
Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened 25 October 2016

Site visit made on 28 October 2016

by D R Cullingford BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P3040/W/16/3143126

Land to the north of Abbey Lane, Aslockton, Nottinghamshire, NG13 9AE

- 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 by Davidsons Developments Limited against the decision of the Rushcliffe Borough Council.
- The application (ref: 15/01204/OUT and dated 20 May 2015) was refused by notice dated 20 August 2015.
- The development is described as an 'outline planning application [with] all matters reserved except access for up to 65 dwellings'.

Summary of Decision: ~ The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

1. Although this 'urban development project' falls within the descriptions set out at paragraph 10b of Schedule 2, exceeds the thresholds in column 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011, the Screening Opinion issued by the Council on 10 November 2014 indicated that the scheme would not entail development likely to have a significant effect on the environment, not being in a sensitive area and having regard to the criteria set out in Schedule 3 to the Regulations as well as the advice in the National Planning Policy Guidance. I agree. Consequently the scheme is not EIA development and an Environmental Statement is not required.

Nevertheless, the application was accompanied not just by a:

- A Planning Statement and by a
- Design and Access Statements,

But also by:

- A Landscape & Visual Appraisal (CD3)
 - An Ecology Report (CD4)
 - An Archaeology Report (CD5)
 - A Geophysical Survey (CD6)
 - A Preliminary Utilities Appraisal (CD7)
 - A Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy (CD8)
 - An Heritage Statement (CD9)
 - A Tree Survey (CD10)
 - A Transport Statement (CD11)
 - A Site Appraisal Risk Assessment (CD12)
 - A Statement of Community Involvement (CD13)
 - A Location Plan (CD14)
 - A Constraints & Opportunities Plan (dwg no HG2819/003) (CD15)
-

- An Indicative Masterplan and site layout plan (dwg no HG2819/012/ Rev G) (CD16)
- Four visuals (CD17)
- A Proposed Site Access Layout (December 2014) F14184/01 now /04 (CD11) and
- A Built Form Master Plan (April 2015) HG2819/011/Rev G (CD16)

Reasons

The site and surroundings

2. Aslockton is a modest village of almost 400 dwellings set amidst a wide expanse of flat arable fields beneath vast skies within the Vale of Belvoir. It is the birthplace of Thomas Cranmer, commemorated here in the Cranmer Centre (a recent addition to the Listed late nineteenth century church of St Thomas – listed mainly due to its eminent Victorian designer rather than the archbishop) and in the Scheduled Ancient Monument of Cranmer’s Mound. Previously, burials (until confined to their own cemetery) and worship took place at St John of Beverley in Whatton, a separate village beyond a few intervening fields beside the River Smite and (now) the railway line. Aslockton (rather than Whatton) is blessed with a railway station. Indeed, the village is one of only 4 such settlements in Rushcliffe, though services are limited to roughly hourly intervals to and from Nottingham, Grantham and even Skegness in the morning and evening, dropping to 2-hourly intervals during the day; there is just one train on Sundays. Buses connect the village to Bingham, Nottingham and Bottesford on an hourly basis in the early morning and early evening, but not at all on Sundays; there are infrequent services to Radcliffe, Grantham and Newark. The village also benefits from a primary school, a nursery, a small shop-cum-post office, a pleasant public house (the Cranmer Arms), a hairdresser’s and the activities of several local clubs; the Cranmer Centre can also serve as a village hall.
3. The village is an attractive place. Its core is a Conservation Area with collections of small brick cottages, often with gables set against (the historic ‘bustle’ of) Main Street, interspersed with modest farmsteads and the occasional manor; there are glimpses of paddocks and farmland beyond the cottages. And, footpaths (both to the east and west) traverse the cottage gardens and paddocks within the ‘depth’ of the Conservation Area to delve into the rural surroundings.
4. Those surroundings are in the landscape of the *Trent and Belvoir Vales*, as denoted within the National Character Area classification and within the *Aslockton Village Farmlands*, as described in the Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (2009) (CD38). Key characteristics of the latter include: a very gently undulating landform of medium to large arable fields; mostly modern enclosures with some older enclosures around villages; a regularly dispersed pattern of small distinctive rural villages; a strong rural tranquil character apparently remote from urban centres; and, small coverts and copses scattered throughout the landscape with linear belts of trees along maturing hedgerows.
5. The appeal site is part of an extensive arable field within those wide rural surroundings to the west of the village. It extends to some 2.8ha behind the bungalows and inter-War properties that line the north side of Abbey Lane and contribute to a neat, though suburban, approach to Main Street. The site is level with existing hedgerows and trees evident along the eastern and western boundaries; a mixture of fences and foliage demarcate the end of the back gardens along Abbey Lane. Nothing demarcates the northern boundary of the site, but hedgerows around paddocks and enclosures behind Mill Lane and Chapel

Lane are evident along the northern boundary of this arable field. To the east, beyond dense hedgerows, are playing fields behind the primary school and, evident further north beyond more intermittent foliage, open land within the Conservation Area amongst the cottages on, and behind, Main Street. Beyond the western hedgerows it is possible to glimpse the upper elements of the gable at The Maltings, a locally listed building. A gap, some 8.5m wide between the bungalows fronting Abbey Lane (Tabora and Field View) serves as an entrance for agricultural vehicles and machinery. A public footpath (footpath 3) runs along the eastern boundary of the site connecting Abbey Lane with Mill Lane (the northern edge of the village). It also connects with footpaths leading back to Main Street; footpath 10 rounding the school into Dawns Lane and footpaths 8 and 9 squeezing past the cottage gardens and paddocks behind Chapel Lane and Main Street.

The proposal

6. The proposal is made in outline with all matters except the means of access reserved for subsequent approval.
7. Those access arrangements are now shown on drawing no.F14184/04 (CD18) and entail the creation of a new estate road through the field entrance between Tabora and Field View on the north side of Abbey Lane. Those details are acceptable to the Highway Authority and show the width of the carriageway and pavements, the installation of a 'traffic calming' feature together with the position and height of close boarded fencing to protect the peace and privacy of adjacent residents. However, it became clear at the Inquiry that several small variations to those details might significantly improve the lot of those nearby, including the length of the fencing sections, the position and height of the rear fencing, the treatment of adjacent grass verges and the position of the traffic calming feature. In those circumstances, it was agreed that suitable flexibility might best be achieved by also treating the means of access as a reserved matter. I shall determine this appeal accordingly.
8. All other matters were reserved for subsequent approval from the outset. However, an illustrative Masterplan (CD16) indicates how 65 dwellings could be arranged around 2 culs-de-sac and various pathways, incorporating a village green, a play area, a surface-water attenuation pond and new planting; those 'green' areas are currently shown along the northern boundary and towards the north eastern corner of the site, although there is considerable scope for variation. The Design and Access Statement (CD2) indicates that the dwellings would range in type and size (incorporating from 1 to 5 bedrooms); 30% of the units would be 'affordable dwellings'.
9. A submitted section 106 Unilateral Undertaking (ID15) would provide some £193,587 towards consequent improvements required to educational, transport and library facilities as well as the cost of monitoring compliance with the terms of the Undertaking. Contributions of £1,115.31 per dwelling would also be made towards the provision of a sports hall and a swimming pool in Bingham and towards improvements to pitches, pavilions and changing rooms at Dark Lane (between Aslockton and Whatton). Parts of the land to be provided and permanently maintained as public open space, including the sustainable urban drainage arrangements, would be provided to the Council and a 'travel pack' would be made available to each first occupant of the proposed dwellings. Importantly, the Undertaking would secure the provision of 30% of the dwellings as affordable homes or, in certain defined circumstances, commensurate payment of an affordable housing contribution.

10. Suggested conditions (ID4) would ensure that the scheme would be implemented as intended and that the reserved matters and other details (including hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments) would be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval: that foul and surface water drainage systems would be installed and controlled: that a Construction Management Plan (including hours of operation and lorry routing) would be devised and implemented: that further archaeological investigations would be undertaken: and that the 'green infrastructure', the retention of trees and the provision of new pedestrian and cycle facilities would be secured. An important suggestion is that development should begin within 2 years to ensure that the scheme would contribute to the 5 year supply of housing.

Planning policy and the main issues

11. The Development Plan currently consists of the Core Strategy 2011-2028 (the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1) (CD25) formally adopted on 22 December 2014 and the 5 'saved' policies in the Rushcliffe Borough Local Plan (1996), all of which are agreed to be irrelevant to this appeal. There is also a Non Statutory Replacement Local Plan (2006) used to determine planning applications (CD26). Since this was prepared in accordance with the Development Plan Regulations in force at the time and the 3 policies cited in the remaining reasons for refusal appear generally consistent with the Framework (and have previously been accepted as such), they remain relevant here. The Non-Statutory Plan is expected to serve until the Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies is adopted. The latter is intended to set out the non-strategic development allocations. However, although consultation on the 'issues and options' was completed in March 2016 and the Plan is currently the focus of much effort, amendments and alterations for the 'preferred options' are yet to emerge; a date for September 2016 is now more likely to materialise after the New Year, or even later. Adoption, initially anticipated for 2016, was revised for July 2017 and is now unlikely before August 2018. This must affect the development of those sites (including some strategic allocations) entailing the release of land currently within the Green Belt, since this is an issue to be addressed by the Local Plan Part 2.
12. The Core Strategy aims to focus most new development on the main urban area of Nottingham. This is partly because the City is deemed to be the most sustainable location, where employment, services, facilities and public transport networks are concentrated. It is also because a sizeable proportion of the housing to be provided within Rushcliffe is to serve the needs of the wider housing market area (mainly the City of Nottingham) and to ensure that most new housing is located where most new jobs are likely to be created. To that end, policy 3 indicates that, of the 13,150 new homes required to be provided between 2011 and 2028 (though 13,450 are actually anticipated), 7,650 (about 58%) are to be in or adjoining the built up area of Nottingham, mainly in 3 'sustainable urban extension' at South Clifton (3,000), Edwalton (1,500) and between Gamston and Tollerton (2,500), with some 650 dwellings to provided elsewhere in the built up area. A further 5,500 dwellings (42%) are to be provided beyond the built up area, including 3,520 (about 27%) at 5 'key settlements' (Bingham (1,000), Cotgrave Colliery (470), East Leake (450), Keyworth (450), Radcliffe on Trent (400) and Ruddington (250)) and some 550 new homes at RAF Newton. The remaining 1980 dwellings (some 15% of the total requirement) are to be located in 'other villages solely to meet local needs' (policy 3b(viii)).
13. The Council point out that Aslockton is not a settlement explicitly identified in policy 3 to accommodate growth. Rather, it is a village where development is

expected to meet local needs only to be delivered (as the Plan explains) either 'through small scale infill development or on exception sites' or 'where small scale allocations are appropriate to provide further for local needs'; such sites are to be identified (eventually) through the emerging Local Plan Part 2. The Council consider that the scheme would contravene the requirements of policy 3. It would also fail to reflect the form and character of the village and intrude into the rural surroundings of the place, contrary to policy 10 and the aims of policies GP2, EN19 and HOU2 of the Non Statutory Plan; such harmful effects are alleged to impinge on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to policy 11 and guidance in the Framework (NPPF). In addition, the proximity of the proposed access road to the bungalows at Tabora and Field View is considered to affect the amenity of residents there.

14. Local residents echo some of those concerns. In particular, they are apprehensive about the noise and loss of privacy likely to be caused by the proposed access arrangements and the creation of a higher density estate incorporating 2-storey properties quite close to existing back gardens and bungalows. They point out that the distribution of the open space shown on the illustrative Masterplan could be altered to provide a buffer between the new dwellings and existing properties while the mix of dwellings could be rearranged to reflect the type and character of those nearby. The proposal would result in the loss of 'good' agricultural land, alter the character of well-used footpaths and impinge on the function of the back gardens as wildlife corridors. There are worries that the SUDS arrangements might not be able to cope with the standing surface water evident on the flat site after heavy rain. And, now that permission has recently been granted on appeal (CD34) for a new estate of 75 dwellings to the south of Abbey Lane, the cumulative impact of traffic might well engender road hazards and conflicts with the 'school run'. In any case, 75 additional dwellings is an increase of 19% in the size of the village which must exceed what is envisaged in the Core Strategy. As the letter from DCLG states (document 8.7); *The Localism Act and the Framework together reaffirm the importance of Local Plans as the primary basis for identifying what kinds of development are needed in each area. Whenever a Local Plan is drawn up, consulted on and agreed, local residents should expect decisions to be taken in accordance with it. This is a sign of true democratic decision taking in action.* Residents thus assert that the adopted Local Plan should prevail here.
15. Nevertheless, much is agreed between the Council and the appellants (ID4). It is agreed that the traffic can be accommodated safely: that there would be no serious effect on wildlife or the ecology of the area: that the archaeological interest evident on the site can be appropriately safeguarded: that the site can be drained sustainably: and, that adequate provisions for foul drainage of the proposed estate can be installed.
16. It is also agreed that the Council cannot demonstrate the availability of sufficient land to meet the estimated housing requirement over the next 5 years (see also ID7). In the Statement of Common Ground it is estimated that sufficient land is available to provide for the requirement over the next 3.4 years (actually 3.43 years, but figures purporting to provide estimates to within 4 days or so impart a wholly unwarranted perception of precision). Provision for 5 years was indicated when the Plan was adopted, but this fell to 4.3 years barely 3 months later (the end of March 2015); the current estimate is lower still.
17. It follows that paragraphs 49 and 14 of the Framework are engaged, which together indicate that 'relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five-

year supply of deliverable housing sites' and, in those circumstances, that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be interpreted to mean that permission should be granted unless consequent adverse impacts of the scheme significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (as assessed against the Framework as a whole), or specific policies in the Framework indicate otherwise. Even so, not all policies that might influence the supply of housing deal solely with housing supply. So, although policy 3 is certainly a policy restricting the supply of deliverable housing sites (in line with the judgement set out in *Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Limited and SoS and Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East Borough Council and SoS* (CD32)), it is also fundamental to the aim of achieving a sustainable distribution of housing across, not just the Borough of Rushcliffe, but also across the whole of the strategic housing market area (essentially the City Region of Nottingham). As achieving 'sustainable development' is seen as a 'golden thread' in plan-making and decision-taking within the Framework, this is an important consideration here. In addition, the cited judgement also confirms that an 'out-of-date' policy should not necessarily be discarded or disregarded; the statutory requirements, both to have regard to the Development Plan and to make decisions in accordance with it unless material considerations indicate otherwise, remain. In that context, policy 3 aims to provide (in conjunction with policy 10) a way in which decision-taking can take account of the distinctiveness and identity of villages, hamlets and other places (as the Framework extols). Thus, the task here is to set those statutory requirements against the other material considerations that apply in order to arrive at an appropriate balance in favour or against the scheme, always bearing in mind that the advice in the Framework is itself an important material consideration.

18. In those circumstances, and from all that I have heard, read and seen, I consider that the main issues here involve:
 - i) the need for, and the provision of, additional housing,
 - ii) the role of the village in relation to the Core Strategy,
 - iii) the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the village and the perception of the Conservation Area,
 - iv) the impact of the scheme on the peace and prospect of nearby residents,
 - v) the overall planning balance in relation to the economic, social and environmental dimensions of 'sustainable development'.

Housing provision

19. It is agreed that, as at March 2016, deliverable sites could be identified to provide for the housing required only for 3.4 years. Indeed, the shortfall might be marginally larger as, whatever 'buffer' is to be applied (and a longer term view could well show that a 20% 'buffer' might be inappropriate), it should operate on both the 'requirement' and the 'shortfall'. However, the existence or otherwise of a 5-year supply of housing land is not solely an end in itself, but rather one of 5 tasks set out in the Framework to 'boost significantly the supply of housing'. Those tasks are consistent with a plan-led approach to decision-making and are all addressed by the adopted Core Strategy and its supporting evidence base. There is no dispute that the Plan is designed to meet the 'full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing' in the 'housing market area', including significant needs from the City of Nottingham: efforts to identify a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites in accordance with the Plan are undertaken annually: specific sites and broad locations for growth are also identified in the Plan and the SHLAA to accommodate residential development 6-10 years hence and 11-15

years ahead: the expected rate of delivery is set out in the 'housing trajectory' and an 'implementation strategy' has been prepared with the aim of maintaining a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites: and, several policies in the Plan identify appropriate densities in relation to specific sites and locations. The result is that the supply of housing is showing recent signs of being 'boosted significantly', the most recent annual completions being some 60% above the average achieved in the 6 years preceding the Plan period (ID8). Is that enough?

20. Unfortunately, it is not. On the contrary, the recent 'boost' actually achieved is only the start of what is intended to be almost a 4-fold annual increase in the delivery of housing envisaged within the trajectory. That is an ambitious target, as recognised by the Inspector examining the Core Strategy (CD40). Moreover, since over half of those dwellings are to be provided within the 3 'sustainable urban extensions', their delivery entails the provision of 'up-front' infrastructure and the discharge of complex conditions and Agreements, as well as coordination and cooperation between diverse developers and builders. All are potential impediments to immediate development. Consequently, it is not surprising that the completions set out in the trajectory have proved optimistic (perhaps even unrealistic) and the levels of delivery forecast have not materialised. This is one of the main reasons for the current dearth in the supply of housing land. The question is what is being done to rectify the situation.
21. Considerable effort is being expended by the Council to make progress with the 'sustainable urban extensions' and to encourage development on the identified 'key' strategic sites (ID8). Progress is being made at the Edwalton SUE. There, full planning permissions exist for 929 dwellings with an outline permission for a further 52 homes. National house builders are involved in all but the latter scheme and development has begun on a site for 261 dwellings. So, although the latest assessment indicates a reduction of 150 dwellings to be built over the 5-year period, the anticipated development is likely to be completed within the Plan period. At the Clifton SUE highway and viability issues have stalled the progress of an outline planning application, although the Council are endeavouring to expedite matters with the aid of a planning performance agreement. However, the anticipated on-set of development is now expected to be delayed by 3 years and the dwellings to be delivered within 5 years are reduced by 575 to less than half of those envisaged in the trajectory. Since there is no evidence that the high rate of development ultimately envisaged (250dpa) could be increased, it is possible that some 750 dwellings may not materialise within the Plan period. A rather similar situation exists at the Gamston and Tollerton SUE, except that here landowners (rather than developers or builders) are being encouraged by the Council to prepare an outline application. Again, the on-set of development is now expected to be delayed by 3 years and the dwellings to be delivered within 5 years reduced by 615. It is also possible (for the same reasons that apply to Clifton) that some 750 dwellings may not materialise within the Plan period. As a result the SUEs are estimated to deliver some 1,340 fewer dwellings within the 5-year period than had been anticipated in the trajectory and there could be a shortfall from this source at the end of the Plan period of some 1,500 dwellings.
22. Development on the 'key' strategic sites is also the focus of much effort on the part of the Council. At Bingham proactive working with the Crown Estate aims to identify a preferred developer or development partner, modify phasing and alleviate flood risks, for which a contribution of £2.5m has been secured by the Council from the Growth Fund. The anticipated delivery is expected to be delayed by 2 years resulting in a reduction of 400 dwellings within 5 years, although the scheme should be completed within the Plan period. At Cotgrave Colliery detailed

permissions delivered 112 dwellings by the end of March 2016 and the whole scheme is likely to be completed in advance of trajectory expectations, complemented by £3m for regeneration secured by the Council from the Growth Fund. At East Leake a series of detailed permissions involving several national house builders has resulted in planning permission for 814 dwellings, of which 243 were completed by the end of March 2016. The expectation is that the remaining 571 homes will be delivered within the 5-year period, resulting in an addition to the trajectory of 421 dwellings. At RAF Newton a proactive approach has led to preliminary discussions with a major house builder relating to the submission of a reserved matters application and working with land owners on viability, phasing and infrastructure. In relation to the latter, a contribution of £750k has been secured from the Growth Fund for the installation of a footbridge over the A46. The anticipated delivery is expected to be delayed by 3 years resulting in a reduction of 200 dwellings within 5 years, but completion within the Plan period. The sites at Keyworth, Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington are all within the Green Belt and their release must await the adoption of the Local Plan Part 2. However, the trajectory indicates that no dwelling is expected to be completed before 2018/19. Since all those sites have attracted development interest and planning applications (albeit currently withdrawn or refused), the envisaged delay to the emerging Local Plan may not significantly affect their contribution to the anticipated delivery of dwellings. On that basis, the 'key' strategic sites are now estimated to deliver some 280 fewer dwellings within the 5-year period than had been anticipated in the trajectory but to deliver the whole of their contribution to the housing required within the Plan period.

23. It seems to me that the overall picture is one of delay in providing the housing envisaged in the trajectory, but not yet of an outright failure in the Core Strategy. True, there is not a 5-year supply of housing land and the provision anticipated in the trajectory from the SUEs and the 'key' sites within that 5-year period is reduced. But, apart from the possibility of failing to deliver the 1,500 dwellings at Clifton and Gamston, the latest estimates suggest that the rest of the requirement should be delivered in accordance with the Core Strategy. That, in itself, would boost the supply of housing very significantly. In any case, the Plan actually anticipates the provision of about 300 more dwellings than the minimum required. And, as estimating housing provision is far from an exact science, there may yet be repetitions of the successes already experienced at East Leake and Cotgrave and (from the evidence) impending at Edwalton. Moreover, I think that the proactive efforts of the Council in seeking to expedite problems in consultation with developers and landowners and in securing monies from the Growth Fund to facilitate regeneration and the provision of infrastructure, deserves a chance to bear fruit; it has already achieved some tangible success.
24. In addition, when progress in delivering the dwellings anticipated in the trajectory is compared with what has actually been achieved to date, it is apparent that performance is ahead of schedule. In the 5 years since the start of the Plan period to 2015/16, the Core Strategy has delivered 1,561 dwellings against an anticipated 1,268 (ID8). That must denote an element of success. Moreover, being currently 'on track' suggests that it is, at least for the moment, too early to embark on a course of action significantly different from the 'strategy' mapped out in the Plan. And, even if that were different, a Plan examined, found to be sound and adopted less than 2 years ago deserves some support having emerged from the scrutiny and responded to the extensive consultation involved. Hence, it seems to me that the justification for the proposed development in the absence of a 5-year supply of housing must partly depend on how significantly the scheme

would depart from the aims of the recently adopted Core Strategy. I turn to consider that issue below.

The role of Aslockton

25. Aslockton is not a settlement identified in policy 3 to accommodate growth. It is designated as 'another village' in the settlement hierarchy where development is expected to meet local needs only. The Plan explains that such schemes are to be delivered either 'through small scale infill development or on exception sites' or 'where small scale allocations are appropriate to provide further for local needs'. The intention is that those 'small scale allocations' are to be identified through the emerging Local Plan Part 2.
26. On the face of it, the proposal would meet none of those requirements. It is clearly not a 'small scale infill development' nor does it involve an 'exception site'. Both terms are common in many planning contexts and require no further explanation to be readily understandable. Perhaps the interpretation of 'appropriate small scale allocations to provide further for local needs' is not so straightforward since 'allocations' are not necessarily on 'infill' or 'exception' sites and there is no explicit indication of how the 1,980 dwellings envisaged are to be distributed amongst 'other villages' or between 'infill', 'exception' and 'allocated' sites. However, read in a straightforward manner and in the context set out in the Plan, it seems to me that 'small scale' is sensibly interpreted in relation to a settlement or (possibly) a locality and 'local need' must imply some local dimension or purpose. The suggestion that 'scale' might be interpreted in relation to the full quantum of dwellings to be scattered across all the 'other villages' in the whole of the Borough on 'infill', 'exception' and 'allocated' sites is, in the context offered by the Plan, not credible. It is not obviously 'local', in the sense implied by paragraphs 3.3.5 and 3.3.17 of the Plan and it muddles the clear distinction between the strategic sites identified to sustainably meet the requirements of the wider HMA and non-strategic 'local' development. So, although this scheme may only represent 3% of all the dwellings to be provided in 'other villages', that does not make it a small scale scheme in relation to Aslockton. On the contrary, it would represent a 16% increase in the size of the village and, with the 75 dwellings granted on appeal to the south of Abbey Lane, enlarge the settlement by 35%; should the 50 dwellings at Cliffhill Lane materialise (planning permission has recently been refused), then an expansion of almost 50% would have been achieved. Even without the latter, I think that the scheme would result in a significant cumulative expansion of the village. I consider that this proposal would not be a 'small scale' scheme in any sense envisaged within the Plan.
27. Nor would it 'provide further for local needs'. It would provide 'affordable housing'. But, although there is a need for affordable housing within the Borough as a whole (as indicated in the SHMA), the evidence available indicates that it is not 'local' to Aslockton. Indeed, the Council's Housing Needs Survey shows that, for the Parish of Aslockton, a need for 6 affordable homes existed in 2009 (document 7). This has now been met by the provision of 6 affordable dwellings at Crawfords Meadow. Local people and the Parish Council indicate that the initial criteria for occupation of those dwellings had to be relaxed substantially in order to recruit qualifying residents, the intention being to meet 'local needs' in the settlement or locality where they arise. No subsequent Housing Needs Survey has yet been undertaken. However, in this case, the permitted appeal to the south of Abbey Lane is expected to provide around 22 affordable homes; from past experience that is likely to be more than sufficient to accommodate the affordable housing needs in the locality for the foreseeable future. No other 'local need' is

claimed. It follows that the proposal would not, in itself, serve the function intended by the Plan for development on allocated sites here to 'provide further for local needs'.

28. The rationale of countenancing a significant cumulative expansion of Aslockton to contribute to the supply of housing sites over the next 5 years seems to me to be fundamentally at odds with the carefully honed 'spatial vision' on which the Core Strategy is based. The Core Strategy aims to focus most new development on the main urban area of Nottingham not just because that is where most employment, most facilities and public transport networks are all focussed, but also because, under the 'duty to cooperate', a sizeable proportion of the housing requirement in Rushcliffe emanates from the City of Nottingham and is intended to meet needs that cannot be met within the City. It makes little sense, in planning terms, to seek to meet those needs in relatively remote and far flung rural corners of Nottinghamshire as soon as difficulties (not yet demonstrated to be insurmountable) arise in meeting them in accordance with the Plan.
29. Moreover, much effort has been expended on devising a 'spatial vision' to ensure that the pattern of housing provision is sustainably distributed not just across Rushcliffe, but also across the wider 'housing market area'. The Greater Nottingham Accessible Settlements Study and the Sustainable Locations for Growth Study (CD35 and CD36) both show that Aslockton is not a preferred location for substantial housing growth. I realise that my colleague (CD34) found the location 'sustainable'. The village does benefit from some services and facilities; there is a railway station, a bus service, a primary school, a nursery, a small shop-cum-post office, a public house, a hairdresser's, several local clubs and a village hall. But, the trains and buses are infrequent (except at commuting times) and the shop is limited. There is precious little local employment (save for the prison), there is no supermarket, no secondary school and no higher order services. It is thus inevitable, as the Council suggest, that this scheme would be likely to entail more car-borne travel, notwithstanding the provision of the 'travel packs' envisaged. Several higher order facilities are available in Bingham, or further afield, but that is why Bingham and other places, rather than Aslockton, have been identified to accommodate 'strategic levels' of additional housing. That is the whole point. The studies, and consequently the Core Strategy, identify and build on the relative 'sustainability' of settlements across the 'housing market area'. So, the fact that Aslockton turns out to be the 18th most accessible place out of 67 (or perhaps 60) settlements in Rushcliffe, and 1st within the 'rural east housing market sub-area', simply demonstrates that Rushcliffe is blest with few places suitable to cater for 'strategic' levels of housing and none within the 'rural east housing market sub-area'. Indeed, there are levels in the wider settlement hierarchy that do not exist anywhere in Rushcliffe. In relative terms (the relevant consideration here, in my view), Aslockton is not a 'sustainable' location to accommodate substantial cumulative additions of new housing. Hence, I consider that this proposal would not only contravene the aims and requirements set out in policy 3 of the Core Strategy, but also be fundamentally at odds with the 'spatial vision' on which that Plan is based.
30. The Core Strategy has been examined, found to be sound and adopted less than 2 years ago. It is the result of much effort, several years of study, severe scrutiny and extensive consultation. And, of course, the Framework sets out as the first 'core planning principle' that decisions should be genuinely plan-led and empower local people to shape their surroundings, an aim reiterated in the letter from the DCLG sent to local people here (document 8.7). This Plan is certainly recent, even if the housing policies should not now be considered up-to-date, and it is certainly

based on joint working and co-operation designed to address 'larger than local issues'. Indeed, the 'spatial vision' on which the Plan is based is designed to contribute to meeting the housing requirements from Nottingham in a 'sustainable' way. And, as my colleague has observed (document 7.2), a central purpose of the plan-led system is to deliver sustainable development in the right place at the right time in accordance with the vision and aspiration of local communities. As this scheme would be contrary to the aims and requirements of policy 3 and fundamentally at odds with the 'spatial vision' entailed, it would undermine the approach of a recently adopted Core Strategy to delivering 'sustainable development'. The scheme would thus confound both the 'core planning principle' that decisions should be genuinely plan-led and the 'golden thread' of pursuing 'sustainable development', set out in the Framework. Such development would be very damaging. Hence, I consider that the contribution that this scheme would make to the 5-year supply of housing would be insufficient to overcome the serious disadvantages and significant harm due to seeking to make that provision in the 'wrong' place (contrary to the 'spatial vision'), namely at a village identified in policy 3 to accommodate local needs only rather than significant growth.

The village and the Conservation Area

31. The appeal site is within an extensive arable field that is part of, and contributes to, the rural surroundings of the village. It thus allows some perception of the ancient agricultural origins of the place, still evident in field, paddock and plot boundaries in the vicinity, including some of those around the appeal site (document 6). The proposal would result in an extensive incursion into that wide open landscape and 'push' those rural surroundings further from the centre of the village. The scheme would thus add to the suburban extensions evident along other approaches to the village (from the west on the southern side of Abbey Lane, from the south behind Dark Lane and from the north east along Cliffhill Lane), thereby enveloping more of the ancient core amidst a cacophony of modern estates. Here, the few glimpses of the agricultural hinterland beyond the bungalows and dwellings that line the northern side of Abbey Lane would be obliterated, reflecting the suburban development in depth (soon to be accentuated) that characterises the southern side of the road. And, of course, the outlook over the flat rural landscape, now enjoyed by adjacent residents, would be transformed.
32. But, although those changes would diminish the perceived 'rurality' of the village and alter the outlook of residents, this is not a specially designated or even a high quality landscape and the proposed estate would reflect a pattern of development already evident here. There would be scope to adapt the Masterplan to accord with all the requirements of policy 10, including the retention of views towards the spire of the Parish Church at Scarrington and of a visual connection to the flat agricultural surroundings beyond the proposed landscaping to the north of the estate. It should still be possible to glimpse the upper elements of the gable at The Maltings across that remaining open land. And, to be fair, it is hard to argue that the retention of a vista across this agricultural land is 'key' to understanding the rural origins of this village; as the appellants point out, most villages were once surrounded by agricultural land and that can often be commonly understood even in the context of subsequent land use changes.
33. Nevertheless, I think that there would be 2 ways in which the impact of this proposal would noticeably diminish an appreciation of the character of the village and its Conservation Area. First, part of the eastern boundary of the appeal site,

and the field in which it lies, abuts the western boundary of the Conservation Area (CD27). Although views of the proposed estate from most 'historic' and 'positive' buildings identified in the Townscape Appraisal (CD29), and from the core of the Conservation Area, would be largely obliterated by dense hedgerows, the village footpaths (particularly footpaths 3, 8 and 9) would continue to provide a physical and visual link between the two. Footpaths 8 and 9 squeeze past the traditional cottages, the cottage gardens and the paddocks behind Chapel Lane and Main Street. In doing so they traverse the Conservation Area to the west of Main Street in depth and pass paddocks identified as 'positive open spaces' (CD29) before emerging on to footpath 3 towards the north east corner of the field containing the appeal site. Here (or close by) a 'panoramic view' is identified in the Townscape Appraisal that sweeps across the flat field and the appeal site towards field hedgerows and open countryside beyond. In contrast to the enclosing hedges and enveloping foliage within the Conservation Area, I think that this vista is surprising and dramatic, allowing walkers to appreciate the abrupt juxtaposition of the historic core of the village with the surrounding open countryside in which it is set. The proposal would intrude into that vista, diminishing its impact as well as its contribution to the setting of the village and the Conservation Area.

34. Second, it seems to me that the proposal would significantly alter the character of footpath 3. At present, this footpath emerges from a narrow passage between the dwellings on Abbey Lane to enter the wide expanse of agricultural land immediately to the north before passing between paddocks and gardens to emerge, eventually, between dwellings and cottages on Mill Lane. Most of the footpath lies beside open agricultural land. But, as a result of the proposed development, most of the footpath would run beside buildings and their associated gardens or through the proposed landscaping. It would not be beside open countryside. On the contrary, it would become a link largely through existing and proposed development. Such a change in character would be perceived by many, for this is, like others here, a well-used footpath. Moreover a section of it (roughly about 70m towards the north east corner of the 'appeal field'), allows views through intermittent hedging into the Conservation Area of identified 'positive open spaces', providing thereby a visual link (albeit limited) between the agricultural surroundings of the village and the Conservation Area. This link would remain. But, I consider that it would be diminished by the evident proximity of the appeal scheme.
35. It is agreed (between the appellants and the Council) that the impact of the scheme on the significance of the Conservation Area through the change to its 'setting' would be 'less than substantial'. For the appellants it is deemed to be 'negligible'. But that does not mean that all harm would be absent. In my view, the intrusive impact of the scheme on a dramatic vista would erode the strength of the physical and visual connection between the Conservation Area and the surrounding agricultural landscape and 'suburbanise' a well-used village footpath. Both would be tangible effects manifest to the many users of the footpaths. Some harm would thus ensue in relation to the character of the village and the setting of the Conservation Area.

Peace and prospect

36. The access arrangements shown on drawing no.F14184/04 are now to be considered as illustrating the scheme intended; the scope for variation is limited, but small alterations to the details proposed would be possible. However, a fundamental constraint concerns the width of the field access and the position of

the adjacent bungalows beside it. The access is about 8.5m wide: the flank wall of Tabora stands on the boundary with a small window serving a study-cum-occasional bedroom: patio doors to that room are in the front elevation: the flank wall of Field View is about 3.5m from the proposed access road behind close boarded fencing with a thick neat hedge around the front garden. Hence, although there would certainly be space to accommodate the access arrangements proposed, the new estate road would be rather closer to the adjacent properties than might normally be expected in a suburban area such as this including, for example, in comparison to the dwellings at the entrance to Fields Drive opposite. I consider that the proximity of vehicles and pedestrians passing by so close to their homes and gardens would inevitably impinge on the peace and privacy residents at Tabora and Field View now enjoy.

37. The solution proposed is to install a number of ameliorative measures, including a 'traffic calming' feature and close boarded fencing (of at least 10kgm^{-2}), 2m in height beside Tabora and 1.8m high beside Fields View. There is scope to vary some of the details currently envisaged, such as extending the length of the fencing, altering the position and height of the rear fencing, treating adjacent grass verges and repositioning the traffic calming feature. All those variations are likely to improve the performance of the ameliorative measures proposed by reducing the noise likely to be evident in the adjacent properties and increasing the screening of gardens and elevations there. However, the assessments undertaken relate only to the detailed scheme initially proposed (document 2).
38. The impact of the traffic expected to pass between the adjacent bungalows is assessed in relation to BS8233:2014 and the WHO guidance relating to community noise (1999) and night time noise (2009). The first 2 are similar suggesting daytime levels of $L_{Aeq}=35\text{dB}$ within living rooms and $L_{Aeq}=50\text{dB}$ in gardens (with an upper level of 55dB) and night-time levels of $L_{Aeq}=30\text{dB}$ within bedrooms. The WHO 1999 guidelines also indicate that the number of individual events heard within bedrooms exceeding an $L_{Amax}=45\text{dB}$ should be limited and quoted research implies that such a limited should be 10-15 times a night. The WHO 2009 night-time update introduces a slightly different measure (L_{night} rather than L_{Aeq}) and suggests a limit of 40dB as representing the 'lowest level at which an observed effect occurs'. However, it does not withdraw the previous guidance so that although it states that some effects are known to occur at lower levels than $L_{Amax}=45\text{dB}$, the aim is still to reduce their occurrence.
39. The assessment (document 2) demonstrates that, with the additional mitigation measures in place, the gardens, living rooms and nearly all the bedrooms in Tabora and Field View would meet the relevant noise standards. The only place where those standards would be breached would be within the study-cum-bedroom in the side elevation of Tabora, if that room was in use as a bedroom. Readings of over 70dB (L_{Amax}) are recorded at that façade which, even assuming a 20dB reduction due to the small side window being partially open, would result in a noise level of about 50dB within the room. Since some 18 vehicles are predicted to pass by during the night, that level of 'disturbance' would exceed the incidence recommended by the WHO. And, because the initial traffic distribution (document 11) entails a higher level of traffic over a 12-hour day than the 24-hour distribution used to predict noise levels (document 2.H), it is possible that more vehicles might pass over the access at night. Even so, it is clear that further mitigation measures could be implemented. Moreover, the room affected by the predicted traffic is only sometimes used as bedroom.

40. However, it seems to me that the mitigation measures proposed also entail some detrimental consequences in themselves. In particular, the stout close boarded fencing would be quite tall (2m in height beside Tabora) and above 'normal' eye level (1.8m high beside Field View). Although such structures would effectively screen those bungalows from the casual surveillance of people passing by at close quarters, they would also incarcerate occupants behind impenetrable barriers, confining the prospect residents might reasonably expect to enjoy across suburban gardens and open fields by a solid, enclosing fence. The height and proximity of the structures would accentuate their incarcerating effects and render their presence unexpectedly obtrusive amongst these otherwise rather verdant suburban surroundings. I realise that such screens might well be preferred by residents to the visible proximity of people and vehicles. But, that does not mean that they would have no effect on the amenities that residents might reasonably expect to enjoy.
41. Clearly, the mitigation measures proposed attempt to secure 'a good standard of amenity for all existing ... occupants of land and buildings' as the Framework extols. Nevertheless, they would not prevent some detrimental change to the living conditions currently enjoyed by residents of Tabora and Field View. Policy GP2a of the non-statutory plan insists that new development should have no 'significant adverse effect' upon the amenity of adjoining properties; in the circumstances that apply here, I doubt that the adverse effects of the scheme would necessarily be 'significant'. But, policy GP2b indicates that a suitable means of access to new schemes should be provided 'without detriment to the amenity of adjacent properties'. For the reasons indicated above, I consider that these access arrangements would cause some detriment to the amenity of adjacent residents.

The planning balance

42. I have found that this proposal would contravene the aims and requirements set out in policy 3 of the Core Strategy. But, in the absence of a 5-year supply of housing land, that policy cannot be regarded as 'up-to-date' and this scheme must be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Hence, permission should be granted unless either any consequent adverse impact would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits (assessed against the advice in the Framework as a whole) or specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted. No specific policies in the Framework have been identified that would indicate that the scheme should be restricted. The outcome of this appeal thus depends on: whether the scheme would be sustainable; whether its adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits; and, whether the overall planning balance would be in favour or against the scheme.
43. Aslockton has been deemed to be a sustainable place (CD34). I disagree. While the village does benefit from some services and facilities, it lacks many. And, in the absence of any measure to extend the hours of operation and increase the frequency of the passing trains and buses, it seems to me that additional housing in the village must largely entail more car-borne travel. Much effort has been expended on devising a 'spatial vision' to ensure that the pattern of housing provision is sustainably distributed not just across Rushcliffe, but also across the wider 'housing market area'; the studies (CD35 and CD36) show that, relative to other settlements, Aslockton is not a preferred location to accommodate substantial housing growth. That is the whole point. There are more sustainable locations better suited to accommodate the housing required. And, given that a

sizeable proportion of that housing is required to meet needs generated in Nottingham that is not surprising. Hence, in the context of the 'spatial vision' pursued in the Core Strategy and relative to the other settlements and locations in the housing market area, Aslockton is not a sustainable place to accommodate levels of housing that would neither be small scale nor intended for local needs.

44. There would be benefits of the scheme. Economic benefits would include the New Homes Bonus (perhaps up to £1.1m) and the construction of 65 new dwellings that would provide jobs in the short term and contribute to the 5-year supply of housing. The new residents might be expected to spend something in the Cranmer Arms, the hairdressers and the small village shop-cum-post office, so helping to sustain the viability of existing services and facilities in both Aslockton and nearby Whatton-in-the-Vale and contribute to the local economy. Potential social benefits would entail 30% of the units to be provided as affordable housing, meeting an identified Borough-wide need. And, although environmentally the scheme would result in the loss of a green field site on the edge of the village, the site is an ordinary agricultural field, adjacent to existing development and the Core Strategy must require some development on such sites to provide for some of the 1,980 dwellings envisaged in 'other villages'. In any case, there are opportunities for additional landscaping, the provision of open space and enhanced ecological provision as well as a reduction in the flood risk from surface water by the installation of sustainable drainage.
45. But, there would be adverse impacts too. I have found that the scheme would be contrary to the aims and requirements of policy 3 and fundamentally at odds with the 'spatial vision' on which the Core Strategy is based. It would thus undermine the approach of a recently adopted Core Strategy to delivering 'sustainable development' and, thereby, confound both the 'core planning principle' that decisions should be genuinely plan-led and the 'golden thread' of pursuing 'sustainable development'. The scheme would thus fail to reflect key elements in the advice proffered by the Framework. Such development would be very damaging entailing serious economic, social and environmental consequences. Moreover, although a need for affordable housing exists within the Borough, the evidence available indicates that it is not 'local' to Aslockton. And, although the appeal site may only be an ordinary agricultural field, the intrusive impact of the scheme would diminish a dramatic panoramic vista, thereby eroding the strength of the physical and visual connection between the village, the Conservation Area and the surrounding agricultural landscape, as well as 'suburbanising' a well-used village footpath. Those tangible effects would result in some environmental harm to the character of the village and the setting of the Conservation Area. Finally, I have found that the access arrangements would cause some detriment to the amenity of adjacent residents. Hence, I have no doubt that the adverse impacts of this scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits not least because, being fundamentally at odds with this recently adopted Core Strategy, the proposal would not only entail serious economic, social and environmental consequences, but also constitute unsustainable development.
46. It follows that the planning balance must be firmly against the scheme. For, although there would be environmental, social and economic benefits (as outlined above), particularly in providing 65 new houses that would contribute to the 5-year supply and providing a policy-compliant number of affordable homes, there would be serious serious economic, social and environmental consequences in departing fundamentally from a recently adopted Core Strategy and in failing to pursue the 'golden thread' of 'sustainable development'. In my view, the substantial and significant harm to those policy objectives would not be

outweighed by the provision of jobs, the spending power of new residents, a New Homes Bonus or the measures to be achieved through the suggested conditions and the section 106 Obligation.

Conclusion

47. I have found that this scheme would be contrary to the requirements of policy 3 and fundamentally at odds with the 'spatial vision' on which this recently adopted Core Strategy is based. That would confound an aim of the Framework that decisions should be plan-led and, since the Core Strategy has been designed and found to be sound on the basis that it would achieve a sustainable distribution of development across both Rushcliffe and the wider housing market area, undermine the sustainable rationale embedded in the Plan. The scheme would thus be unsustainable and entail harmful economic, social and environmental consequence. Although the 5-year supply of housing sites has progressively deteriorated since the adoption of the Core Strategy, the Council are making strenuous efforts (negotiating with developers, finding potential developers for landowners and securing grants to facilitate infrastructure and development) to redress the situation; those efforts are clearly bearing fruit. While current predictions indicate that problems are likely to persist at least until August 2018, the Plan embodies a very significant boost to the supply of housing and the evidence indicates that current achievements are ahead of schedule. Hence, I consider that the advantages of development would not outweigh the harmful consequences of pursuing such an unsustainable scheme. On the contrary, I find that the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits and that the planning balance would be firmly against the scheme; the effect of the project, albeit limited, on the character of the village, the setting of the Conservation Area and the amenities of residents confirms my view. Hence, and in spite of considering all the other matter raised, I find nothing sufficiently compelling to alter my conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

David Cullingford
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES
FOR THE APPELLANTS:

Hugh Richards	of Counsel	No.5 Chambers, Birmingham Instructed by: Peter Wilkinson BA MCD MA FRTPI FIM MPIA Managing Director, Landmark Planning Limited, Leicester
He called:		
Leslie Jephson	BEng MIA	Acoustic Consultant and Managing Director, LF Acoustics Limited, Leicester
Ian M Reid	DipTRP DipLD MLI	Director, Ian Reid Landscape Planning Limited, Leicester
Gail Stoten	BA MCIfA FSA	Heritage Director, Pegasus Planning Group, Cirencester
Peter Wilkinson	BA MCD MA FRTPI FIM MPIA	Managing Director, Landmark Planning Limited, Leicester

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Jonathan Mitchell	of Counsel	Ropewalk Chambers, Nottingham Instructed by: Mr Ian Norman, Solicitor to Rushcliffe Borough Council
He called		
James Bate	BSc MSc DipHBC	Conservation Officer, Rushcliffe Borough Council
Melissa Kurihara	MLPM MRTPI	Principal Planning Consultant, Urban Vision Partnership Limited, Salford

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Christopher Smith	Local resident
Richard Sharpe	Aslockton Parish Council
Phillip Simkin	Local resident

DOCUMENTS

Document	1	Lists of persons present at the Inquiry (including Derby Telegraph)
Document	2	Summary, proof and appendices A-H ~ Leslie Jephson
Document	3	Summary, proof and appendices 1&2 ~ Gail Stoten
Document	4	Summary, proof, plan and figures 1-5 ~ Iain Reid
Document	5	Summary and proof ~ Peter Wilkinson Speech given at the Conservative Party Conference, 16 October 2016 by Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government
Document	6	Summary, proof and appendix 1 ~ James Bate
Document	7	Summary, proof and appendices 1-4 ~ Melissa Kurihara
Document	8	Statement and appendices ~ Chris Smith 1. Masterplan 2. Traffic survey at Starnhill Way, Bingham 3. The Linden Homes scheme 4. CAD representations 5. Other access arrangements as at Barrett Homes 6. Extracts from the Greater Nottingham Accessible Settlements Study: accessibility by theme 7. Letter to Mr Smith from DCLG, 22 February 2016 8. Letter from Mr Smith to Robert Jenrick MP 9. Noise Assessment, appendices and figures: Acoustic Associates 10. Highway Comments on access arrangements
Document	9	Statement and appendices ~ Richard Sharpe, Aslockton Parish Council 1. New dwellings in the village 2005-2015 2. Survey of commuters from Aslockton 3. Accident data and traffic surveys at the A52 junction with New Lane, including a comparison with Waterman TA
Document	10	Statement ~ Phillip Simkin
Document	11	Correspondence, traffic statement, appendices A-F and revised access drawing ~ Bancroft Consulting
Document	12	Inspector's index of representations to the appeal
Document	13	Representations to the appeal
Document	14	Questionnaire and associated documents
Document	15	Additional documents

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

ID01	Opening Statement ~ Hugh Richards <i>Daventry DC v SoS and Gladman Developments [2016] JPL</i> <i>SoS v BDW Trading Limited [2016] EWCA Civ 493</i> <i>Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Limited and SoS and Richborough Estates Partnership LLP v Cheshire East Borough Council and SoS) [2016] EWCA Civ 168</i> <i>Ivan Crane v SoS and Harborough DC [2015 EWHC 425 (Admin)]</i> <i>Forest of Dean DC v SoS and Gladman Developments Limited [2016] EWHC 421 (Admin)</i>
ID02	Opening Statement ~ Jonathan Mitchell
ID03	Revised Local Development Scheme 2016

ID04	Statement of Common Ground with suggested conditions
ID05	Planning Obligation, draft I
ID06	Lasting power of attorney relating to the appeal site
ID07	5 Year Housing Land Supply Assessment, 2015/16
ID08	Response to Inspector's Questions
ID09	Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals, EH and PAS
ID10	Planning Obligation, draft II
ID11	Closing submissions ~ Jonathan Mitchell
ID12	Closing submissions ~ Hugh Richards
ID13	Planning Obligation, final unsigned draft
ID14	Planning Obligation, CIL compliance statement
ID15	Planning Obligation, final signed version

CORE DOCUMENTS

CD1	Application Form
CD2	Design & Access Statement (incorporating Planning Statement)
CD3	Landscape & Visual Appraisal
CD4	Ecology Report
CD5	Archaeology Report
CD6	Geophysical Survey
CD7	Preliminary Utilities Appraisal
CD8	Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy
CD9	Heritage Statement
CD10	Tree Survey
CD11	Transport Statement
CD12	Phase 1 Site Appraisal Desk Study
CD13	Statement of Community Involvement
CD14	Location Plan
CD15	Constraints & Opportunities Plan (HG2819/003)
CD16	Indicative Masterplan and site layout plan (HG2819/012 Rev G)
CD17	Four visuals
CD18	Revised access layout (F14184-04, Bancroft Consulting dated 4/2/16
CD19	Noise Report - LF Acoustics Ltd - 18/3/16 (includes correspondence with Highway Authority - Appendix C)
CD20	Archaeology Evaluation Report – Allen Archaeology – Feb 2016
CD21	Updated Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy Rev C, Rodgers Leask (Feb 2016)
CD22	Correspondence from Nottinghamshire County council as LLFA regarding revised Flood Risk Assessment
CD23	Correspondence from Nottinghamshire County council archaeology regarding revised archaeological evaluation
CD24	Correspondence from Environmental Health Officer regarding revised road layout
CD25	Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (Dec 2014)
CD26	Rushcliffe Borough non-Statutory Local Plan (2006)
CD27	Aslockton Conservation Area Map
CD28	Aslockton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan
CD29	Aslockton Townscape Appraisal
CD30	Rushcliffe Residential Design Guide
CD31	National Planning Policy Framework
CD32	Court of Appeal – case C1/2015/0583 & C1/2015/0894 “Hopkins Homes” 17/3/16.
CD33	High Court – case CO/4082/2014 “Stroud” 6/2/15

- CD34 Planning Appeal APP/P3040/A/14/2227522 – Hallam Land Management – Abbey Lane Aslockton - 15/12/16
- CD35 Greater Nottingham Accessible Settlements Study (February 2010)
- CD36 Sustainable Locations for Growth Study (2010)
- CD37 Extracts from Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition) (GLVIA3)
- CD38 Extracts from Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment
- CD39 Section IN6 of the 6Cs Design Guide
- CD40 Inspector's Report into the Examination of the Core Strategy
- CD41 Officers Report
- CD42 Decision notice
- CD43 High Court Case CO/4231/2012 "Barnwell Manor" 18/04/14
- CD44 Historic England Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment
- CD45 High Court Case CO/16932/2013 "Forge field" 12/06/14
- CD46 Planning Appeal APP/T3725/A/14/2229398 – Gallagher Estates Ltd – Land South of Gallows Hill – 14/01/16
- CD47 Historic England – Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (GPA 2)
- CD48 Historic England – The Setting of Heritage Assets (GPA3)
- CD49 High Court Case C1/2015/1067 "Mordue" 03/12/15
- CD50 High Court Case CO/9953/2012 "Nuon" 26/07/13

PLANS

Plans	A	1. Site Location	1:1250 @ A3, May 2015
		2. Proposed site access layout	1:250 @ A3, Feb 2016, F14184/04
Plan	B	Built Form Masterplan	1:1000 @ A3, April 2015, HG2819/001 RevG
Plan	C	Constraints and Opportunities	1:1250 @ A3, May 2015 HG2819/003