The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 14 – 17 and 21 July 2015
Site visit made on 21 July 2015

by Gloria McFarlane LLB(Hons) BA(Hons) Solicitor (Non-practising)

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

Decision date: 27 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/C3105/W/14/3001612
Land off Lince Lane, Kirtlington, OX5 3HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Gladman Developments Limited against Cherwell District Council.
- The application Ref 14/01531/OUT, is dated 4 September 2014.
- The development proposed is the demolition of the existing bungalow and agricultural buildings and residential development of up to 95 dwellings including highway works, landscaping and Public Open Space.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is in outline with all matters other than access reserved for future applications. An illustrative only masterplan has been provided in the Design and Access Statement[1].

3. A completed planning obligation pursuant to s.106 of the 1990 Act was provided at the Inquiry and therefore the Council's second deemed reason for refusal, that is, that 'in the absence of a planning obligation infrastructure and affordable housing directly required as a result of the scheme would not be delivered' was no longer an issue in the appeal.

Main Issues

4. I consider that there are two main issues. The first is whether the proposed development would be appropriate having regard to the relevant Local Plan policies, the character, setting and the settlement pattern of Kirtlington and its location in the countryside. The second is whether the Council has a five year housing land supply, having regard to the housing requirement, the appropriate buffer, the application of the buffer to the shortfall, the Annual Monitoring Report 2014 and the delivery of housing.

[1] CD 1.4 Figure 33 page 30

The appeal site and context

5. The appeal site is a field of about 5.8 hectares located to the north and west of Lince Lane. It has a short frontage onto the road with a vehicular access in the southern corner. The site lies to the southwest of Kirtlington and is outside the settlement boundary. The site is bounded by Kirtlington Golf Club to the south and west, by pasture to the north and by houses on Oxford Close and Lince Lane to the east. There is a bungalow and a group of modern farm buildings in the southwest corner of the site known as Corner Farm. A public right of way runs north-south across the site, adjacent to the eastern boundary with Oxford Close, exiting onto Lince Lane in the south and Hatch Way at the north.

Chronology of relevant dates

31 January 2014	Emerging Cherwell Local Plan submitted for examination
4 June 2014	Examination adjourned because of concerns about housing delivery
4 September 2104	Application for outline permission for up to 95 houses (the subject of the appeal)
9-23 December 2014	Examination of Local Plan resumed
18 December 2014	Appeal made on the basis of non-determination
19 March 2015	Deemed reasons for refusal (referred to no five year housing land supply)
31 March 2015	Publication and approval of Annual Monitoring Report 2014
21 May 2015	Amended deemed reasons for refusal (referred to a five year housing land supply)
9 June 2015	Date of Local Plan Inspector's Report
13 July 2015	Inquiry opened
20 July 2015	Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (2015) adopted by the Council
21 July 2015	Inquiry closed

Reasoning

First issue: The appropriateness of the proposed development

Relevant Local Plan policies

6. The Local Plan Inspector addressed the strategy of the Local Plan with regard to the numerous villages and rural areas in the District as follows: "The plan's overall strategy focuses most new development on the two towns of Bicester and Banbury, with about 5,400 new homes in the rural areas, including at Kidlington and the former RAF Upper Heyford to 2013. This is clearly the most sustainable strategy for the district over the plan period and reflects the guidance in paragraphs 17 and 30 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It properly seeks to alter the local pattern of recent housing

growth, as a disproportionate percentage (almost half) has taken place in the smaller settlements, adding to commuting by car and congestion on the road network at peak hours. The number of new homes outside the two towns would be about a quarter of the overall total for the plan period taking into account the significant level of housing land supply already available in the rural areas"[2].

7. Policy Villages 1, where Kirtlington is designated as a Category A service village, advises that proposals for residential development within the built up limits will be considered for minor development, infilling and conversion. It was agreed at the Inquiry that the proposal does not fall within this policy because the site is outside the built up limits of the village and the proposal for up to 95 dwellings is not 'minor development'. The designation means that, so far as development within the built up area is concerned, Kirtlington is considered to be one of the most sustainable villages in the District[3].

8. Policy Villages 2 provides that a total of 750 homes will be delivered at Category A villages on new sites for 10 or more dwellings[4] and it was agreed at the Inquiry that 'at Category A villages' could mean adjacent to the settlement boundary. The Policy goes on to say that 'sites will be identified through the Local Plan Part 2, through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans where applicable, and through the determination of applications for planning permission' which means that the proposal is one that can properly be considered under the terms of Policy Villages 2 and the criteria that are set out therein.

9. The Parties agreed that the figure of 750 was not a ceiling or maximum but neither is it a minimum figure. The Local Plan Inspector referred to 'around 750 new homes in total'[5] and I note that a dictionary definition of 'total' which is the word used in the Policy and by the Local Plan Inspector is 'complete, comprising the whole, absolute, unqualified'[6] which seems to me to imply a limit of 750. Be that as it may, even if the figure of 750 is not a maximum or strict limit, any significant increase over and above 750 could lead to unconstrained growth which would result in non-compliance with the strategy for re-balancing housing growth away from the villages and rural areas.

10. The Housing Delivery Monitor appended to the Annual Monitoring Report 2014 (AMR) shows that 473 homes are expected from deliverable sites at Category A villages which results in 277 homes out of the 'total of 750' having to be delivered for the remaining 16 years of the plan period up to 2031; the proposal would reduce this to 182 homes over 16 years.

11. In referring to Policy Villages 1 the Local Plan Inspector said that "Most of the rural housing would be directed to the larger villages with existing services and facilities as the clearly more sustainable locations in accordance with paragraphs 28, 55 and 70 of the [Framework]"[7]. Mr Keen provided a table in which he set out the 23 Category A villages in order of their population size and allocated the 750 homes to them pro rata[8]. On his calculations Kirtlington,

[2] CD 9.4 paragraph 212
[3] CD 18 paragraph C.226
[4] CD 18 paragraph C.234a
[5] CD 9.4 paragraph 218
[6] The Concise Oxford Dictionary
[7] CD 9.4 paragraph 213
[8] Appendix B to Mr Keen's proof

which ranked 11th with a population of 988, would receive 17 homes. Whilst Kirtlington is designated as one of larger villages it is in the middle of that category and although development is not precluded, the size of the village in relation to others is a factor to take into account in the distribution of development.

12. I cannot speculate what might happen in the future with regard to such matters as where housing may be most needed or the numbers that may be required, but the indications are that the provision of 95 homes in one location at this early stage of the Local Plan period would leave little scope for development in the other Category A villages either in terms of numbers or timing and would thus not be in accordance with the housing strategy for the villages as set out in the Local Plan and addressed and confirmed by the Local Plan Inspector. In addition, the provision of 95 homes at Kirtlington would result in a significant increase in the population which would raise further matters which will be the subject of the following issue.

13. In my opinion similar issues with regard to housing development in the other villages would also arise even if there was no five year housing land supply and the Local Plan housing policies were not up-to-date because other strategies in the Local Plan with regard to such matters as employment, transport, public services and utilities would be undermined by unconstrained and unplanned growth. The provision of 95 homes in Kirtlington would, in my opinion, not be in compliance with the overall housing strategy in the Local Plan.

The character, setting and the settlement pattern of Kirtlington and its location in the countryside

14. The village lies on a slight ridge to the east of the River Cherwell about 13km north of Oxford. It is close to the junction of two landscape character areas as defined by the Countryside Design Summary, that is, the Cherwell Valley to the west and the Ploughley Limestone Plateau to the east.

15. The characteristics of the Cherwell Valley include a loose patchwork of fields with strong field patterns concentrated on steeply undulating land and close to villages; the fields are bounded by mixed thorn hedgerows, many of which contain oak trees, but large woodland belts are not characteristic; and there are extensive views across rolling slopes from both sides[9].

16. The characteristics of the Ploughley Limestone Plateau include extensive remains of 18th century parkland and estate farmland; fine specimens of single trees enclosed by limestone walls and groups of pine trees; adjacent to the parkland, farmland displays estate farm characteristics such as railings and avenues of trees[10]. The character analysis suggests that Kirtlington is an estate village built around a series of formal village greens[11] and one of the implications for new development is that it should reinforce the existing street pattern, which creates the basic village form. In linear villages, development should strengthen the dominant street scene and limit backland development and new development proposals should reflect the character found in the immediate locality in terms of the relationship between buildings, open space and roads[12].

[9] CD 16.2 page 5 paragraph 2.1
[10] CD 16.2 page 11 paragraph 2.1
[11] CD 16.2 page 12 paragraph 3.1 (iv)
[12] CD 16.2 page 12 paragraph 3.2

17. The Appellant undertook a landscape and visual assessment and the Statement of Common Ground records that the Parties agree with the Council's Landscape Planning Officer's comment that "the conclusions of the landscape and visual assessment are fair. The study shows that the development will have a limited effect on the wider landscape"[13]. The Landscape Planning Officer's comments go on to say that "There will be greatest impact from the footpath to the rear of Oxford Close, the dwellings backing onto the site and the open view from the proposed entrance to the site on Lince Lane"[14].

18. I accept that the proposal would have a limited effect on the wider landscape and that it would not be visually intrusive in views from many public viewpoints. It would, however, be extremely visible when entering the village from the south where the current field provides an open and rural approach to the built up area of the village. I appreciate that the village boundary could be expanded but the expansion of the village as proposed, because of its depth, scale and housing with associated infrastructure, would result in an urban character to the outskirts of the village which would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the undeveloped landscape and the setting of the village.

19. The Year 1 significance of effect on the residents of some dwellings in Oxford Close; The Bungalow; and Windover as stated in the Landscape and Visual Assessment is major/moderate adverse[15]. Although the number of affected properties is relatively small, the proposal would have an adverse visual impact and this weighs against the proposal.

20. The village of Kirtlington lies on several ancient routes and it is a settlement that dates back to at least Saxon times. Although there is no suggestion that the proposal would have any effect on the Kirtlington Conservation Area it is notable that there is a moated site to the east of the school that is a scheduled monument; St Mary's Church is Grade II* listed; Kirtlington Park is a listed Grade I Palladian house located to the east of the village within Grade II listed parkland; and there are about 30 Grade II listed, mostly residential, buildings in the village.

21. The Appellant and the Council agree that Kirtlington's traditional linear settlement pattern, predominantly along a north-south route, contributes strongly to its character. They disagree, however, whether the historic core of Kirtlington and the development that has taken place since the Second World War results in it being a village of two parts (the Appellant's position) or not (the Council's case).

22. The historic core comprises about 250 dwellings which tend to front directly onto the roads and village greens. The linear form is particularly evident on the western side of the A4095, around the South and North Greens and along Bletchington Road. Since the 1940s about 200 new homes have been added to the village; in the main these have been small backland developments around cul-de-sacs, some on previously developed land such as the five house development on Mill Lane in a former quarry[16] and others on land closely associated with the dwellings/buildings fronting the road[17]. These relatively recent developments were small, comprising about 10 houses in each phase,

[13] SOCG 1 paragraph 4.1.7
[14] CD 16.4
[15] CD 1.5 Appendix 2 Tables 2 page 5
[16] GDL 7 – marked yellow
[17] St John's Map of Kirtlington 1750, Exhibit EB1 to Mr Booth's proof and Kirtlington Farmlands map c.1805 IP 6

and there have also been a small number of individual developments within the settlement boundary[18].

23. From the evidence and from what I saw on my visits[19] to Kirtlington it is apparent that the village has developed over time, predominantly along the north-south axis, and that the phasing of more recent development, much of which is linked together and to the main road by short cul-de-sacs and footpaths, has been gradual and restricted in numbers. The resulting village is a coherent mix of 'ancient and modern' development that sits comfortably together forming an attractive and relatively compact village. I therefore concur with the Council's case.

24. The proposal, in contrast to the settlement pattern and the history of gradual growth over time, would provide up to 95 dwellings at a rate of about 35 dwellings per year within the next five years[20] which would represent a 20% increase in the size of the village. In addition, the proposal would accommodate about 228 residents[21] whereas the most up-to-date census figure for the population of the village is 988[22].

25. The development and character of Kirtlington is reflected in the clustering of small numbers of buildings that have been erected at different times and gradually absorbed into the village. The proposed development, involving a large number of houses and residents at one time, would considerably exceed the threshold of incremental change and expansion that has occurred in Kirtlington and would be detrimental to the established character of the village.

26. The appeal site lies to the south-west of the village and the proposal would extend the village to the west; the proposed development would be approximately double the width of the development comprising the dwellings fronting the A4095 and in Oxford Close at the southern end of the village. Although not perhaps the most elegant description, I agree with Mr Booth that the proposal 'represents a large bulge jutting out from the long and relatively narrow shape of Kirtlington into the open countryside'[23]. The proposal would therefore not reflect the linear settlement pattern of Kirtlington, which I consider further below.

27. The new vehicular access would be some distance outside the built-up area of the village, unlike the other cul-de-sac accesses, and although this could help in limiting traffic through the village it would not lead to integration of the appeal site into the village. The improvement of the public right of way through the appeal site would be a benefit, as would the extension of the footpath along Lince Lane from the southern end of the public right of way; but as the public right of way from the appeal site in the north to Hatch Way lies outside the Appellant's control, even with the imposition of a Grampian condition requiring improvement and maintenance, little if anything could be done to improve the current narrow width and its route which includes a corner and a bend. Because of these impediments I consider that the footpath link would provide only very limited access to, and integration with, the heart of the

[18] IP 6
[19] In addition to the accompanied site visit I made two unaccompanied visits on 13 and 17 July 2015
[20] Mr Podesta's proof paragraph 6.4.12 9th point
[21] Mr Podesta's proof paragraph 12.8.4
[22] Mr Hartley's proof paragraph 4.49
[23] Mr Booth's proof paragraph 7.4

village. The constraints of the vehicular and pedestrian accesses emphasise the separation of the proposal from the village.

28. The importance of design is a key aspect of sustainable development and the Framework advises that 'securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations', and that decisions should 'address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development'[24]. Supporting advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) says that 'achieving good design is about creating places or spaces that work well; successful integration of new development with their surrounding context is an important design objective, irrespective of whether a site lies on the urban fringe or at the heart of a town centre; proposals should promote accessibility and safe local routes by making places that connect appropriately with each other and are easy to move through; a place should have an appropriate number of routes to and through it; and that designs should ensure that new and existing buildings relate well to each other, that spaces complement one another[25].

29. Taking the Framework and the PPG into account, while I accept that the layout within the site and the appearance of individual buildings can be left to a later stage, the access is not reserved. Accessibility would be limited as I have identified above and the proposal would not have any meaningful connection with the village; the proposal would be a separate housing estate on the edge of, but not part of, the village. The proposal would be poorly integrated into the fabric of the built environment of Kirtlington and it would therefore fail to comply with the Framework and would not amount to sustainable development. I give substantial weight to this matter.

30. Mr Barnes was instructed by the Appellant to 'assist with the preparation of material for an outline planning application for new houses and associated landscape improvements on this site in Kirtlington'[26]. As with Mr Barnes I am concerned in this appeal with this proposal only; evidence and submissions about 'where [or, indeed, even if] it would be appropriate to accommodate further development in Kirtlington'[27] therefore do not fall to be considered.

31. I do, however note, that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2014 (SHLAA)[28] identified the appeal site as a 'potentially developable site for about 75 dwellings on a narrower 2.5 hectare of land to rear of Oxford Close'[29]. The SHLAA is 'an evidence source to inform plan making and it sets out information on developable land availability for growth options to be investigated further through the plan-making process'[30] and I note that the appeal site was not included in the very recent Local Plan process. In addition, the potential noted was for a smaller area of land and for a smaller number of houses than are the subject of this appeal.

32. Policies H18, C8, C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996[31] have been retained under the Local Plan. The Appellant accepts that the appeal site is to

[24] Paragraphs 56 and 61
[25] PPG Paragraphs 001, 007, 008, 022 and 024 ID: 26-20140306
[26] Mr Barnes' proof paragraph 1.2.1
[27] Document D paragraph 89
[28] CD 12.3
[29] CD 12.4
[30] CD 12.3 paragraph 2.1.3
[31] CD 8.2

be treated as "open countryside" and, as such, it conflicts with Policy H18[32] the intention of which is to ensure that the countryside is protected from sporadic development whilst at the same time recognising the legitimate needs of agriculture and forestry. Policy C8 also seeks to resist sporadic development in the open countryside and, although it specifically refers to development in the vicinity of motorway or major road junctions, I consider it to be a relevant policy in this appeal which concerns a proposed development in the open countryside. Policy C28 largely concerns standards of layout, design and external appearance, which would be matters for future consideration; but both Policies C28 and C30 seek to ensure that development is sympathetic to the character of the rural context and that new housing development is compatible with the scale of existing dwellings in the vicinity. The Policies are consistent with the Framework in that they contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment[33] and therefore I give them significant weight.

33. Policy ESD13 of the Local Plan 2015 provides, among other things, that proposals will not be permitted if they would harm the setting of settlements and be inconsistent with local character. Policy ESD16 advises that, among other things, new development proposals should be designed to improve the quality and appearance of an area. One of the criteria in Policy Villages 2 is that development should contribute to enhancing the built environment.

34. For the reasons I have set out above I conclude that the proposal would not be appropriate having regard to the character, setting and the settlement pattern of Kirtlington and its location in the countryside and that it would not be in accordance to the Development Plan policies referred to above.

Second issue: Housing land supply

35. In raising the question of the five year housing land supply the Appellant agreed that it was not appropriate in this appeal to carry out some sort of Local Plan process[34] but the Appellant's case was that an interrogation of the figures in the trajectory and other matters such as the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) were proper issues for the Inquiry. If the Appellant's case is accepted, and a five year housing land supply could not be demonstrated the housing policies in the Local Plan, adopted the day before the Inquiry closed, would not be up-to-date[35].

The Local Plan (2015)

36. The Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (2015) (the Local Plan) was adopted on 20 July 2015[36]. The Local Plan five year housing requirement for the period 2015-2020 is 9,464[37] which is based on a housing trajectory for the period 2011-2031; this trajectory was before the Local Plan Inspector.

37. In his report[38], the Local Plan Inspector considered Policy BSC1: District Wide Housing Distribution and he concluded "Overall and taking into account all the available evidence, statements and submissions, that, as modified, the plan is based on a full and up to date objective assessment of housing need in the

[32] Document A paragraph 11 and Document D Schedule paragraph 2
[33] Paragraph 17
[34] Document D paragraph 22
[35] NPPF paragraph 49
[36] CD 18
[37] Document C paragraph 25
[38] CD 9.4

area to 2031, taking account of reasonable population and household projections, having regard to all relevant local factors, including current market conditions in the district. The modified new housing total and revised housing trajectory represents a reasonable and realistic, deliverable and justified basis for meeting local needs over the plan period[39]. … The plan would be consistent with the objectives of the [Framework] in providing a significant boost to new housing delivery and in terms of helping to provide a rolling 5 year supply of sites across the area. In particular, this would be assisted by the allocation of the strategic sites that are critical to overall delivery, in direct accord with the first point of paragraph 47 of the [Framework][40]."

38. The first point of paragraph 47 of the Framework says that "to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed need for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period".

39. The Local Plan, after a lengthy process and full examination, was found to be sound and adopted.

40. The differences between the Parties range across both what should be regarded as the objectively assessed need to provide for a five year period and the details of the supply. On the basis of the evidence put to me at the Inquiry, including that from both sides concerning what was before the Local Plan Inspector, it is plain that there are significant differences between each Party on all issues. In particular, on the requirement side the Appellant criticises the Council's position at the Inquiry, as well as its adopted Local Plan, for failure to apply the correct buffer (and then failure to apply the buffer itself to the correct housing requirement figure, that is, that including the shortfall identified in the AMR).

41. In short and in sum, this results in a position, according to the Appellant, where, applying a 20% buffer to recognise what the Appellant argues (based on its very detailed evidence of delivery) is a history of persistent under-delivery, and having regard to the Council's latest AMR (which was not available to the Local Plan Inspector), there is a land supply of at best 3.7 years[41] or at worst, depending on where the buffer is applied, 3.5 years[42]. I will return below to the make-up of the supply side assumptions.

42. On the other hand, the Council maintains that, notwithstanding its past acceptance in considering other proposals, when a 20% buffer was applied, its Local Plan is reasonably and correctly based on a 5% buffer. Accordingly, taking account of data in its AMR, it claims that it can demonstrate a housing land supply for the 2015-2020 five year period amounting to a 5.1 years' supply[43], even if the 5% buffer is applied to the shortfall[44]. It says that that supply is 8,950, a matter to which I return below.

[39] CD 9.4 paragraph 58
[40] CD 9.4 paragraph 59
[41] GDL 7 Table 3
[42] GDL 7 Table 4
[43] GDL 7 Table 1
[44] GDL 7 Table 2

43. The Local Plan Inspector's report is silent on whether he was specifically told or knew whether the 5% or the 20% buffer had been applied to the housing requirements and he reached no conclusion as to whether there had been persistent under delivery. However, it is clear that he was satisfied that the figures provided in the housing trajectory, which were based on a 5% buffer, 'represented a reasonable and realistic, deliverable and justified basis for meeting local needs over the plan period'[45] and, therefore, the housing trajectory met the requirements of the first bullet point of paragraph 47 of the Framework and that the Local Plan was sound. If he had not been so satisfied, it is a reasonable assumption that he would not have found the Local Plan to be sound.

Supply

44. The Appellant and the Council disagreed about the deliverable supply shown in the AMR in that the Council's figure was 8,950 and the Appellant's was 7,100. The Appellant's evidence given by Mr Johnson in relation to delivery rates was based on a report by Savills that was prepared for a major house builder, Barratt Homes, in October 2014[46]. The report tracked the progress of 84 urban extensions through the planning system over the last 25 years and the analysis indicated that 'once construction starts and in a strong market, annual delivery can be anticipated to be around 60 units in the first year of construction, picking up to more than 100 units per annum in subsequent years and increasing to around 120 units'[47]. The report went on to comment that 'We are aware of many urban extensions in the south of England where recent delivery rates have been substantially in excess of 120 units per annum'[48].

45. Taking this report into account and following some site visits Mr Johnson prepared a table of disputed sites with the conclusion that there was a shortfall in delivery of 1,850 between his figures and those in the Council's housing delivery monitor appended to the AMR 2014[49]. During the course of oral evidence to the Inquiry it was agreed that some of the disputed sites were no longer 'disputed' but that there was a difference of opinion about where the figures should be allocated. The Appellant's case remained that there was a considerable shortfall in delivery.

46. Mr Peckford explained that the Council's figures for the housing delivery monitor in general, and the disputed sites in particular, had been derived from information provided by the house builders, landowners and agents involved with each site and that the Council had taken a cautious approach to the information provided and had calculated the delivery figures accordingly. Mr Peckford confirmed there were 946 completions for 2014-15 which exceeded the 632 in the trajectory.

47. The difference in methodology between the Council and the Appellant is of particular significance in respect of the site at Graven Hill, Bicester. This is a self-build proposal where the Council's figure is 600 homes in the five year period 2015-16 to 2019-20 and the Appellant's is 300. However, the Appellant's figures are based on those in the Savills report which in turn are taken from major house building sites and, as acknowledged by Mr Johnson in

[45] CD 9.4 paragraph 58
[46] Mr Johnson's Appendix 2
[47] Page 1 of the Savills report
[48] Page 2 of the Savills report – and it was agreed that this appeal site was in the south of England
[49] GDL 1 for Mr Johnson's table and Appendix 1 to Mr Peckford's proof for the AMR

his evidence to the Inquiry, Savills do not include any information at all about this particular type of housing development.

48. Advice in the PPG with regard to assessing the timescale and rate of delivery says that 'on the largest sites allowance should be made for several developers to be involved. The advice of developers and local agents will be important in assessing lead-in times and build out rates by year'[50].

49. The Savills report, as relied on by Mr Johnson, provides useful general guidance on delivery rates based on a number of sites and years, but it is not site specific to this Council and it acknowledges that differences and variations occur. The Council's evidence is site specific to this locality and the Local Plan area and is based on direct information as advised by the PPG yet taking a realistic and cautious approach.

50. I have taken into account the comments made by the Inspector in the Sandbach decision that rather than rely on claims from landowners and developers "… it is more proper to take a cautious and conservative approach to delivery rates"[51]. But I am satisfied by Mr Peckford's evidence that the Council did not rely solely on the information received from developers, landowners and agents but adopted a cautious approach and adapted the figures accordingly.

51. I therefore find that, having regard to the specificity of the Council's data and analysis in this case, the Appellant's more generalised data cannot reasonably be applied to the circumstances of this Council, nor of this appeal, in the face of what I judge to be well founded and robust empirically based local data.

52. Whilst aware that, even in the context of a s.78 appeal, I am required to assess the housing requirement and supply positions, I also note that the PPG advises that "The examination of Local Plans is intended to ensure that up to date housing requirements and the deliverability of sites to meet a five year supply will have been thoroughly considered and examined prior to adoption, in a way that cannot be replicated in the course of determining individual applications and appeals where only the applicant's/appellant's evidence is likely to be presented to contest an authority's position"[52].

53. As part of the Local Plan process the Local Plan Inspector examined delivery rates and, among other things, he said that "All the available evidence, including the recent viability up-date indicates that both the timing and total of new housing would be largely viable and essentially deliverable over the full plan period, albeit challenging for all concerned … the Council's evidence is essentially robust, up to date and credible in these respects, with no insurmountable barriers apparent in relation to the strategic sites"[53]. These findings were made after the Local Plan Inspector had heard evidence relating to delivery rates, which included representations by the Appellant that the delivery rates in the revised housing trajectory were not realistic[54]. The case made by the Appellant in this appeal was in many respects similar to the representations made to the Local Plan Inspector which were rejected. In

[50] Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 3-023-20140306 (Mr Peckford's Appendix 3)
[51] GDL 2 paragraphs 23 and 26
[52] Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 3-033020150327 (Mr Peckford's Appendix 3)
[53] CD 9.4 paragraph 56
[54] Mr Peckford's Appendix 30 paragraph 6.1.4

accordance with the advice in the PPG I do not accept the Appellant's submissions on housing delivery/supply.

Conclusions

54. The PPG advises that "Housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as a starting point for calculating the five year supply. Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans which have successfully passed through the examination process unless significant new evidence comes to light"[55].

55. The 'significant new evidence' in this appeal is the Annual Housing Monitor 2014. The figures in this document are consistent with my findings above. I therefore conclude that the Council is able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and that it follows that the relevant policies for the supply of housing in the Local Plan are up to date.

56. In reaching this conclusion I am mindful of the Council's closing submissions[56] that if the Appellant's case was accepted and the 20% buffer was applied on the shortfall, the 2015-20 housing requirement would be an additional 1,400 homes above that provided for by the Council[57] and 658 more homes than that projected in the Local Plan trajectory. Also, the Appellant's position with regard to supply is that with a requirement of 10,122 there is only a supply of 7,100[58]. The Local Plan Inspector found the housing trajectory to be justified and challenging but achievable. In my opinion the Appellant's case as put at this Inquiry would mean that the Local Plan is not deliverable contrary to the Local Plan Inspector's conclusions. The PPG makes it clear that an appeal such as this cannot replicate a Local Plan examination and given the fact that the Local Plan was adopted during the course of the Inquiry it is not for me, in this appeal to challenge the Council's position which was found to be sound by the Local Plan Inspector.

57. In any event, on the basis of the evidence presented to the Inquiry and having regard to my findings above, and taking account of all other matters including the position concerning any contribution to meeting the City of Oxford's requirement that may arise in the future, I have no reason to disagree with the Local Plan Inspector's findings and judgement. I therefore conclude that the Council has a five year housing land supply,

Other Matters

Affordable housing

58. By virtue of the s.106 agreement 35% of the dwellings comprised in the development would be affordable homes. If 95 dwellings are completed this would equate to 34 units. The Housing Needs Survey 2011 (albeit somewhat dated) identified a local need for 15 affordable homes[59] and the Kirtlington Plan (also dated 2011) produced by the Parish Council identified 23 households looking for affordable housing[60].

[55] Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph:030 Reference ID: 3-030-20140306 (Mr Peckford's Appendix 3)
[56] Document C paragraphs 46-52
[57] GDL 7 Tables 4 (10,122) and 1 (8,721)
[58] GCL 7 Table 4
[59] CDC 1
[60] CD 13.1 page 20

59. Whilst the provision of affordable homes would be a benefit, particularly in a rural location such as this, the provision of that number of affordable units in excess of the requirement could be a dis-benefit in providing a concentration of affordable homes in one location where there is no assessed need for that number.

Sustainability

60. The designation of Kirtlington as a Category A village in Policy Villages 1 means that, so far as development within the built up area is concerned, Kirtlington is considered to be one of the most sustainable villages in the District[61]. "The most sustainable village" designation does not extend to development at Kirtlington as provided for by Policy Villages 2 to which this proposal applies.

61. The Framework establishes that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental[62] and the presumption in favour of sustainable development[63]. In order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.

62. Mr Hartley's largely unchallenged evidence demonstrated that Kirtlington fulfils many of the criteria for judging a sustainable settlement in that, among other things, it has a primary school, a village hall, a sports field and a post office/shop. It is agreed by the Appellant and the County Council that these facilities are within walking and/or cycling distance from the appeal site for most people[64].

63. However, the nearest GP and dentist are in Kidlington and the nearest secondary school is in Woodstock; both of these villages are just within the 5km radius of Kirtlington. Pupils attending the secondary school are provided with a bus service and no details were provided about how many pupils travel there from Kirtlington, either by the school bus or by private car.

64. The Parish Council advised that there were currently three to four part-time vacancies for employment within the village[65]. The main sources of employment in the district are Bicester and Banbury, where the Local Plan focuses most new housing development "in order to ensure that the housing growth which the district needs only takes place in the locations that are most sustainable and most capable of absorbing this new growth"[66]. Similarly the main shopping centres are in the two towns.

65. I note that the County Council considers that the bus routes through the village provide a realistic option for travel to these facilities and destinations[67]. The Parish Council, however, advises that neither the GP surgery nor the dental surgery is on a Kirtlington bus route[68]. I consider that the infrequent bus service, and the more infrequent service at weekends, even if the financial contribution to upgrade the bus service as provided for in the s.106 agreement was to be effective, means that transport to Kidlington, Bicester and Banbury

[61] CD18 paragraph C.226
[62] Paragraph 7
[63] Paragraph 14
[64] SOCG 5 paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3
[65] IP 8
[66] CD 18 paragraph B.85
[67] SOCG 5 paragraph 4.4 and 4.5
[68] IP 8

for employment, GP and dentist appointments and shopping/leisure would be more than likely to be by private car. In my opinion there would be little, if any, real choice of transport other than private car for future residents. Given the necessity for current and future residents to travel for a number of facilities, services and employment, the sustainability of Kirtlington itself and the proposal in particular is questionable.

66. Emphasis was placed by the Appellant on the economic benefits of the proposal which included a construction spend of about £10.06m; the creation of 94 full time equivalent jobs over the three year period of the development; the addition of 122 economically active residents; and Council Tax of about £1.1m over a ten year period.

67. The environmental benefit of the proposal would arise from the planting of native species in the Parkland Frame, the provision of bird and bat boxes[69] and generous open spaces. Whilst these matters would comprise a positive outcome of the proposal, they need to be balanced against the harm to the landscape and visual character that I have identified from the replacement of an open agricultural field by houses and vehicles and the resultant emissions and urbanisation of the countryside.

68. Taking all of these matters into account I consider that the proposal would not, on balance, be sustainable development in the terms of the Framework.

The primary school

69. Pursuant to the s.106 agreement a financial contribution would be made towards the expansion of the primary school that would be necessitated by the proposal. The evidence relating to the primary school was conflicting. The Parish Council was of the view that the school was at full capacity and there were concerns about excessive numbers in the coming year from the current village; the Chair of Governors confirmed there had been no dialogue with the governing body about plans to raise the capacity of the school and that this subject had not been raised when the Chair had a hand-over meeting with the departing Head Teacher in July 2015[70].

70. The County Council wrote that a meeting took place on 27 February 2015 between a representative of the Education Directorate and the then Head Teacher; there was, however, no agreed note of the meeting but the County Council assert that the concept of expansion was discussed and how, with remodelling/expansion, the school could increase its capacity; the potential capacity increase was considered feasible. The school is voluntary aided and is controlled by the Oxford Diocese which means that the County Council cannot insist that the school expands[71]. The s.106 agreement provides for 'the expansion of Kirtlington Church of England Primary School (or any alternative which achieves similar benefits) in such form and at such time as the County Council shall in its discretion decide'[72].

71. The financial contribution would be based on the formula provided by the primary education matrix which depends on the final composition of the

[69] To be secured by condition
[70] IP 5
[71] OCC 5
[72] GDL 3 Fifth Schedule clause 1

development[73]. I note that the sum of £370,740 is mentioned in the definition clause of the s.106 agreement[74] and that this sum is calculated on the basis of 32.01 pupil places[75]. The discussion referred to in the paragraph above, however, appears to relate to an increase of 20 pupils only.

72. The presence of the primary school is an important feature of the village in respect of matters such as sustainability and social integration. However, its future appears to me to be unresolved and I cannot speculate whether the current school could be expanded or whether an alternative would have to be provided. The latter in particular could have a significant impact on the proposal in terms of travel and integration of the proposal into the village.

The access and traffic impact

73. The Parish Council instructed Peter Brett Associates to review the Transport Assessment submitted by the Appellant[76] and the conclusion in the review was that the Transport Assessment was not robust enough. Although the review was considered by the County Council, there was no change to its findings that in terms of highway design standards the proposed vehicular access provides an acceptable access to the proposed development and that there are no material traffic impacts associated with the proposed development[77].

74. Having seen the amount of traffic that passes through Kirtlington at busy times and the congestion caused at the end of the school day I share the concerns of the Parish Council about any increase in traffic that would arise from the proposal. I also share concerns about the proposed access given its location on a bend in the road and the two serious accidents reported by Peter Brett Associates that took place in 2009 and 2014 on bends on the A4095 close to the proposed site access. But the test in the Framework is that impact on transport and highways grounds must be severe to justify refusal[78] and given the conclusions of the Highway Authority this would not be the case in respect of both traffic movements and the access.

Conditions

75. The Framework advises that consideration should be given to whether an otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions and that conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects[79].

76. I have considered the suggested and largely agreed conditions[80]. Whilst they meet the tests in the Framework and are all relatively straightforward 'usual' conditions that would generally be imposed on an outline proposal such as this, given my findings in respect of the main issues I do not consider that their imposition would render the unacceptability of the proposal acceptable.

[73] SOCG 4
[74] GDL 3 Fourth Schedule clauses 1.6 and 1.11
[75] CD 4.11
[76] CD 1.6
[77] SOCG 5 paragraph 2.4 and 3.1
[78] Paragraph 32 3rd bullet point
[79] Paragraphs 203 and 206
[80] GDL 12 – only the 'red' condition was not agreed by the Appellant; those in blue and green had been added following the discussion about conditions

The planning balance

77. The proposal would provide affordable housing which in most cases would be a benefit to which significant weight would be given, but the amount that would be provided, being in excess of the quantified need, could result in an inappropriate concentration of such units in this one location.

78. There would be economic benefits arising from the creation of jobs in the construction of the development, the construction spend and indirectly from the new residents. The economic and social roles would be fulfilled by the provision of housing and the introduction of new residents, who would most likely be families with children, into a village where the population is aging. But there is no evidence that the village lacks vitality and despite the aging population the primary school is thriving (and full).

79. The Parkland, play areas and village green that form parts of the proposal would be of benefit to the occupiers of the development, but given the constraints of the pedestrian access and the separation of the appeal site from the village, the use of such areas by anyone other than occupiers of the proposal would be questionable.

80. Having in mind paragraph 49 of the Framework, the Appellant maintains that, if I were to find that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and that the relevant policies for the supply of housing in the Local Plan should therefore not be considered up-to-date, I should allow the appeal. However, that paragraph advises that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Reference to paragraph 14 of the Framework indicates that for decision-taking this means: approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out–of–date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework.

81. I have found that the evidence put to me by the Appellant does not give me good reason to conclude that the recently adopted Local Plan is not soundly based in its provision for the housing that is required to be provided over the relevant five years (including a buffer). As to the supply itself, I have concluded that the Council's figures are the more robust and, based on the evidence put to the Inquiry, represent a reasonable assessment of the supply. Accordingly the Development Plan attracts great weight and I see no basis to find, therefore, that its policies for the supply of housing are out of date.

82. Bringing all of this together, given my findings on the first issue, that the proposal cannot be said to represent sustainable development, being conscious that the housing requirement is not a maximum or ceiling and having regard to my findings on the housing land supply position, I conclude that the proposal fails to satisfy Policy Villages 2 of the Local Plan[81], and is not compliant with the Local Plan as a whole. The harm that the proposal would cause, as set out in my findings on the first issue, significantly and demonstrably outweighs such benefits that it would bring (principally in the provision of housing) so there are

[81] As well as Policies H18, C8, C28 and C30 of the retained Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Policies ESD13 and ESD16 of the Local Plan 2015

no material considerations which would warrant a decision other than in accordance with the Development Plan. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

83. For the avoidance of doubt, had my judgment on the housing requirement and/or supply positions been different, such that either or both had favoured the Appellant's position, leading me then to conclude that the Council had inaccurately assessed the need for housing and/or failed to provide an adequate supply, and thus its policies for the supply of housing were out of date, the harm I have found on the first issue would still have caused me to find that the benefits would not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the harm, which as my reasons illustrate, would be very substantial. The appeal would therefore not have succeeded.

The s.106 agreement

84. I have commented above on the obligations contained in the s.106 agreement. As I have reached the conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed there is no necessity for me to consider it further.

Conclusions

85. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gloria McFarlane

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr J Barrett	Counsel

He called

Mr James Podesta BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Planning Manager for the Appellant Company
Mr M Johnson RICS MRTPI	Managing Director – Johnson Brook Planning and Development Consultants Ltd
Mr C Barnes CMLI	Managing Director – Barnes Walker Ltd
Mr D Hartley BSc(Hons) MA DipTRP MRTPI	Director of Planning – Rural Solutions Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Mr H Flanagan	Counsel

He called

Mr E Booth BA DipUD MRTPI IHBC FSA	Director – The Conservation Studio
Mr D Peckford BA(Hons) MTP MRTPI	Planning Policy Team Leader
Mr A Keen BA(Joint Honours) MA MRTPI	Principal Planning Officer, Major Developments

FOR THE S.106 DISCUSSION

Mr G Owens	Cherwell District Council, Investment and Growth Team Leader
Mr R Oliver	Oxfordshire County Council, Infrastructure Funding Negotiator

INTERESTED PERSONS

Ms H Macbeth	Deputy Chair Kirtlington Parish Council
Ms C Marsh	Local resident
Cllr J Macnamara	District Councillor for Astons and Heyfords
Ms J Shakleton	Local resident
Mr D Pratt	Chair, Kirtlington Parish Council
Ms J Esplen	Local resident
Mr A Mobley	Local resident

AGREED STATEMENTS OF COMMON GROUND SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE INQUIRY

SOCG 1 – Statement of Common Ground between the Appellant and the Council
SOCG 2 – Statement of Common Ground – Housing Land Supply
SOCG 3 – Supplementary Statement of Common Ground
SOCG 4 – Education Statement of Common Ground
SOCG 5 – Statement of Common Ground - Highways Matters

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY BY THE APPELLANT

GDL 1 - Note 1: Cherwell District – Table of disputed sites
GDL 2 –Appeal decision APP/R0660/A/13/2189733
GDL 3 - S.106 agreement and letter of authority dated 17 July 2015
GDL 4 - Cherwell District Council Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update 2014
GDL 5 - Plan of housing development in Kirtlington
GDL 6 - Appeal decision APP/G2713/A/14/2218137
GDL 7 –Tables showing AMR and Local Plan 5 year supply scenarios – agreed with the Council
GDL 8 - Unilateral Undertaking – Land at Barford Road
GDL 9 – Secretary of State's letter and Inspector's report – Land off Barford Road
GDL 10- Oxfordshire CC and SSCLG and Others [2015] EWHC 186 (Admin)
GDL 11– Route of accompanied site visit and illustrative masterplan
GDL 12- Draft conditions, agreed with the Council except for condition 14

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY BY CHERWELL D C

CDC 1 – Consultation comments on affordable housing dated 6 October 2014
CDC 2 – Comments on affordable housing clauses in the s.106 agreement

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY BY OXFORDSHIRE C C

OCC 1 – Statement on s.106 contributions
OCC 2 – Advice by Ian Dove QC dated 30 January 2014
OCC 3 – Advice by Ian Dove QC dated 7 May 2014
OCC 4 – Secretary of State's letter and Inspector's report – Land off Highworth Road
OCC 5 – Statement re Kirtlington Primary School

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY BY INTERESTED PERSONS

IP 1 – Statement by Ms Marsh
IP 2 – Photographs of and comments about the footpath from the Parish Council
IP 3 – Statement by Cllr Macnamara
IP 4 – Email from a local resident
IP 5 – Email from the Parish Council about the Primary School
IP 6 – Email from the Parish Council and attachments – map of Kirtlington c.1805 and comments on GDL 5
IP 7 – Statement by Mr Mobley
IP 8 – Statement by Ms Macbeth, Deputy Chair of Kirtlington Parish Council

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE ADVOCATES AT THE INQUIRY

Document A - Opening on behalf of the Appellant
Document B - Opening statement on behalf of the Council
Document C - Closing submissions on behalf of the Council
Document D - Closing on behalf of the Appellant

CORE DOCUMENTS

Folder 1

CD1 Submitted Planning Application Documents

1.1 Application, covering letter, application form and certificates

1.2 Location plan (including application red line)

1.3 Development framework plan

1.4 Design and access statement

1.5 Landscape and visual assessment

1.6 Transport assessment

1.7 Travel plan

1.8 Ecological assessment

1.9 Arboricultural assessment

1.10 Ground conditions desk study

1.11 Flood risk assessment

1.12 Air quality assessment

Folder 2

1.13 Noise assessment

1.14 Archaeological assessment

1.15 Built heritage

1.16 Socio economic report

1.17 Assessment of current and future sustainability

1.18 Statement of community involvement

1.19 Affordable housing review and statement

1.20 Planning statement

Folder 3

CD2 Additional documents submitted

2.1 Footpath statement

2.2 Refused access plans

2.3 Revised access plans Oct 2014

2.4 Revised access plans Nov2014

2.5 Speed survey

2.6 Geophysical survey

2.7 Archaeological evaluation report

2.8 Updated archaeological desk based assessment

2.9 Design and access statement additional character areas

CD3 Correspondence between Cherwell District Council and the Appellant

CD4 Consultee responses

4.1 OCC Planning archaeologist

4.2 CDC Community services

4.3 CDC Landscape planning officer

4.4 CDC Landscape planning officer

4.5 CDC Ecology officer

4.6 OCC Ecologist planner

4.7 Environment Agency

4.8 Thames Water development planning department

4.9 Thames Valley Police

4.10 OCC Property

4.11 OCC Education

4.12 OCC Transport

4.13 Kirtlington Parish Council

4.14 Kirtlington wildlife and conservation society

4.15 CDC Anti-social behaviour manager

4.16 Kirtlington Parish Council

4.17 CDC Arboricultural officer

4.18 Kirtlington Parish Council

Folder 4

CD5 Appeal scheme decision making

5.1 Committee Report 19 March 2015

5.2 Supplementary Update Report 13 March 2015

5.3 Transcript of Committee meeting

5.4 Resolution letter 20 March 2015

5.5 Committee Report 21 May 2015

5.6 Amended resolution letter 22 May 2015

CD6 Second application (Ref:14/02139/OUT) Documents

6.1 Development framework plan

6.2 Committee Report 19 March 2015

6.3 Transcript of Committee meeting

6.4 Decision notice 25 March 2015

CD7 Relevant post appeal correspondence

CD8 The Development Plan

8.1 Cherwell Local Plan Direction Letter

8.2 Extracts from the adopted Cherwell Local Plan

8.3 Local plan proposals map – Kirtlington

CD9 Emerging Development Plan

9.1 Extracts of illustrative Cherwell submission Local Plan Part 1 incorporating proposed modifications (February 2015)

9.2 Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Area designation application

9.3 Mid Cherwell neighbourhood Plan Area designation letter

9.4 Inspector's report into the Cherwell Local Plan June 2015

CD10 Relevant Appeal Decisions

10.1 APP/A0665/A/11/2167430 – Land off Nantwich Road, Taporley, Cheshire. Allowed 29 August 2013

10.2 APP/R0660/A/13/2192192 – Land opposite Rose Cottages, Holmes Chapel Road, Bereton Heath, Cheshire. Allowed 12 February 2014

10.3 APP/C1625/A/13/2207324 – Land off Bath Road, Leonard Stanley. Allowed 21 July 2014

10.4 APP/C3105/A/12/2182183 – Cherwell at the Green, Chesterton. Allowed 21 February 2013

10.5 APP/C3105/A/12/2184094 – Land north of the Bourne and adjoining Bourne Lane, Hook Norton. Allowed 23 September 2013

10.6 APP/C3105/A/12/2189191 – Milton Road, land south of Bloxham. Allowed 23 September 2013

10.7 APP/C3105/A/13/2189896 – Land off Barford Road, Bloxham. Decided (allowed by SoS) 23 September 2013

10.8 APP/N1350/A/2217552 – Land off Sadberge Road, Middleton St George, Darlington. Allowed 12 January 2015

10.9 APP/R0660/A/13/2209335 – Gesty Lane, Rope Lane, Crewe Road and A500 Crewe. Dismissed 19 January 2015

10.10 APP/C3105/A/14/2220513 – Land south of Broughton Road, Banbury. Dismissed 6 January 2015

10.11 APP/C3105/A/14/2227907 – Harwick Farm, west of Southam Road, Banbury. Dismissed 11 March 2015

10.12 APP/C3105/A/14/2213263 – Land off Banbury Road, Adderbury, Oxfordshire. Allowed 3 September 2014

10.13 APP/F0114/A/2215930 – Land at Boxbury Hill, Midsomer Norton. Dismissed 20 May 2015

10.14 APP/C3102/A/2203995 – Land west of Warwick Road, Banbury. Allowed 3 March 2014

Folder 5

CD11 Relevant Legal Cases

11.1 Bloor Homes v SoS [2014] EWHC 754

11.2 Hunston v SoS [2103] EWHC Civ 1610

11.3 Gallagher and Lioncourt v SMBC [2014] EWHC 1283

11.4 Oxfordshire CC v SoS [2015] EWHC 186

11.5 Crane v SoS and HDC [2015] EWHC 425

CD12 Evidence Base

12.1 2014 Oxfordshire SHMA – key findings on housing need

12.2 Oxford's housing land availability and unmet need, Dec 2014

12.3 CDC's SHLAA update 2014 extracts

12.4 Corner Farm 2014 SHLAA

12.5 Housing land supply update 2014

12.6 Annual monitoring report 2014 (March 2015) extracts

12.7 Village categorisation update October 2014

12.8 Savills delivery rates on urban extensions final report

12.9 SUE study Hourigan Connelly – analysis and summary

CD13 Planning

13.1 Kirtlington Plan 2011

13.2 Letter from Green Square to John East (landowner) 29 November 2012

13.3 Planning Obligations Draft SPD

13.4 Representations made by the Appellant to Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan

CD14 Sustainability

14.1 Kirtlington Mosaic Report

14.2 UCL Rural Housing affordability Exec summary

14.3 ONS Characteristics of Home workers 2014

14.4 DEFRA rural productivity

14.5 Employment densities 2nd edition 2010 DJD

14.6 National travel survey

14.7 Entec 2004 page 57

CD15 Transport

15.1 Extract from Manual for Streets

CD16 Landscape

16.1 Kirtlington Conservation Area appraisal

16.2 Countryside design summary extract

16.3 Cherwell District landscape assessment extract

16.4 Landscape comments on appeal scheme

16.5 Landscape comments on 75 dwelling scheme

Folder 6

CD17 Additional Documents

17.1 APP/F1610/A/11/2165778 – Highfield Farm, Tetbury. Allowed 13 February 2013

17.2 Cotswold DC and SoS v Fay and Son Ltd [2015] EWHC 3719 (Admin)

17.3 APP/R0660/A/13/2203282 – Land north of Crewe Road, Alsager. Allowed 29 July 2014

17.4 Woodcock Holdings v SoS [2015] EWHC 1173

17.5 Oxfordshire SHMA 2014 extracts

17.6 SHLAA report 2013 extract

17.7 Residential completions and permissions as at 31 March 2015

Separate Document

CD18 Illustrative Cherwell Submission Local Plan