



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 17, 18 and 19 November 2020 and 14 January 2021

Site visits made on 8 and 28 December 2020

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/20/3248877

Greendene Farm, Chazey Heath, Mapledurham, Reading RG4 7UG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Hamberley Development Limited and Mapledurham Estate against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref P18/S0650/FUL, dated 23 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the buildings at Greendene Farm other than Greendene Farmhouse and the development of a 65-bedroom elderly care home use class C2 with access, car-parking and a comprehensive landscaping strategy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by South Oxfordshire District Council against Hamberley Development Limited and Mapledurham Estate. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The Hearing was adjourned, and an additional sitting day required as the appellant presented an Alternative Site Assessment for the market catchment area during the Hearing. I accepted the late evidence, and this was discussed on the resumption of the Hearing. I have taken it into account accordingly.
4. The Council adopted the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2035 (LP) on 10 December 2020. It now forms part of the development plan for the district and replaces the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and Core Strategy. The adoption was between the Hearing dates and both parties were provided with the opportunity to provide comments on the new local plan policies at the resumed Hearing day. I have taken account of the new Local Plan policies which have replaced those cited in the Council's decision notice.
5. A planning obligation was submitted in draft form, discussed at the Hearing and subsequently finalised, dated 22 January 2021. I have taken it into account. Owing to the submission of the obligation, the Council did not pursue the 3rd reason for refusal, which related to securing infrastructure. I have proceeded to determine the appeal accordingly.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- (a) Whether the proposal would be in a suitable location in relation to the Council's spatial strategy;
- (b) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and,
- (c) Whether there would be exceptional circumstances to justify major development in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons

- 7. The site is a triangular shaped plot of land measuring approximately 1.15 hectares, located within the Mapledurham Estate off the A4074, to the north west of Reading. The site and wider Estate are located within the very southern part of the escarpment of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). A Public Right of Way (PROW) runs the length of the southern boundary outside of the site.
- 8. Although a former working farm, agricultural activity ceased some time ago and the site currently contains 17 agricultural buildings and structures that cover approximately 2,300 square metres of the site. Additionally, there are 3 dwellings, including Greendene Farmhouse. Most buildings on site are dilapidated and whilst low level and of a rural appearance, detract from the overall character of the area. Additionally, the site is relatively unkempt and overgrown.
- 9. The proposal is to redevelop the site to provide a residential, dementia and nursing care home for 65 residents. It would be 2 storeys high, with staffing facilities in the roof space on a second floor. The footprint of the care home would be in the form of a 'T' shape. An attached 1.5 storey 'barn style' building is also proposed to the south providing a main entrance, offices, salon and a café that would be open to the public. Apart from Greendene Farmhouse, that would operate independent of this proposal as a B&B, all buildings on site would be demolished. Access would be taken from the A4074 and a parking area would be provided to the front of the building. Landscaping works and enhancements both within the site and to the wider Mapledurham Estate are proposed.

Location of development

- 10. The location of the proposal is in the countryside, outside any defined settlement and it is not allocated for development in the LP. The LP seeks to actively create a sustainable pattern of development, with Policies H1 and H13 encouraging specialist housing for older people in locations with good access to public transport and local facilities.
- 11. The site is adjacent to the main road that connects Oxford and Reading. Walking to the site from nearby urban areas is highly unlikely to be an option given the rural location, and there being no footpath or streetlights and a speed limit of 50mph. However, there is a regular bus route during the week and in daytime hours that passes the site with bus stops very close to the site entrance and opposite. Buses passing in both directions could be easily caught from the site. Whilst it would be very unlikely that future residents of the care

home would use the bus service, staff and visitors could access the site by this form of public transport.

12. The Framework Travel Plan indicates staff shifts would be 0700-1500, 1500-2000 and 2000-0700. During weekdays, staff could use the bus to access the site from Reading for most shifts, except for the 2000 finish, whereby wait times would be around 40 minutes. On Saturdays, there would be a wait of around 40 minutes for the early bus, and each one arriving about 30 minutes early. However, on a Sunday, the service is much reduced. There would be no reasonable bus times available.
13. Nevertheless, these buses are coming/going from/to Reading town centre, and it would be reasonable to assume that staff may need to get another connecting bus from their homes. For the later and early shift patterns, even despite the good service during the week, this would come with difficulties.
14. Therefore, whilst I am not ruling out the possibility of traveling by bus to the site, I am not confident that this would be the primary option for most staff. That said, visitors may choose to access the site by bus given the proximity of bus stops and the regular day time service. The Framework Travel Plan would also include the encouragement of car sharing and free bus taster tickets. This would go some way to encourage sustainable methods of travel.
15. Cycle parking would be provided along with staff changing facilities. The Council assert there would be very limited cycling uptake particularly in inclement and dark weather and given the undulating nature of the road. Whilst not all staff or visitors are likely to cycle, there may be people who choose to do so, and it would be unfair to discount cycling as an option per se. Nevertheless, given its countryside location, overall public transportation options to the site could not be described as 'good', as required by Policies H1 and H13.
16. In terms of local facilities, there is a public house opposite. Aside from this, there are very few other local facilities. Whilst residents are unlikely to leave the home and staff catering would be provided on site, resulting in little reliance upon other local facilities, access to local facilities is limited.
17. Therefore, whilst the site is not inaccessible and the appellant has explored opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes, the fact remains that the site is in the countryside and it does not benefit from what could be described as good access to public transport and local facilities. The proposal would conflict with H1 and H13 of the LP.
18. However, as the proposal would be located on an existing strategic public transport corridor and encourages cycling and features links to PROWs, it goes some way to promoting sustainable transport. Therefore, there would be no direct conflict with TRANS2 and TRANS5 of the LP. There would also be no conflict with the relevant policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seeks to ensure appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location.

Character and appearance

19. Special qualities of the AONB¹ include, amongst others, panoramic views, concentrations of chalk grassland and chalk streams with a dramatic chalk escarpment, ancient hedgerows, hedgerows and field trees, tranquillity, wooded landscapes, industrial heritage, and distinctive buildings. I have had regard to the purposes for which the AONB was designated.
20. At a local level, the site also lies within Character Area 10; Chilterns plateau with valleys of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). Key features include an undulating landscape dissected by an irregular pattern of shallow, small-scale dry valleys. It is heavily wooded, with extensive areas of Ancient Woodland, some of which are designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest. The A4074 and A4130 roads cross through the area, although it is sparsely settled with small villages and hamlets, accessed via narrow lanes with tall hedgerows. Agriculture comprises the predominant land use. The LCA recognises that the character is generally rural and unspoilt, but there are some suburbanising influences within settlements and along main roads.
21. From the A4074, this site is one of those suburbanising features and whilst it is a former farmstead, the collection of sheds and outbuildings being in a state of disrepair detracts from the quality of the area. The site has an unkempt and unmanaged appearance which is particularly noticeable from the PROW to the south, where the unsightly metal sheds border the bridleway. These sheds have a negative contribution to the character of the site. However, from the north and west, the existing development and vegetation enclose the site, and with intervening fields, it is not readily visible from the rural roads and other PROWs. From longer range views, the site appears as a farmstead with numerous lower level buildings and the dilapidated appearance is less apparent. That said, overall, the site contributes little towards the special qualities of the AONB and contains very few positive key features of the LCA.
22. Turning to the proposed building, the front elevation has been designed to appear as 3 linked parts. Each part is reflective of elements of local residential properties and the distinctive Mapledurham House. The 2 outer sections have a lower ridge height and simpler architectural features. The building contains varying set backs, changes in roof form, projecting gables, bay windows and low level porches, all of which serve to articulate the building in a vernacular and style appropriate to its location. The barn style building to the south provides the main entrance, and it takes reference from the existing traditional barns on site and in the area. The projecting rear wing would be of the same height as the front elevation and would contain similar features to the rest of the building. It would appear as a well-designed, high quality and decidedly articulate building, reinforcing local distinctiveness.
23. Despite this, there is no escaping the substantial scale and bulk of the structure. There would be a larger and significantly greater amount of development on the site in terms of the overall volume and bulk of the proposal. It would be more prominent from localised views, particularly from the south on PROWs and from the A4074 when passing the site, and there would be a noticeable change in the area. The scheme would also introduce a greater amount of lighting at night, which would not be consistent with the objectives of the AONB Management Plan.

¹ Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2019-2024

24. On the other hand, the location adjacent to the A4074 is not tranquil or isolated. There is existing development opposite, where the public house includes night-time lighting of the building and car park. Additionally, both parties agree the site has a lower (Medium) landscape sensitivity than the surrounding AONB landscape. Indeed, comments from the Chilterns AONB Board note that *"although the Greendene farmstead site is in a high quality landscape (the semi-enclosed dipslope) where the recommended landscape strategy is conserve, a noticeable part of the Mapledurham Estate in the open dipslope is in the 'repair' category, which is unusual for the Chilterns area"*.
25. Attempts to reduce the apparent bulk of the building, using setbacks in the building line and changes to the ridge line would be moderately successful and the height would not be overly tall. Moreover, the landscaping proposed is comprehensive and extensive, and it was undisputed by the Council that this would help to ameliorate the bulk and massing to some extent.
26. A lighting scheme could also be required by a condition, and this would ensure that the effect on the dark skies was moderated. However, I am concerned that night time light from the building itself would be somewhat conspicuous given that corridors, stairwells and staff facilities would remain lit throughout the night.
27. Drawing this all together, I accept that the building size is not flexible, and that the landscaping would develop over time to filter views and ameliorate the effect. However, even despite the very high quality design and removal of the existing dilapidated buildings and unkept appearance; the overall scale and bulk would still be prominent and somewhat incongruous for its location. This would not enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.
28. On balance, this would have a moderately adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the area and the wider AONB. This would conflict with policies STRAT1, DES1 and DES2 of the LP. These policies seek to protect and enhance the countryside, offering the highest level of protection to the AONB, requiring all new development to be of a high quality design that uses land efficiently while respecting the existing landscape character and reflecting the positive features that make up the character of the local area.
29. There would also be conflict with the relevant policies in the Framework, which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, with great weight given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs.
30. I will however examine the Wider Estate Enhancement Plan (WEEP) below when assessing the extent to which the moderately detrimental effect on the landscape could be moderated.

Exceptional circumstances

Policy context

31. It is agreed by both parties the proposal would be major development in the AONB. Paragraph 172 of the Framework sets out that planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Whether the scheme amounts to "exceptional

circumstances” to justify such major development within the AONB should include an assessment of:

- (a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- (b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- (c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

32. Additionally, Policy STRAT1 of the LP seeks to protect and enhance the countryside and particularly those areas within the AONB by ensuring that outside of the towns and villages any change relates to very specific needs. Whilst the Council argue that those specific needs must be specific to the rural area, I disagree. On plain reading, the policy does not require this and the examples given are not a closed list. Policy ENV1 replicates the requirement in the Framework regarding exceptional circumstances and I do not agree that for development to be acceptable, it must meet every part of the policy.
33. The proposal would deliver residential, dementia and nursing care to vulnerable and/or elderly residents over 65. This would in turn reduce pressure on local NHS acute services through the provision of local services for those who no longer require acute care, thus creating a benefit to the local health economy. Therefore, it is clear to me that the development would be in the public interest.

The need for the development

34. The number of older people in Oxfordshire is expected to grow at twice the rate of overall population growth. South Oxfordshire has a higher percentage of its population across all age bands aged 65 and over compared to Oxfordshire, and it currently has the lowest per capita supply of care home beds for people aged 65 and over. This may be due to South Oxfordshire being a healthier district, but it does expect to see growth in the population of older persons, particularly in the oldest age groups (85 and over). This 85+ population is highly likely to require accommodation of the sort being proposed, because care homes provide the highest level of care and nursing.
35. The need for older persons accommodation was the subject of much discussion at the Hearing, with both parties using different methods to calculate need. The approaches from both sides are reasonable.
36. The Council preferred to use a district level approach to assess need for specialist accommodation for older people, asserting that this follows the policies in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. This assessment of need is not disaggregated for care homes and encourages all types of older persons housing through the LP.
37. The appellants prefer to use a market catchment area to assess need for a care home, which is based upon a geographical area surrounding the site, taking account of the accessibility to major transport networks, proximity to other settlements, rural or urban location, target market of the proposed home and the size of population. However, they state that local geography is the

- overwhelming dominant factor – and there is a heavy weighting of demand by closest proximity to any care home.
38. Originally, a rural catchment area was presented to the Council following discussions with the AONB Board who were seeking to understand need in the rural area. Following negotiations with the Council, this was amended to include an extended rural catchment area. However, for the purposes of the appeal, the appellants seek to use the market catchment area. They assert this approach is an industry standard practice when assessing need.
39. The appellants' approach is based upon a real-world situation assessing the actual needs arising from a specific and evidenced geographical area around the site. It takes account of the rural, semi-rural and urban nature of the surrounding area and has been adjusted accordingly. The approach makes sense when understanding need in a specific area, especially for assessing market demand for the operators. Additionally, as this site is located on the very southern edge of the district, it would address needs arising not only within South Oxfordshire, but other nearby urban areas such as Reading and Henley. The Council did not dispute the appellants' figures (using the appellant's methodology), which purports to show an unmet need of at least 205 care home bed spaces in 2022. This is equivalent to at least 3 care homes.
40. However, and this is my principle concern, applying this market catchment area assumes that there is an unmet need in 3 other local authorities. I have no evidence of need in these areas, aside from that set out in the appellants' evidence, and this only considers the assessed areas, i.e. market and rural catchment areas. The appellants' evidence relating to the Oxfordshire MPS, as an attempt to 'back up' their need evidence for the market catchment area is flawed, because these 3 other local authorities sit outside the County. Importantly, these other authorities may well have their own supply of sites that sit outside the market catchment area, just as South Oxfordshire does, even if each would draw from its own catchment areas.
41. The Council's approach is genuinely plan led. The LP has been very recently adopted and seeks to locate care homes in the most accessible locations, it is an encouraging and permissive policy and simply requires good access to public transport and local facilities. Additionally, despite the assertions over the wording of 8.36 within the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (April 2014) (SHMA), it is clear to me that the projected need² includes registered care home places as part of the overall need for specialist housing for older people. The term '*as well as*' is used frequently throughout the SHMA and the overall conclusion recognises a potential requirement for around 280-450 additional housing units to be specialist accommodation across the County. The Council's target is 65-105 units per year, and recent delivery of around 90 units per year indicates it is comfortably meeting the identified need of specialist older persons accommodation.
42. Whilst this number is not disaggregated for care home beds, it was undisputed by the appellants that the Council has currently exceeded the target care home bed rate in the district as a whole when applying Oxford County Council's approach³.

² Table 75

³ Oxfordshire Market Position Statement 2019-2022

43. Taking the market catchment area again, the appellants argue that there is a basic operational point as to how people would choose a care home near to their 'roots'. The appellants suggest that around two thirds of people move into a care home from within 5 miles of their home. However, the evidence before me details that the majority of the remaining third would travel between 5-16⁴ miles to enter a care home. It would be reasonable to assume that people currently living in this rural area would be accustomed to travelling further afield to access services and facilities than those in more urban areas.
44. Therefore, travelling more than 5 miles to access a care home would perhaps be inconvenient, but certainly not, as the appellants assert, inhumane. Furthermore, if future occupants are from the rural areas within the AONB, their friends and family may not live close by, as one may suppose in a suburban or urban area. Therefore, the proximity of friends and family to the care home may often be immaterial. Likewise, having a care home located in a more accessible area is likely to encourage visitors to carry out linked trips and use sustainable transport methods, such as walking to the site.
45. Consequently, whilst most of the care home provision for the Council is in the north of the district and outside the market catchment area, there is sufficient and evidenced provision for care homes in the district that would be accessible, if not slightly further away than one would like.
46. Whilst the appellants' method provides an assessment of need based upon a geographical area, the absence of detailed need evidence for the other local authority areas leaves me unconvinced that there is a *real* need in these districts that is not already catered for outside the market catchment area - in more accessible locations. I also remain of the opinion that travelling more than 5 miles to access a care home would not be inhumane. Therefore, in this specific instance, I prefer the Council's plan led and district approach. This is after all, what the planning system should seek to do.
47. Given that the Council has demonstrated it is meeting the projected need for specialist older peoples housing in the district, there is no proven and unequivocal need for this care home in this location.
48. Lastly, I accept the effect of permitting the proposal would be a benefit to the local economy, creating 67 full time equivalent jobs. This is of moderate weight in favour.

The cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way

49. The appellant presented the Alternative Site Assessment (October 2020) (ASA) for the market catchment area at the Hearing. This assessed 340 potential sites within the market catchment area. Of these, 36 potential sites were visited and the report concludes there are no alternative sites that are suitable, available and achievable.
50. The ASA only assessed sites within the 4 local authorities' housing land availability assessments and there may be many other sites that come forward without being previously identified. However, it would be difficult to assess every single possible site within the market catchment area and the appellants' approach to including only these sites is reasonable.

⁴ Addendum Report – Need (May 2020) Page 3

51. That said, the ASA only considered sites between 0.3 and 0.69 hectares, screening out a high number of sites. The proposed site extends to approximately 1.15 hectares. The whole site includes land and buildings not required for the proposed care home development, such as Greendene Farmhouse, and the land required for the scheme is approximately 0.69 hectares. The Council raised issue with this search criteria, claiming that several sites could have been screened out owing to their size.
52. The appellants advised that the size range covers what a typical care home operator would seek. I was advised that larger sites would generally be discounted as there would be more land than required. Nevertheless, this site is notably larger, and it was deemed suitable by the appellants to progress, even if they would not be developing the whole site. Therefore, I find it difficult to understand why such a narrowly sized site parameter was applied, which removed over 200 sites. This leaves me with concern that some larger, but suitable sites may well have been screened out.
53. There is disagreement between the parties as to whether 4 discounted previously developed sites outside the AONB are available. The appellants have discounted these sites as they were not available to them. The Council states that this does not stop them being available for development. My view is that whilst the sites may not be available for the appellants, there are 4 sites that could be developed. Land adjoining 40 Redlands Road site was being developed by the site owner, and the other 3 sites were owned by Reading Council. Of these, notably, site T27 was a former care home and is a derelict site. The appellant claims that Reading Council confirmed no land was available for acquisition over a phone call, but I have no written evidence to confirm this. Therefore, I am uncertain that these sites are not available.
54. Whilst I have concluded that there is no prevailing need in the district for a care home in this location, having assessed the ASA, I am not convinced that there are no other suitable, achievable and available sites outside the AONB.

Any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated

55. As discussed above, there would be a moderately adverse effect on the character and appearance of the AONB. In response to this, the appellants propose a WEEP. The WEEP is a scheme that would provide enhancements to the wider Mapledurham Estate in the AONB. It is committed to by way of the planning obligation and would deliver extensive off-site enhancements. These include:
- hedgerow restoration.
 - planting of native hedgerows, hedgerow trees and tree belts/woodland.
 - repairs to buildings at Lilley Farm, a Grade II Listed Building.
 - replacement of roof at the Pack Horse, a Grade II Listed Building.
 - Increased public access to the Estate.
 - Promoted pedestrian route around the Estate.
 - Green corridors connecting existing habitats.
56. Whilst these enhancements would not be provided on site, they would certainly enhance the wider estate and bring about many positive improvements to the wider AONB. Indeed, the scheme has been worked up in conjunction with the Chilterns AONB Board, who detail that it is *"pleased to have worked with the*

Mapledurham Estate to identify and agree a package of enhancements that provide lasting and substantial benefits to the AONB". They believe the WEEP would be a welcome and positive move towards repairing the areas which have been intensively farmed with arable cultivation. They also state that the WEEP will help to re-connect areas of woodland habitat, much of which on the Estate is ancient woodland.

57. The WEEP would bring about many enhancements and improvements to the wider AONB in this area. The beneficial effect of the WEEP was not disputed by the Council. However, it did not believe the WEEP was directly related to the development, and thus would not meet the Framework paragraph 56 or Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. I disagree.
58. The works to the wider estate are directly linked to the development, in that they are part of the same Estate, and are proposed to offer a wider enhancement and benefit to the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities within the AONB. They would only be delivered if planning permission were granted and they would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
59. Therefore, it is my judgement that the works proposed in the WEEP would moderate the detrimental effect of the care home development on the character and appearance of the area and the wider AONB landscape. This would result in compliance with Policies DES1 and DES2 of the LP, and STRAT1 (in part).

Benefits

60. The on-site landscaping would lead to a 54% net gain in broad habitats and 346% net gain in linear habitats. This is of moderate weight.
61. There could be a release of family housing back into the market due to the re-location of occupants into the care home. However, there is limited evidence of under-occupation, or knowledge of the types of properties residents would move from. This is of limited weight.
62. The onsite café would be open to the public and although the facilities appear limited, it would offer a small benefit of limited weight.

Other Matters

Other decisions

63. Two appeal decisions and other planning decisions have been put before me in written evidence by the appellants. These were not specifically relied upon at the Hearing. Whilst they were all allowed, this case turns upon need and the exceptional circumstances test for major development in the AONB. Each decision would have turned upon its own evidence and the material circumstances would have been different.

Planning obligation

64. In addition to the WEEP, the completed planning obligation also commits to provide monies towards local health services (the contribution will support the local GP practice in Sonning Common), highway works (including dropped kerbs, pedestrian access to bus stops, footway to the south of Greendene

Farm), a s106 monitoring fee and travel plan monitoring fee. There is also a commitment to provide public art on site.

65. These obligations would meet the tests set out in the Framework and CIL Regs, however, they mitigate the effect of the development and therefore are neutral in the overall balance.

Exceptional Circumstances and Planning Balance

66. There is a critical need for older persons accommodation nationally, and this identified need is of substantial weight in the public interest. Furthermore, there are other environmental, social and economic benefits associated with the scheme. Additionally, the scheme would redevelop a previously developed site and the WEEP would moderate the proposal's detrimental effect on the AONB. This would result in an acceptable effect character and appearance of the area and the wider AONB landscape.
67. However, I am not persuaded that there is a need for this proposal in this location, nor that there are no alternative sites outside the AONB. The location is in the countryside and the site would not have good access to public transport and local facilities; there is development plan conflict here.
68. Exceptional circumstances should be clear given the conflict with the development plan. This is not the case here, and it is my judgement that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated sufficient to allow this major development in the AONB.
69. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with policies H1, H13, STRAT1 (in part) and ENV1 of the LP, and both the LP and the Framework indicate that planning permission should be refused.

Conclusion

70. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

For the Appellant:	
Christopher Katkowski QC	Instructed by Hamberley Development Limited
Matthew Johnson	Director of Planning, DLBP Ltd
Jessamy Venables	Need consultant, Carterwood
Robert Belcher	Need consultant, Carterwood
Peter Nurse	Need consultant, Carterwood
Tanya Kirk	Landscape consultant, Hankinson Duckett Associates
Adrian Meurer	Ecologist, Hankinson Duckett Associates
Romola Parish	Solicitor, Travers Smith
Tim Street	Appellant
For the Local Planning Authority:	
Cain Ormondroyd of Counsel	Instructed by South Oxfordshire District Council
Emma Bowerman	Principal Major Applications Officer, South Oxfordshire District Council
Avril Williams	Landscape Officer, South Oxfordshire District Council

HEARING DOCUMENTS

1	Council's table of care home bed spaces permitted but not operational since March 2019
2	Appellants' table of care homes granted planning permission
3	Map showing 'Need' catchment areas and South Oxfordshire District Council area
4	Comparison of Need between Addendum Report (May 2020) and Oxfordshire County Council Market Position Statement prevalence rates for care home beds
5	Alternative Site Assessment (October 2020)
6	Council's comments on the Alternative Site Assessment
7	Appellants' comments on the Council's comments on the Alternative Site Assessment
8	Appellants' approaches to land owners of alternative sites
9	Excerpt from the South Oxfordshire District Council Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2017
10	Council's closing statement
11	Appellants' closing statement
12	Completed planning obligation