



Planning Committee

10.00 a.m. Wednesday 7th September 2011
The Chilterns Conservation Board office,
90 Station Road, Chinnor

Agenda

1. Apologies
2. Public Question Time
3. Declarations of Interest
4. Minutes of Previous Meeting
5. Matters Arising
6. Draft National Planning Policy Framework
7. High Speed 2 – update
8. AONB Planning Forum
9. AONB Planning Conference 2011
10. Proposed student research project – implications of internet land sales
11. Development Plans Responses
12. Planning Applications – Update
13. Any Urgent Business
14. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 30th November 2011 at The Chilterns Conservation Board office, 90 Station Road, Chinnor, OX39 4HA

Future meetings – 7th March, 30th May and 5th September 2012

Item 4 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Approximately £600 a year for minute-taker plus staff time

Summary: Minutes of the previous meeting are attached (at Appendix 1) and need approving.

Purpose of report: To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting.

Background

1. The draft minutes from the meeting on 25th May 2011 have been previously circulated and are attached (at Appendix 1) for approval.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee approves the minutes of its meeting which took place on 25th May 2011.**

Cllr David Barnard, North Herts District Council (Board Member) and Gill Gowing (co-opted member).

2. Public Question Time

No members of the public were present.

3. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

5. Matters Arising from the minutes

- Item 8 (Planning Policy Guidelines): the Planning Officer had intended to report on progress made in connection with the drafting of the Planning Policy Guidelines, however work on the response to HS2 has taken up considerable amounts of time. It was still considered that it would be useful to visit a waste treatment plant and to this end Members made a number of suggestions.

6. High Speed 2 - update

The Planning Officer updated the Committee on the latest developments and recent activity in connection with HS2.

One focus has been on the issue of spoil and the fact that the calculations are wrong in the HS2 information. There is significant concern that the effects of transport of waste material will be felt both within and outside the Chilterns AONB.

At the moment officers are working on the Board's response to the consultation. When available in draft this will be circulated and added to the AONB website to enable its use by others interested in HS2. There continues to be a great deal of press coverage with contributions from the Board often being quoted.

1. The Committee NOTED the report.

7. Draft position statement on development affecting the setting of the AONB

The Planning Officer reported on the responses made to the consultation on the draft position statement on development affecting the setting of the AONB. This statement was circulated to a number of different organisations and the

results of the consultation were detailed.

Various changes had been proposed and it was recommended that the statement be adopted by the Board. The Committee discussed the various responses at length. Endorsement from English Heritage was considered important and a further change was discussed to remove the concern that EH had about setting of heritage assets. The Planning Officer would incorporate the suggested changes into the document and circulate to the Committee.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the comments received during the consultation on the draft position statement on development affecting the setting of the AONB.**
- 2. The Committee AUTHORISED the Planning Officer to finalise the responses and amendments as discussed at the meeting in consultation with the Chairman.**
- 3. The Committee RECOMMENDS that the amended statement be adopted by the Board at its next meeting**

8. Chilterns AONB Planning Forum - feedback

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about the feedback from the recent AONB Planning Forum. 13 people had attended the forum. About half of the Chilterns authorities were represented as well as a parish council, The Chiltern Society and Natural England.

The discussion that took place about neighbourhood plans and recent changes within local authorities was very useful.

The lack of officers is a cause for concern because there is no real consistency in the attendees from local authorities at each forum. This may be a reflection of the pressures that officers are under, which are likely to increase in the future.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the feedback from the last AONB Planning Forum.**

9. Chilterns AONB Planning Conference 2011

The Planning Officer reported that the proposed date for the next Planning Conference is Wednesday 5th October. This year will be the 9th such conference and will focus on renewable energy. Issues that could be discussed include changes to feed in tariffs, hydro-electricity and the River Thames and encouragement for the use biomass boilers.

Members made suggestions for suitable speakers to be invited. A venue has not yet been organised but it is proposed that one be sought in the north of the AONB. Once the date and venue have been confirmed the event will be promoted.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the draft arrangements for the 9th AONB Planning Conference.**

10. Chilterns Building Design Awards 2011

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about the winners for this year's Chilterns Buildings Design Awards and the arrangements for the Awards Ceremony. 10 entries had been received and 6 were short listed and visited on 3rd May.

The judges decided that this year there would be joint overall winners. These are for the extension and refurbishment of a traditional cottage at Studridge Lane, Speen and the reconstruction and restoration of a Victorian farm complex to accommodate a modern business at Green Street, Chorleywood. Two other awards will be made for the restoration of a market office and its conversion to a museum at Brook Street, Tring (highly commended) and for the extension and refurbishment of a clubhouse at Aylesbury Sailing Club, World's End Lane, Weston Turville (special project).

The awards will be given out at a ceremony that takes place on the morning of Wednesday 8th June at the Village Hall, Church Road, Chinnor. The awards will be given out by the Chairman of the Board and the Chairman of The Chiltern Society.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the winners of the 2011 Chilterns Buildings Design Awards.**
- 2. The Committee NOTED the arrangements that have been made for the Design Awards ceremony and AGREED to inform the Planning Officer if any Member wished to attend.**

11. Development Plans Responses

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about the responses that had been sent in connection with the public consultation documents that were listed in the report.

The Committee was made aware that some Core Strategies may be delayed due to Planning Inspectors' concerns about soundness. The Board has been made aware of exploratory meetings to discuss both the South Oxfordshire and Luton and southern Central Bedfordshire Core Strategies. The discussions focussed on housing numbers and consistency with regional strategies.

It is understood that in both the cases mentioned that there will be delays in the examination programmes.

- 1. The Committee NOTED and APPROVED the responses already made on behalf of the Board in connection with the consultation exercises on the development plan documents as detailed.**

2. The Committee NOTED the position in connection with core strategies within the Chilterns.

12. Planning Applications Update

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about the various representations that had been made in connection with planning applications and updated the Committee on any outcomes. Last year details of 152 planning applications or appeals were brought to the attention of, or requested by, the Planning Officer. All of these were responded to, with 21 being the subject of formal representations (18 objections and 3 supports). Of the 17 applications thus far determined 12 are in line with the Board's comments. This year the Board has been consulted on 18 applications and has responded to 14 of these thus far.

On the proposed Wycombe stadium it was reported that the new leader of Wycombe District Council has vowed to listen to the public. The Chairman and the Planning Officer had been in a small group that had visited the new stadium near Brighton. Although it is a large building the landform is more like a bowl, whereas at High Wycombe the proposed stadium would be located on a plateau.

1. The Committee NOTED the updates and APPROVED the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 4.

13. Any Urgent Business

- Planning Committee Tour: the Committee discussed the Planning Committee Tour and considered that it was a valuable exercise to undertake. It was decided to continue with the tour but in order to reduce costs further Members would provide their own lunch. The Committee agreed that the Tour should take place at about the end of July and that all Board members should be invited to encourage a greater take-up than in the past.
- The Chairman indicated her intention not to stand for the election of Chairman of the Planning Committee after the Board's AGM in 2011.

14. Date of the next meeting

Wednesday 7th September 2011 at the office of the Chilterns Conservation Board, 90 Station Rd, Chinnor commencing at 10.00 am.

Future meetings: 30th November 2011, 7th March and 30th May 2012

The meeting closed 12.40

The Chairman

Date

Item 6 Draft National Planning Policy Framework

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The Government has published a Draft National Planning Policy Framework which will replace current Planning Policy and Minerals Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance Notes. The policy texts have been significantly reduced though some important details have been lost. A number of areas are specifically commented on in a proposed response. This has been circulated to other AONBs and the Planning Officer will contribute to a NAAONB response.

Purpose of report: To report on a proposed response to the consultation on the Draft National Planning Policy Framework.

Background

1. The Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was recently published and is subject to a period of public consultation which started on 25th July and lasts until 17th October. A copy of the Draft NPPF was circulated to members of the Committee prior to the meeting.
2. The Draft NPPF has been prepared in order to try and reduce the amount of planning policy and guidance that currently exists. Though the number of pages has been drastically reduced it appears that some of the important detail has been lost, particularly in connection with protected landscapes when compared to the previous advice contained in PPS7 and the South East Plan for example. There is also a significant perceived shift away from the plan-led system to a development-led system, in that there is a presumption in favour of development and that it may come forward even if a local plan is absent or silent on a matter.
3. The changes proposed to the policy applicable to protected landscapes have been commented on in an attempt to try and get back to a position close to that which currently exists. Protected landscapes are still subject to policy protection, which is welcome, and although the AONB itself may be all right, there is concern about the potential implications for the areas immediately adjacent to the boundary and within the setting of the AONB as they are likely to be put under significant pressure for development purposes. Developers are likely to look to greenfield sites in preference to previously developed land because the Draft NPPF is silent on this matter. This is a matter that causes significant concern particularly if a plan is absent or silent as may be the case with a number of Chilterns local planning authorities which have yet to adopt a Core Strategy.
4. The concern about the AONB boundary and the setting of the AONB is real. The experience at Sonning on the recent Planning Committee tour demonstrates that the boundary does not always appear to be in the right or logical place. Development

pressures are already being felt in other parts of the AONB and its setting (around Luton and in the South Oxfordshire area with housing allocations for example).

5. The Committee is aware of the recently published criteria for National Park and AONB designation. This was reported to the Committee and Board late in 2010. Natural England has been asked where these criteria have got to and what the intention is for AONB boundary reviews. A number of suggestions have been made to Natural England for reviews in many different locations, including within the Chilterns. However, although staff from Natural England are due to meet the NAAONB soon there has been no indication of what will happen with the suggested reviews. Natural England's stance is not completely clear though its Chairman has stated that the intention is to manage expectations and not seek bids for boundary reviews (see letter from Natural England sent out with the Agenda). This, however, does not rule out boundary reviews and we are aware that there have been calls for reviews of the Chilterns AONB boundary. In addition, the Board is often approached for information.
6. In order to be in a better position with regard to the likely pressures on the AONB boundary and the setting of the AONB, and in order to answer requests for information it is suggested that a small sub-group of the Planning Committee is set up.
7. The Draft NPPF will also be reported to the Conservation Board meeting in October, although this is after the close of the consultation period. The intention is that reports will be prepared for future Planning Committee meetings about the likely implications of the NPPF and any review of the AONB boundary.
8. The following table details a proposed response from the Chilterns Conservation Board to the consultation on the Draft NPPF. Only those paragraphs that are considered to have implications for the Chilterns AONB or the Conservation Board have been commented on.
9. The Planning Officer has forwarded the proposed response to colleagues in other AONBs and will be contributing to a response on behalf of the NAAONB following a meeting in Chichester on 19th September.

Para.	Comment
General	The Board considers that the draft NPPF would change the purpose of planning. The NPPF would herald a shift from a system that is currently plan-led (development should take place in accordance with the approved development plan unless there would be harm to interests of acknowledged importance) to one that has a primary purpose of being development-led (the presumption is in favour of development taking place when a plan is absent, silent, indeterminate or out of date, see comments on paragraph 14 below). This is a particularly worrying change and could place significant pressures on protected landscapes and their settings. This may apply in the Chilterns AONB where a number of local authorities have yet to adopt a Core Strategy or similar plan.
General	The Board considers that the draft NPPF appears to abandon several fundamental planks of the current system which have delivered many benefits for society, the environment and the economy over many years. These include: urban regeneration; the need to use land efficiently; reducing the need to travel and protection of the countryside for its own sake and its intrinsic value. The

	draft NPPF would also weaken other well-established principles such as the town centre-first policy for office development and the need to ensure that most new development takes place on previously developed land (the only mention of this in the NPPF is in relation to Green Belt).
Gen	The Board is very concerned that there is no mention of the need to protect Sites of Special Scientific Interest in their own right. Though European sites are protected (as they should be) the protection that should be afforded to nationally protected SSSIs is wholly absent. This should be rectified.
2	The Conservation Board, whilst welcoming the recognition given to the need to properly consider the natural and built environment whilst delivering development, objects to the use of the phrase 'protect and enhance' and considers that this should be amended (here and throughout the NPPF where it is used) to read 'conserve and enhance' in order to be consistent with legislation, particularly as it applies to the natural environment through the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This comment also applies to the following paragraphs: 10 (third bullet point), 11, 19 (fifth bullet point), 23 (fifth bullet point), 103 (final bullet point which should state 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'protect'), 164 (first bullet point which should state 'conserving and enhancing protected' landscapes rather than 'protecting valued'), sub-heading before paragraph 167 (which should state 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'protect'), 167 (second bullet point which should state 'conserving' rather than 'protecting') and 167 (fourth bullet point which should start 'give great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of' National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).
10	Under 'planning for places' the Board welcomes need to consider the wider effects of development, however, the planning system should be used not to 'protect and enhance' but to 'conserve and enhance' the natural, built and historic environment.
11	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (line 3 delete 'protecting' and replace with 'conserving').
12	The Board considers that this paragraph: adds nothing to the NPPF; is not required and should therefore be deleted.
13	The Board is very concerned that 'sustainable economic growth' appears to be a priority of the NPPF at the expense of the other key aims and objectives relating to social and environmental aspects of development.
14	The Board considers that the third bullet point (that Local Planning Authorities should grant permission where the plan is 'absent, silent, indeterminate or where relevant policies are out of date') has the potential to ride roughshod over the current system in that it actively promotes development whilst placing on those assessing proposals the burden of showing that it would be unacceptable. It

	would be better to have an up to date plan in place in order to better assess proposals and this should be the default position. The Board considers therefore that the third bullet point should be removed and any further similar references should also be removed (paragraph 110 for example).
18	The Board welcomes the statement that development should be of good design and appropriately located.
19	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (fifth bullet point).
21	The Board objects to the stance taken in connection with supplementary planning documents (SPD). The NPPF states that SPD should only be produced in order to bring forward development at an accelerated rate. This is more than likely to lead to poorer quality developments as things are rushed through. In many instances SPDs, such as buildings design guides, have been used to improve the overall quality of development. If the principles of the SPD are accepted from the start, then there would be no delay and the quality of development would improve. This is something that clearly concerns the Government. The Board suggests that 'at an accelerated rate' is deleted as this text is not considered to be necessary.
23	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (fifth bullet point delete 'protection and replace with 'conservation)).
24	The Board considers that the bullet point which states that Local Plans should identify land which it is important to protect from development should also include 'landscape' as one of the things that are valued (this is not addressed by either environmental or historic though may contain elements of both). The Board therefore suggests that 'landscape' should be added before 'environmental' in line 2 of bullet point 6.
54	The Board is very concerned about the stance taken in the second bullet point which places greater emphasis on economic and housing growth at the expense of other elements of sustainable development. This is not consistent with other parts of the NPPF and the second bullet point should therefore be removed.
62	This paragraph states that 'the planning system is plan-led'. This is a statement that is welcomed and supported by the Board. However, it appears to directly conflict with other statements in the NPPF, particularly the final bullet point in paragraph 14 which allows for development to take place in the absence of a plan. The Board considers that the sentiment in paragraph 62 should receive much greater prominence.

81	The requirement to respect the character of the countryside should apply to all rural economic development (not just tourism and leisure) and the Board therefore suggests that in the third line 'including' is deleted and replaced with the following: 'whilst respecting the character of the countryside and should include', and that the following is deleted from lines 2 and 3 in the third bullet point: 'and which respect the character of the countryside'.
82	The Board welcomes the Government's recognition that the smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel. This should be reflected across the whole of Government as well as local planning authorities.
102	The Board considers that this paragraph weakens the current presumption against major minerals development in protected landscapes (MPS1 paragraph 14) and suggests that 'as far as is practical' is deleted from the first bullet point.
103	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (final bullet point which should state 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'protect').
109	The Board is very concerned about the requirement, as detailed in the second bullet point, to include within supply figures an additional housing allowance of at least 20%. The apparent intention is to make the development land market more competitive. The Board considers that this is unlikely to happen. In addition, it will stifle previous good intentions of bringing forward previously developed land, will lead to some sites that are already committed not coming forward in a timely manner, will lead to long-term planning blight, premature development on unsuitable sites, excessive and overcrowded developments and a move to more greenfield sites which are more easily brought forward. This would in turn place excessive pressure on areas like the Chilterns AONB which is in many instances close to or abuts large towns and other urban areas. The Board suggests that this element of the NPPF should be removed and that the second sentence of paragraph 109 should be deleted.
113	This paragraph is considered to be much weaker than the previous policy in connection with isolated new dwellings as detailed in paragraphs 9 to 11 of PPS7. The Board considers that the second bullet point does not provide sufficient protection for heritage assets and drafted and suggests that 'and takes proper account of its setting' is added after 'interest'. The Board also considers that the final bullet point may well lead to many more applications in rural areas and suggests that it should be deleted. Should it remain and in order to make the NPPF more robust the Board suggests that: 'or' in the first line of bullet point 4 should be deleted and replaced by 'and' (because something that is innovative is not necessarily of exceptional quality), and 'or' in the first sub-bullet point should be deleted and replaced by 'and' (for the same reason as above).
130 and 131	The Board welcomes the policy that allows local communities through local and neighbourhood plans to identify for special protection green areas of particular

	importance to them. This would mean that local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in exceptional circumstances.
131	The Board considers that it would be appropriate for the Local Green Space designation to be used in the Green Belt and that the policies are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, the Board suggests that the fourth bullet point of this paragraph is deleted.
163	As the key objective for the natural environment the Board considers that paragraph 163 falls short of what should be aimed for. The Board therefore suggests the following changes: delete 'healthy' in line 1 and replace it with 'functional and well-managed'; add ', whilst securing its intrinsic character, beauty and the diversity of its landscape, heritage and biodiversity,' after 'environment' at the start of line 2, and add ', healthy' after 'safe' in line 2.
164	The Board considers that 'and local' in the second line of the first sentence are not required and suggests that they are deleted.
164	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (first bullet point which should state 'conserving and enhancing protected' landscapes rather than 'protecting valued').
164	The Board considers that the NPPF would benefit from an additional bullet point (after the first one) which deals with responsible land management. Therefore add the following: 'promoting environmentally responsible land management' as a new second bullet point.
165	The Board considers that this paragraph is not explicit enough about the need to protect land with environmental or amenity value and suggests the following changes to address this. In line 1 delete 'minimise' and replace with 'avoid'; in line 2 delete 'local and'; in line 2 add 'by:' after 'environment' and create two new bullet points to read: 'identifying and respecting the area's character and local distinctiveness, and' (first new bullet) and 'understanding and promoting appropriate land management and environmentally responsible practices.' (second new bullet); create a new sub-paragraph and add 'Where otherwise unavoidable,' before 'plans should allocate land'; delete 'with the least environmental or amenity value where practical' and replace with 'sequentially, avoiding the best and most sensitive sites or those with high amenity value, whilst', and delete from 'Plans should' in line 5 to the end of the paragraph as this is repetitive.
Sub head before 167	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (which should state 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'protect').

167	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to ‘conserve and enhance’ the natural beauty of such areas (second bullet point which should state ‘conserving’ rather than ‘protecting’ and fourth bullet point which should start ‘give great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of’ National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).
167	The Board considers that the third bullet point of this paragraph: significantly weakens the current policy; is not consistent with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000; does not provide sufficient safeguards for nationally protected landscapes or their settings, and it fails to mention the need to comply with the statutory management plans that are produced for such areas. Therefore, the Board suggests the following changes (in addition to those already detailed above): add ‘whilst having due regard to statutory Management Plans,’ at the start of the bullet point; add ‘and their settings’ after ‘Beauty’ in line 2; add ‘Support should be given for small-scale, suitably located and designed development necessary to facilitate the economic and social well-being of these areas and their communities.’ after ‘Broads.’ in line 4; add a footnote and Glossary reference for ‘major developments’ in line 5, and add ‘that’ after ‘demonstrated’ in line 6.
169	The Board welcomes the stance taken over ancient woodland and aged and veteran trees, but considers that the paragraph should be amended to ensure consistency with other policies. Therefore, the Board suggests that ‘and demonstrably’ should be added after ‘clearly’ in line 4 of the fourth bullet point.
173	The Board welcomes the stance taken in connection with the need to identify and protect areas of tranquillity.
175	The Board welcomes the stance taken in connection with the need to limit the impacts of light pollution.
Glossary	As there is confusion about what ‘major development’ constitutes the Board recommends that a reference to ‘major development’ that reflects the General Development Procedure Order 1995 should be included in the Glossary.

Recommendations

- 1. That the Committee approves the proposed response to the Draft National Planning Policy Framework consultation.**
- 2. That the Committee approves the creation of a sub-group of the Committee to assess the likely implications arising from the NPPF and any potential AONB boundary review.**
- 3. That the Draft NPPF is considered by the Board at its next meeting.**

Item 7 High Speed 2 update

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time at present and a budget of £1,000.

Summary: There continues to be a significant amount of activity in connection with the High Speed 2 proposal following the public consultation exercise, a response was sent in connection with this and representations have been made to the Transport Select Committee.

Purpose of report: To update the Committee about the latest developments in connection with a possible high speed rail route through the Chilterns.

Background

1. The public consultation period on the proposal for High Speed 2 closed on 29th July. A response was submitted on 27th July and circulated to a wide audience. A number of responses have been received from other organisations.
2. Although the consultation period has closed there is still a lot going on.
3. The Board has prepared and submitted a statement as evidence to a Transport Select Committee inquiry into HS2. This meets again on 6th September and the Board will be represented by the Chief Officer. Any outcomes will be reported if known.
4. The wider HS2 Group met on 24th August and a useful round up of activity was given. All bodies had submitted responses, the 51M group is growing all the time with new Councils being added, the Right Lines Charter is holding a reception in Westminster in October and Stop HS2 are looking to hold a lobby day in London in late November or early December. The wider group will meet again in early October and early December and soon after this it is anticipated that the Government's response to the consultation will be publicised.
5. There are continuing pressures to contact and lobby MPs and to involve people who are not on the route in such activities.
6. There continues to be a great deal of press coverage with contributions from the Board often being featured.
7. Any change in the situation will be reported to the Committee in the future.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee notes the report.**

Item 8 Chilterns AONB Planning Forum

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The next Chilterns AONB Planning Forum takes place on 16th November at Aylesbury Vale DC's offices. In order to re-invigorate the Forum it is proposed that the Chairman of the Committee and the Planning Officer undertake a series of meetings with key Councillors and staff at the Chilterns local authorities.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the arrangements for the next Chilterns AONB Planning Forum and about measures that will be taken to re-invigorate the Forum.

Background

1. The next AONB Planning Forum will take place from 9.30 (for a 10.00 start) to 13.00 on Friday 18th November 2011 at the Aylesbury Vale District Council's Gateway Offices in Aylesbury. The District Council has kindly allowed us to use a room without charge. Invites will be sent out shortly.
2. With the publication of the Draft NPPF it would be appropriate to take stock and define a common message from the local planning authorities within the Chilterns. There will also be an opportunity to discuss the associated issues of the Localism Bill, neighbourhood planning, green spaces and the role of the design guide. All of these matters are addressed in the Draft NPPF and the Planning Officer will introduce the issues and attempt to get local authority planning officers to contribute as well.
3. At the last Committee meeting it was reported that a limited number of Chilterns local planning authorities had been present at the previous Forum. Following internal discussions it is proposed that the Chairman of the Committee (Barbara Wallis at present) and the Planning Officer do a tour of the Chilterns local planning authorities to try and re-invigorate the Forum and to encourage the right officers to attend. It is suggested that the meetings should involve the relevant Cabinet Member, the most senior officer in planning, any other main officer contact that the Board has and the relevant local authority Conservation Board member.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the arrangements for the next Chilterns AONB Planning Forum which will take place on Friday 18th November at the Aylesbury Vale DC Gateway offices in Aylesbury.**
2. **That the Committee agrees that the Chairman and Planning Officer should do a tour of Chilterns local authorities to re-invigorate the Forum.**

Item 9 Chilterns AONB Planning Conference 2011

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: £1,200 plus staff time.

Summary: The annual Chilterns AONB Planning Conference is going to take place on Wednesday 5th October 2011 at the Berkhamsted Civic Centre. The theme is one of renewable energy and implications for protected landscapes. Speakers have been organised and the event is being promoted.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the arrangements for the next AONB Planning Conference and to encourage its advertisement.

Background

1. The 9th Chilterns AONB Planning Conference takes place on Wednesday 5th October at the Berkhamsted Civic Centre.
2. The following speakers have agreed to attend: Dave Holt (Goring and Streatley Sustainability Group) who will talk about hydro-power at Goring, Lyndis Cole (Land Use Consultants) who will talk about over-arching national renewable energy issues, Zoe Colbeck and Andrew Harris (National Trust) who will talk about implementation of various renewable energy and sustainability measures at a National Trust property, Mike Render (Forestry Commission) who will talk about wood fuel and the problem of extracting wood in protected landscapes and Tom Leveridge (CPRE) who will talk in more detail about protected landscapes.
3. The event will start at 9.30 (for 10.00) with refreshments. A number of talks will be split by refreshments and a question and answer session and then followed by a panel discussion. It is proposed that a single site visit be made to the Matthews Brickyard at Bellingdon in order to review the various measures that have been and are being put in place to reduce the environmental impact of brick making. We should be given a guided tour by Jim Matthews. It is intended that a smaller coach is booked in order to reduce costs and seats will be assigned on a 'first come – first served' basis. After the site visit there will be an opportunity for discussion and the conference will conclude at 4.30.
4. The programme and booking form will be widely circulated and the Committee is asked to promote the event.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the arrangements for the 9th Chilterns AONB Planning Conference.**
2. **That the Committee promotes the conference as widely as possible.**

Item 10 Proposed student research project – implications of internet land sales

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The Board has been made aware of a number of sites where land has been sold off in small plots. With numerous owners management becomes much more difficult and there are various implications that could be closely examined as part of a student research project.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about a proposed student research project which would assess the implications of the sub-division of plots of land which are then sold to many individuals.

Background

1. Over the last few years the Board has been made aware of a number of different sites within and on the edge of the AONB where large parcels of agricultural land have been subdivided (on a plan) and then sold off to numerous individuals.
2. In many instances local authorities have issued Article (4) Directions which have removed various permitted development rights (invariably that which allows the erection of fencing and other means of enclosure). This has resulted in a number of planning applications being made on some sites in order to enclose individual plots. This was seen as part of the recent Board walk at Pophley's Wood and can be seen at other sites such as Cryers Hill in the Hughenden Valley.
3. With various different land owners (many of whom live abroad and have no easy way of accessing their plot), rather than a single one as in the past, management of individual sites becomes less cohesive and more problematic. There are no real planning powers to deal with this and in time the implications may be wide ranging with scrub encroachment and the use of sites for dumping of rubbish for example.
4. In order to try and assess what has happened over the past few years, and to give some guidance about what advice may need to be given to future owners, it is proposed that a student from Oxford Brookes University is approached and invited to undertake a project for an M.Sc. To this end the Planning Officer approached Mike Stubbs (Oxford Brookes). As a result of that approach both Phil Taylor and Joe Weston from Oxford Brookes are aware that the Board has made a request and appear to be supportive.
5. Both are happy to approach an appropriate student at the start of the coming academic year and we should find out in October or November if one is able to undertake the study. An update will be provided at the next Planning Committee and the matter will be reported to the next Board meeting.

Recommendations

- 1. That the Committee approves the setting up of a student project to assess the implications for the AONB of the subdivision of agricultural land on large sites into smaller plots.**
- 2. That the Committee is updated at its next meeting and that the matter is reported to the next Board meeting.**

Item 11 Development Plans Responses

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: A response has been sent in connection with the public consultation on the following development plan document: **DCLG** Planning for Traveller Sites.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about, and approve, the response that has been made under delegated powers in connection with a development plan document.

Background

The following paragraphs detail the response that has already been drafted and sent in connection with the public consultation exercises on the development plan document listed.

DCLG consultation: Planning for Traveller Sites

1. The Board generally supports the policies in the draft policy statement.
2. Policy C: sites in rural areas and the countryside states: ‘When assessing the suitability of sites in rural or semi-rural settings, local authorities should ensure that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community’. The Board supports this policy in general. However, we believe that though consideration should be given to the scale of sites in relation to existing communities, this is only one of a number of issues to consider with respect to development in rural areas in general, and nationally designated landscapes (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks) in particular. The Board understands that when assessing planning applications the full range of planning policy statements and planning policy guidance should be taken into account, however, the lack of detail in draft Policy C contrasts strongly with that in Policy E, Green Belts. The Board therefore considers that Policy C should be altered to include the following: ‘The conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the landscape and countryside should be given great weight in assessing the suitability of sites in nationally designated landscapes (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks)’.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee notes and approves the response already made on behalf of the Board in connection with the consultation exercise on the development plan document detailed above.**

Item 12 Planning Applications Update

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: Representations have been made regarding a number of planning applications and appeals and a number of previous cases have been determined.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the various representations that have been made in connection with planning applications and appeals and to update the Committee on any outcomes.

Background

1. This year the Board has been consulted on 76 applications and has responded to 63 of these thus far. There have been 8 formal representations (1 support and 7 objections).
2. The applications that have resulted in formal representations so far include: car park extension for a pub at Cadsden (support, refused), 426 ground mounted PV panels at Harpsden (approved), relocation of Peppard CE Primary School, 2Mw wind turbine at Aylesbury, 4 dwellings at Peppard Common (refused), two mobile homes, two touring caravans, hardstanding and day room, next to RAF Walters Ash (refused), the Arla Foods proposals at Aston Clinton and an agricultural workers dwelling at The Lee (all objections).
3. Thus far 4 of the applications have been determined with 2 being in line with the Board's comments and 2 not in line.
4. Following the previous Committee meeting it is understood that Wycombe District Council has now distanced itself from the proposals for a stadium and associated sports village development at High Wycombe.
5. The outstanding formal representations are detailed in Appendix 2, and where decisions have been made by the local planning authorities these are detailed.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee notes and approves the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 2.**

APPENDIX 2

Location	LPA	Development	Ref. No.	Status	AONB Planning Officer's Response	Date
Adjacent B481, Peppard	OCC	Relocation of primary school	R3.0065/11	Pending	Object – principle of the development is acceptable though the Board objects to the proposed use of large, coloured, mineral fibre wall cladding panels (the drawings show blue, red and green). The Board considers that these should be replaced with materials that would be more in keeping with the local context (brick, traditionally constructed flint work or wood). In addition, care will need to be taken with the proposed use of light coloured render as this could quickly degrade and stain if not appropriately treated. It would be better to use a lime based render in this instance as it would weather better and would help to improve the environmental credentials of the building. There appear to be no firm commitments to provide renewable energy technologies as part of the development. Rather, the statement talks about options being considered and investigated. The Board considers that to make the scheme as sustainable as possible it should include roof mounted solar hot water and solar photovoltaics and a wood fuel heating system or ground source heat pump. The requirement to provide these should be subject to specific conditions should permission be granted. Other technologies are also mentioned and the Board would object strongly to any proposal to erect even small wind turbines on this site. It is also difficult to tell where the front and entrance of the building are.	16.06.11
Quarrendon Fields,	AVDC	2Mw wind turbine	10/00136/A PP	Pending (appeal)	Object - 2Mw wind turbine that would be 149m to blade tip and 113.5m to the hub. Contrary to the	27.05.11

Bicester Road, Aylesbury				against non-determination has been submitted, 04.07.11)	assertions made in the environmental statement the Board considers that the proposal would represent a significant vertical visual intrusion into the landscape of the Vale of Aylesbury and would be significantly taller than the County Hall building (approximately twice the height) and would be much more obvious due to the movement associated with the turbine blades. The consideration that has been given to the impacts on the setting and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB suggests that any impacts will be neutral. The Board does not agree with this assessment and therefore objects to the development as a result. The Board considers that the development would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the AONB and that it would be dominant in views both from and to the AONB.	
College Road North and Buckland Road, Aston Clinton	AVDC	Proposed developments for Arla Foods Ltd.	11/00962/A PP, 11/00963/A OP, 11/00964/A OP and 11/00965/A OP	Pending	Object – a lengthy objection was submitted to the 4 applications. The key reasons are as follows – impact on the setting of the AONB (views of the Vale of Aylesbury and effects on the public’s enjoyment of these views and effects on views of the AONB), impacts on the sense of remoteness and tranquillity in the area, lack of proper assessment of the effects of the proposals on interests of acknowledged importance including the use of only two receptors in the AONB, LVIA is challenged as a result, the proposals do not accord with development plan and other policies, the demand for the main site (milk processing plant) is questioned due to a decreasing market for milk, question jobs creation as proposal may result in taking jobs from other places and as a result the	01.07.11

					Board considers that the proposals would have a substantial and unacceptable impact on the setting and enjoyment of the AONB. If the Council were to approve the applications the Board would wish to be involved in any future decision-making due to the likely impacts.	
Newland Park, Gorelands Lane, Chalfont St Giles	CDC	Redevelopment of site to provide 326 dwellings, fitness and sports facilities and energy / recycling centre	CH/2010/09 76/FA	Pending	Object – (see copied information sent out for full details) the Board does not object to the principle of the proposal and a redevelopment of parts of the site would bring about enhancement of the AONB if undertaken in the most sensitive manner, using the best designs and most appropriate materials. There are elements of detail the Board objects to including: the design and materials for various buildings (both parkland dwellings and apartment blocks), the lack of provision of solar pv and solar hot water, provision of extra lighting (particularly in association with the playing pitches), the lack of provision of affordable housing, lack of facilities such as shops and employment and lack of public transport provision thus leading to significant amounts of car traffic on minor local roads and the likely impacts of large numbers of lorries on the same roads during construction (to bring materials in and take spoil away).	03.11.10
Land adjacent The Old Mill, The Lee, Great Missenden	CDC	Provision of agricultural workers dwelling	CH/2011/09 71/FA	Pending	Object – need for dwelling is questioned as there are many other properties that could be used locally, including that currently occupied by the proposed occupier of the dwelling and design is objected to as it fails to meet the principles of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Flint Technical Note.	25.08.11
Kitcheners Field,	DBC	Astroturf pitch, fence and	Pre-app	Pending	Object - development would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The	29.09.10

Berkhamsted		floodlights			pitch itself would have limited implications, however, both the fencing and lighting would be particularly intrusive features in the landscape. It is difficult to see how the detrimental impacts could be resolved without removing the fence and lights completely from the proposal. A lower fence using different materials that are more appropriate to the rural setting would be more acceptable (wooden post and wire for example) but it is accepted that the purpose of the fence is to keep balls within the playing area. The lighting columns themselves would be tall and their use would introduce an incongruous feature into the AONB to the detriment of the tranquillity of the area.	
Ploughmans, Howe Hill, Watlington	SODC	New access and track	P11/E0006/RET	Approved – 15.06.11	Object – to the loss of the hedgerow that fronted onto the main road (and any trees that were within it), and the loss of an important part of the character of the rural road have not been taken account of by the applicant. Other parts of the hedgerow are also likely to be affected by any possible change to the currently constructed visibility splays and this should clearly be taken account of. Based on the very small size of the holding that this application relates to (with significantly less than 5 hectares available for any agricultural use, now markedly reduced by the new fence that has been built) the Board considers that the Council should undertake a very careful examination of Classes A and B of Part 6 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. The Board remains to be convinced that the applicant has permitted development rights for the access and associated drive even for agricultural purposes. Though the	10.02.11

					<p>access itself might be used for agricultural purposes, the Board considers that this would not be frequent based on the limited use of the site at present. The Board cannot see how the drive would be needed for agricultural purposes, it appears to be solely for domestic use and the Board is not aware that permitted development rights exist for this.</p> <p>The Board has also noted the construction of a significant length of close board fencing along the south west boundary of the site. This has had a detrimental impact on the natural beauty of the AONB and that impact is compounded when account is taken of the new access and drive. As constructed the access and drive are inappropriate development and have resulted in a suburbanisation of this part of the nationally designated Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. They neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and the Board therefore considers that they should be removed and the site returned to its former condition, including the reinstatement of the hedge and any bank that it was on. The previously approved access and track (P04/E1426) did not constitute a similar harm and the Board would not object if they were constructed in the correct place and as previously permitted.</p>	
Oak Farm, Harpsden	SODC	426 ground mounted PV panels	P11/E0626	Approved – 21.06.11	Object – development would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, would set a dangerous precedent for future similar installations and is regarded as a major installation. Impact would be lessened if the panels were placed on a roof.	27.05.11
Mulberry	SODC	4 new dwellings	P11/E0805-	Refused –	Object - Despite the changes that have been	16.06.11

House, Peppard Hill			33	20.07.11	<p>made to the previously application (10 to 4 dwellings but on smaller site) the Board considers that this development would still be too dense on such a small site in the rural part of the District. The Board notes the decrease in number of dwellings on the site and also notes that the site area has decreased to the extent that it would still appear to be an overly dense form of development. The designs proposed fail to take proper account of the fact that the site is located in very close proximity to, and therefore within the setting of, the nationally designated Chilterns AONB. In addition, the designs fail to take account of the adopted design guides (including the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Supplementary Technical Notes on local building materials, flint and brick in particular). In particular the proposal includes: at least one 2½ storey building which would dominate the local area, a variety of design features and building materials that do not comply with the principles outlined in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the use of half hipped roofs when fully gabled roofs should be used. The Board notes that flint is not mentioned as part of the design and access statement. However, the elevation drawings for plot 4 appear to show the use of something other than brick as part of two of the elevations. If, despite objections, the Council should decide that the application should be approved, and flint is included as a building material then it should be a condition on any approval that all flint work should be completed on site, be built by hand, in a random manner and using lime mortar. On no account should pre-cast concrete flint blocks be</p>	
------------------------	--	--	----	-----------------	--	--

					used. The Board considers that the development fails to take proper account of the need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and its setting and that it does not comply with planning policy as it applies to AONBs.	
Grange Farm, Widmer End	WDC	Agricultural building to be used as potting shed	07/06948/F UL	Pending	Object - The proposal seeks to construct a very large (30m by 15m and 5.6m high) utilitarian, agricultural, building that will be clearly visible to users of the local rights of way. The principles of the AONB appear not to have been taken on board by the applicants. The development could not be assimilated into the Chilterns AONB. The proposal could create a dangerous precedent. The Board is mindful of the need to facilitate growth in the local economy and the evident importance of the applicant's business, however, it considers that the proposal would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB.	07.09.07
Wycombe Sports Centre, Handy Cross, High Wycombe	WDC	Coachway, park and ride, business development, car parking, hotel	09/07309/R 4OUT	Pending	Object – Whilst not objecting to the principle of the development a number of concerns have been submitted. The development proposes the inclusion of a number of wind turbines that would almost certainly sit idle for most of the time based on their location within the development where the wind resource will be affected by both the topography and adjacent buildings. It would be better to investigate other forms of energy generation, particularly wood fuel (which should be conditioned should approval be given). Any lighting used should take full account of the site's proximity to the nationally protected Chilterns AONB. The Board objects to the bulk, mass and draft designs for the hotel and headquarters buildings as these would be up to 8 storeys high and, despite the	06.01.10

					<p>visual appraisals in the supporting information, the Board considers that they would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Chilterns AONB. The Board has suggested that greater work is required on photomontages that show these prominent buildings in their setting and has yet to see this information. This objection would be removed if the scale, mass and bulk of these two buildings were significantly reduced. The Board is also concerned about the level of parking that is to be provided for the proposed office buildings. At the level proposed the Board considers that this will be unlikely to lead to modal shift. Increased bus provision and re-routing would also be required.</p> <p>Changes proposed – reduced height for prow building and hotel that would significantly lessen the potential impact on the setting of the AONB and on views from the AONB. If developed as proposed the changes, combined with the imposition of a proposed condition 12 and the inclusion of appropriate tree planting (not screening to hide the development), enable the Board to withdraw its previously stated objection.</p>	24.02.10
Sports Hall, RAF High Wycombe, Walters Ash	WDC	Demolish existing buildings and erect new sports hall, pavilion and two tennis courts	11/05494/F UL	Pending	<p>Comments - the Board welcomes the changes to the original designs that have resulted in the application as submitted. However, whilst not objecting to the principle of the development (provided all other buildings are removed as per the details of the application), the Board considers that additional changes could be made to the scheme that would improve it further thus leading to a development that would meet the purposes of the AONB (conservation or enhancement of the natural beauty).</p>	20.05.11

				<p>Timber cladding – it may help to add some interest if one of the facades of the building was detailed with vertical timbers (possibly the eastern elevation). The detail shown in this drawing is not reflected in the Design and Access statement which talks about graduated colour panels (these are not considered to be appropriate).</p> <p>East elevation – this is one of the more dominant elevations from an AONB perspective and as drawn it shows little relief. Putting vertical timbers may provide some relief. This elevation would benefit from having 3 bigger doors than those shown which could be spread more evenly along the wall. This would make this building look more agricultural in its appearance.</p> <p>The plans accompanying the application show areas of cut/fill and bunding to the east of the sports building and around the proposed tennis courts. These appear alien in the landscape and are nearly 3m high in places. The reason for the bunds is unclear and the inference is that this is a method by which excavated material can be disposed of on the site. This is not acceptable and the bunds should be significantly reduced in height and the form changed, if needed at all, to be more natural.</p> <p>Tree planting is proposed associated with the bunds to the east of the sports building, there is no reason why the trees cannot be planted without the bund. All trees should be provided with sufficient space to grow to maturity and should be planted in clumps to allow partial screening of the corners of the sports building.</p> <p>Those trees already on or adjacent to the site should all be retained wherever possible as they</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>form an important part of the backdrop to the site. Although the drawings do not appear to show any flintwork the Design and Access statement refers to flint on page 36, paragraph 4.03. The Board would object in the strongest possible terms if flintwork of the type proposed were to be used. The materials mentioned are pre-cast concrete flintblocks which do not conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB (as clearly demonstrated by the examples given in the statement). These have no place in the AONB and should flintwork remain as a design element (and the Board does not think it should) then it should all be constructed on site by hand, using random flint sizes and lime mortar throughout in accordance with the Conservation Board's technical advice.</p> <p>No real details are provided in connection with lighting. The Design and Access statement talks only about building mounted external lighting on the sports building. The impact of lighting needs to be very carefully considered in what should be a dark and tranquil area. The floodlighting for the artificial grass court has a major detrimental impact and this should not be compounded by yet more lights. Any lighting should be kept to the absolute minimum and be properly directed and suitably cowled to avoid any spillage.</p> <p>Comments on changes – Building 1 east elevation – the Board notes the change to increase the area of brickwork around the doors in the middle of the façade and welcomes this change as it is considered that it will lessen the dominance of this part of the building. However, the Board still considers that 3 larger doors on this façade would</p>	09.06.11
--	--	--	--	--	----------

					create a better appearance. Bunding to the east of building 1 – the removal of the bunds and re-grading of the slope in a more natural way are both welcomed and the Board considers that this issue has now been resolved. Tree planting – the inclusion of more trees in limited numbers of clumps to the eastern corner of building 1 is also welcomed. Tennis courts – the plans and sections appear to show that there will be no bunding around the tennis courts and that the land will be more gently re-graded. This is welcomed and the Board considers that this issue has now been resolved. All other comments remain.	
The Hedgerow, Walters Ash	WDC	Gypsy site for 2 touring caravans, 2 mobile homes, day room and hardstanding	11/05644/F UL	Refused – 17.08.11	Object - The development fails to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, it proposes the placing of 2 mobile homes, 2 touring caravans and a utility/day room on a site that previously had little or no development on it. This would introduce buildings and a very urban form of development into the countryside where the principle is that such developments should be resisted. The mobile homes, caravans and day room would have no architectural merit and take no account of the local distinctiveness of the AONB and would not conform to the advice in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. The Board considers that the development that is proposed is contrary to the principles outlined in Circular 01/06, particularly those set out in paragraphs 49 and 52. The Council's adopted Core Strategy will have been drafted in accordance with this Circular. All applications for gypsy sites should be determined against policy CS14 and the Board considers that this development does not accord with that policy. This is the most up to date	17.06.11

					<p>planning policy applicable to this specific form of development. The development is also considered to be contrary to various other adopted Core Strategy policies and 'saved' policies in the Adopted Wycombe Local Plan. The development is considered to be contrary to a number of policies in the adopted statutory Chilterns AONB Management Plan. The Board considers that, due to the proximity of the site to the main road and associated public rights of way, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the enjoyment of users of the AONB and their appreciation of the protected landscape. The Board considers that, because the development neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB, it is clearly contrary to policy and there are no overriding circumstances that would warrant a departure, the application should be refused and that immediate enforcement action should be taken to rectify the situation should this be required.</p>	
The Plough PH, Cadsden	WDC	Extension of car park to provide 22 extra spaces	11/05930/F UL	Refused – 17.08.11	<p>Support - The Board is aware that the application would extend the existing car park and that, as a result, this could encourage more visitors to the local countryside as well as customers to the pub. The Board considers that this would enable greater use of the local rights of way network. The Board does not object to the use of rolled scalplings for the surface and the use of a post and rail fence for the enclosure. The Board can find no mention of the provision of any extra lighting. Provided none is proposed, and this remains the case, the Board supports the proposal as submitted.</p>	20.06.11