

---

## **LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE**

### **MINUTES**

Of a meeting held in the Penn Chamber, Three Rivers House, Rickmansworth on Thursday 18 August from 7pm to 7.52pm and from 7.55pm to 9.21pm.

Members of the Local Plan Sub-Committee:

Councillors:

Stephen Giles-Medhurst (Chair)  
Matthew Bedford (Vice Chair)  
Sarah Nelmes  
Stephen Cox

Ciaran Reed (for Rue Grewal)  
Philip Hearn  
Reena Ranger  
Jon Tankard  
Stephanie Singer (for Phil Williams)

Councillors also in attendance:

Andrea Fraser, Chris Mitchell, Chris Lloyd,  
Debbie Morris, Abbas Merali, Keith Martin,  
Raj Khiroya, Batchworth Community Cllr and  
Chorleywood Parish Cllr Diane Barber and  
Chorleywood Parish Cllr Jon Bishop

Officers in attendance:

Geof Muggeridge, Director of Community and Environmental Services  
Marko Kalik, Head of Planning Policy and Conservation  
Sarah Haythorpe, Principal Committee Manager

---

#### **LPSC 17/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Phil Williams and Rue Grewal with the substitutes being Councillors Stephanie Singer and Ciaran Reed.

#### **LPSC 18/22 MINUTES**

It was confirmed that the Minutes of the Local Plan sub-committee meeting held on 25 July 2022 were a correct record and were signed by the Chair.

#### **LPSC 19/22 NOTICE OF OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

#### **LPSC 20/22 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

None were received under Procedure Rule 30.

#### **LPSC 21/22 CONSIDERATION OF ARTICLE 4 DIRECTIONS TO REMOVE PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS**

The Chair gave an introduction to the sub-committee on the report which set out the implications of the new Permitted Development Rights from Class E (commercial, business and services) to Class C3 (residential) that came into effect from 1 August 2021. Various options and recommendations were provided to Members for bringing forward Article 4 Directions for selective parts of the District to remove this PDR, withdrawing permitted development rights under Class MA.

The Chair moved, duly seconded, an amendment to recommendation 5 to add the wording “and to fastrack officers support to do this.” It was noted that the work on the Article 4 Direction may impact on the Local Plan but it was for Members to decide if this work should be fastracked to get the Article 4 Direction in place.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that from the 1 August 2022 the Article 4 Directions ceased to exist and from this date Three Rivers’ employment areas were no longer protected from PDRs. The evidence that would be required for an Article 4 Direction now needs to be much more robust than what was required in 2016 and may require the geographical areas to be made smaller. It would take time to get all the evidence together, in the region of 3 weeks, with an officer working full time on this. There would need to be a 21 day consultation period before sending to the Secretary of State (SoS) who could agree or reject the Article 4 Direction. It was noted there were two types of Article 4 Directions that can be prepared. The ‘standard’ non-immediate Article 4 Direction and the immediate Article 4 Direction. The non-immediate option had a 12-month period between the Article 4 Direction being made and it coming into force. This would leave the area covered by the non-immediate Article 4 Direction susceptible to prior approval applications under PDRs for those 12 months and provided a risk to offices and light industrial of conversions to residential taking place under PDRs during the 12 months before the non-immediate Article 4 Direction came into force. The Council’s insurers had advised that our insurance would not cover any compensation claims as part of our insurance. Advice from Finance was that the risk was too great to take. The recommendations were as detailed in the report for Members to consider.

The Chair advised details on the routes two other Local Authorities in Hertfordshire were taking with one looking at the non-immediate route and the other immediate. Their Article 4 Directions had also lapsed. The Chair advised that the feedback received to them from the SoS was that further evidence was required to be produced.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services advised that there was no guarantee the Article 4 Direction would be granted by the SoS. Two London Borough’s had their Article 4 Direction’s refused by the SoS. The Chief Executive and Shared Director of Finance had advised that the immediate option was too great a risk and the Council did not have sufficient balances to cover any potential developer claims.

Members of the sub-committee and those outside the sub-committee made the following points/comments

- Not interested in the outcomes of other Authorities and should just focus on Three Rivers.
- How had we got into this situation?
- Could the team be strengthened further with more resources and were the resources required for this going to delay the Local Plan.

- Could legal advice be sought that a landlord could not put the rent to an extortionate level on a premises which means it then becomes vacant for three months prior to the date of the prior approval application? They were concerned that units could be deliberately left unlet to benefit from the PDRs from 1 August 2022. They felt this loophole should be highlighted to our local MPs to see if the Government can stop this.
- What protection would there be for our High Streets, primary shop frontages and local Shopping Centres to ensure they are not eroded away.
- Whether we recommend an immediate or non immediate Article 4 Direction should look at what other authorities are doing and see if we should do things differently.
- Had there been any interest shown in any of the commercial areas or the High Street.
- Felt we should focus on the Article 4 Direction over the next 3 weeks.
- Referred to recent appeal decision on a planning application and a further application coming forward and was concerned about delays to the Local Plan.
- Referred to the presumption in favour of sustainable development and our lack of housing in the District and what risks this poses on the Council with this its Local Plan.
- There would be a new SoS and a new team and there may be changes on the housing numbers. Councils which had submitted their Local Plan had found that the Planning Inspector was not able to go against the housing numbers set by the Government so we are at an advantage in that we had not submitted ours with the hope that the housing numbers would be reviewed.
- Regrettable this process was not started earlier and if we don't start now we will be in a worse position. There will be an impact on the Local Plan but we are not the only Council in this situation. We are not able to control how long the SoS takes to determine the Article 4 Direction and whether extra evidence would be asked for.
- Could any more detail be provided on the amount the claims could be as the range was quite broad between £100,000 and millions and what were the chances of success in making a claim?
- Did we know of any buildings which were vacant and were they at danger of being converted into housing?

In response to the points/comments made by Members officers advised:

- The matter had not been picked up by the team and was not in any handover notes. A new interim Head was appointed and start date agreed but they didn't take up the appointment and the matter was therefore not expedited.
- Noted there was a whole new team now and new Head of Service.
- It was a Member decision on how long the process takes.
- Would require an officer to dedicate significant time over a 3 week period to get the evidence and details together.
- Noted that the Council had advertised 3 times for a Senior Planner but had no applicants. For the interim role around 12 applications were received but not one of them met our requirements even for an assistant planning role.
- There already was extra resources in the team following additional budget provision.
- The emerging Local Plan would protect our High Street and local shopping centres along with secondary areas, for example in Church Street and Station Road, Rickmansworth.

- On shop vacancies in the High Street we were among the least affected in the country as it was not made up of high street chains which made it more resilient. From the shopper surveys we have seen people were now shopping more locally.
- Agents do contact the Council but not had contacted us on these areas.
- Not able to advise if the SoS would require further evidence once the Article 4 Direction was submitted or if the evidence would be sufficient. It was not possible to be over ambitious on protecting our employment sites. In addition we do not know how long the SoS will take to make a decision.
- On the High Street there had only been 2 prior approvals since 2021 and it was considered less of a priority but would be reviewed at the same time as shopping frontages.
- The amounts provided in the report on claims were speculative and it was a risk the Chief Executive and Chief Financial Officer could not recommend.
- The evidence gathering was crucial as the first start of the process.
- Unlike other Councils we don't have a huge amount of office and industrial space.
- As for the chances of getting the Article 4 Direction this was in the hands of the SoS.
- We don't have information on the number of vacant buildings as it would form part of the evidence gathering process.
- Any vacant building which someone wished to covert would need to go through the planning process and could need the applicant to pay a six figure amount. The process could take many months before being able to do any physical work.

Councillor Sarah Nelmes moved the recommendations as set out in the report along with the amendment proposed by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst to recommendation 5 "to fastrack officer's support to do this." The motion was seconded by Councillor Stephen Giles-Medhurst

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RECOMMEND:

- 1) Members Approve the preparation of non-immediate Article 4 Directions to withdraw permitted development rights for Use Class E (commercial, business and service use) to Use Class C3 (residential) on each of the three District's Employment Site Allocations at:
  - Croxley Business Park-site ref: E(a),
  - Tolpits Lane-site ref: E(b),
  - Maple Cross/Maple Lodge-site ref: E(d).
- 2) Members Approve the preparation, following on from the completion of the employment area Article 4 Directions, of non-immediate Article 4 Directions to withdraw permitted development rights for Use Class E (commercial, business and service use) to Use Class C3 (residential) in the District's primary shopping frontages as set out in the draft Regulation 18 version of the emerging Local Plan.
- 3) Members note that the evidence work involved in preparing the non-immediate Article 4 Directions may influence whether the Article 4

Directions are made or result in changes to the boundaries of the Article 4 Directions.

- 4) Members note the possibility that the Secretary of State may refuse all or part of an Article 4 Direction at these locations.
- 5) That delegated authority is given to the Director of Community & Environmental Services in consultation with the Leader and Lead Member for Infrastructure and Planning Policy to prepare the Article 4 Directions as outlined in recommendations 1 and 2 and to fastrack officers support to do this.

#### **LPSC22/22 ADJOURNMENT OF THE LOCAL PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING**

The Chair moved, duly seconded, that the meeting be adjourned to allow the Special Policy and Resources to consider the recommendation on the Article 4 Direction

On being put to the sub-committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being unanimous.

RESOLVED:

That the meeting be adjourned at 7.51pm

The meeting was reconvened by the Chair at 7.55pm

#### **LPSC23/22 LOCAL PLAN: Changes to Preferred Policy Options following Regulation 18 Consultation**

The sub-committee received a report with proposed changes to some of the preferred policy options contained in the Draft Local Plan Regulation 18 Part 1: Preferred Policy Options document in response to changes to national planning policy, changes to Building Regulations and comments received to the Regulation 18 consultation.

The Chair advised that would be taking each of the five policies separately and go through the proposed changes that officers had put forward or any other suggestions that maybe raised by Members on each policy and sign them off.

A Member of the public wished to speak on Appendix 9 the Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping Policy and the Chair agreed to move this up the agenda to be taken after Appendix 1.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation provided an update on the Local Plan work and where we were with the policy updates. There were further policy updates coming to the September and October meetings and the November meeting will discuss the sites. This report provided updates on five policies and were based on the consultee comments to the R18 consultation, changes in legislation on build regulations and national policy. Any new wording was provided in red text and any wording to be deleted had been struck through. Any existing wording was what was agreed by the Council for the R18 consultation.

A Member referred to the over-arching report and when we initiate looking through the comments. One comment from a statutory consultee, Croxley Green Parish Council, stated “the local plan seems to be a collection of ad hoc

responses to various development pressures across the District rather than a strategic vision for sustainable development in the communities which make up Three Rivers” and wondered if that comment had been considered.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that the Local Plan was based on a strategic vision with the plan starting as a vision with strategic policies then shaping these policies. It was proposed to continue that approach and officers would be coming back with strategic policy updates at future meetings.

A Member said extensions are asked about all the time and asked what impact any of these policies would have on extensions. How many times do we take note of a comment made i.e. “we want all houses painted green” by residents before we take any action on this.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that details on extensions would come forward as part of the design policy which would come forward at a later date. It should be noted that in general the direction of travel for extensions would be more through permitted development.

#### *Adapting to Climate Change (Appendix 1)*

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised this was an overarching policy and there would be further detail provided in other policies. Water consumption was covered in more detail in the flood risk and water resources policy which was brought to the sub-committee in March. On sustainable construction there would be another policy coming forward on that. The policy had been amended to make it stronger on adapting to climate change and on sustainable construction and design.

The Chair advised that clarification had been provided on what was a major development which was 10 dwellings or over or greater than 0.5 hectare. If you ask for over onerous tasks for smaller developments it would make them unviable.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that with regard to a major development being 10 dwellings or over, going forward the vast majority of future developments in the potential allocated sites would follow a different trend to past development which was for smaller sites.

Members felt the policy was a big improvement and made it more stringent.

Councillor Philip Hearn moved an amendment to the policy. Points 1 and 3 seemed to refer to major developments, 2 and 4 to all developments and part 5 to non residential major developments. The Councillor asked if officers could put points 1 and 3 and points 2 and 4 together with some clearer headings so that people knew what the sections related to. The Chair agreed with that amendment.

**Post meeting note** – policy updated accordingly and circulated to sub-committee members.

A Member outside the Committee had put forward some suggested amendments to the policy as follows:

- (1) could it be all developments, not just major developments
- (2)(d) important and is shown up by the 2 recent heatwaves, not having to run energy guzzling air conditioning units.

(3) should be all developments. The built fabric is the most important aspect – materials that conserve heat in winter and resist heating in summer. All development should be required to think about “future proofing”. The problem with an excellent fabric, you then need an air circulation system and best with a heat exchanger. Passivhaus stated this, but Part L does not cover this very well, in section 6.54 to 6.56.

(4) should we also cover refurbishments and extensions. Retrofitting is important and it is much cheaper to do it when works are taking place. Using a passivhaus or Home Quality mark 5 i.e. be specific in the policy as well as the reasoning described further on, which looks good.

The Chair advised it may not be possible to say all developments but may be able to add “where possible on developments” as we do not want to put a standard in where an Inspector says that was unreasonable and scrap it which would mean we could lose the control on the major developments.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation agreed with the Chairs comments and said it was important to note that anywhere where we push harder on one policy there is a potential that this could have a knock on effect on other policies. When we are going into the R19 stage of the Local Plan, prior to submission, officers will do a whole plan viability assessment that considers all of the policies and all of the sites together and if we push too far on one policy we would find it harder to push on other policies. The policies can be relooked at the viability stage to see if there is more scope to change them. Reference to extensions could be considered to be added to point 4 but the majority of extensions will be beyond the Councils control as they will be under permitted development.

A Member thought some of the points made were covered by Building Regulations. You could not extend a passivhaus unless it was complete and also building regulations segregate extensions out and did not think we can say they are separate structures.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services advised these were the over arching policies and there are some more detailed policies which had either been to the sub-committee or would be coming forward. The problem of looking at them in isolation meant Members were not seeing them in a joined up way. The suggestions being made may weaken the policy. Whilst we welcome the comments put forward officers did not think it fitted into this aspect of the Local Plan or this policy and did not feel extensions would apply here.

A Member said that the policies were being considered at different stages and wondered if Members would be given the opportunity to do some cross referencing before going out for consultation. The Chair advised that the process would be that once we get close to the R19 consultation the whole documentation would come before Members to consider in terms of the recommendations.

A Member referred to water and in point 7.14 it stated that “consumption in the District is significantly higher than the rest of Hertfordshire” and therefore we should be looking at rainwater harvesting and water recycling. We also have a challenge on the infrastructure in terms of the sewage, the usage of water and drainage of the roads. Roads were not coping with the number of housing already let alone future housing, and was concerned with a number of potential sites and the impact on our rivers.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that most of the points raised on water were addressed in the flood risk and water resources policy that had already been to the sub-committee but which could be shared again with Members.

The Chair wondered if the source of the data on the significant amount of water used in the District could be provided to substantiate the high usage in case it was challenged. The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation said that details could be added.

**Post meeting note:** added the sources to the water stress paragraph

In response to a Member who asked what our baseline policy was it was advised that the Government lead on this and provide the strategy. The Council can only adapt the policy but must remain within the Government guidelines. The standards will continue to change so we have to be careful about being too prescriptive and have some flexibility. Passivhaus is only one example.

A Member asked how this policy related to Appendix 9 and the policy on Local Distinctiveness and how can we adapt local distinctiveness, particularly with regard to shutters on buildings, when we are trying to become sustainable. The Chair advised that you do not have to have shutters externally they can be installed internally now.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation said local distinctiveness can also come down to the general form and shape of the buildings rather than the really detailed points of shutters and blinds.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services said with the nature of the Local Plan document there will be contradiction between some policy areas as there a different pressures and priorities. The whole point of planning is that it weighs up the balance of different policies and officers then make recommendations based on the evidence in front of them and weigh up which policies apply or which do not.

The Chair moved, duly seconded, to agree the policy to include the amendment that points 1 and 3 and points 2 and 4 be put together with some clearer headings so that people knew what the sections related to, also whether the amendment on extensions could be included, use, and to include the wording “where possible on developments” within the policy.

On being put to the Committee the motion was declared CARRIED by the Chair the voting being by general assent

- *Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping (Appendix 9)*

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 35(b) a member of the public spoke on this policy from the Three Rivers Joint Residents Association.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation said with regard to the points raised on light pollution and connectivity the officer would go away and check this against other policies and whether the points are covered already in another policy and report back to the sub-committee.

**Post meeting note:** No changes were made to the Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping policy as the issues raised are addressed through other policies. Regarding the Three Rivers JRA comments ‘connectivity’ is addressed in the

Sustainable Transport policy coming to the 13 October LPSC and 'light pollution' is addressed in the Ground Conditions, Contamination and Pollution policy coming to 5 September LPSC.

A Member asked whether the points raised by the member of the public were new points tonight or whether these had been provided as part of the R18 consultation which were still being digested by officers.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services welcomed the comments made by the member of the public but officers would need to go and check where these fit in with comments already made and where they relate to other policies. It was suggested that the points be noted and officers will look to see whether they can be captured and within which policy (*see above post meeting note*).

On a question raised by a Member on tree lined streets and having a buffer between settlements it was advised that trees were included within the Tree policy. The Tree Strategy was a separate document and not part of the Local Plan.

A Member said on local distinctiveness and place shaping this addressed areas that are smaller than the whole District and where we wish to maintain the distinctiveness of that particular area. So where we want to put trees as part of a carbon policy that would be part of a Tree policy and where we want to preserve the Green Belt goes within the Green Belt policy. Where we want to do something special in a particular area that would form part of this policy whereas other policies covered the whole District.

On edge of settlement development a Member wondered if that should be included in this policy or in the Green Belt policy. The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that would be part of the Green Belt policy

A Member raised a question on Part 22 (page3) and where it stated there are appropriate levels of parking to avoid on street parking and wondered if we had any data on what that looks like in practise i.e. one parking space per house and how can this be resolved going forward in new developments.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation said this was one of the policies which overlaps some of the other policies and more detail would be provided in the Parking policy.

A Member still wished to see reference made "that large new developments reflect the diversity of architecture in the area".

Member's thoughts that point 4 covered that and also a new development should create its own character. As more and more Parishes have a Neighbourhood Plan this would be taken into account.

The Chair moved, duly seconded, that the policy be agreed on the Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping taking into account the Residents Association points and for officers to consider these and the points raised by Members. It was noted all the policies would come back to the sub-committee as a final document.

- *Carbon Dioxide Emissions (Appendix 3)*

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that the comments/changes made were largely based on the changes to Part L of the

Building Regulations which now enabled us to set higher standards than were in the R18 consultation.

A Member raised some points on the policy which included

“Developments should maximise opportunities for on-site electricity and heat production from solar technologies (photovoltaic and thermal) and use innovative building materials and smart technologies. This will reduce carbon emissions, reduce energy costs to occupants to improve the Districts energy resilience.” Can we set higher standards than the new regulations? Welcomed being able to agree a common standard if possible with adjoining Districts.

Point 7.1. Should we be expecting new developments, with a lifespan of at least 30 years, to be aiming to meet the requirement for 2050 now and not to be requiring retrofit or upgrading every few years? It didn't seem right to allow substandard buildings now when it possible to meet the requirements for 2050 now. Or at least they must show a clear plan to achieve this.”

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation had not had the opportunity to go through the comments in detail which had been provided.

Councillor Matthew Bedford moved an amendment, duly seconded, to add some text which stated that “we would expect a developer to achieve the maximum standard that was required under Government legislation that applied at the time.”

The Director of Community and Environmental Services said it would not be possible to be too prescriptive in the policy but we could look to set the highest standards we can and adapting those standards when we can.

**Post meeting note:** Carbon Dioxide Emissions policy has been amended to refer to future standards and to encourage developments to go beyond current standards

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation said where other authorities had included more prescriptive details within proposed policies this had been challenged by the Inspector with WBC being a recent example.

A Member thought Camden had gone above Government policy and this had been accepted and wondered if officers could look into this.

**Post meeting note:** In answer to the question regarding the Camden Local Plan, it is from 2017 and refers to the 19% Building Regs and any subsequent standards. It does not go beyond the standards, just encourages developers to do so.

The Director of Community and Environmental Services said the introduction could include the wording along the lines of “Developments would be more favourably considered if they include....and not meeting the basic standards.” It was not possible to include financial inducements through the Local Plan that would be totally inappropriate.

On being put to the Committee the policy was declared CARRIED by the Chair with the amendments proposed above the voting being by general assent.

#### *Heritage and the Historic Environment*

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that the policy had been strengthened following comments by HCC and Historic England, Parish

Councils and Resident Associations. A section had been added on non designated heritage assets and reference added on the Grand Union Canal as it had an historic importance.

A Member asked if there was a list of designated heritage assets.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that there was distinction in national policy between designated and non-designated. Designated would be listed buildings and Conservation Areas whereas the non-designated would be the Council's local list but which did not have the same status as a designated asset. Both the lists do exist and are on the Council website.

**Post meeting note:** Reference added to non-heritage assets identified in Neighbourhood Plans. Reference to views being from public realm also added. The link for our conservation areas: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/conservation-areas> and listed buildings: <https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/egcl-page/listed-buildings> (though this is more informative about listed buildings, it directs people to Historic England who publish the list. Finally locally listed buildings are available as points on the policies map: <http://www.planvu.co.uk/trdc/>

The Chair said it was possible to suggest buildings for local listing.

In response to a Member on pastiche design the Director of Community and Environmental Services advised that this should form part of the more detailed design policies.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that some of the Conservation Area appraisals included reference to pastiche design. In response to a Member question on whether buildings with special heritage interest included in the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan (NP) were included the officer agreed to check this but thought they were included as the Council had adopted the policy as part. This would be clarified in a post meeting note. **See above post meeting note.**

A Member asked about Conservation Areas and whether we were talking about views from the public highway or any views from private land. Should this be made clear in the policy? Also had we checked against local NP that these policies are consistent

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation said the views would be from the public realm but this can be clarified in the policy (**see above post meeting note**). In terms of the Local Plan the NP needed to be consistent with the Local Plan and then gets adopted into the Development Plan.

On being put to the Committee the policy was declared CARRIED by the Chair with the points raised to be checked the voting being by general assent.

#### *Landscape Character*

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation said the main areas of amendment were around strengthening the areas of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

A Member said they had been alerted by Bucks CC that there had been some talk about extending the Chilterns AONB and asked if it would be worth future proofing the policy on this or any other areas of AONB that may be declared.

The Head of Planning Policy and Conservation advised that from what they understood any extension would not be considered in the life of this Local Plan or any new area of AONB in the District. The wording would cover any extension to the Chiltern AONB.

With regard to the Beech Wood Special Area of Conservation (SAC) it did not prevent development but there are additional requirements on developers. It was noted it did not fall under Landscape character but may need to be an update to another policy. This would be looked at by officers and brought to Members attention.

**Post meeting note:** Regarding the query about Beechwoods SAC – we are in discussions with Dacorum BC and will arrange a meeting with Natural England in due course. Although a portion of the District is in the 'zone of influence' we were not considered to adversely affect the SAC as things stand. This may change based on our future growth scenario and as stated these discussions are ongoing.

**RECOMMEND:**

Noted the contents of this report, and recommended to the Policy & Resources Committee the following policy updates with the amendments above under each policy and the comments made:

- Adapting to Climate Change (Appendix 1)
- Carbon Dioxide Emissions (Appendix 3)
- Heritage and the Historic Environment (Appendix 5)
- Landscape Character (Appendix 7)
- Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping (Appendix 9)

**CHAIR**