



---

## Appeal Decisions

Hearing held and site visit made on 14 June 2016

**by Terry G Phillimore MA MCD MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 August 2016**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/W/15/3136302 (Appeal A)**

#### **Land OS 5775 North of Kelways, Wearne Lane, Langport, Somerset**

- 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 The Cook Family against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 14/05234/OUT, dated 20 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2015.
  - The development proposed is residential development of land, formation of vehicular access, provision of roads and open space, demolition and alteration of wall.
- 

### **Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/Y/15/3136307 (Appeal B)**

#### **Old Kelways, Somerton Road, Langport, Somerset TA10 9YE**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Spinney Developments Ltd against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 14/05235/LBC, dated 20 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2015.
  - The works proposed are demolition of western end of wall.
- 

## **Decisions**

### ***Appeal A***

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### ***Appeal B***

2. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Procedural Matters**

3. At the hearing an application for costs was made by the appellants against the Council. This application is the subject of separate Decisions.
  4. The appeals were originally being dealt with by another Inspector by way of written representations. The procedure was subsequently changed to a hearing, and I was appointed in his place.
  5. An agreement dated 23 December 2015 containing planning obligations pursuant to section 106 of the Act has been submitted. A deed of variation to this agreement dated 23 June 2016 was received following the hearing, in accordance with a timetable I specified at the hearing.
-

6. After the close of the hearing the Council drew attention to appeal decision reference APP/R3325/W/15/3131336 dated 22 June 2016, on the basis that it deals with issues similar to those raised by the current case. I allowed the appellants a period to submit written comments in response to this.
7. Appeal A relates to an outline application with all matters reserved other than means of access. It was supported by an illustrative layout showing the provision of 71 dwellings and 217 parking spaces. The nature of the layout is described in the Statement of Common Ground, which refers to the explanation of the rationale for the scheme set out in the Design and Access Statement. With this submitted material, and the level of detail contained in the supporting plans, I have viewed these as giving a clear indication of the likely form of development, which I have accordingly taken into account in my assessment.

### **Main Issues**

8. The main issues are:
  - a) whether the proposal is in accordance with the development plan with respect to the location of new residential development and the scale of the proposal;
  - b) the implications of the housing land supply position in the District;
  - c) the effect the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area, in particular the landscape gap between Langport and Wearne;
  - d) the effect the proposal would have on the special interest of the heritage asset of the former Kelways nurseries wall by reason of physical works and impact on its setting;
  - e) the overall balance of harm and benefits that would result from the proposal and whether or not it amounts to a sustainable development.

### **Reasons**

#### ***Development plan position***

9. The 3.42ha site comprises predominantly agricultural land on the northern edge of the town of Langport.
10. Policy SS1 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 (adopted in 2015) sets out a settlement strategy for the District. This identifies Yeovil as a Strategically Significant Town and the prime focus for development. It also lists Market Towns where provision will be made for housing, employment, shopping and other services that increase their self-containment and enhance their roles as service centres. Langport/Huish Episcopi is in the second tier of Local Market Towns. Paragraph 5.19 explains that Market Towns are the focal points for locally significant development including the bulk of the District's housing provision outside Yeovil. This growth aims to increase the self-containment of these settlements and enhance their service role. According to paragraph 5.20, the types of Market Town differ due to their current level of services, facilities and economic activity, so that two tiers have been identified. The scale of future growth allocated to the two tiers is proportionate, with the larger Primary Market Towns planned to receive a higher level of growth and the smaller Local Market Towns a lower level, with the specific amounts set out in policy SS5.

11. On housing, policy SS4 sets out that provision will be made for sufficient development to meet an overall District requirement of at least 15,950 dwellings over the plan period. In delivering new housing growth, policy SS5 provides that at least 7,441 dwellings will be located within the Urban Framework of Yeovil and via two Sustainable Urban Extensions. Prior to the adoption of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document, a permissive approach will be taken when considering housing proposals in Yeovil (via the SUEs), and 'directions of growth' at the Market Towns. The overall scale of growth and the wider policy framework will be key considerations in taking this approach, with the emphasis upon maintaining the established settlement hierarchy and ensuring sustainable levels of growth for all settlements. The policy specifies that the distribution of development across the settlement hierarchy will be in line with the numbers given in a table: for Langport/Huish Episcopi, the figures are a total plan period requirement of 374, with 289 existing commitments (at April 2012) and additional housing provision required of 85.
12. Policy LMT2 deals with the Langport/Huish Episcopi 'direction of growth'. The direction of strategic growth will be to the north, east, and south east of the settlement. All development must avoid coalescence with the settlement of Wearne. The policy also adds that development will be subject to habitats assessment and open space will be required. Paragraph 7.128 explains that Langport/Huish Episcopi is classified as a 'Market Town' due to the settlement having a strong employment, retail and community role. Given its relatively smaller scale and nature compared to some of the larger Market Towns, it is identified as a Local Market Town with a reduced scale of growth to match. According to paragraph 7.129, in order to sustain and enhance its role, with a level of development that is relative to the size, accessibility, character and environmental characteristics of the town, at least 374 dwellings should be built in the plan period, requiring further provision for around 85 dwellings. The paragraph also states that there are few sites available within the existing urban area, meaning a 'direction of growth' is required to identify a broad location to accommodate new development on the edge of the town.
13. The appeal site lies within the northern part of the 'direction of growth' of Langport/Huish Episcopi as shown on the policy map.
14. The Council's most up-to-date monitoring information for Langport/Huish Episcopi indicates that 273 dwellings were completed from 2006-2015 and 199 dwellings had planning permission but were not yet completed. The combined total of 472 dwellings is 98 (or 26%) in excess of the figure of 374 dwellings included in the Local Plan for the town. With the additional 71 dwellings of the proposal, the total would rise to 543, which is 45% above the figure.
15. The Council notes that the 543 total exceeds the equivalent Local Plan growth figure of 496 dwellings for Ilminster, which is designated as a Primary Market Town and therefore the next tier up in the settlement hierarchy. The Council also puts forward some other calculations. Yeovil's minimum requirement of 7,441 dwellings represents 47% of the District-wide requirement. Over the nine-year period of 2006-15, 1,876 dwellings were completed in Yeovil, which is 33% of the total delivery in the District and therefore significantly below this proportion. The figure of 374 dwellings for Langport/Huish Episcopi represents 2.3% of the District-wide total, while the delivery of 273 dwellings so far is 4.8% of the total of completed dwellings in the District.

16. Based on these figures, there is understandable concern about the scale of housing development that would be reached in Langport/Huish Episcopi with the addition of the proposal, in terms of whether this would reflect the strategic intention of the Local Plan. This is particularly so having regard to the use of the relatively prescriptive term 'in line with' in the reference of policy SS5 to the housing numbers given for Langport/Huish Episcopi, among other settlements, and the degree to which these would be exceeded only part way through the plan period. However, this apparent inconsistency is balanced by other factors. In the same way that the District-wide requirement is couched in terms of 'at least' in policy SS4, this label is attached to the figure of 374 for Langport/Huish Episcopi in paragraph 7.129. That this does not represent a threshold beyond which no further dwellings should be approved is reinforced by the evidence of the appellants and third parties that the Council has itself continued to grant permissions for new dwellings in the town, albeit on a smaller scale than the current proposal.
17. Furthermore, it appears that the preparation of a Site Allocations Development Plan Document is not now being pursued by the Council, with this being postponed until a review of the Plan. The 'permissive approach' of policy SS5 within the 'direction of growth' where the appeal site is located therefore applies.
18. Appeal decision reference APP/R3325/W/15/3131336 deals with a proposed residential development at the settlement of Martock elsewhere in the District. I note the conclusion of the Inspector that the proposal before him would harmfully distort the spatial strategy of the development plan and conflict with the plan-led system. That case differed from the current one in that Martock is designated as a rural centre with an indicated requirement for 230 dwellings. As well as being lower in the hierarchy than Langport/Huish Episcopi, the proposal at up to 91 dwellings was larger than the present scheme and would on its own have raised the commitments in that settlement from close to the plan figure to some 50% above it. In addition, the site was not located within a 'direction of growth'.
19. With respect to the potential effect of allowing this development on the position of Langport/Huish Episcopi in the hierarchy, the proposal represents less than 6 percent of the existing number of dwellings in the town. The development therefore in itself would be unlikely to have a serious impact in terms of a further increase in the town's size or overall degree of self-containment. There is also no firm evidence to support the suggestion that it would have an adverse effect on the potential for future growth of Yeovil. I deal with the sustainability of the location below, but it is not established that as a service centre the town could not support this level of housing growth. In contrast, in the Martock case the Inspector found that the proposal before him would result in tangible harm in terms of out-commuting and impact on the scale of development elsewhere. That appeal decision therefore does not warrant resisting the current proposal on the same basis.
20. Overall I do not find material conflict with the settlement strategy of the Local Plan or that a harmful dilution or undermining of this would result from allowing the proposal. It is reasonably in accord with the development plan in this respect.

### ***Housing land supply position***

21. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out an aim in paragraph 47 to boost significantly the supply of housing. It requires that local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework. They should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements, with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. The Framework indicates that the buffer should be increased to 20% where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing.
22. According to paragraph 49 of the Framework, relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
23. The current five year housing land position for the District as agreed at the hearing was a supply of just over 4 years and 4 months. It appears that the Council has since calculated the supply at a reduced period of 4 years and 2 months. There is therefore somewhat below a demonstrated five-year supply. It is not in dispute that all of the above policies are relevant policies for the supply of housing on the basis of their potential effect in governing the location of housing in broad geographical terms. Consequently under paragraph 49 these policies are not up-to-date.
24. I have concluded above that the proposal is not in material conflict with these policies, and that there would be no real harm to the settlement strategy of the Local Plan from the development. In the alternative, had I found that the disparity with the housing growth figures for Langport/Huish Episcopi contained in the Plan amounted to a conflict with the out-of-date policies, in the circumstances of the case the limited conflict would be outweighed by the current housing land supply shortfall in the District and the housing gain that would result from the proposal. Therefore, the conclusion reached either way is that resisting the proposal on the basis of a lack of accord with the settlement strategy policies of the Local Plan is not warranted.

### ***Landscape***

25. An element of policy LMT2 on the Langport/Huish Episcopi 'direction of growth' is that all development must avoid coalescence with the settlement of Wearne. This is a small rural settlement in a countryside setting with access by narrow country lanes. It is primarily of a linear nature on an east-west axis, and is a distinctive entity separated by agricultural land from its larger neighbour to the south.
26. A stone wall which runs along the whole southern boundary of the site currently provides a clear demarcation to the north edge of this built up part of the town. The agricultural land of the appeal site together with a continuation of fields running northwards form a swathe of open land extending towards the rear boundaries of the properties on the south side of Wearne. The proposal would extend built development onto the southern section of this swathe.

27. On the east side the development would be contained by an existing cluster of buildings on the west side of Wearne Lane, but this is currently an isolated group beyond the town and the effect here would be to create a continuous outrider of development abutting the Lane. On the west side the proposed housing would not project further northwards than an approved residential development lying to the west. The submitted drawings indicate a soft northern edge to the proposal, with a reducing density and blocks of planting.
28. The appellant's submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal assesses that the development would have only a minor adverse landscape impact. The degree of this would be partially mitigated by landscape improvements associated with the proposed northern boundary buffer and landscaping within the main body of the site. In terms of predicted visual impacts, it assesses that there would be localised impacts close to the site of a substantial to moderate magnitude with lesser impacts from intermediate and distant viewpoints. The exception would be middle distance views from higher ground overlooking the site to the north of Wearne. From here the development would be clearly seen as a northern extension of built development. The proposed planting associated with the development would mitigate the impact of this and create a well defined soft buffer. In addition, a significant distance of over 200m would remain between the outer edge of the built development and the main linear part of Wearne, and this would limit the impact.
29. I essentially agree with these conclusions. In views from the higher ground to the north there is no doubt that the landscape gap between the town and Wearne would be perceived as less substantial than it currently is, involving an element of harm to the character and appearance of the area. Nevertheless, policy LMT2 clearly anticipates some development in this area, based on the Council's own previous assessments of where development on the edge of the town could best be accommodated. The Council agreed at the hearing that the site does not lie within a valued landscape as referred to in the Framework. With the retained extent of separation and the proposed landscape buffer, the development would not give rise to a coalescence with the main part of Wearne. The degree of harmful impact therefore does not amount to a breach of policy LMT2 in this respect, or of policy EQ2 which seeks to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the District.

**Heritage asset**

30. The wall referred to above divides the site from that of the former Kelways nurseries which lies to the south. The buildings of the nurseries which date from the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century are Grade II listed. They are now used for a mixture of offices, café, public house, restaurant and letting rooms. Between the wall and this building group is a modern residential housing estate which comprises blocks of traditionally designed dwellings. It is laid out in 2 culs de sac which point northwards towards the appeal site and terminate close to the wall, with a large open space between the two parts.
31. The continuous masonry wall around 2.5m high defines the northern, eastern and southern boundaries of the former nurseries. In total it is some 570m long. A second wall continues along the southern roadside boundary of the Kelways site, which is a lower structure of varying architectural detailing.
32. The section of the wall along the boundary of the appeal site is constructed of coursed white lias rubble in hard sand/lime mortar. It incorporates a masonry

water tower towards its western end, and is pierced by a broad vehicle access at roughly its mid point. The wall has recently been capped with a variety of materials, and is in a generally good condition. It is agreed to be protected by listed status as a result of association with the listed nursery buildings.

33. The wall was probably built in several stages commencing shortly after establishment of the nurseries in 1851. The breach may have been formed as part of later expansion of the nurseries northwards. At the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the wall was lined with plant houses, the wall protecting plants from the northerly and easterly winds and trapping sunlight. In this respect it acted as a form of 'kitchen garden' wall on a large commercial scale.
34. The wall was thus an integral physical component of the mid-late 19<sup>th</sup> century premises of Kelway & Sons Limited, one of Langorth's principal employers during the 19<sup>th</sup> century and one of Britain's longest established commercial nurseries. As such, it has considerable historical significance, despite the limited archaeological or architectural interest of the structure and its incomplete elements. Much of that historical significance derives from the important functional role that the wall performed in terms of its assistance in the growing of plants within the nurseries.
35. Historical significance also derives from the spatial relationship of the wall to the rest of the premises it enclosed and to the surroundings. The wall would previously have been perceived within the nurseries as part of the physical background and as a boundary. The principal buildings have been retained and sensitively converted to alternative uses, but the planting beds and ancillary structures that were the essence the nurseries' character have been lost. The historic legibility of the ensemble has been further compromised by the high density residential development now in place. As well as removing the former planting beds, that development has to a degree visually and functionally separated the enclosing wall from the rest of the premises. There is now limited inter-visibility between the former offices and workshops of the nurseries and the wall. However, the connection is partly retained through the penetration of the central open space from the wall into the site and the continued sense of there being a surrounding wall with a geographical relationship to the retained buildings. The element of the wall's setting within its perimeter therefore provides a contribution to its significance.
36. As experienced from the north, the wall acts as a division between the area within its perimeter and the open agricultural land beyond. This outer land includes the appeal site which abuts the whole of the northern section. In this way the wall continues to function as a boundary, even more so in that at this point it marks the outer extent of the developed part of the settlement. From close to, long views of the wall tend to be obstructed by vegetation, but the full structure is visible to a much greater degree from the higher ground at Wearne to the north, including from public viewpoints. From this perspective the townscape of roofs and upper storeys to some extent gives the wall with the water tower feature a defensive character, rather than that obviously of a nursery wall. Nevertheless, the retained appearance of enclosure and the separation of an inner zone from the agricultural land beyond provide the informed viewer with a material sense of key elements of the historic spatial character of the nurseries. The wall is a continuing strong physical expression of the historic divide between the protected land within the nurseries with its particular character and function and the contrasting open agricultural land

outside. The present open land is part of that distinguishing feature and therefore is an aspect of setting that contributes to the wall's significance. I do not agree with the appellants that the wall can be appreciated as a specific heritage asset only from within the former premises. The open area to the north is an essential part of the long-term historical character of the wall associated with the group of listed buildings.

*Effect of the proposal*

37. The proposal would require the demolition of some 6.7m length of the western end of the wall. This represents less than 2.5% of the 260m length of the northern arm. The affected fabric incorporates no architectural or functional historical detail, and is a part likely to have been relatively recent following demolition of the southern return. The proposed demolition would not in overall terms undermine the spatial or visual relationship of the rest of the wall to the former Kelways premises, nor affect the legibility of the wall as an historic structure. It would however amount to the permanent loss of a material element of the structure.
38. The new residential development would affect views of the wall from the north, with a loss of the ability to experience an extensive panorama of the wall looking towards it. As indicated in the plans, the proposal would also introduce built development comprising dwellings, roads and parking across the full span of the northern section of wall. The effect of this would be to change the outer setting of the wall from one that helps define a strong enclosing boundary of a distinctive area to one that would give it the character of a dividing structure between two sections of urban residential development. In this respect it is notable that the area of open space indicated as part of the proposed layout is significantly smaller than that to the south of the wall, and this would not retain the existing sense of open agricultural fields outside the wall. This adverse impact on the contribution that the open aspect makes to the historic significance of the wall as outlined above would outweigh the benefit of any enhanced appreciation by way of new axis views and the degree to which the wall would become a centrepiece within the development. Instead, the harm to setting which the appellants recognise has occurred due to the residential development to the south of the wall would be extended to the north. As a result the setting would not merely be preserved as that of a high wall adjacent to a residential development, since the new development would further add to the compromise of the setting that has already taken place. This assessment is based on the particular circumstances of the case, and does not represent an unqualified approach of precluding all new development within sight of a listed building.
39. I find that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, by way of direct loss and detriment to its setting. According to paragraph 134 of the Framework, in such circumstances the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing optimum viable use. According to the appellants, the wall as now divorced from the former nurseries has no practical use, and the optimum use of it would be as an integral component of a residential development in which it performs an architectural and functional purpose as a centrepiece of the development, warranting planned maintenance and encouraging its appreciation as a heritage asset. I give little weight to this argument in view of the lack of evidence that the wall requires maintenance



that would otherwise not happen, and due to the adverse effect of the spatial changes outlined above. As an historic feature the wall already makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. I deal with other public benefits of the proposal and the balance between benefits and harm below.

40. The proposal does not accord with policy EQ3, which requires heritage assets to be conserved and where appropriate enhanced for their historic significance and important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place.

### **Overall balance and whether sustainable development**

41. The Framework sets out that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. It states that the policies in its paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice.
42. Paragraph 7 identifies three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental.
43. As noted above, the provision of additional housing is in line with national planning policy, and is an economic and social benefit. This is an important positive aspect of the proposal, particularly with the identified shortfall in housing land supply. Specifically, the provision of a significant number of affordable dwellings (at some 35% of the units), secured by a planning obligation, is a matter that carries substantial weight given the need for such housing.
44. The economic benefits of the development would encompass investment, employment and local spending. In social terms, obligations and conditions would deal with infrastructure needs that would be generated by occupation of the development. However, claimed potential benefits with respect to reinforcement of the role of the designated market town as a rural service centre by way of additional growth are of limited weight in view of the extent of development that has already been permitted in the settlement as against the specific numerical provision of the Local Plan.
45. In environmental terms, it is common ground between the main parties that the site is in a sustainable location in relation to the services and facilities of the town. Despite local concerns expressed about highway safety and traffic, there is no technical evidence to warrant departure from the assessment of the Highway Authority that the proposed access arrangements are acceptable for both vehicles and pedestrians, including the emergency access provided onto Wearne Lane. As set out above, there would be only a limited degree of harm to the landscape character and appearance of the area. Based on evidence from ecological surveys that have been carried out, mitigation of biodiversity impact could be appropriately ensured by way of conditions, and Natural England has advised that the proposal would be unlikely to have a significant effect on any European designated site. The loss of Grade 2 'best and most versatile agricultural land' is a disbenefit, but the weight of this is limited by the location of the site within the Local Plan's identified 'direction of growth'.
46. The harm to a designated heritage asset set out above is a negative impact of the proposal in both environmental and social terms.

47. The proposal therefore rates well on some aspects of sustainability, and would provide the important benefits of new housing. In carrying out the balance required under paragraph 134 of the Framework, it is necessary to give considerable importance and weight to the harm that would result to the heritage asset. In terms of the justification for the harm, it is relevant that the site lies within the Local Plan's 'direction of growth' for the town, and I note the appellants' assertion that a decision against the proposal would undermine confidence in the plan-making process. However, there is no compelling reason as to why there should be this specific scale and layout of development within the 'direction of growth', with the particular degree of harmful impact. The extent of housing development that has been permitted in the town, which is well above that indicated in the Local Plan, is also a factor that mitigates the degree of benefit. This is on the basis that there appears to be no strong justification for the amount of housing proposed to be provided in this location, despite that the District forms a single housing market area.
48. Taking all of the above into account, I judge overall that the harm to the heritage asset is not outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. In relation to Appeal B, in the absence of an acceptable scheme for development, there is no justification for the proposed demolition of a section of the wall.
49. Paragraph 14 of the Framework sets out what its presumption in favour of sustainable development means for decision-taking. This includes approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay, but this is subject to the caveat of footnote 10 which is that 'unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. In this case, the degree of accordance with the development plan is outweighed by the harm to the designated heritage asset. The paragraph also sets out that, where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date (as in this case), the presumption means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. As specified by footnote 9, the latter include policies relating to designated heritage assets. Due to my conclusion above on the heritage harm, and that in applying paragraph 134 this is not outweighed by public benefits, the proposal is not subject to the tilted balance of paragraph 14. The housing gain that would result from the development, in combination with the other benefits of the proposal as set out above, are in my judgement insufficient to outweigh the conflict with the objective of sustaining and enhancing the significance of a heritage asset and the harm that would result to this.
50. Overall I find that the proposal does not represent sustainable development.

### **Conclusion**

51. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

*T G Phillimore*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Michael Williams	Clive Miller & Associates Ltd
Clive Miller	Clive Miller & Associates Ltd
Michael Heaton	Michael Heaton Heritage Consultants
Colin Brown	LanDesign Associates Ltd

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

David Norris	Development Manager, South Somerset District Council
Keith Lane	Senior policy planner, South Somerset District Council
Andrew Tucker	Conservation Officer, South Somerset District Council

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Tobias Paul	Zyda Law (representing Ben Wilcock)
Ian Graves	Zyda Law (representing Ben Wilcock)
Ben Wilcock	Local resident
Robert Morfee	Local resident
Anne Michell	Local resident
John Wood	Huish Episcopi Parish Councillor
Shirley Nicholas	Chairman of Huish Episcopi Parish council
Keith Howe	Local resident
David Priestley	Local resident
Jennifer Dinsdale	Local resident

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING**

- 1 Council's hearing notification letter
- 2 Appeal decision ref APP/R3325/W/15/3133660
- 3 South Somerset District Council officer report on application ref 15/03313/OUT
- 4 Councillor Wood's figures of housing developments
- 5 Ms Michell's photographs of Wearne Lane
- 6 Key to South Somerset Local Plan 2006-2028 map

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE HEARING**

- 7 Deed of variation dated 23 June 2016
- 8 Appeal decision reference APP/R3325/W/15/3131336
- 9 Appellant's emails dated 29 June 2016