appeal decisions.
327. The Chair closed the meeting at 1:28pm.

**CHAIR**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_