



---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 14-17 June 2016

Site visit made on 13 June and 16 June 2016

**by Mrs A Wood Dip Arch MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10 August 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/15/3136799**

**Low Lane, Badshot Lea, Farnham, Surrey GU9 9NA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Central Land Holdings Limited against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref:WA/2014/0125, dated 23 October 2013, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2015.
  - The development proposed is described as: "*Residential development with associated access and landscaping.*"
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for costs

2. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by the appellant against Waverley Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. The development description in the banner heading is taken from the application form. Although differing from the lengthier description set out in the appeal form, it correctly identifies what is proposed. The proposal is in outline form with all matters of detail reserved for subsequent consideration. The parties agreed that the proposal is intended to provide up to 30 new dwellings on the site.
4. I undertook an unaccompanied visit to the site and its surroundings on 13 June, taking in the viewpoints referred to in Miss Toyne's Landscape and Visual Assessment proof of evidence. A further inspection on 16 June enabled me to re-visit the viewpoints in the light of the evidence given at the inquiry. I was unable to access the site, but the parties were satisfied that the substantive areas for consideration of the scheme and its impacts had been viewed and that it was unnecessary for an accompanied inspection to take place.

### Main Issues

5. Of the seven reasons for refusal set out in the Council's decision notice, the issues relating to affordable housing, odour, Thames Basin Heath Special
-

Protection Area (SPA) and infrastructure were resolved through the provisions of the completed s106 planning obligation. The remaining reasons for refusal form the subject of the first three main issues identified below.

6. The main issues are:

- The landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development, and its effect on the setting of the settlement.
- The extent to which the proposed development would contribute to coalescence of Farnham and Aldershot.
- The flooding implications of the proposal, and in particular whether sequentially preferable sites are available.
- Whether any adverse impacts of allowing the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits such that the proposal would not represent sustainable development.

### **Reasons**

7. The development plan comprises the saved policies of Waverley Borough Local Plan 2002 (LP) and Policy NRM6 of the revoked South East Plan. The parties agree that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land. While disagreeing on the extent of shortfall in the supply, there is consensus that the position renders relevant development plan policies for the supply of housing out of date. In the light of which, I accept that LP Policies C2 (Countryside Beyond the Green Belt), C4 (Farnham/Aldershot Strategic Gap), D1 (Environmental Implications of Development) and D4 (Design and Layout) are out of date for the purposes of paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The weight accorded to each policy is explained below.

### ***Issue 1: Landscape and Visual Impacts***

8. The appeal site lies outside the defined settlement where LP Policy C2 applies strict control on buildings in the countryside away from existing settlements, with the purpose of protecting the countryside for its own sake. This resonates to a point with the NPPF principle of recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. However, in the circumstances of a Local Plan developed to meet the development needs only up to 2006, the Council's inability to meet current needs, and an emerging strategy recognising that greenfield sites are to be released (and have been granted approval by the Council), Policy C2 can be ascribed little weight.
9. Policy D1 covers broad planning issues relating to the environment, which includes avoiding harm to the visual character and distinctiveness of a locality. The policy is therefore consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles relating, for instance, to the countryside, high quality design, and the roles and character played by different areas. Policy D4 relevance to this appeal might be limited, given the outline nature of the proposal, but its aims reflect the importance the Government attaches to the design of the built environment, as well as the NPPF's policy of addressing integration of new development into the natural environment (amongst others). For the reasons given, Policies D1 and D4 are therefore accorded significant weight.

10. In looking at the effect that the development would have on the landscape character and appearance of the area, I note that the appeal site forms part of an area of countryside to the east of the built-up settlement of Badshot Lea. The buildings on the western side of Low Lane and to the south of St Georges Road mark the current developed eastern edges of the settlement. The recent outline approval granted by the Council for up to 71 dwellings on land to the west of St Georges Road would extend Badshot Lea southwards.
11. The Waverley Borough Council Landscape Study – Part 1: Farnham and Cranleigh (dated August 2014) was developed to evaluate the capacity of the landscapes around identified towns and villages to accept change. The appeal site forms part of segment FN11C, much of which covers an area to the south of the current defined settlement of Badshot Lea. The evaluation summary accords segment FN11C 'some' landscape quality, 'limited' contribution to settlement setting and 'low' landscape value and sensitivity. In its analysis of capacity it goes on to conclude that there *"...could also be capacity in the two fields to the east of Low Lane, with their low intervisibility and adjacent existing residential development."* The countryside around Badshot Lea is similarly described in the Council's Green Belt review in less than glowing terms, as *"characterised by progressive and sporadic urbanisation"* and *"typical urban fringe landscape with diverse land uses set within a weak landscape structure."* The officer's report to committee also refers to the appeal site as an area of transition between the urban area and the countryside.
12. My own visits to the site and its surroundings confirmed that the character of the countryside to the east of Badshot Lea is influenced by its proximity to the urban settlements and transport infrastructure. That is typical of the Thames Basin Lowlands National Character Area in which the appeal site is located. Similarly, the land between Badshot Lea and Aldershot to the north and east displays the characteristics of the Blackwater River Floodplain Character Area of flatness, low lying with *"tranquillity and remoteness significantly limited by urban influence and transport routes."*
13. On the other hand, and despite the fenced eastern boundary and change in levels, in its current undeveloped state the appeal site appears as much a part of the openness of the countryside to the east of Badshot Lea as the Tice's Meadow nature reserve on the site of former quarry workings. The flat, river plain, open pasture landscape comprising the nature conservation area and the open character extends as far as the western edge of the appeal site, and ends at the points along which the countryside meets Low Lane and St Georges Road. The site is no more transitional than any piece of countryside abutting a settlement.
14. The addition of up to 30 new dwellings, along with the internal road network associated with the development, is bound to alter the nature of the land on which it is to be sited. Although of unexceptional landscape quality, its rural character would be materially changed. Extending the built environment to the east of Low Lane would add to the urbanising effects referred to in the character descriptions, and further erode the tranquil quality of the countryside.
15. The appearance of the site, undeveloped rough grassland, would be transformed by the proposed scheme. That is inevitable with any development on a greenfield site, and the appellant does not seek to claim otherwise. From

the north along Low Lane and from Badshot Lea Road, views of the new houses would be obscured by the densely wooded land to the north of the pumping station (viewpoints 8 and 9, Figure LT5 of Miss Toyne's illustrative material). Similarly, from much of the length of the wooded Blackwater River corridor to the north, alongside the built up edge of Aldershot, views of the new development would be filtered by trees and a vegetated belt (viewpoints 7 and 10). The residential scheme of 71 dwellings recently permitted to the south of Badshot Lea would also block out much of the new development in approaches from the south (viewpoints 4 and 5).

16. However, from a number of exposed points along the river corridor, notably from Horton's Mound (viewpoint 6), the new houses would be seen extending the built environment of Badshot Lea into an area of countryside where development is sporadic and non-intrusive. Equally, open views over the site and across the nature reserve along Low Lane (viewpoints 1 and 2), and from parts of St Georges Road, would be disrupted by the new housing development, with erosion of part of the countryside contributing to the setting of Badshot Lea. The site provides a soft edge to the settlement which is apparent in the approach from the sharp left hand bend on St Georges Road and forms as much a part of the landscaped setting of Badshot Lea as the wooded land to the north to which it is closely aligned.
17. Low Lane and St Georges Road form well-defined boundaries containing the settlement and separating it from the countryside. These strong defining markers would be breached by the incursion eastwards and the 'urban edge' pressures extended likewise. Harm would be caused to the appearance of an area of countryside already recognised as suffering from urban intrusions, albeit limited to public views from the north, north/east and from closer quarters on local roads.
18. The harm identified would be compounded by a layout relating poorly to the fabric of the settlement, given the parallel and extensive road system illustrated in the indicative layout plan. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) meanwhile does little to explain development of the scheme design, and shows a lack of ambition or imagination in terms of site layout and design of individual buildings. Should the proposal proceed to detailed design in the form envisaged, it would not meet the broad design principles of Policies D1 and D4, nor comply with the NPPF's desire to achieve high quality design and aspire to developments that function well, adding to the overall quality of an area.
19. That said, as design, scale, layout, landscaping and access are reserved matters, the criticisms I have of the illustrative layout and designs envisaged in the DAS need not weigh against the scheme at this point. Despite the constraints of the two sewer pipes running along the western side of the appeal site, the appellant is confident that a layout better integrated with the existing settlement could be achieved. Even so, a proposal meeting the design expectations of policy would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area by virtue of the development's incursion into the countryside. In that respect, it would not comply with the element of LP Policy D1 that looks to resist developments harmful to visual character and distinctiveness of the locality. The conflict with policy, harm to the countryside and to the setting of Badshot Lea are carried forward into the planning balance in the final issue.

### **Issue 2 – Coalescence of Farnham and Aldershot**

20. LP Policy C4 seeks to protect the Strategic Gap between Farnham and Aldershot, by resisting inappropriate development in accordance with Policy C2, and promotes enhancement of the landscape. The policy is within a time-expired LP that addresses the Borough's needs to 2006. The policy clearly has a restraining function and is out of date (for reasons explained earlier), but its strategic function of maintaining the separation and definition of settlements remains relevant. For that reason, I agree with the main parties that the policy carries moderate weight.
21. Aldershot lies to the north, approximately 0.3km from the appeal site. The Local Landscape Designation Review of August 2014 forms part of the evidence base for the emerging LP. The document records that the Gap was introduced as a 'green wedge' in the 1990 LP to halt coalescence between the settlements, in response to pressure from mineral working and the Runfold diversion. The principle of separating Aldershot and Farnham was rolled over into subsequent plan policies. The analysis explains that the northern area of the Gap complies with the Gap aspirations. The area around Badshot Lea is not so successful, for reasons of its mixed character and urban feel. Visibility to the developed edges and development within it are also cited as factors that render the area "*less strong as a landscape Gap.*"
22. My own inspections confirmed that the properties on the eastern edge of Badshot Lea are visible from the Aldershot side of the Gap as indeed is the village hall which lies within its boundary. Nevertheless, the block of woodland to the north of the site, the appeal site itself and the open pasture land of the nature conservation area all contribute to the sense of separation as one moves between the two settlements.
23. The appeal site lies some distance south of the narrowest part of the Gap. Adding development eastwards and beyond the unbroken boundary of Low Lane would encroach on the Gap, albeit to a limited extent given the size of the development proposed. Although the scheme would be visually contained by the area of woodland to the north, extending built development by some 70m beyond the existing settlement boundary would amount to an unwelcome encroachment. The modest scale of the housing project and its containment by the woodland would limit the sense of loss of separation. Nevertheless, some harm would be caused to the separating function of the Gap, resulting in conflict with LP Policy C4.

### **Issue 3: Flooding**

24. The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and addendum reports accompanying the application as well as the Strategic FRA (SFRA) confirm that the site is located within Flood Zone 2. This is shown on the Environment Agency's Flood Map. The appellant's witness (Mr Nelmes) explained that the Flood Zone 2 status resulted from historical flooding records and was derived from recorded events (most notably in 1968 and 1990) as opposed to a 1 in 1000 year modelling, which is not available. It was also claimed that substantial changes in catchment topography, resulting from the sand and gravel workings nearby, has reduced the theoretical and historic risk of flooding to the site beyond the 100 year modelled design event, by delivering more volume within the floodplain.

25. The Council accepted the FRA (plus addendum) findings of low risk of flooding from the River Blackwater; low risk from pluvial and other sources of flooding, but a medium risk from the existing watercourses around the perimeter of the site and from surface water flooding from the south eastern part of the site. Nevertheless, the appellant accepts that, in the absence of detailed modelling of the 1 in 1000 year event, the site should be regarded as falling within Flood Zone 2 for the purpose of this appeal. Without substantiating evidence to the contrary, it must follow that the site comprises land having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1000 annual probability of flooding from the River Blackwater.
26. With the aim of steering new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding (in this case Flood Zone 1), the NPPF calls for a Sequential Test to be undertaken. The appellant agreed the scope of the test with the Council and the method of discounting sites followed an approach used by the Council when considering the planning application for the 71 dwellings to the west of St Georges Road.
27. I agree that the Sequential Test should apply to sites within and outside Farnham, as the town is one of a handful of large settlements to which growth is to be directed to meet the housing needs of the Borough. The potential sites available for development are listed in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2014 (SHLAA). The sites falling within Flood Zone 3 were correctly excluded from consideration. I also agree that sites granted permission (by the Council or on appeal) should not be regarded as contenders to which the test is to be applied, and those refused permission by the Council can be discounted for reasons of likely unavailability as part of the Council's five-year supply.
28. However, the process of discounting alternative sites on the basis of size and for reasons that have nothing to do with flooding is, in my view, flawed. Let me explain. The Council's objective is to address the housing needs of the Borough. The requirement to demonstrate a five-year supply forms an important part of that objective. That five-year requirement could be achieved on a single site or by the more likely scenario of a combination of a range of sites of varying capacity. Either of these options, including an aggregate of smaller sites, would deliver the number of units (up to 30) promoted in the appeal.
29. The objective is to deliver housing numbers. Whether the supply is forthcoming from sites capable of accommodating large numbers, from a number of smaller sites or a combination of both is neither here nor there. The Sequential Test in this case should consider the comparative flooding risks of reasonably available candidate sites capable of accommodating the numbers expected from the appeal site. There is no policy or indeed rational basis for considering sites on a 'like for like' basis only, or for excluding those that fall outside an arbitrary size cut off limit of up to 50 units.
30. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) does not assist in this regard when stating that "*a pragmatic approach on the availability of alternatives should be taken.*" EA standing advice directs applicants to "*...look for sites that could be suitable for your development*", which could be interpreted as a site capable of accommodating a development of the size intended or even a number of sites of lesser capacity. Neither the PPG nor the NPPF refers to suitability of sites in connection with the Sequential Test.

31. The reference to 'reasonably available sites', in Paragraph 19 of the PPG, I take to imply sites that are available to contribute to the area's five-year supply. Thus, applications refused permission or those unlikely to be available (for reasons of continuing alternative uses, for instance) to contribute to the area's five-year supply could not be regarded as reasonably available alternatives.
32. The appellant's sequential exercise excludes sites by making value judgements on a range of non-flooding related issues. For instance, sites are discounted for possible impacts on heritage assets, for contamination reasons, loss of employment or even excluded for reasons of location in the strategic gap. Admittedly, this was based on the Council's approach on the scheme permitted to the west of St Georges Road. The methodology however goes well beyond the principle of looking at the comparative flooding status of reasonably available alternative sites.
33. Instead, the sifting exercise extends to assessing the relative merits and therefore suitability of each site in terms of site and/or policy constraints. This is carried out without detailed knowledge of whether the issues could be overcome and in the absence of an up to date policy basis for countryside or gap protection. The discounting of sites in this way for the purposes of the Sequential Test is a self-serving, circular exercise which would inevitably render the majority of sites incapable of consideration. A similar Sequential Test process applied to an alternative site on the list could, for instance, lead to exclusion of the appeal site for its location within the Strategic Gap. The approach is without support in Government policy or guidance and undermines the overarching objective of steering developments to locations at lower probability of flooding.
34. At the inquiry, the appellant's planning witness continued to defend the approach adopted for the Sequential Test and reported that similar methods were used on other projects. For the reasons explained above, the appellant's conclusion that there is no other site of lower flood risk available is based on a false premise. From the information available, it appears to me that at least four sites across the Farnham area (SHLAA site nos: 29, 381, 438 and 546) are located within Flood Zone 1; all with the capacity to accommodate numbers of dwellings exceeding the 30 units (maximum) proposed on the appeal site.
35. In other words, the evidence shows that 30 new dwellings could be accommodated on reasonably available sites with a lower probability of flooding than the appeal site. In these circumstances, the NPPF says development should not be permitted. The proposal fails on that basis, even though the appellant's FRA has demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that the flood risk from all sources has been adequately assessed and can be appropriately mitigated for.
36. The development can be made flood resilient and resistant, and is unlikely to increase flood risk elsewhere. Residents' experience of flooding relates to the watercourses alongside the site, to which surface water from the highways is discharged. This is an existing problem likely to be partly caused by poor maintenance of the watercourses. However, with measures in place as identified in the FRA, I am satisfied that the proposed development can be made safe for its lifetime and that the development would not add to flooding risks elsewhere. The lack of technical objections to the scheme, however, does

not override the primacy of steering developments to areas of lower probability of flooding, in this case to sites located within Flood Zone 1.

### **Other Matters**

37. The s106 would address the pressures that the new housing development would bring to bear on local infrastructure. It promises contributions towards environmental improvements in Farnham town centre, secondary education, recycling/refuse, transport and highways improvements. The Council confirms that the amounts forthcoming are commensurate with the size and nature of the development proposed.
38. Located as it would be within 5 km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, the proposal is required to put measures in place to avoid or mitigate any potential adverse effects (Policy NRM6 of the revoked South East Plan). A financial contribution, offered in the planning obligation, towards improvements of the Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space at Farnham Park, and for site access management and monitoring, would be in line with the Council's SPA avoidance strategy.
39. The County Highway Authority is satisfied with the appellant's Transport Statement conclusions that the proposal would not have a material impact on the capacity of the local highway network. Based on the indicative site layout plan, the Council accepts that the development can be accommodated without impacting adversely on the safety of pedestrians or drivers. Local residents, however, articulated genuine concerns about the likely increase in vehicular movements at vulnerable points between the bend on St Georges Road and the junction of St Georges Road with Low Lane, pointing to incidents of accidents or near accidents in the vicinity of the site.
40. My own inspection of the area confirmed that there might be some merit in the anxieties expressed by local people. Low Lane is narrow and its capacity is further compromised by vehicles being parked along part of its length. Local residents also park vehicles on the section of St Georges Road traversing past the southern part of the appeal site. This has the effect of causing congestion during peak times but also has the effect of slowing down passing traffic. I am hopeful that there is scope to provide suitable access arrangements for the proposed development and which could be secured at detailed design stage. Furthermore, highways improvements financed through contributions in the planning obligation could help to mitigate the highways related impacts of the proposal. Accessibility to local services and the opportunities for access via alternative modes of transport add to the acceptability of the proposed scheme in terms of its transport and highways implications. Thus, rendering it compliant with the LP Policies M2 and M14.

### **Issue 4 – The Planning Balance**

41. In the light of the FRA findings (agreed by the Council's consultants) that the site is at low residual risk from fluvial flooding, it is argued that the proposal is not subject to the tilted balance of footnote 9, paragraph 14 of the NPPF. In other words, specific policies in the NPPF which indicate that development should be restricted do not apply in this case, as the site is not in a location at risk of flooding. Permission, therefore, is to be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. The



approach is questionable, given the agreed Flood Zone 2 status of the site. Even if it were correct, this proposal raises a range of issues for and against it. A planning balance needs to be struck in any event, weighing the harm on one side against the benefits to enable a conclusion to be reached on whether this is sustainable development.

42. Turning first to the scheme's benefits. The major plank of the appellant's case in this respect is the delivery of new dwellings, of which 40% would comprise affordable homes. While agreeing on the Council's inability to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, there is disagreement on the extent of the deficit. At worst the position is 3.61 years (appellant) while the Council's evidence points to a supply of 4.63 years at best. The worst case scenario is based on a 10% uplift to the annual requirement figure of 519<sup>1</sup>, a 20% buffer and a supply figure of 3,066 as opposed to the Council's estimated supply of 3,329 – difference of 263.
43. The evidence prepared for the inquiry included a range of permutations applying varying buffers, uplifts and supply figures. The material submitted shows that the Council has failed to meet its housing targets for the last seven years. The lack of delivery can be attributed to the recession and added effects of the SPA. However, even in the last three years the shortfall has accumulated to 830 dwellings. There must be some merit in the appellant's argument that lack of an up to date plan for over 10 years and the absence of a spatial strategy or release of land to address the area's development needs has contributed to the backlog. In these circumstances, I am inclined to agree with my colleague that this is a "*borderline case of a 20% buffer being warranted.*"<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, I am unable to endorse the 10% market uplift recommended in a report prepared for the purpose of this appeal and which appears to justify the higher rate of uplift on the basis of recommendations by Inspectors at local plan examinations for other authorities. The report has not been tested at examination and was prepared for the specific purpose of this appeal; its findings cannot be accorded the weight ascribed to the SHMA.
44. In terms of supply, I agree that development proposals refused permission should not be included; there is no certainty of delivery from such sites, even in the event of an appeal. Speculation on how objections to refused permissions can be addressed does not raise the certainty of delivery. There are also doubts about the extent to which large sites could yield the numbers expected within five years. Sites currently being used for other purposes cannot be wholly relied upon to deliver new dwellings within the next five years. The 10% non-implementation rate applied by the appellant is not fully explained. Nevertheless, I accept that the Council's supply figure is somewhat optimistic.
45. Overall, and applying a degree of caution to the disputed figures, it is likely that the current five-year land position falls somewhere close to the four-year mark. This scale of shortfall is a significant material consideration to be accorded substantial weight. Consequently, the contribution that the proposed development would make to the housing needs of the Borough amounts to a significant social benefit.

---

<sup>1</sup> Taken from the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and includes 5% market signal uplift  
<sup>2</sup> Appeal ref: APP/R3650/W/15/3008821

46. Delivery of new affordable homes is a high Government priority. The extensive evidence provided on behalf of the appellant shows the importance of delivering new affordable homes; it is clearly a nationwide problem but one that is acutely felt in Surrey and indeed Waverley. Set against a background of unmet need, almost 166 households on the Housing Register and an annual affordable housing need of over 350 annually, the 12 (maximum) affordable homes forthcoming from the appeal development also weighs heavily in its favour. Economic benefits of building new homes, and additional retail expenditure that the residents would provide, add to the case for the proposal, albeit minimally.
47. The failure to meet the Sequential Test, with added environmental harm to the countryside and setting of Badshot Lea as well as erosion of the Strategic Gap, weigh substantially against the proposed scheme. The conflict with national policy on flooding, with LP Policies C4 and D1 and the potential for conflict with LP Policy D4 as a consequence of the harm identified also tells materially against it. These are substantive matters of national and local concern. Because of the minimal weight attached to LP Policy C2, the conflict with it is a neutral point in the balance.
48. In the final balance, I find that the proposed development would conform to the social and economic dimensions of sustainable development. The provision of new market and affordable homes are significant benefits in the circumstances of a shortfall and unmet need position in the Borough. However, due to the modest scale of the development proposed, and the limited extent to which it would contribute to the supply of housing and affordable housing needs of the Borough, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits described. In coming to this conclusion, it follows that the proposed development would not amount to sustainable development and fails against policies in the NPPF as a whole. Similarly, it falls against the policies of the development plan to which I have accorded significant or moderate weight, in spite of their out of date status.
49. I have taken account of all other matters raised for and against the proposed scheme, including the officer's support for it. For the reasons explained, I disagree with the conclusions expressed in the report to committee. No other matter raised is sufficient to alter the balance of my considerations or decision to dismiss the appeal.

*Ava Wood*  
Inspector

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Robin Green of counsel                      Instructed by Waverley Borough Council  
 He called  
 Mr Brian Woods BA(TP)                      Managing Director, WSP Planning and  
 MRTPI    Architecture

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Christopher Young of counsel                      Instructed by Mr Steven Kosky  
 He called  
 Mr James Stacey                              Director, Tetlow King Planning Limited  
 BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI  
 Miss Lisa Toyne                              Landscape Planning Director, Barton Willmore  
 BA(Hons) DipLA DipTP                      LLP  
 CMLI  
 Mr Timothy J Goodwin                      Director, Ecology Solutions  
 BSc(Hons) MSc,  
 MIEEnvSc, MCIEEM,  
 MIALE  
 Mr Stuart Nelmes                              Accounts Director, BWB Consulting Limited  
 BSc(Hons) MRes  
 MCIWEM CEnv  
 Mr Steven Kosky                              Planning Director, Barton Willmore LLP  
 BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mrs Freeman                                      Local Resident  
 Mrs Flude    Local Resident  
 Cllr Carole Cockburn                      Borough and Ward Councillor

## Documents Submitted at the Inquiry

No	Title	Date	Submitted by
1	Letter of notification of the inquiry and those notified	14/6	WBC
2A	Planning Obligation	14/6	APP/WBC
2B	Final Planning Obligation	21/6	
3	Opening on behalf of appellant	14/6	APP
4	Opening on behalf of WBC	14/6	WBC
5	Note from Cllr Storey	14/6	Mayor of Waverley and Cllr Weybourne and Badshot Lea
6	Appeal Decision 3130438 (Horsham Road, Cranleigh)	15/6	WBC
7	5 year housing supply scenarios	15/6	APP
8	Disputed 5 year supply sites schedule	15/6	APP
9	Mrs J Flude's statement	15/6	Mrs Flude
10	Surrey County Council Highways CIL	15/6	WBC

	Note		
11	Update of Figure 10 to Mr Stacey's proof	15/6	APP
12	Committee report application WA/2016/0268	15/6	WBC
13	Mr and Mrs Freeman's statement	16/6	Mr/Mrs Freeman
14	Affordable housing completions	16/6	WBC
15	Affordable housing in pipeline	16/6	WBC
16	Judgement - [2015] EWHC 3459 (Admin)	16/6	APP
17	Appeal Decision 2211721 Willaston, Cheshire (Richborough)	16/6	APP
18	SHLAA sites	16/6	APP
19	Rushmoor flooding report	16/6	Mrs Flude
20	Note re affordable housing	16/6	APP
21	Secretary of State policy saving letter	16/6	APP
22	Letter from RPS to WBC dated 1 June 2015 re: local area surface water model	16/6	APP
23	EA Standing advice	16/6	WBC
24	Additional commentary by WBC on SHLAA discounted sites (with maps)	16/6	WBC
25	Judgement - [2016] EWHC 624 (Watermead)	16/6	WBC
26	Appellant's response to ID 24	17/6	APP
27	Letter from Royal Haskoning re: highways	17/6	
28	Correspondence re: pumping station	17/6	WBC
29	Additional suggested conditions	17/6	WBC/APP
30	Mr Green's closing	17/6	WBC
31	Mr Young's closing	17/6	APP
32	Costs application on behalf of the appellant	17/6	APP
33	WBC response to the costs application		WBC