



PLANNING STATEMENT

**LOWER FARM, BLACKSMITH ROAD, ALDERTON, GL20 8NN | JANUARY 2021**

*Permission in Principle application for the erection of up to 4no. infill dwellings with associated access and landscaping*



## Contents

1.0	Introduction and Site Context	1
2.0	Planning History	5
3.0	Permission in Principle	6
4.0	Conclusion	17
	Appendix A	18
	Appendix B	32
	Appendix C	37
	Appendix D	44
	Appendix E	51

---

*The contents of this report must not be copied or reproduced in part or in whole without the express written consent of SF Planning Limited*

## 1.0 Introduction and Site Context

- 1.1 This application is submitted on behalf of our client, [REDACTED] (the applicant) and seeks permission in principle (PiP) for the development of up to 4no. dwellings on land off Lower Farm, Blacksmiths Road, Alderton, GL20 8NN (the site).
- 1.2 This application seeks confirmation that the proposals are acceptable in principle, taking into account policy considerations and other matters affecting the site insofar as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is entitled to consider those matters under an application for PiP.

### Site Context and Proposed Development

- 1.3 The application site is located on the southern edge of the village of Alderton and sits between St Margarets Drive and Blacksmith Road. It currently comprises an undeveloped tract of land bordered on three of its four sides (to the north, east and west) by built development and is therefore well-related to the existing settlement pattern. The proposal is for 4no. detached dwellings, with associated access, parking and gardens.



Figure 1: Site location

- 1.4 The site sits outside of, but immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Alderton (on three of the four sides of the site), as shown on the Alderton Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) policies map below.



Figure 2: Alderton NDP Policies map

- 1.5 The village benefits from a number of everyday local services including a shop, public house, village hall, primary school, church, and guest houses, all of which are within walking distance of the Site (see Figure 2 above). Bus stops are also located in close proximity along Blacksmith Road and Willow Bank Road, providing regular services to Cheltenham, Tewkesbury, Chipping Campden and surrounding settlements, where a wider range of services and employment opportunities are available. The site is therefore in a demonstrably sustainable location and conducive to sustainable modes of travel.
- 1.6 The site is also in proximity to a number of heritage assets, albeit the council had no concerns with a larger appeal scheme (ref. 13/00734/OUT, see below) with regard to heritage impact. Nevertheless, due consideration will be given to the design and layout of the scheme at Technical Details Stage to respect their immediate setting.

1.7 In terms of any other 'constraints' the site is not within any major landscape designation but sits within a Special Landscape Area (SLA) and is in Flood Zone 1 on the EA Flood Map for Planning. Two Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) are located to the east and south-west of the site (as shown in the constraints map below), although it is considered these will be unaffected by the proposed scheme and public site lines (including to the church) will be unobstructed.



Figure 3: Constraints Map

1.8 It is considered the key views looking towards and away from the site will remain largely unaffected by the proposals (as shown in Figure 4). The scale and location of proposed development will enable it to be assimilated into the existing settlement pattern, rather than be viewed as a 'bolt on' to the village as was the case with the previous application. Furthermore, the supporting indicative layout plan shows the applicants intentions to further mitigate any visual impact through the incorporation a 'soft edge' to the south of the development and landscaped perimeters to the north and west.



Figure 4: Existing views looking to and from the application site

## 2.0 Planning History

2.1 The relevant planning history for this site is as outlined below:

- **13/00734/OUT** - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 60 no. 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. Demolition of 16 St. Margarets Drive. Decision – Refuse

2.2 A subsequent appeal (ref. APP/G1630/A/14/2222147) was dismissed in March 2015, with the Appeal Inspector finding harm caused by the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. This was because of the scale of the development which would have led to the extension of the built-up part of the settlement into the adjoining countryside and affect the setting of the AONB. It was also considered that the number of homes proposed would have a disproportionate effect on the village in terms of the cumulative impact of the development and on the social wellbeing of the community. A copy of the Appeal Decision is attached at Appendix A.

2.3 The applicant has borne in mind the findings of the above appeal decision and considers that the proposed development is not comparable in relation to size, and therefore clearly addresses the material concerns raised. In doing so, it provides the Council with an opportunity to approve a small-scale, sympathetically designed 'infill' scheme which will only serve to boost much needed local housing supply.

## 3.0 Permission in Principle

- 3.1 The Permission in Principle (PiP) route to obtaining permission came into force on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2018 and aims to provide a fast-track route through the planning process in order to speed up housing delivery. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) relating to permission in principle describes this consent route as an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical details. The permission in principle consent route has two stages. The first stage (PiP as per this application) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second (technical details consent) stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed.
- 3.2 A decision on whether to grant permission to a site following a valid PiP application must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan unless there are material considerations, such as those in the NPPF and national guidance, which indicate otherwise. The scope of PiP is limited to location, land use and amount of development. Issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters should be considered at the PiP stage. Other matters should be considered at the Technical Details Consent (TDC) stage. It is worth noting that local authorities cannot list the information they require for applications (validation checklist) for PiP in the same way they can for applications for full planning permission. The timescale for the determination of a permission in principle application is 5 weeks from the day the council has received a valid application.

### **Planning Policy Justification**

- 3.3 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. To therefore assess the acceptability of this proposal, it is necessary to consider it against the adopted development plan, in this case the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). Moderate weight should also be given to the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan, insofar as it might be relevant to this proposal.



- 3.4 It is also necessary to take account of any material considerations relevant to the development proposals such as national planning policy contained within the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and national planning guidance contained within Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), as well as locally adopted supplementary planning guidance (SPG) and documents (SPD).

***Principle of development***

- 3.5 Policy SP2 of the JCS sets out the spatial strategy for the area, identifying a hierarchy of settlements to which development will be directed with the aim of achieving sustainable development. Table SP2c sets out the settlement hierarchy for the area, of which Alderton is identified as a 'service village'.
- 3.6 Policy SP2 goes on to say at criterion 5 that *"Rural service centres and service villages as identified in Table SP2c below will accommodate levels of development to be allocated through the Tewkesbury Borough Plan and Neighbourhood Plans, proportional to their size and function, and also reflecting their proximity and accessibility to Cheltenham and Gloucester and taking into account the environmental, economic and social impacts including existing levels of growth over the plan period. Over the plan period to 2031:*
- ii. service villages will accommodate in the order of 880 new homes."*
- 3.7 For residential development, JCS Policy SD10 sets out that *"Within the JCS area, new housing will be planned in order to deliver the scale and distribution of housing development set out in Policies SP1 and SP2"*.
- 3.8 Criterion 4 of Policy SD10 states that on other sites housing development will only be permitted where it meets one of four exceptions:
- i. It is for affordable housing on a rural exception site in accordance with Policy SD12, or;*
  - ii. It is infilling within the existing built up areas of the City of Gloucester, the Principle Urban Area of Cheltenham or Tewkesbury Borough's towns and villages except where otherwise restricted by policies within District plans, or;*
  - iii. It is brought forward through Community Right to Build Orders, or;*
  - iv. There are other specific exceptions / circumstances defined in district or neighbourhood.*

3.9 In relation to whether or not the site could be considered appropriate 'in principle' relative to whether or not its development would constitute 'infilling', the definition of infill development set out at paragraph 4.10.5 of the JCS is as follows:

*"For the purpose of this policy [i.e. Policy SD10 (4.ii)], infill development means the development of an under-developed plot well related to existing built development"*

3.10 The Site is well related to existing building development which borders three of its four sides, it is also in close proximity to all local services and amenities within the village. It is noted that the definition sets no parameters on the type of 'existing built development'; and therefore, all forms should be considered. The site is also 'under-developed' given that it has no development on it but is otherwise very well related to the existing settlement pattern around it. It is thus considered that the application site meets the definition of infill development and is therefore policy SD10 compliant.



Figure 5: Application site with development to north, east and west

3.11 Furthermore, the scale of the proposal is considered consistent with the general pattern and character of more recently approved development in Alderton, which comprises small infill sites and edge of village schemes, as was confirmed in the previous Appeal Decision. It is therefore submitted that the Proposed Development will clearly contribute to the organic matter in which housing at Alderton has developed over the years, and in a way that does not lead to the coalescence of

Alderton and Lower Farm, nor impact on the AONB, as was the case in the previous application.

- 3.12 It is also noted that paragraph 4.10.5 of the JCS goes on to state, "*additional special circumstances where housing may be acceptable are listed in NPPF paragraph 55.*" Paragraph 55 of the 2012 version of the NPPF has now been superseded by paragraphs 78 and 79 of the February 2019 version of the NPPF. Paragraph 78 of the NPPF is clear that, "*To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.*" The future occupation of the dwellings will therefore assist in maintaining the vitality of this rural community.
- 3.13 Policy H1 of the Alderton NDP relates to new housing in Alderton and states that within the settlement boundary, small windfall development will be supported together with infill housing development of 1-2 dwellings within existing built-up frontages when it is consistent with the scale, proportion and density of existing houses and gardens in the adjacent area. It goes on to state that "*in the event that a future development plan identifies an additional need for further housing development in Alderton (as a service village), beyond what is being accommodated within the settlement boundary, then sites outside the boundary will be considered in line with the other policies of the plan.*"
- 3.14 Notwithstanding the above, emerging Borough Plan Policy RES3 states that outside defined settlement boundaries the principle of new residential development will be considered acceptable where development is very small-scale development at rural settlements in accordance with Policy RES4.
- 3.15 Although Policy RES4 appears to be aimed at settlements other than service villages, Policy RES3 is not so specific and allows for small-scale development in rural settlements (Alderton is a settlement in a rural area) and therefore it is arguable the criteria of RES4 apply:
- *It is of a scale and function that is proportionate to the size and function of the settlement and maintains or enhances sustainable patterns of development;*
  - *It does not have an adverse cumulative impact of the settlement having regard to other developments permitted during the plans period; as a general rule no more than 5% growth or 10 dwellings, whichever is lesser will be allowed;*

- *It complements the form of the settlement and is well related to existing buildings within the settlement;*
- *The site of the proposed development is not of significant amenity value or makes a significant contribution to the character and setting of the settlement in its underdeveloped state;*
- *The proposals would not result in the coalescence of settlements;*
- *The site is not located in the Green Belt, unless the proposals would involve limited infilling in a village, limited affordable housing for local community need (in accordance with Policy RES6) or any other exceptions explicitly stated within the NPPF.*

3.16 The proposed development is considered well related to the existing settlement pattern and consistent with recent approvals. Moreover, the addition of 4no. 'infill' dwellings is considered 'very small-scale' development, proportionate to the site and its immediate setting.

3.17 Policy RES5 states that new development should be of a design and layout that respects the character, appearance and amenity of the surrounding area and capable of being well integrated into it. When an edge of settlement site is proposed, it should respect the form of the settlement and its landscape setting. This would be more appropriately considered at the Technical Details Stage.

#### ***Five-year supply of housing***

3.18 Without prejudice to the case as set out above (i.e. that development here is policy compliant, and therefore acceptable in principle), it is recognised by the council that it does not have a five year housing land supply (5YHLS). The NPPF clarifies (ref. footnote 7) that planning policies for housing will be considered to be out of date where the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.

3.19 The latest available information from the council calculates the 5YHLS to be 4.35yrs (December 2020), which represents a shortfall of approximately 186 dwellings. However, this figure has been the subject of a number of appeal decisions.

- 3.20 The Secretary of State (SoS) in the Highnam appeal did not consider it appropriate to use the previous oversupply to offset future 5YHLS figures. Although TBC challenged the Inspector's approach, the High Court did not find the Highnam appeal decision to be legally flawed. Accordingly, the Highnam appeal remains valid and the Inspector's approach in this appeal is therefore relevant to the means by which the council calculate their 5YHLS. Moreover, recently revised planning practice guidance does not advocate the approach suggested by TBC.
- 3.21 The Highnam appeal discounts approximately 700 units 'oversupply' from the land supply that Tewkesbury Borough Council calculated within its figures. The planning Inspector's report discounts 171 dwellings from 5YHLS from sites deemed undeliverable in 5 yrs and finally it adds a 5% buffer to delivery to factor in old undersupply and future growth, so from 495 to 520. The planning Inspector's report for the Highnam appeal concluded that the council could only demonstrate a 3.66 5YHLS figure and as such there is a shortfall of approximately 695 dwellings. The SoS agreed with his Inspector's findings in this regard.
- 3.22 Furthermore, in the statement of common ground for Land at Fiddington, Ashchurch (ref. 17/00520/OUT) it is noted that the 5YHLS figure was considered to be less than that stated above. Under section 'Housing Land Supply' (paragraph 8.6) the statement of common ground states that *"if the approach to land supply as recently endorsed by the SoS in the Highnam appeal is adopted then using the Councils figures it is able to demonstrate a 2.77 year land supply"*.
- 3.23 This is further updated through the recent appeal decision for Land at Gotherington (ref. PP/G1630/W/20/3256319) whereby the Appeal Inspector found, at paragraph 73, that *"Considering my conclusions on the additional supply and the disputed sites, the housing land supply would reduce to 1.82 years. This reflects the appellant's conclusions. Additionally, the lack of supply beyond year 3 is deeply concerning; and, even if I had taken account of the additional supply, the Council would still not have a 5 year housing land supply and the past trend of additional supply is not projected to continue."*
- 3.24 It is clear that the council at this time, which ever approach is taken, cannot adequately demonstrate a 5YHLS. If the surplus is not taken into account (which should be the case following all relevant material considerations including an appeal decision and the PPG) the council cannot demonstrate a 3 year housing land supply either.

- 3.25 Paragraph 11d of the NPPF should therefore be used in the determination of this application should the council disagree with the applicant's conclusions relating to compliance with policy SD10. Paragraph 11d confirms that the presumption to permit is engaged unless any adverse impacts of a development proposal significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. In this respect there is an absence of any adverse impacts, and even if there were any, they would not be capable of meeting the 'high bar' of significantly and demonstrably outweighing the benefits of providing a dwelling in a sustainable location, well related to the existing settlement pattern and immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary for Alderton.
- 3.26 Paragraph 68 of the NPPF is also relevant in this regard, with emphasis placed on the importance of small and medium sites for housing as they can make an important contribution to local housing requirements and are often built out relatively quickly. As such, Councils are encouraged to support the development of windfall sites, giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes.
- 3.27 Additionally, paragraphs 73-76 of the NPPF sets out requirements to;
- i. Demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing with an appropriate buffer; and*
  - ii. Monitor progress in building out sites and to prepare an action plan where delivery falls below 95%.*
- 3.28 It is further considered that the existence of an adopted neighbourhood plan in Alderton does not change the conclusion that the adverse impacts of the development would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, taking into account paragraph 14 of the NPPF. This is because not all the criteria in this paragraph have been satisfied; the plan was adopted over 2 years ago as well as the arguable case that the council does not have a three-year housing land supply. In addition, the council's latest housing needs assessment has demonstrated that the council has an increased housing need compared to what was taken into account when the neighbourhood plan was prepared (that was in any event based on JCS figures and the JCS is under review). This makes the neighbourhood plan and the evidence in relation to it out of date.

- 3.29 The Proposed Development would contribute to housing supply (albeit in a relatively small way, it would be delivered quickly – unlike a large site) and it is therefore important that the council continues to grant planning permission for housing in suitable locations such as this one, despite being immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary, to ensure that the above targets are met.

**Precedent analysis**

- 3.30 Furthermore, the proposal is considered comparable to the following applications which were deemed acceptable despite being outside of development boundaries in service and large villages.

**Land off Blackmore Lane, Maisemore**

- 3.31 An application (Ref. 20/00769/PIP) for 1no. infill dwelling was granted in September 2020, with the Delegated Report (see Appendix B) concluding that:  
*“Policy RES2 of the emerging Borough Plan defines settlement boundaries for the Service Villages, which includes Maisemore. The proposed settlement boundary cuts through the garden of Field House, and excludes the application site. However, whilst outside of the proposed settlement boundary, the application site is well contained by existing vegetation on the boundaries and it well related to existing property. Moreover, the site is well related to a parcel of land to the south east where Members have recently resolved to grant outline permission for up to 8 houses subject to the completion of a S106. It would also be well related to a further dwelling located to the rear of Field House, which is currently under construction. It is therefore considered that despite sitting just outside of the proposed settlement boundary, the proposal represents infilling in the context of Policy SD10 and the location for this development is acceptable. In any event, given the stage of the Borough Plan and the level of unresolved objections to Policy RES2, the weight that can be afforded to the proposed settlement boundaries is considered to be limited at this point in time.”*

**Land northwest of Westview, Apperley**

- 3.32 This application (ref. 19/00791/PIP) was for 1no. infill dwelling on land to the northwest of Westview, a small residential cul-de-sav located on the western edge of Apperley. Similar to this proposed application, the site was adjoined by residential development to the north and east and agricultural buildings/stables to the west, with open countryside to the south.

3.33 The Delegated Report (see Appendix C) sets out (at para 6.3) that "While the application site lies outside of the previously defined village boundary and conflicts with Policy SD10, it would however be adjoined on three sides by existing development and the site itself is undeveloped." It goes on to say under 'Harms' at the second paragraph 6.3 that "The proposal conflicts with development plan policies relating to housing. Nevertheless, the council's policies for housing are out of date as explained above. Further, the development would encroach into the open countryside and have an impact albeit limited upon the LPZ. However the impacts would be tempered by the fact that the site is adjoined on 3 sides by existing built development."

3.34 The Delegated Report concluded "In consideration of the above, and in light of the 'tilted balance' whilst the benefits of the proposal are somewhat limited, given the scale of the development, it is however considered that the proposal is well related to the existing built development in of the village and local services which are accessible on foot. It considered that the adverse impacts would not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole."

**Gabb Lane, Apperley**

3.35 An application (Ref. 19/00944/PIP) for the erection of 1 no. dwelling was granted in November 2020, on a parcel of pasture land adjacent to Gabb Lane, Apperley. The site was bound by existing development to the east and to the south along Gabb Lane, with a water treatment works to the north west.

3.36 In assessing the proposed development against the provisions of JCS Policy SD10, the Delegated Report (see Appendix D) considered that "When viewed in plan form, despite being excluded from the previous settlement boundary for Apperley, the site appears to be well contained to the east and south west by existing residential development. Where views into the site are obtained from Gabb Lane, the land reads as an integral part of the surrounding countryside as your eyes are drawn in a north westerly direction towards an open rolling landscape. Views towards the north east of the site from Gabb Lane feel much more contained as the plot tapers.

3.37 It goes on to say that "Whilst there are long distant views towards the surrounding countryside from the existing access, the site itself, is well contained within the tapered part of the land where it meets the existing settlement edge. It is therefore considered that a single dwelling could be provided on the land, whilst having an acceptable impact on the landscape. Moreover, any dwelling could be designed to



*respond to the contours of the site, which could further mitigate any potential adverse visual impacts.” This is not dissimilar to the application site, and the provision of a small-scale residential development is considered contextual and concordant to the immediate setting and surrounding development.*

- 3.38 The Delegated Report concluded that *“It is considered that the site does not represent ‘infilling’ in the context of Policy SD10 of the JCS and is therefore contrary to the development plan in this respect. However, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites and therefore the ‘tilted balance’ is engaged in accordance with paragraph 11(d) of the Framework. It is also material that policy RET4 of the emerging Tewkesbury Borough Plan to 2031 supports this type of development in principle. In light of the above, it is considered that there would not be any adverse impact that would significant or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme, subject to securing appropriate details at the technical detail stage.*

**Land off Ashmead Drive, Gotherington**

- 3.39 A recent appeal was allowed (ref. APP/G1630/W/20/3256319) and planning permission granted for an outline planning application for the erection of up to 50 dwellings on land to the south of Gotherington’s settlement boundary (see Appendix E). The site is an open field with existing residential development influencing the northern and eastern boundaries of the site and agricultural fields extending to the south.
- 3.40 Whilst the Appeal Inspector acknowledged that the proposal would conflict with the spatial strategy of the area and the development policies set out in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), the Inspector concluded at paragraph 41 of the appeal decision that *“Given its location adjacent to the settlement boundary, the relatively enclosed nature of the site and its limited contribution to the SLA; development of the site would not appear as a significant encroachment into the surrounding rural landscape that could be considered as harmful or disproportionate. The gap between villages would be maintained and the linear nature of Gotherington would not be adversely affected.”*
- 3.41 The Appeal Inspector goes on to say at paragraph 90 of the decision that *“given my conclusions on the housing land supply, the policies which govern the spatial strategy and housing development in the area are deemed out of date by Framework paragraph 11 d). Because of the very poor housing land supply position, this indicates that the spatial strategy is not effective and therefore these*

*policies are of limited weight” and concludes at paragraph 94 that “Taking account of all the above, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As such, the material considerations indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.”*

## 4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 Applications for PiP are to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This statement has demonstrated that, as far as the matters against which PiP applications may be assessed (location, land use and amount) the proposal is entirely acceptable. There is no material harm arising from the principle of development and granting PiP, with the technical details to be resolved in due course, does not undermine the plan-led system.
- 4.2 The development of this infill plot is compliant with the adopted plan policies and should therefore be granted without delay. The proposal provides the opportunity to deliver much needed new homes, appropriate to the site and to a size appropriate to the current market. The site is suitable, available and development is achievable now; making a more effective use of the site.
- 4.3 There is an overwhelming case for permission in principle to be granted for the reasons set out above and in the other documentation supporting the application. Without prejudice to the above, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year housing supply of deliverable housing sites. The presumption in favour of sustainable development should therefore be applied in accordance with paragraph 11d of the NPPF. The minimal adverse impact of granting permission (i.e. the fact that it lies outside the settlement boundary) do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
- 4.4 As a result of the above, we trust this application for Permission in Principle will be granted without delay.

## Appendix A



## 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

[www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate](http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planninginspectorate)

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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 2014<sup>1</sup>. Permission was granted on appeal for 47 dwellings on land to the south of Beckford Road in May 2014 and construction has recently commenced<sup>2</sup> (the Beckford Road Development). An application for 24 dwellings at land east of Willow Bank Road was refused in September 2014<sup>3</sup> and an appeal has been lodged. An application for 53 dwellings west of Willow Bank Road was refused in December 2014<sup>4</sup>.
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

<sup>1</sup> Ref 13/01018/FUL

<sup>2</sup> APP/G1630/A/13/2209001

<sup>3</sup> Ref 14/00414/FUL

<sup>4</sup> Ref 14/00747/OUT

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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 Framework<sup>5</sup>. 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)<sup>6</sup> 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.

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

<sup>6</sup> Document C10

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

17. A recent study<sup>7</sup> 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'<sup>8</sup> 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.

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

<sup>8</sup> Core Document B16 LVIA Para 7.27, Receptor 13



Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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.

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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 others<sup>9</sup> 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

<sup>9</sup> Para 76 APP/G1630/A/13/2209001

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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

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 Devon<sup>11</sup>. 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 Orchard<sup>12</sup> 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 estimated<sup>13</sup>.
37. The CPRE<sup>14</sup> and a local resident<sup>15</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> Page 32, Design for Social Sustainability Document F2

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

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

<sup>13</sup> SoCG Addendum

<sup>14</sup> Document 19

<sup>15</sup> Document 31

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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*<sup>16</sup> 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*<sup>17</sup> 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

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

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

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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 effects 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

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

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

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

---

**APPEARANCES**

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

She called	
Paul Smith BA(Hons) Dip DesBltEnvr 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

Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

---

**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



Appeal Decision APP/G1630/A/14/2222147

---

- 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



12 ROYAL CRESCENT, CHELTENHAM, GLOUCESTERSHIRE GL50 3DA T: 01242 231575

 @SFPLANNINGLTD    INFO@SFPLANNING.CO.UK    WWW.SFPLANNING.CO.UK

REGISTERED NO: ENGLAND 06114677