



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 15 November 2023

Site visit made on 16 November 2023

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/W/23/3317112

Land at Braintree Road, Great Bardfield, CM7 4FE

Easting (x) 567962, Northing (y) 229885

- 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 Croudace Homes Limited against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03121/FUL, dated 12 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of 56 dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated works, including access; internal road network and associated highway works; hard and soft landscaping; formal and informal open space; vehicular, cyclist and pedestrian infrastructure; utilities and drainage infrastructure; car and cycle parking; and refuse storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Croudace Homes Limited against Braintree District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The first reason for refusal on the Local Planning Authority's (LPAs) decision notice refers to, amongst other things, 'sub-standard garden sizes'. At the hearing, the LPA clarified that the quantum of space within the gardens was not in dispute. Rather its concerns relate to garden depths and the consequent relationships between the proposal and existing neighbouring dwellings. I have taken this into account in defining the main issues and in my assessment of the appeal.
4. A revised layout drawing (Proposed Site Plan 003 Rev E) has been provided by the appellant as part of their appeal submission. When compared with the layout that was before the Council when it made its decision, the dwellings on Plots 2 – 6 are shown to be re-sited to increase the distances between these dwellings and the boundary with properties on Deer Park View. I am aware of the concerns of existing residents in respect of the proximity of the development to existing properties. I have also heard the Council's thoughts in respect of this matter as well as the effect of the revision on the appearance of the development in terms of the internal site arrangement.

5. Therefore, I am in a position to take these respective concerns into consideration. Consequently, I can exercise my own judgement as to whether the revised plan would be necessary, or in the alternative whether it would be successful in overcoming the concerns of the LPA and third-parties. Having regard to the Holborn Studios Ltd judgement¹, I am therefore satisfied that no party would be unduly prejudiced by me taking the revised plan into consideration as part of my assessment.
6. My attention has been drawn to the Government's consultation in respect of prospective changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), including in terms of housing land supply considerations. I have also been referred to an appeal decision at 'Land to the east of Braintree Road, Tye Green'². However, that decision acknowledged that prospective changes to the planning system indicate a certain direction of travel but that as such changes are inherently uncertain, they could not be afforded any significant weight. I concur and, whether or not such changes are imminent, given they are not adopted policy they cannot outweigh the currently adopted Framework which is what I have to apply.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:
 - (i) whether the local planning authority can demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing land and its implications for the application of planning policy;
 - (ii) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - (iii) whether the proposal would provide suitable living conditions for occupants of the development and neighbouring properties with particular regard to privacy; and
 - (iv) whether the proposal would made adequate provision for affordable housing and any other necessary infrastructure requirements arising from the development.

Reasons

The policy context and Housing Land Supply

8. Policy SP3 (Spatial Strategy for North Essex) of the Braintree District Local Plan – Section 1 (2021) (LPS 1) confirms that existing settlements will be the principal focus for additional growth across the North Essex Authorities area and that development will be accommodated within or adjoining settlements according to their scale, sustainability and existing role. Future growth will be planned to ensure existing settlements maintain their distinctive character and role, to avoid coalescence between them and to conserve their setting. It confirms that Section 2 of the LP will identify a hierarchy of settlements where new development will be accommodated according to the role of the settlement, sustainability, its physical capacity and local needs.

¹ Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

² Appeal Ref APP/Z1510/W/22/3307493

9. Policy LPP 1 (Development Boundaries) of the Braintree District Local Plan – Section 2 (2022) (LPS 2) confirms that development outside development boundaries will be confined to uses appropriate to the countryside whilst also protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. The supporting text to this policy identifies Great Bardfield as a ‘Second Tier’ village within which development of a small scale may be considered sustainable.
10. It is common ground between the main parties that the appeal site is situated outside the settlement boundary for Great Bardfield and in the countryside for planning purposes. The appellant does not dispute that residential development of the site for 56 dwellings in this location would conflict with the requirements of the development plan.
11. The Council suggests that it can demonstrate a 4.86 year supply of deliverable housing sites. This is as per its ‘Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement – April 2022’ and equates to a deficit of 138 dwellings. The appellant’s position is that the supply stands at 4.11 years.
12. While the Council did not seek to argue a higher level of supply than 4.86 years at the hearing, I heard evidence which suggested that some of the sites which the appellant has disputed as being clearly deliverable were progressing either through the planning process or are already under construction. In response the appellant contended that there are cases in the LPA’s evidence where either planning permissions had lapsed or there are unresolved issues that would be likely to slow delivery.
13. However, there was an overall acceptance between the main parties that a greater number of houses was likely to be delivered on the disputed sites than accounted for in the appellant’s assessment. This suggests that the housing land supply is unlikely to be as low as 4.11 years when factoring in the progress on some of the disputed sites and I find that the figure is more likely to sit within the range of the respective positions.
14. My attention has been drawn by Mr Gardner to an ‘Appendix 1b update of schedule of sites in 5 year supply 2022 to 2027’ which indicates a total five year supply of 4,975 dwellings which I understand equates to a 4.99 year housing land supply. However, the LPA advised that this data is not intended to make a different argument to its published position at the base date of 4.86 years supply but to provide comfort that sites are coming forward.
15. Mr Gardener also suggested that a 6.18 year housing land supply could be demonstrated if sites allocated in the Local Plan were included. However, the LPA has confirmed that the LP was examined in the context of the 2012 Framework which did not include the same tests of delivery. It was also confirmed that the LPA’s calculation of 4.89 years took into account allocated sites where there was clear evidence that they were deliverable within five years.
16. Overall, I am more persuaded by the evidence of the main parties which includes a site-specific critique of the likely factors influencing delivery in each case. Even if I find that the housing land supply would likely to be 4.89 years as a best case scenario, Paragraph 11d of the Framework is engaged for the purposes of my planning balance and conclusion.

Character and appearance

17. The appeal site is an open field used for arable purposes and forms part of the rural surroundings at the edge of Great Bardfield. It is situated adjacent to the settlement boundary and the residential developments at Deer Park View and Bendlowes Road. Mature trees and hedgerows line its boundary with Braintree Road. As one travels towards the site along Braintree Road as it leads out of the village, to the eastern side of the road dwellings are mainly set back behind landscaping including wide verges and open ditches with some mature trees. To the western side of the road front gardens, hedgerows and grass verge are prevalent. This gives a spaciousness and rurality to this part of the settlement. Indeed, the expanse of the frontage increases wider still at Deer Park View and together with the greenery within it, this provides for a sympathetic transition in views along Braintree Road towards the countryside beyond.
18. The development would alter the site from an open field of rural character to a residential estate. However, the substantial landscaping scheme including open space and planting would provide a strong landscape setting on the southern approach to the village, particularly as planting matures, and its early implementation could be secured by condition. Indeed, it is not part of the LPA's case that there would be an unacceptable effect on the wider landscape and I agree.
19. Nevertheless, the Framework confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 130 of the Framework states that decisions should ensure that developments add to the quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and be sympathetic to local character.
20. The design of the dwellings would have a traditional aesthetic and would generally draw upon the styles and palette of materials seen at Deer Park View. Even so, the layout includes dwellings which are sited closer to Braintree Road than the forwardmost dwellings at Deer Park View. For those leaving the village in the vicinity of the Deer Park View entrance, the eye would be drawn to the side elevation of the dwelling on Plot 48 due to its position just beyond the boundary with, and its prominent siting forward of, the dwellings at Deer Park View. This encroachment of built form closer to the road would significantly detract from the spacious characteristics of the roadside at the edge of the village.
21. Even accounting for the mature planting to the Braintree Road frontage, the closer presence of dwellings at this point, particularly plots 47 and 48, would be evident through gaps in the vegetation. Moreover, the private access drive and turning head to the front of Plot 48 would create a pinch point. As illustrated on the Landscape Strategy Plan, this would be likely to unduly compromise the extent to which this unsympathetic arrangement could be screened by planting.
22. At the hearing, I asked whether the appellant had considered siting the dwellings and vehicular circulation areas further back from Braintree Road. The appellant noted that the building line changes as one moves along Braintree Road. I accept that as one moves north towards the central core of the village buildings are often sited closer to the road. However, even if the building line is not consistent, the generous frontages towards the fringe of the settlement positively contribute to the entrance to the village, and this is particularly the

case at Deer Park View. The proposal would jar with the layout of Deer Park View and would be an abrupt addition to the vista out of the village towards the countryside.

23. The appellant contends that the proposal would have a lower density than the development at Deer Park View. I acknowledge that the depth of the soft landscaped areas and the linear layout of dwellings to the northern part of the development in particular would have a low density arrangement. However, Deer Park View benefits from a focal green which gives it a spacious feel. In contrast the central areas of the appeal scheme would have a tighter grain and the experience with the estate would consequently feel more urban and generic.
24. Another point put forward by the appellant is that on entering the development off Deer Park View, the dwellings at Plots 1 and 37 would be closely aligned with those within the existing estate. I also heard that suitable back-to-back distances between dwellings had influenced the layout of the scheme. Furthermore, I appreciate that development should make an efficient use of land.
25. Even taking the above factors into account, this does not mean that the overall layout should not respond to existing character and context. I am not persuaded that a layout could not have been devised which resulted in a sympathetic interface with Braintree Road, better reflecting the layout of neighbouring development and the interface with the countryside.
26. Paragraph 131 of the Framework states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined unless there are clear, justifiable and compelling reasons why this would be inappropriate. The tree planting in the landscape buffer would effectively create tree-lined streets to the external perimeter. However, along the spine road through the centre of the development, most of the trees indicated appear to be located within front gardens. Rather than trees sitting within adopted highway, their predominant location within front gardens within private ownership would mean that the same level of control could not be exercised on these trees from a visual and hence appropriate design point of view.
27. During discussions at the event, I asked the appellant whether they would be agreeable to a landscape maintenance condition with a longer period of compliance than 5 years. Following the hearing, the appellant confirmed that there is no evidence to suggest that a longer period than normal should be applied. A comparison was also made with the trees within front gardens at Deer Park View. However, I understand that development was approved prior to the requirement in the Framework for tree-lined streets. I am also unaware of the precise details of landscaping incorporated in the 'numerous more recent permissions' referred to by the appellant.
28. Taking all the above matters into consideration, I find that the proposal would not address the requirement for tree-lined streets in the true sense of the words. The limited opportunities to provide trees outside garden areas to the central parts of the site is symptomatic of the tight grain in those areas. The failure to agree a longer period for the maintenance and replacement of tree planting in front gardens as part of the conditions exacerbates my concern that, left to the discretion of individual occupiers, the proposal would not

secure tree-lined streets. This would jeopardise the character and appearance of the development in the longer term and adds to my other design concerns.

29. At the hearing, the appellant clarified that the revised layout drawing submitted with the appeal was provided as an alternative option if required to provide acceptable relationships between existing and proposed dwellings. However, given, my findings under the second main issue, it has not been necessary to consider the revised position of the dwellings on plots 2 – 6. Nevertheless, this does not overcome my overall concerns in respect of design and layout of the wider scheme.
30. I have heard and seen representations from the Great Bardfield Historical Great Bardfield Historical Society. I also walked through to the centre of the village during my site visit. Given the extent to which the appeal site is set away from the Conservation Area boundary and the settlements more historic built environment, I agree with the main parties that the proposal would not harm the significance of any heritage assets. Even so, this does not overcome the harm that I have identified to local character and distinctiveness as a result of the specified elements of the proposal's unacceptable layout and design.
31. With regards to the LPA's concern in respect of the prominence of parking spaces within the layout, in the majority of instances any frontage parking would be interspersed by gardens or soft landscaped verge. In instances where side-of-plot parking comes forward of the building line, dwellings would help to screen parked vehicles in those cases. Visitor parking is dispersed across the site. Consequently, the parking arrangements would not result in a dominance of vehicles and hard landscaping in the street scene.
32. The affordable housing would be generally clustered amongst the tighter grain 'central perimeter block'. Even so, the buildings would incorporate a similar style to those seen in the wider development and would not include any significant barriers to social interaction. Therefore, I am satisfied that the affordable housing would not be unduly segregated or visually distinct from the market housing.
33. Even though the integration of parking and affordable housing within the scheme does not add to my concerns, they do not overcome the detrimental aspects of the scheme already identified.
34. Overall, I find that the proposal would not be sympathetic to the character of the Braintree Road frontage including the transition into the countryside. The tighter grain to the central parts of the site together with the failure to provide tree-lined streets within this area would not provide an attractive layout. In these respects, the proposal is of an unacceptable design even if these elements could be addressed through an alternative layout.
35. I conclude, the development would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard it would conflict with the design, local character and context requirements of Policy SP7 (Place Shaping Principles) of the LPS1, Policies LPP 1 (Development Boundaries) and LPP 52 (Layout and Design of Development) of the LPS2. It would also conflict with the design, layout, local character and tree-lined streets requirements at Paragraphs 130 and 131 of the Framework.

Living conditions

36. Policy LPP 52 (Layout and Design of Development) of the LPS2 requires that development should ensure that there shall be no unacceptable impact on the amenity of any nearby properties including on privacy. The supporting text to this policy confirms that The Essex Design Guide is a useful starting point for a development and provides guidance regarding amenity standards, layouts and separation distances for dwellings. It also confirms that the guide should be used flexibly and should not prevent innovative layouts or design proposals.
37. The LPA contended at the hearing that the reference to the guidance being applied 'flexibly', specifically relates to not preventing innovative layouts. However, on a straightforward reading of the text which includes the word 'and' and not for example 'used flexibly so as not to prevent innovative layouts' I interpret this as meaning both of these factors can be considered independently. This is particularly given that requirements that must be rigidly adhered to would be more than just guidance.
38. I have been provided with a copy of the Essex Design Guide (2005) (EDG). The LP confirmed at the hearing that this is the document that it continues to apply and which is available on its website. The EDG confirms that where new development backs on to the rear of existing housing, existing residents are entitled to a greater degree of privacy to their rear garden boundary, and therefore where the rear faces of the new houses are approximately parallel to the existing, the rear of new houses may not encroach any closer than 15 metres to an existing rear boundary, even though with a closer encroachment 25 metres between the backs of houses would still be achieved.
39. The appellant's appeal statement includes a diagram which indicates that the revised drawing submitted with the appeal would ensure that Plots 2 – 6 would be in full accordance with the guidance in the EDG. However, from what I have seen and heard this would be a result of moving the dwellings approximately 1.2 metres further from the boundary than was proposed on the drawing considered during the planning application. Consequently, the scheme considered by the LPA would not have fallen significantly short of the 15 metre guidance. Moreover, the layout previously considered by the LPA would also have ensured distances between rear elevations in excess of 25 metres.
40. In terms of other plots of concern identified by the LPA, Plot 56 would sit at a suitably oblique angle to the boundary with the properties on Bendlowes Road such that a high standard of amenity would be retained for occupiers of existing properties. At the hearing the LPA conceded that if Plot 50 would have a garden depth of 19 metres, as indicated in the appellant's evidence, it no longer had an issue. At Plot 51, the rear garden would have a minimum depth of 11.1 metres, but the interface distance between the nearest rear elevation at Bendlowes Road would be in excess of 36.0 metres and the same can be said for the majority of the dwellings that would back on to Bendlowes Road. Furthermore, No 51 would have a bathroom window in the gable nearest to the boundary with No 58 Bendlowes Road, which could be conditioned to be obscure glazed.
41. Consequently, I find that applying a degree of flexibility in respect of the guidance in the EDG, the layout that was before the LPA when it made its decision would ensure that a high standard of amenity with respect to privacy would be provided for occupiers of the proposal and existing neighbouring

properties. In the circumstances, I find that the revised drawing provided with the appeal would not be required to overcome this particular aspect of the LPA's concerns.

42. I conclude, the development would provide suitable living conditions for occupants of the development and neighbouring properties with particular regard to privacy. In that regard the proposal would accord with the amenity requirements of Policy LPP 52 of the LPS2 and the EDG. Given the site specific factors described, the levels of privacy provided would also accord with the requirements at Paragraph 130 of the Framework for developments to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements

43. The LPA has provided a CIL compliance statement. This confirms that the appellant's Section 106 Agreement (s106) would secure 22 dwellings for affordable housing in a mix of tenures. The LPA is satisfied that this would acceptably meet the requirement in Policy LPP 31 (Affordable Housing) of the LPS2 for 40% of the dwellings to be provided as affordable units in areas outside the District's main towns.
44. Policy SP6 (Infrastructure and Connectivity) of the LPS1 states that all development must be supported by the provision of the infrastructure, services and facilities that are necessary to meet the needs arising from the development.
45. The CIL compliance statement confirms that the s106 would ensure that the occupants of the development would have access to amenity green space and equipped play areas and that these will be managed appropriately meeting the Policy LPP50 (Provision for Open Space, Sport and Recreation) of the LPS2 and the LPAs Open Spaces Supplementary Planning Document (Open Spaces SPD).
46. A healthcare contribution of £27,700.00 would be secured in line with the NHS calculation on the number of patients likely to be generated by the development and the amount of additional clinical space that would be required. The contribution would be spent to improve capacity at the surgeries in the Primary Care Network which would be used by residents from the development.
47. The s106 includes a provisions for an 'Outdoor Sport Contribution' of £67,374.68 as the proposed development would increase the demand and use of existing outdoor sports facilities within the village. The contribution would be spent providing new or improved facilities listed in the LPAs 'Potential Open Spaces Improvement Plan' (POSIP) which amongst other things identifies works at Great Bardfield Playing Field off Bendlowes Road. A 'Play Area Contribution' of £45,251.82 is also included in line with the requirements of the LPAs Open Spaces SPD and would then be used to provide new or improved equipped play facilities for projects listed in the POSIP.
48. Education contributions equating to £269,380.80 for local primary provision and £247,260 towards local secondary provision are secured in the s106. These financial contributions would be used by the Education Authority at primary and secondary schools and early years and childcare settings near to the appeal site to meet the additional demand arising from the development. Furthermore a 'secondary school transport contribution' is included as the nearest secondary

school is over 3 miles from the appeal site. The CIL compliance statement confirms that the basis for calculating the level of financial contributions is set out in the Essex County Council Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contributions.

49. A contribution of £77.80 per dwelling is considered necessary towards the cost associated with upgrading existing facilities at local libraries serving the development to include, but not limited to, additional furniture, technology and stock. The LPA has confirmed that this is in accordance with the Essex County Council Developers' Guide to Infrastructure Contribution (Revised 2020).
50. Finally, the LPA is satisfied that the obligation includes suitable arrangements to allow for the collection of refuse and recycling.
51. The CIL compliance statement confirms that the contributions secured would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and would comply with the requirements of Policy SP6 (Infrastructure and Connectivity) of the LPS1 and Policies LPP 31 (Affordable Housing), LPP42 (Sustainable Transport), LPP 50 (Provision for Open Space, Sport and Recreation) and LPP 78 (Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation) of the LPS2 and the Open Space SPD. In the circumstances, and based on the evidence before me, there is no reason for me to find that the contributions secured by the S106 Agreement would not meet the relevant tests at Paragraph 56 of the Framework and Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations.
52. I conclude that the development would make adequate provision for affordable housing and the other necessary infrastructure requirements arising from the development.

Other Considerations

53. The appeal site has good accessibility attributes due to its location next to the existing settlement and close to the centre of Great Bardfield with its range of local services and amenities. Provisions could be made to ensure the site would be served by fast and reliable broadband. Conditions could be incorporated to ensure that the landscape strategy would incorporate native species and that the proposal would deliver the measurable net gain for biodiversity envisaged by the appellant. While such factors attract positive weight, my concerns under the first main issue are also important in considering the sustainability of the proposal which includes an environmental objective.
54. At the hearing, the LPA brought a recent appeal decision in South Oxfordshire at 'Land off the B480, Chalgrove, Oxfordshire'³ (the Chalgrove decision) to my attention. That decision stated that *'harm arising from conflict with the development plan, in particular the overarching strategy on the location of development is fundamentally entwined with public confidence in the planning system. Framework paragraph 15 refers to the "...planning system being genuinely plan led.'* In that particular instance, the Inspector decided that the relative youth of the development plan and maintaining public confidence in the planning process were such that they attached very significant weight to the conflict with the development plan.
55. The appellant observed that the Chalgrove decision was a different District and a different set of circumstances. They also referred me to examples of appeal

³ Appeal Ref APP/Q3115/W/22/3309622

decisions⁴ in Braintree District. None of those cases raise the same or similar character and appearance concerns as the proposal before me. However, they do deal with sites outside settlement boundaries which have been allowed in the District since the adoption of the development plan and Policy LPP1.

Overall, I find that in the context of the housing undersupply position and that Policy LPP1 is currently acting as a constraint to addressing the undersupply, I find the harm arising from the conflict with this policy attracts moderate weight in the overall planning balance.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

56. It is common ground between the main parties that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. For the purposes of determining this appeal I am applying the very worst-case scenario of 4.11 years supply, even acknowledging it is likely to sit within the range of 4.11 years and 4.86 years. The tilted balance set out at Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is triggered.
57. In the context of the identified shortfall in deliverable housing sites and the Government objective to significantly boost the delivery of housing, 56 dwellings would make a substantial contribution towards the provision and mix of housing in the District. The proposal would also secure affordable housing which would help to address the need for such units in the District.
58. There is no dispute that the site is accessibly located close to the villages services and facilities. There would also be social and economic benefits through jobs created in the construction phase, through the future contributions of occupants of the development to the services and facilities in the wider area and through an increase in council tax receipts. There would be investment in education, healthcare facilities and Public Open Space in the local vicinity as secured by the s106, which would be required to address the increased population arising from the development but also has the potential to benefit the wider community. Overall, these are matters which together with the provision of housing attract significant weight in favour of the development.
59. However, paragraphs 130 and 131 of the Framework seek amongst other things that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character and that new streets are tree-lined. I have found that the proposal would conflict with these requirements. Paragraph 134 of the Framework confirms that development that is not well designed should be refused. In these respects, there would also be conflict with the design, character and context requirements of the policies of the development plan. In addition, there would also be conflict with Policy LLP1 to which I afford moderate weight. When considered collectively, these adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the identified benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.
60. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR

⁴ Appeal Refs APP/Z1510/W/21/3289751, APP/Z1510/W/22/3299178, APP/Z1510/W/22/3305099, APP/Z1510/W/22/3306479

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANTS:

Guy Williams – Kings Counsel

Tom Pike – Director of Planning at Lanpro

Roland Bolton – Senior Director at DLP Planning Ltd

Colin Pullan – Senior Director Urban Design – Pegasus Group

Richard Kelly – Croudace Homes

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Emmaline Lambert – Counsel

Melanie Corbishley – Planning Officer

Kathryn Carpenter – Planning Policy Officer

Lee Smith-Evans – Urban Design Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Geoff Gardner – Planning Consultant representing Great Bardfield Parish Council

Carolynne Ruffle – Local resident and Great Bardfield Parish Council

Dr Janet Dyson – Local resident and Great Bardfield Historical Society

Lynn Ward – Local resident

Hilary Simkins – Local resident

Michael Staines – District Councillor for the Three Fields Ward

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

Copy of Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/22/3309622 – Land off the B480, Chalgrove, Oxfordshire

Great Bardfield 'Inset 28' Map and Key

Photographs dated 'November 2023' of appeal site and Deer Park View

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING

Copy of statements of Lynn Ward, Hilary Simkins, Carolynne Ruffle and Dr Janet Dyson as read out at the hearing.

Comments of Essex Highways Department dated 28 July 2023 as discussed at the hearing.

Completed Section 106 Agreement dated 15 November 2023.

Amended suggested conditions.