
Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 20 – 23 January 2015

Site visits made on 23 and 29 January 2015

by P N Jarratt BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

Land east of St Margarets Drive, Alderton, Tewkesbury

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Freeman Homes against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 13/00734/OUT, dated 6 August 2013, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2014.
 - The development proposed is an outline application for the erection of up to 60 no. dwellings (net increase of 59 dwellings) and associated parking; vehicular access from St Margarets Drive; provision of open space; the construction of highways through the site and associated engineering works, including the creation of an attenuation pond. The proposals include the demolition of an existing dwelling (16 St Margarets Drive).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application originally proposed up to 70 dwellings but was reduced to 60 units (59 net) during the course of the application with the submission of amended plans and a revised site boundary. I have therefore used the above description of development in the determination of the appeal. It is an outline application with all matters reserved except for access.
3. Alderton Parish Council (APC) was granted Rule 6 status under the Inquiry Procedure Rules.
4. Two separate executed s106 agreements were submitted at the inquiry (Documents 40 and 45). The first relates to County Council contributions for education, libraries and highways and the second relates to Borough Council contributions for open space, allotments, health, dog bins, sports facilities and affordable housing. In view of the agreements the Council withdrew reasons 2-5 in the decision notice.
5. The remaining refusal reason (reason 1) refers to emerging Policy SD2 of the Pre-submission Joint Core Strategy (JCS), but the Council has advised that this should have been a reference to JCS Policy SP2.
6. I carried out an accompanied site inspection following the close of the inquiry on 23 January but due to failing light I carried out a further unaccompanied site

inspection on 29 January, taking in viewpoints suggested by the parties, including a visit to Stoke Orchard.

Main Issues

7. The main issues in this appeal are:

- i) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
- ii) Whether the scale of development would have a disproportionate effect on the village and on the social wellbeing of the community;
- iii) Whether the proposal represents sustainable development to which the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) presumption in favour should apply.

Reasons

Background

8. The application site is 2.86 hectares in extent and is located adjacent to the south east edge of Alderton bordering existing residential development on St Margaret's Road and St Margaret's Drive. It comprises two fields currently used for sheep grazing. The site includes a bungalow at 16 St Margaret's Drive which would be demolished to provide vehicular access to the site. The site is located in a Special Landscape Area (SLA) but it is outside the Cotswolds AONB, the boundary of which skirts the northern side of the village. There are a number of listed buildings in the vicinity of the site. The "Winchcombe Way", a figure of eight recreational PRow walking route of more than local interest, runs along the eastern boundary of the appeal site in the adjoining field.
9. Although the application is in outline, indicative masterplan and parameters plans indicate that the development would be for a mix of two storey dwelling types including 2,3,4 and 5 bedroom family houses and 35% affordable housing, open space, children's play area, attenuation pond, landscaping with pedestrian access from St Margaret's Drive and from two points on St Margaret's Road. Access to Lower Farm, to the east of the site would be retained.
10. There is no relevant planning history on the appeal site although there have been a number of recent housing applications in Alderton. An application for 4 dwellings adjacent to Gretton View was refused in April 2014¹. Permission was granted on appeal for 47 dwellings on land to the south of Beckford Road in May 2014 and construction has recently commenced² (the Beckford Road Development). An application for 24 dwellings at land east of Willow Bank Road was refused in September 2014³ and an appeal has been lodged. An application for 53 dwellings west of Willow Bank Road was refused in December 2014⁴.
11. The statutory development plan consists of the saved policies of the Tewkesbury Local Plan which was adopted in 2006 and pre-dates the Framework. In accordance with the Framework at paragraph 215 I will give

¹ Ref 13/01018/FUL

² APP/G1630/A/13/2209001

³ Ref 14/00414/FUL

⁴ Ref 14/00747/OUT

due weight to relevant policies according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. The JCS is an emerging plan and whilst it has reached submission stage no date for its examination has been set. An Alderton Neighbourhood Parish Plan is being prepared by the community but this has yet to be published.

The character and appearance of the area

12. The Framework at paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and, at paragraph 115, it emphasises that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs.
13. The Cotswolds AONB covers Alderton Hill and Dumbleton Hill, and extends right down to the northern edge of the settlement of Alderton. To the south, Oxenton Hill is also part of the AONB. The land between these outliers, known as the Teddington and Greet Vale, is designated a Special Landscape Area (SLA) in the Local Plan. The setting of the AONB is not the subject of any national or statutory policy protection although the SLA is the subject of Local Plan Policy LND2.
14. Policy LND2 states that special attention will be accorded to the protection and enhancement of the landscape character of the SLA. Within this area proposals must demonstrate that they do not adversely affect the quality of the natural and built environment and its visual attractiveness, or detract from the quiet enjoyment of the countryside. The supporting text to this policy explains that while the quality of the landscape in the SLA is worthy of protection in its own right, it also plays a role in providing the foreground setting for the adjacent AONB. However I agree with the main parties that the second part of the policy is not consistent with the Framework as any development would be likely to have an adverse effect on the quality of the natural and built environment. Consequently I attach less weight to the second part of the policy than I do to the first part, which the parties agree is consistent with the Framework. The appellant has also drawn attention to Policy LND2, particularly in its second part, not providing for any form of cost/benefit assessment which underpins the approach of the Framework⁵. Notwithstanding this, I take account of economic or other benefits of the scheme in the overall planning balance.
15. The Gloucestershire Landscape Character Assessment (2006)⁶ identifies the key characteristics of this "Unwooded Vale" landscape type as including medium-to large-scale hedged fields with a combination of both regular and irregular field patterns, and a relatively sparsely settled agrarian landscape with rural villages and scattered farms and dwellings. It notes that the escarpment and outliers create a sense of enclosure within the Teddington and Greet Vale, and provide a backdrop to many views across it.
16. The landscape experts for both the appellant and the Council submitted detailed assessments of the landscape and visual effects of the proposals based on the appellant's Application Landscape and Visual Assessment (ALVIA) and best practice guidelines. Whilst in agreement on certain matters, different conclusions on the level of harm arising from the proposed development were reached by the parties.

⁵ Colman and SSCLG and North Devon DC and RWE NPower [2013] EWHC 1138 (Admin)

⁶ Document C10

17. A recent study⁷ identifies the site to be within an area of medium landscape sensitivity and high visual sensitivity. It identifies that the sense of separation between Alderton and the B4077 is characteristic and vulnerable to insensitive development.
18. The appeal site is a constituent of its enveloping rural landscape character by virtue of the similarity of its high quality features; topography, geology, openness, pasture use, stream, vegetation and presence of settlement. It is not on the fringes of the rural character area but very much part of it. I do not consider that Alderton acts as a buffer between the appeal site and the AONB but is part of a contiguous landscape. The appeal site and its setting consist of features characteristic of both the SLA and the AONB landscape. Although the AONB is higher ground with the SLA as a lower vale, the appeal site is seen as forming part of the gentle slope that falls from the AONB. The development of the appeal site would impact on the setting of the AONB through a loss of openness and pasture use.
19. The proposals would also lead to a coalescence of Alderton and Lower Farm and an increase in the suburbanised character to the village not readily reflected by the morphology of Alderton with its small scale infill and layout reflective of the historic road form. Historically the village has a generally east-west layout with two historic cluster areas. This east-west form will be accentuated through the recently approved 47 dwellings in the Beckford Road development.
20. In terms of the visual effects, the locations receiving large negative effects are the dwellings and footpaths close to the appeal site as well as Lower Farm. Views of the appeal site will change from rural fields to a suburban residential estate and certain views of the AONB would be lost. The Cotswold Conservation Board and Natural England object to the proposed development because of the impact that the development would have on views of the AONB, with the Board drawing particular attention to views south-west from the Winchcombe Way from the north east corner of the site where the development would block views of substantial parts of Dixton Hill and Oxenton Hill. Having viewed the site from this and other points on the Winchcombe Way I would agree that impact on views would be 'substantial adverse'⁸ and walkers would experience a change in their relationship with Alderton, its landscape and the enjoyment of the countryside. In particular, walkers approaching the village along the Winchcombe Way cross fields and enter the most historically picturesque part of the village where St Margaret's Church is a local landmark building. This would be a substantially different experience with the construction of the proposed development.
21. In terms of landscape and visual impact, the Beckford Road site and the current appeal site can be distinguished on their own facts. The Beckford Road inspector considered that those proposals would not alter the character of Alderton as they were within the overall pattern of development along Beckford Road, a factor which was considered to mitigate the 'bolt-on' location of the scheme. Additionally, Alderton's character was not considered to be altered in views from within the AONB or from the SLA. The same cannot be said for the appeal site where the location is counter to the pattern of the settlement and does not benefit from the mitigating factors attributed to Beckford Road.

⁷ Landscape and visual sensitivity study, Toby Jones Assoc., November 2014, paragraph 3.3 (Document 17)

⁸ Core Document B16 LVIA Para 7.27, Receptor 13

22. The extent of this impact would be dependent on the viewpoint and distance from the appeal site. Although there would be visual creep towards the B4077, the site when viewed from greater distances from the south west, south and south east, (such as from Viewpoints D, 10 and 14) would have a lesser effect on the SLA and setting of the AONB as the development would be seen as part of the settlement envelope. Additionally landscaping proposals would mitigate the harder edges of the development over time. When viewed from the north (Viewpoint 11), the site would be largely assimilated in the visual impact of the settlement due to the village being in the foreground.
23. Alderton itself would retain the character and appearance of a rural village nestled within an open, agricultural landscape. The development would not, therefore, detract significantly from the quiet enjoyment of walkers using the public rights of way when viewed from longer distances away from the site. However, from closer public viewpoints, such as from points on the Winchcombe Way on the edge of the village or when approaching the site from the south and south east, the proposed development would change the overall experience for those walking through the countryside due to the loss of open pasture and the introduction of built development. I consider that this would cause significant harm.
24. The appeal site makes an important contribution to the foreground setting of the AONB and, for the reasons set out above; I consider that the proposed development would be detrimental to its setting. It would result in the loss of what is currently an open, arable field and its replacement with built development and associated human activity. This would have an adverse effect on the rural quality of the landscape adjoining the southern edge of Alderton, increasing the extent of the built-up part of the settlement at the expense of the surrounding open countryside. In these terms, the proposed development would conflict with the Policy LND2 requirement to have no adverse effect upon the quality of the natural environment but as referred to earlier I do not attach the same degree of weight to this aspect of the policy as I do in respect of the first part of the policy requiring special attention being accorded to the protection and enhancement on the SLA.
25. In summary, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, through the loss of a long, rectangular open pasture field, leaving a smaller one uncharacteristic of either the AONB or SLA. It would lead to the extension of the built-up part of the settlement into the adjoining countryside and affect the setting of the AONB. This would conflict with paragraph 109 of the Framework and with the aims of Policy LND2 of the Local Plan, and this would represent an adverse impact that will need to be weighed in the overall planning balance.

Effect on the Village and on the Community

26. Alderton is a healthy vibrant community that is valued by its residents, where about one half of households have resided for over 20 years. It is also a village in which its residents are engaged in matters of community interest and this is evident through their involvement in the Service Village Forum which supports the JCS evidence base and through the carrying out of surveys, a Village Design Statement and in the preparation of the emerging Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan (ANDP). There is also a wide range of clubs and associations.

27. The Parish Council and local residents were present at the inquiry and provided a balanced approach in expressing their concerns. It was clearly evident from their contributions that they place a high value on maintaining and planning for their community and they are very much concerned over the cumulative effect that the appeal scheme would have following on from the Beckford Road development (and other schemes that may not have been determined finally).
28. In allowing the Beckford Road development, the inspector recognised the concerns of APC that the scheme may set a precedent for others⁹ but she made it clear that her decision should not be interpreted as a finding that Alderton is necessarily a sustainable location for any further residential development. She went on to say that 'Substantially increasing the number of dwellings in a settlement without proportionate increases in infrastructure, employment opportunities and other local services risks eroding community cohesion, and the fact that 47 dwellings have now been allowed on appeal will be a consideration to be weighed in the balance when considering any future proposals'.
29. The appeal proposal makes contributions through the planning obligations towards education, libraries, highways, open space, allotments, health, dog bins, sports facilities and affordable housing. These contributions would provide proportionate increases in infrastructure and would be benefits of the scheme. However there was disagreement between appellant and the Chair of the Governors of the Oak Hill Primary School regarding the pupil forecast as identified by the County Council, a matter that was left unresolved at the inquiry, but there was no evidence of weight to suggest that the viability of the school would be threatened in the absence of the appeal scheme.
30. No permanent employment would be provided through the scheme although it would provide jobs on the site through the construction phase and perhaps assist in the viability of a few local jobs in the area in the longer term. However, community cohesion goes beyond this in a small rural settlement. Also of significance is the capacity for the settlement and the community to accept the impacts that a rate of change for the construction of 107 houses would have over a relatively short period of time in a settlement of only 265 dwellings. Alderton has grown organically and slowly over a long period of time and its physical character would change as a result of the major development that would arise from the Beckford Road scheme and the appeal proposals which, together, would represent a 39% increase in the number of dwellings. Alderton would appear more suburbanised and less of a rural settlement and it would be adversely affected as a consequence.
31. The Framework at paragraph 7 recognises that sustainable development includes a social role that planning performs and Section 8 sets out how healthy communities can be promoted. Mr Smith, on behalf of the Council, made reference to various studies on social cohesion and sustainability and to factors relevant to an assessment. Whilst this provided a useful background, its application to a small rural settlement was limited although the sense of identity of a place was aptly summarised as being '...rooted in history, in local celebrations, the stories people tell about the area, and in regular local events. These build up over time. When new large-scale housing developments are built, the sense of place cannot be defined by its shared history. New residents

⁹ Para 76 APP/G1630/A/13/2209001

will not know others, and, in the early stages, there will be few social connections.¹⁰

32. At the inquiry there was considerable discussion about the age profile of Alderton. Whilst the proposed development would accommodate younger households and assist in bringing the population profile more into balance, no doubt the Beckford Road proposals would go some way towards achieving this.
33. Apart from the physical changes that would occur, I recognise that a sizeable expansion of the village could take the community some time to adapt to and there could be adverse consequences for the social and cultural wellbeing of existing residents, as recognised in an appeal in Devon¹¹. I recognise that, as in other cases elsewhere, there is a danger that potential adverse impacts of new housing on an existing community is a consideration that needs to be weighed in the overall planning balance. This goes beyond a community's natural resistance to change. Indeed, the APC has indicated that a number of residents would sell up and leave the village because Alderton would no longer be a quiet rural village.
34. The appellant referred to an appeal decision at Stoke Orchard¹² where the impact of further housing development on social cohesion in the village was not considered to be materially affected. However, I do not consider that the Alderton proposals are comparable to the situation in Stoke Orchard as that village has recently experienced substantial expansion arising from a brownfield site redevelopment.
35. I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would have a disproportionate effect on the village in terms of the cumulative impact of development and also on the social wellbeing of the community, which I consider would be harmful.

Sustainable Development

36. It is common ground that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land in the terms set out in the Framework. The Council and the appellant's estimates vary slightly due to the way the buffer is applied. The housing land supply calculated against the South West RSS requirement, gives a supply of 2.5 years (appellant's figure) or 2.7 years; and similarly, in calculating supply against the Pre-Submission JCS requirements, figures of 3.7 years (appellant's figure) and 3.9 years supply are estimated¹³.
37. The CPRE¹⁴ and a local resident¹⁵ disagreed with the estimated assessments of supply but neither of their approaches accord with the approach to calculations of housing need and supply contained in the Framework at paragraph 47 or in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). Mr Crofts, on behalf of the CPRE, argued that the future release of Green Belt sites should be included in the calculation of housing land supply. However this approach was withdrawn under cross examination as it was accepted that it is only via the development plan process that such sites should be released for development.

¹⁰ Page 32, Design for Social Sustainability Document F2

¹¹ Core Document D2 APP/U1105/A/13/2191905, Feniton, Devon

¹² Document 37 APP/G1630/A/14/2223858 Stoke Orchard, Nr Tewksbury

¹³ SoCG Addendum

¹⁴ Document 19

¹⁵ Document 31

38. In the absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, paragraph 49 of the Framework indicates that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date, which, in this appeal, relates to saved Policy HOU4 of the Tewkesbury Local Plan 2006 which seeks to restrict residential development outside the designated development boundaries of settlements. This means that the location of the appeal site outside Alderton's settlement boundary is not a reason to refuse planning permission for the scheme but that the scheme should be assessed in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Framework. This sets out that at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision-taking, this means that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of a development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or where specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted, with footnote 9 giving examples of such policies.
39. Mr Crofts also sought to argue that the *William Davis*¹⁶ judgement requires an assessment of sustainability prior to the application of paragraph 14 of the NPPF but this was not the view taken in the later *Dartford*¹⁷ judgement which indicates that there is nothing in the Framework, whether at paragraphs 7 or 14, which sets out a sequential approach.
40. Concern was expressed by the APC that a decision on the appeal should wait for the publication of the JCS and the ANDP. They have relied on the Government's localism agenda in support of this approach and on the core principal of the Framework for planning to be community led. APC recognises that there will be a need for further housing development in the village but that this should be provided as smaller schemes on other sites. They anticipate that the emerging plans would identify Alderton's allocation to be between 40-48 dwellings up to 203, of which 47 have already been committed.
41. However, such estimates would be premature as the headline figure for objectively assessed housing need within the terms of policy SP1 of the JCS could, according to the appellant, be substantially higher and, because of constraints elsewhere, it is possible that the service villages, of which Alderton is one, would need to accommodate more housing than the 752 units currently envisaged in Policy SP2 of the Submission JCS. I note that this is a reduction of the 880 dwellings that would need to be accommodated in the service villages as set out in the Pre-Submission JCS. These changing figures demonstrate why, in view of the current status of the plan, I cannot attach any more than limited weight to current estimates of future growth that may need to be accommodated in Alderton, including Mr Rainey's original contention that Alderton would need to accommodate 130 dwellings over the plan period.
42. Notwithstanding the considerable work that has already been undertaken on the ANDP, it is still at an early stage as a draft of the plan is not yet available and the process of formal consultation has yet to take place. Consequently, although it is a material consideration, I can only attach very limited weight to it at the present time. Whilst I appreciate that expectations will be let down by this approach, it is the approach set down at paragraph 216 in the Framework

¹⁶ *William Davis Ltd, Jelson Ltd v SSCLG*, NW Leicestershire DC [2013] EWHC 3058 (Admin)

¹⁷ *Paragraphs 54 and 55 Dartford v SSCLG, Landhold Capital Ltd* [2014] EWHC 2636 (Admin)

- where the weight attached to a plan increases as it progresses through the various stages of preparation and approval.
43. Turning to the three dimensions of sustainable development, the proposed scheme would lead to a number of benefits such as the jobs created through the construction process, the economic output, additional consumer expenditure, a New Homes Bonus payment and additional Council Tax payments. Whilst some of these economic benefits would not necessarily be directly enjoyed by the local community, they would benefit the wider area.
 44. Whilst the affordable housing provision would be a social benefit it is not necessary, nor in my view desirable, for the affordable housing needs of the wider area all to be provided in Alderton, as I would anticipate the Beckford Road scheme to meet some of this need with the provision of the remainder taking place elsewhere, in response to the policies in the JCS when adopted, or through the development management or neighbourhood planning process. Other elements of the scheme such as a children's play area and public open space would also provide social benefits. However there would be adverse affects on social cohesion arising from the cumulative amount of residential development at Beckford Road and the appeal site.
 45. Alderton is an accessible location within the rural area with a range of day-to-day services and it is designated as a service village in the Submission JCS. It has reasonable accessibility being close to the B4077 and has a limited bus service. However, despite this, I have found that there would be some adverse effects resulting from the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area through the extension of the built-up part of the settlement into the adjoining countryside which would affect the setting of the AONB, thus having a negative impact on the environmental dimension of sustainability.
 46. I conclude on this issue that whilst the provision of additional housing is a significant benefit, when taking account of all relevant factors the proposed development would not represent sustainable development in the context of the Framework.

Other Matters

47. A local resident expressed concern over the safety of the highway network and in particular, to traffic accidents that have occurred on the B4077. However highway assessments in relation to the proposed scheme have not led the highway authority to consider that the traffic generation arising from the proposed scheme would be unacceptable in highway safety terms and there is no reason why I should not reach the same conclusion.
48. A flood risk assessment has been submitted and found to be acceptable and this and other matters such as ecology, archaeology and residential amenity do not raise issues that could not be resolved through the imposition of appropriate conditions if I were to be minded to allow the proposals.
49. The occupant of Lower Farm raised issues in relation to the maintenance of access to the farm. The scheme provides continued access to Lower Farm but the occupants concerns appear to relate to matters of a private interest.
50. I have considered the contributions set out in both of the planning obligations and consider that all of these satisfy Regulation 122 of the Community

Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 and are necessary, directly relevant, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development in question.

The planning balance and conclusion

51. I have found that in the absence of a five year supply of deliverable housing land, the Framework gives support for the scheme to which I attach significant weight. However, against this must be balanced the harm that the development would cause.
52. I have found harm in terms of the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area as it would lead to the extension of the built-up part of the settlement into the adjoining countryside and affect the setting of the AONB. This would conflict with the aims of Policy LND2 of the Local Plan and the Framework. This is an adverse impact to which I attach considerable weight.
53. I also found that that the proposed development would have a disproportionate effect on the village in terms of the cumulative impact of development and also on the social wellbeing of the community. I attach significant weight to the harm that would arise.
54. The totality of the harm I have identified is not clearly outweighed by the social or economic benefits of the development, including the supply of new housing, both market and affordable.
55. In the context of the Framework taken as a whole, the adverse impacts of the proposed development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Accordingly, the proposal would not represent sustainable development for which a presumption in favour should apply.
56. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all matters that have been raised, including all the decisions elsewhere referred to by the parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P N Jarratt

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY: Miss Sarah Reid of Counsel instructed by the Borough Solicitor

She called	
Paul Smith BA(Hons) Dip DesBltEnvnt MRTPI	Chartered Town Planner Sole, Practitioner
James Overall BA(Hons) CMLI	Chartered Landscape Architect, Ovelier Consultants

FOR THE APPELLANT: Peter Goatley of Counsel instructed by Pegasus Planning Group Ltd

He called	
Andrew Cook BA(Hons) MLD CMLI MIEMA CEnv	Director, Pegasus Planning Group Ltd
Jonathan Rainey BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Planner, Pegasus Planning Group Ltd

FOR ALDERTON PARISH COUNCIL: Matthew Clayton, Barry Sear and Becky Parish

They called	
Becky Parish	Local resident
Iain Armishaw	Local resident
Holley Lockley	Local resident
Barry Sear	Local resident
Mike West	Local resident
Jane Hamilton	Local resident
Andrew Cocks	Parish Councillor, Chairman of the Service Village Forum

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Robert Jones	Local resident
Caroline Page	Local resident
Emerys Knight	Local resident
John Appleton	Local resident
Mike Newman	Church Warden
Nigel Roe	Chair of Governors of Oak Hill School
Dr D Shepherd	Local resident
Jessica Shepherd	Local resident
David Crofts	Planning Consultant on behalf of the CPRE

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Draft s106 agreement with the county council (appellant)
- 2 Draft s106 agreement with the borough council (appellant)
- 3 CD C4: Policy SP2 (TBC)
- 4 CD F2: Design for Social Sustainability (TBC)
- 5 CD F3: Creating Strong Communities (TBC)
- 6 CD D3: Land at Handcross, Mid Sussex (appellant)
- 7 ANDP summary of work to date (APC)
- 8 Appeal decision 2199166 Upton upon Severn (APC)
- 9 Appeal decision 2189451 Sayers Common, West Sussex (APC)
- 10 Appeal decision 2183317 Winchcombe (appellant)
- 11 Appeal decision 2209980 Blofield, Norwich (appellant)
- 12 Appeal decision 2222311 West Haddon, Northants (appellant)
- 13 Table detailing corresponding photographs (TBC)
- 14 Opening submissions by the appellant
- 15 Opening submissions by APC
- 16 Opening submissions by the Council
- 17 Landscape and Visual Sensitivity Study Toby Jones Assoc., Nov 2014 (APC)
- 18 Alderton Matters Report A Counts (TBC)
- 19 Statement and Summary Statement (CPRE)
- 20 Drawing ref BRS.3055_20-C (TBC)
- 21 Document bundle of CPRE correspondence (TBC)
- 22 ANDP Statement on behalf of Alderton residents (TBC)
- 23 Statement by Mike West on behalf of APC – housing and infrastructure
- 24 Statement by Ian Armishaw on behalf of APC – vitality, social wellbeing and sustainable living
- 25 Statement by Jane Hamilton on behalf of APC – visual impact
- 26 Statement by Andrew Cocks on behalf of APC – Service Village Forum
- 27 Alderton Matters – questionnaire, October 2014 (APC)
- 28 Questionnaire response spreadsheet, October 2014 (APC)
- 29 Photographs of damage to road verges (APC)
- 30 Statement by Caroline Page, local resident

- 31 Statement by Emerys Knight, local resident
- 32 Statement by John Appleton, local resident
- 33 Statement by Mike Newman, Church Warden
- 34 Statement by Nigel Roe, Chair of Governors of Oak Hill School, and statistical first release DoE National Pupil Projections
- 35 Extract from JCS evidence base (appellant)
- 36 Superseded development plan policies and proposals (TBC)
- 37 Appeal decision 2223858 Stoke Orchard, Nr Tewksbury (appellant)
- 38 Revised list of conditions (TBC)
- 39 S106 Heads of Terms (appellant)
- 40 Executed s106 agreement with Gloucestershire County Council (appellant)
- 41 Closing submissions on behalf of APC by Holly Lockley
- 42 Colman and SSCLG and North Devon DC and RWE NPower [2013] EWHC 1138 (Admin)(appellant)
- 43 Dartford BC v SSCLG and Landhold Capital Ltd [2014] EWHC 2636 (Admin) (appellant)
- 44 Extract from appeal decision 2199085 and 2199426 Droitwich Spa (appellant)
- 45 Executed s106 agreement with TBC (TBC)
- 46 Closing submissions by the Council
- 47 Closing submissions by the appellant