The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 2 to 4 April and 9 April 2019
Site visits made on 1 and 3 April 2019

by Richard Schofield BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/18/3206217
Land North of Greenhill Road, Sandford

- 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 Progress Land (Sandford) Ltd and Aurora Land and Design against North Somerset Council.
- The application, ref 17/P/0887/O, is dated 31 March 2017.
- The development proposed is residential development of up to 93 dwellings and associated infrastructure.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was made in outline, with all matters other than access reserved for future consideration. I have considered the proposal on this basis, regarding the submitted layout plans as illustrative.

3. During preparation for the appeal it became evident that a small part of the site boundary had been drawn incorrectly on the submitted plans. Revised plans corrected this minor error and I do not consider that anyone has been prejudiced by it.

4. In addition, during the consideration of the application, the description of development, as set out in the header above, was revised such that the proposal became for up to 85, rather than 93, dwellings. The original application was considered on this basis and I have determined the appeal thus.

5. The Council did not determine the application. Following the lodging of the appeal Members agreed that, had they been in a position to do so, they would have refused the application on the grounds of the proposal's conflict with the Core Strategy's locational strategy and its impact upon the rural character of Sandford, notably the approach to the village from the east.

6. Following an adjournment to allow for the provision of additional ecological information and executed deeds, the inquiry was closed in writing on 25 April 2019.

Main Issue

7. The main issue is whether, having regard to the requirements of local and national planning policy for the delivery of housing, and the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, the appeal site is an appropriate location for the development proposed.

8. For reasons of clarity, I address it under a number of headings below.

Reasons

Sandford as an appropriate location for the development proposed

1) Policy context

9. North Somerset Council Core Strategy (CS) policy CS13 (Scale of New Housing) requires the delivery of a minimum of 20,985 dwellings within North Somerset over the plan period, 2006 to 2026.

10. CS policy CS14 (Distribution of new housing) sets out how new housing development will be distributed across the district. The primary focus is on Weston super Mare, with the towns of Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead taking "*most additional development*" beyond this. Smaller scale development is provided for in Service Villages.

11. Much greater control is applied to "*infill villages*", of which Sandford is one, where "*appropriate development*" will be acceptable within settlement boundaries. The supporting text to CS13 suggests that, in the rural areas of the district, growth will be "*small scale*" and that "*appropriate*" takes in considerations of scale and character.

12. CS policy CS33 gives greater detail in relation to what is expected of development within settlement boundaries. It emphasises the rationale behind the control that boundaries provide, notably to prevent unsustainable development. The clear inference to be drawn from the supporting text is that unsustainable development is to be regarded as that which will perpetuate commuting, arising from dispersed patterns of growth.

13. The appeal site is outside Sandford's settlement boundary and plainly conflicts with the locational strategy of the development plan, which does not seek to focus growth at infill villages.

14. Even if the site was within the development boundary, at up to 85 dwellings one would be hard pressed to consider the appeal proposal as "*small scale*", given the current size of Sandford[1] and the proportional level of growth that would occur.

15. Thus, on its face, the appeal proposal fails to accord with CS policies CS14 and CS33, which seek to direct development to the district's most sustainable locations.

[1] Defined by the Sandford Neighbourhood Group (SNG) as the area covered by Map 2 in Mr Armstrong's evidence. This is, in my judgement, a more appropriate boundary than the more extensive civil parish boundary used in other evidence.

2) Sandford and surrounding villages

16. Sandford has a limited range of facilities, in so far as the day-to-day needs of most, or many, residents are concerned. These total a primary school, a reasonably sized shop, a village hall (which is well-used for a considerable range of meetings) and a small play area. The village also has a pub and a church but there is no substantive evidence that either are frequented on a day-to-day basis by many Sandford residents. Indeed, the evidence of residents was that the former was chiefly a restaurant, with a wide catchment, rather than a village 'local'.

17. There are local employment opportunities available, but there is nothing before me to suggest that significant numbers of (if any) Sandford residents have taken them up. It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the vast majority of residents of working age commute out of the village. Of these, having regard to the Sandford Residents Survey of 2018, the overwhelming majority appear to travel by private vehicle, which is unsurprising given the limited availability of other options for reaching the settlements with the greatest concentrations of employment opportunities (e.g. Weston super Mare and Bristol).

18. This being so, Sandford's position in the CS settlement hierarchy, and the implications for development at Sandford arising from that, appears to be fully justified. Indeed, the matter was debated at the CS examination with the Inspector concluding[2] that "*the categorisation [of Sandford] is not unreasonable*" and that there was no need to push the village further up the hierarchy.

19. My attention was drawn, however, to an appeal decision[3] wherein the inspector granted planning permission for up to 118 dwellings on a large site immediately to the west of the appeal site; the so-called 'Strongvox' site[4]. His determination was based upon considerations that took in Sandford's relationship with neighbouring villages, "*particularly Winscombe and Churchill*", in the context of the absence of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

20. It was suggested by the appellant that similar considerations should apply in this case, as it was common ground between the main parties that the Council was unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Based upon all that I have read and heard, I have no reason to disagree with the agreed position on housing land supply. As such (albeit noting firmly that the Strongvox appeal decision pre-dates the adoption of the CS) the appellant's argument is not without merit.

21. There is no doubt, having regard to the evidence of local residents, that there is a relationship between Sandford and the villages of Winscombe, Churchill and Banwell. The paucity of services and facilities at Sandford means, however, that this is something of a one-way relationship. Sandford residents travel to these villages to access, among other things, secondary education, toddler groups and pre-school care[5], primary healthcare and a pharmacy, Scouts[6], post office services, opticians, more extensive social opportunities and a library.

[2] CD6.2 paragraph 41
[3] 3139633
[4] Now known as Russet Copse.
[5] Following the closure of the Sandford pre-school group's meeting room, post the Strongvox appeal.
[6] Following the demolition of the Sandford Scout Hut, post the Strongvox appeal.

22. It is theoretically possible to access Winscombe, Churchill and Banwell by means other than a private vehicle. Bus services are, however, limited; cycling is unlikely to be popular other than for experienced cyclists, given the nature of the A368[7]; and I agree with the Strongvox inspector that:

> *"it is unlikely that residents would choose to walk to either Churchill or Winscombe[8] to access services there on a regular basis, due to the distance involved…".*

23. Clearly, therefore, there seems to be little benefit in growing Sandford such that one perpetuates the need for local residents to travel elsewhere (even if relatively nearby), chiefly by private vehicle, to access services and facilities.

24. Paragraph 78 of the Framework notes, with regard to rural areas that:

> "*where there are groups of smaller settlements development in one village may support services in a village nearby*".

25. This does not, however, reflect the situation here. There is no substantive evidence that development in Sandford may support services in the surrounding, higher tier, villages (which, in any case, have their own residential allocations). Nor does the CS articulate this approach as a planned strategy for the four villages, in spite of the possibility clearly being raised in the CS hearings[9]. As such, I cannot accept that Sandford's sustainability credentials have been underplayed.

26. The Strongvox inspector's assessment of the inter-relationship between Sandford and surrounding villages is reflective of mine, albeit that he reached a different final conclusion having regard to the specific circumstances at that time. Since his decision, the adopted CS has formally defined Sandford's place in the settlement hierarchy; the pre-school has closed; the Scouts have had to move to Churchill; the A5 bus service is now a two / two and a half hourly rather than hourly service; and the bank in Winscombe has closed.

27. There was also a considerable body of, albeit largely oral, evidence from local residents to suggest that the capacity of the village hall to accommodate increased class sizes or increased numbers of events/services, which one might reasonably expect to be necessary as a settlement's population, and thus demand, increases, is extremely limited. Certainly, the number of timetabled events already taking place in the hall was considerable.

28. In addition, the Strongvox inspector was very clearly not seeking to suggest that Sandford was now to be regarded as a *de facto* 'sustainable' location for additional development. Indeed, the CS, which was adopted after his decision, is very clear about Sandford's role *vis-a-vis* new development. Overall, therefore, while I have carefully considered the Strongvox decision I do not consider that it sets a definitive precedent to which I must be wed.

29. I am also mindful that the nearest bus stop to the appeal site, providing access to a policy compliant service, is situated well beyond the development plan's expected walking distance for a rural area. Thus, as accepted by the appellant[10], the proposal would fail to comply with Development Management

[7] The Strawberry Line appeared to be more of a leisure route
[8] And, in my view, certainly not to Banwell, given the distance and lack of footway.
[9] Inspector's Report 8 November 2016 (CD 6.2)
[10] Mr McKechnie XX (SNG)

Policies policy DM27: Bus Accessibility Criteria. This seeks to ensure that all new residential development is accessible by bus services at an appropriate level.

3) Conclusion on appropriate location

30. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that Sandford is not an appropriate location for the development proposed. The proposal would conflict with the requirements of CS policies CS14 and CS33, which seek to direct residential development to higher order settlements, ensuring that it is better related to employment, services and public transport access, thus reducing unsustainable travel patterns through reliance on private vehicles.

Character and appearance

31. One is very much aware of the wooded slopes of Sandford Hill and Lyncombe Hill, rising above the village to the south. They provide it with a clear rural context. Even so, Greenhill Road (A368), which runs directly through the village, is a busy A road, with close knit buildings fronting onto it for some distance. This situation, combined with the dominance of mid to late 20th century housing, gives Sandford a relatively dense, suburban appearance.

32. The appeal site is comprised of three fairly non-descript fields, much of which is given over to horse grazing, and domestic gardens. The fields are well-contained by attractive, mature hedgerows, which surround and cross the site. The hedges on the site's northern boundary provide a definite edge, separating the site from the wider countryside beyond.

33. The rear of dwellings on Greenhill Road are readily apparent, immediately beyond the site's southern boundary. These dwellings also screen the site from Greenhill Road, such that the site has little bearing upon the village's character when approaching Sandford or when travelling through it on this road.

34. Approaching the village from the east it is not readily apparent where Sandford definitively begins, with sporadic development either side of the road as one departs from Churchill and moves towards Sandford. This intensifies as one passes the extant dwellings on the appeal site, becoming a ribbon of development[11] along the A368. There is no clear sense of arrival and certainly no obvious "*gateway*", as the Council's reason for refusal describes it, to compromise.

35. The appeal proposal would only marginally increase the amount of development fronting Greenhill Road over what is currently present, as the site frontage would not be extensive. Most of the proposed development upon the appeal site, if of an appropriate height and mass, would be barely discernible upon entering Sandford, as it would be set behind existing buildings. This would increase the depth of development to the north of Greenhill Road but that process has already commenced with the construction of houses on the Strongvox site to the immediate west. As such, the appeal scheme (to the extent that it would be visible) would not appear particularly incongruous.

36. Development upon the site would alter, marginally, the character of Greenhill Lane, in so far as the lane acts as a public right of way (PROW). Development on the site would be visible through, and possibly above, the mature

[11] Albeit in some depth in places.

hedgerows. Given that dwellings on Greenhill Road are already apparent from Greenhill Lane, however, and noting that the lane also has a number of dwellings along it, no significant harm to character would arise. I am also mindful that the outlook from this PROW has already been compromised, further along, by the presence of development on the Strongvox site.

37. A footpath also crosses the site from north to south. The appeal scheme would give rise to some harm as, rather than passing through a field, PROW users would be walking through a housing development even if, as is proposed, the PROW is, sensibly, retained largely in a green corridor. Nonetheless, this PROW is very short and is, in essence, a means of accessing the countryside and hamlets beyond, rather than being a significant section of a PROW network itself.

38. In summary, there is no reason why a well-designed and landscaped scheme, with buildings reflecting the local historic vernacular, could not deliver a high-quality residential development appropriate to its context.

39. Sandford Neighbourhood Group suggested that the appeal proposal would give rise to adverse impacts upon the Mendip Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). As the site is not within the AONB, there would not be any direct impacts upon it. Any adverse impacts would be upon views into or from the AONB as Sandford, and thus the appeal site, is undoubtedly within the AONB's setting. I have, therefore, carefully considered the potential impact of the appeal scheme upon the AONB, and its setting, having regard to the AONB's purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area.

40. Views of Sandford from that part of the AONB nearest the village are limited. The public footpaths across the escarpment of the hills directly to the south of the village are mainly through dense woodland. At the time of my site visit the trees were not in leaf, yet the village was barely discernible (although traffic upon Greenhill Road was audible). Glimpses of the site would be even more obscured during the summer months.

41. The appeal site is visible from vantage points lower down the slope, but only if one is looking for it, as it is viewed through existing intervening hedgerows and treed boundaries. Future impact would be further softened by the proposed landscaping and would be seen in the context of the existing built form of Sandford. Being well contained, with definitive boundaries, the site would not 'roll out' into open countryside so as to appear as an obvious extension to the village. Nor would it lengthen the village in any material way.

42. Thus, the appeal proposal would not introduce a distinct new built form into a setting where none currently exists. Nor would Sandford encroach further towards the AONB. Any impact upon the AONB, in relation to views from or to it, would be negligible and there would be no impact upon users' enjoyment of it. In reaching this judgment, I am also mindful that the AONB Partnership did not object to the appeal proposal.

43. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the character (in as much as it relates to Sandford's rurality) and appearance of the area. It would not conflict with Development Management Policies policy DM10. This seeks, among other things, to ensure that new development is carefully integrated into the natural, built and historic environment, whilst minimising landscape impact.

Other Matters

44. The settlement boundaries in the CS were drawn up having regard to the minimum housing requirement figure noted above. There was no dispute that this figure did not reflect an assessment of housing need undertaken in line with that required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

45. The CS examining inspector was clear in his report that such an approach was sound subject to there being a review in the short term, based upon a full objectively assessed need for housing. This review requirement is set out in policy CS13, to be achieved by 2018. It has, in my judgement, occurred. The Council has produced a joint SHMA with the other authorities working on a Joint Strategic Plan (JSP) for the West of England. This has led the Council to conclude that a plan period figure of around 25,000 dwellings is appropriate going forward with the JSP.

46. The supporting text to CS13 makes reference to a replacement policy for it, presumably with a revised housing requirement, being adopted by the end of 2018. Although this reference gives a helpful indication of what the Council's envisaged timetable was it is not a policy requirement. Indeed, it appears to be reflective of the, generally, overly optimistic timescales set for local plan production and review. Being dogmatic about it, particularly in the light of the evident progress being made on a JSP, does not, I would suggest, take us anywhere constructive.

47. The upshot of this may well be that boundaries around settlements in North Somerset need expanding to accommodate an increased housing requirement set out in a final JSP. Conversely, it may well be that the housing requirement is reduced, through the JSP examination, such that no such expansion is necessary. Either way, one cannot assess a proposal against what may or may not happen in a future plan and, in any case, the point seems moot. The focus of the main issue, and of the evidence, is not on whether the development site lies the correct side of a settlement boundary. It is, rather, whether in disregarding such a boundary Sandford would be an appropriate location for the scale of development proposed, having regard to the strategic requirements of the CS.

48. A number of decisions were drawn to my attention, wherein inspectors had allowed and dismissed appeals for housing (in the district and elsewhere) where a lack of five-year housing land supply was a factor. Indeed, I have both allowed and dismissed appeals where this is an issue. The fact that there is no definitive approach, with decisions being based upon the particular circumstances arising, means that I afford them very little weight as precedents.

49. The appellant set out in some detail how they considered that the appeal proposal would comply with development plan policies. It is indeed likely that it would accord with a number of 'standard' development management requirements but I have set out above how I consider that it would fail to meet the more fundamental strategic aims of the CS.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

50. Where, as here, a local planning authority is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the Framework, which is a significant

material consideration, indicates, *inter alia*, that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

51. The appeal scheme would bring about social benefits through the delivery of housing (including affordable housing) in a district with an acknowledged shortfall; a shortfall agreed as being "significant"[12]. It is common ground between the main parties that this benefit should be afforded significant weight. I see no reason to depart from this consensus.

52. That said, any focus on affordable housing benefit must be tempered somewhat by the fact that the CS has delivered 92% of the relevant plan period target for affordable housing to date and that any Sandford and Winscombe parish need[13] is likely to be met by developments in other villages, including the Strongvox development in Sandford itself.

53. While there may be a greater proportion of retirees in the village than compared with the district average, this figure is likely to be skewed by the presence of the sizeable, largely self-contained, Sandford Station retirement village. The fact that the primary school has a full complement of pupils on roll would also suggest that there is a reasonable number of young families in the village.

54. Similarly, any arguments about the ability of the proposal to reverse an alleged "*ossification*"[14] of Sandford must be treated with caution, not least because of the presence of the large Strongvox development, which will itself inject "*new blood*"[15] into the community. In addition, the accepted evidence was that there is much going on in Sandford, which appears to have a strong sense of community.

55. The appellant had initially argued that the scheme's provision of additional land for the primary school was a significant benefit, as it would allow the school to expand in order to accommodate the pupil numbers arising from both the Strongvox and appeal schemes. The Council confirmed at the inquiry, however, that need from the Strongvox site could be met through pupil churn, including the natural displacement of future applicants to schools nearer to where they lived[16] (which is arguably more desirable in terms of accessibility and a reduction in the need to travel) without the need for an extension to it.

56. In addition, the Council confirmed that, at present, there are insufficient funds available to commence any works to the school. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds could be used to make up any shortfall, but such funds are not ringfenced and there is nothing in the Council's capital programme to suggest that anything has been directed to Sandford primary's expansion[17].

[12] ID13
[13] As set out in Mr Muston's Proof para. 7.4 (parishes being the areas by which choice-based housing preferences are made).
[14] Appellant's Closing
[15] Ibid
[16] It was not disputed that Sandford Primary attracts pupils from beyond the village. Thus, future applicants to the school from out of the catchment would be unlikely to secure a place and would look instead to their local school(s). Current pupils would not be "bumped" out.
[17] Ms Varley in response to my questions.

57. I note the content of the appellant's Review of Primary Education Requirements, which, in essence, favours the expansion of Sandford Primary School as a matter of course rather than of necessity. It takes issue with the size of the school at present and disagrees with the Council's judgement, in so far as future provision of primary schooling in Sandford and the wider area is concerned. That said, much appears to be predicated on the assumption that the appeal scheme (and, potentially, another development in Sandford) would come forward.

58. Notwithstanding this, there is nothing within it that leads me to the conclusion that the school's expansion is required at present (in the absence of the appeal proposal coming forward) or that, if it was, that the provision of additional land would be anything other than mitigation for, rather than a significant benefit of, the appeal scheme.

59. It may be that a new school hall, if built, could be made available to other users, relieving pressure upon Sandford village hall, but there is nothing before me to suggest that this is anything other than aspiration. In any case, it is not clear why the existing school hall could not fulfil such a function should it be desirable and feasible.

60. In environmental terms, the evidence before me would suggest that the development would not have a significant adverse impact on the integrity of European sites, alone or in combination with other plans or projects. I am satisfied that if an Appropriate Assessment was required to confirm this, the relevant information is available to allow such to be undertaken. In reaching this view, I am mindful that this is the common position of the main parties. More significantly, Natural England, having carefully scrutinised the relevant material, is also of this view. Even so, this outcome is clearly an expectation rather than a benefit.

61. Likewise, a lack of impact upon built heritage and the ability to provide a high-quality built environment are basic expectations rather than benefits.

62. It is suggested that the proposal includes biodiversity enhancements. Nothing beyond provision of areas of green infrastructure (to include bat mitigation areas)[18], which one might reasonably expect on any new development, particularly in a rural context, is cited in evidence. Indeed, the site already supports protected species (notably badgers and both Lesser and Greater Horseshoe bats), which is evidence of its existing ecological benefit. As such, this factor attracts little weight.

63. Turning to the economic dimension of sustainability, the appeal scheme would provide construction jobs and some local investment during its build out, as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy (albeit that the latter is likely to receive a boost, whether or not required, from the residential developments already proposed for the larger villages). Moderate weight should be afforded to this benefit. There is no obvious need for a small village like Sandford to be economically competitive[19] and, in any case, the sizeable Strongvox development will already secure some economic benefits to the immediate locality.

[18] Mr Jewson's Proof paras 8.24 and 11.12.
[19] Mr Jewson's Proof 8.11 and 8.12.

64. The development would also generate Council Tax, S106 and CIL receipts for the Council. As these are, essentially, a means for the Council to cover its costs arising from an increased local population, and/or to mitigate development impacts upon local infrastructure, I consider that they attract very little weight as benefits in the planning balance.

65. The appeal scheme would be situated beyond the settlement boundary of Sandford. In my judgement, having regard to the lack of a five-year housing land supply in the district, the weight to be afforded to this conflict is necessarily reduced. The reason being that, arguably, the district's settlement boundaries could be a factor in constraining the delivery of housing.

66. Of greater significance, however, is the appeal scheme's conflict with the development plan's overarching locational strategy, which would perpetuate unsustainable travel from a relatively small, poorly served village. This factor, rather than the site being the wrong side of Sandford's settlement boundary *per se*, attracts very significant weight.

67. Thus, in my judgement, the appeal scheme would fail to accord with the development plan as a whole. A development plan that was only, finally, adopted in January 2017.

68. The conflict is compounded by the fact that in the lowest tier of the settlement hierarchy, where Sandford sits, provision has already been made for 1438 new dwellings[20]. This is well above the figure of 985 set out in the CS (policy CS14). That figure is, admittedly, a minimum but the degree to which it has already been exceeded is, in my judgement, leading towards a distortion of the district's plan-led strategy. A distortion that would be exacerbated by the appeal proposal.

69. National planning policy seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. This is not, however, its be all and end all. Considerable emphasis is placed upon a genuinely plan-led system, to actively manage patterns of growth.

70. Overall, I consider that the adverse impacts arising from the proposal's conflict with the adopted development plan would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits that the proposed scheme would deliver. As such, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

Richard Schofield

INSPECTOR

[20] Mr Muston Proof para. 6.19

ANNEX A: APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Timothy Leader	Instructed by North Somerset Council

He called:

Mr Michael Muston	Muston Planning

FOR SANDFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUP:

Ms Cresten Boase

She called:

Mrs Pat Gould
Mr Keith Ball
Mrs Penny Bond
Mr Ian Armstrong
Dr Robin Jeacocke
Mrs Kate Eastment
Mrs Tabitha Rook

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Christopher Boyle QC	Instructed by Walsingham Planning

He called:

Mr James McKechnie BA(Hons) PGDip CIHT	Hydrock
Mr Nigel Evers Dip CMLI	Viridian Landscape Planning
Mr Ian Jewson	Walsingham Planning
Mr Richard Hughes ICE	Hydrock
Ms Faye Midmore	Green Ecology

INTERESTED PERSONS (local residents):

Mr Tim Smith
Mr Colin Barley
Mr Patrick Martin
Dr Karin Haverson

PRESENT FOR DISCUSSION OF PLANNING CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS:

Ms Sally Varley – Service Lead for School Planning & Governance, North Somerset Council

Mr Roger Wilmot - North Somerset Council (Planning)

ANNEX B: DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE INQUIRY

ID1 CIL Compliance Statement by the Council

ID2 Email correspondence between the Council and the appellant regarding housing land supply

ID3 Council's Opening Statement

ID4 Sandford Neighbourhood Group (SNG) Opening Statement

ID5 Further email correspondence regarding housing land supply

ID6 Statement of Mr Tim Smith

ID7 SNG submission relating to village hall provision on the 'Strongvox' site.

ID8 SNG submission regarding bat foraging on the appeal site and in the wider area

ID9 SNG vehicle count map

ID10 Hydrock response to SNG Traffic Survey data

ID11 Mr Richard Hughes' credentials

ID12 Email correspondence from the appellant regarding village hall provision on the 'Strongvox' site.

ID13 Statement of Common Ground between the Council and appellant in relation to housing land supply

ID14 Statement of Mr Colin Barley

ID15 Statement of Mr Patrick Martin

ID16 Draft S106 agreement

ID17 Statement of Dr Karin Haverson

ID18 Review of Habitats Regulation Assessment by Natural England

ID19 Draft conditions

ID20 Council's Closing Submissions

ID21 SNG's Closing Submissions

ID22 Appellant's Closing Submissions

ID23 Updated ecology documents, including shadow HRA and Appropriate Assessment to replace Appendix 7 of Mr Jewson's proof of evidence

ID24 Review of Primary Education Requirements submitted by the appellant

ID25 Executed S106 Agreement (including counterparts); Unilateral Undertaking; and Deed of Variation

ID26 SNG's final comments on the appellant's updated ecological information and education review

ID27 Email from the Council regarding the Unilateral Undertaking and appellant's education review

ID28 Letter from Mr Gareth Pinfold, for the appellant, with regard to the Unilateral Undertaking, 25 April 2019