



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 24– 27 April and 1 May 2018

Site visit made on 27 April 2018

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/17/3184845

Weston Business Park, Laneys Drive, Locking, North Somerset BS24 8RA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Donna Wall (Moor Park (North Somerset) Ltd) against North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 16/P/0329/O, is dated 23 December 2015.
 - The development proposed is mixed use development comprising uses within some or all of Classes C3 (Residential), Offices (Class B1), Gymnasium (Class D2), Crèche (Class D1), Café (Class A3) and Hotel (Class C1), with associated car parking, means of access, access roads, infrastructure works and landscaping.
-

Decision

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

Procedural Matters

2. All matters other than access are reserved for future determination. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis, and have treated the accompanying illustrative masterplan as such.
3. The Council did not issue a decision in relation to the appeal proposal. Nonetheless, within its Statement of Case, the Council notes that, had it been in a position to do so, it would have refused planning permission for three reasons. These are impact on the strategic gap/ openness; consistency with settlement policy; and the lack of an appropriate S106 agreement to provide for on-site affordable housing provision and financial contributions to mitigate the impact of the development.
4. On April 10 2018, after the planning appeal against the non-determination of the planning application had been made, the North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan, Part 2 Site Allocations Plan, 2006-2026 (SAP) was adopted. Consequently, the development plan consists of the policies of the North Somerset Core Strategy (CS), adopted January 2017, the North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan Part 1: Development Management Policies (DMP), adopted 2016, and the SAP. The West of England Joint Spatial Plan has also been submitted to the Secretary of State. However, both parties attribute little or no weight to this in relation to the appeal before me and I see no reason to depart from this agreed position.

5. I undertook an accompanied site visit. However, prior to, and during the Public Inquiry I made unaccompanied visits to the site and around the wider area, including Haywood Village and Locking Parklands Village. Also, as requested by both main parties, I visited the following sites: Bleadon Quarry, Bleadon; Oxford Plasma, Yatton; and land to the rear of Locking Road, Weston-super-Mare.
6. Following the Inquiry a signed copy of a Unilateral Undertaking relating to the provision of affordable housing and financial contributions towards sustainable transport was provided. This would address the Council's final putative reason for refusal.
7. In addition, as requested, I received a final version of the proposed conditions that had been discussed during the Inquiry.
8. I have been referred to both the draft National Planning Policy Framework and the accompanying draft guidance. However, as both documents are yet to be finalised, I afford them little weight at this time and have relied on extant national planning policy and guidance.
9. Reference has been made to a number of historic appeal decisions which are directly related to the appeal site, and to the Examining Inspector's Reports in the lead up to the adoption of NSC's development plan. Whilst these serve as useful background documents I have determined the appeal on the basis of the policies within the adopted development plan and other material considerations.

Main Issues

10. The main issues are a) whether the appeal site represents an appropriate location for the development proposed, with particular reference to the effect of the proposal on the integrity and function of the Strategic Gap, and on the development strategy of the development plan b) whether the Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites and c) whether any development plan conflict and harm arising is outweighed by other material considerations.

Reasons

Location of development

11. The Core Strategy sets out a clear locational strategy for new development in North Somerset. Policy CS33 of the CS seeks to strictly control new development outside the areas specified in Policies CS28- CS32 in order to protect the character of the rural areas and to prevent unsustainable development. It is common ground between both parties that the appeal proposal is contrary to this policy, and there is nothing before me to suggest I should come to a different conclusion.
12. A major plank of the development strategy of the adopted plan is to identify large scale developments at the Weston Villages. A number of Strategic Gaps are established through Policy CS19 of the CS the purpose of which is to help retain the separate identity, character and/or landscape setting of settlements and distinct parts of settlements. The Strategic Gap, between the settlement boundary of Weston-Super-Mare, Hutton, Locking and Parklands as defined on the Policies Map and referred to within Policy SA7 of the SAP is of direct

relevance to this appeal. This is because part of the proposed development falls on land which is part of the Strategic Gap.

13. Notwithstanding that the appeal proposal is in outline, with only the access subject to detailed consideration, I have carefully considered the likely impact, both individually and cumulatively, of development at the appeal site upon the purpose of the Strategic Gap.
14. The appeal site is formed of three parcels. I will refer to them as parcels A, B and C. Of these, parcels A and C form part of the Weston Business Park (WBP). This is a long established employment use, where the principle of development has been established and is consequently, together with the larger of the Helicopter Museum's (HM) buildings immediately to the north, excluded from the defined Strategic Gap. The Oaktree Residential Park (ORP) to the south is similarly excluded.
15. This leaves Parcel B which is sandwiched between the ORP and the WBP and is defined as part of the Strategic Gap and forms the focus of my consideration.
16. From what I saw on my site visits, and from the evidence presented to me, it is clear that there is a close visual relationship between Parcel B and existing, planned, permitted and potential developments, such as to Area A of the WBP.
17. However, in my judgement, the proximity of planned and existing developments, does not suggest that the Gap is compromised, nor that reliance should be placed on the area of moorland to the south of ORP to fulfil the function and purpose of the Gap. Rather, it illustrates that the Strategic Gap at this point is particularly important in ensuring that the wider gap, between the extensive planned employment uses and Locking, which is clearly fragmented by existing blocks of built development, which are excluded from the Gap, is not further compromised through incremental development. Indeed, Mr Enderby's Appendix 4 illustrates the relatively narrow distance between the edge of the appeal site and the WBP, the ORP and Locking Village.
18. It also demonstrates that the construction of the proposed housing on almost the full extent of Area B would result in a block of built up development extending from the Helicopter Museum to the north through to the Oaktree Residential Park to the south. This replacement of an extensive area of predominantly undeveloped open land with built development would substantially reduce the extent of the Strategic Gap, and, insofar as it is possible to consider this from illustrative plans, would only leave a relatively limited tranche of land without built development. As the gap between the two sites would be substantially narrowed, this would both individually and cumulatively, compromise the ability to retain the separate identity of the existing and planned developments within the wider gap, and that of Locking in particular, which retains a separate identity.
19. I note that the proposed development would not directly front the A371, as an area of agricultural land between the entrance to the Locking Village and the roundabout which serves WBP, and ORP would be retained. Nonetheless, the residential element of the development, whilst I accept it would not appear prominent when leaving Weston-Super- Mare and travelling through the Gap, would be significantly more visible when approaching from the south. Therefore, it would incrementally add to the impact of other developments described at length by the appellants. This would reduce the perception, and the

- reality, of the gap between, the existing and planned development, and the village of Locking.
20. I have also found that the proposed development would result in an acute localised impact when viewed from the ORP and Laney's Drove. However, to my mind, the most significant impact of the loss of this element of the Strategic Gap, which extends across the other side of the A371 to the A370 and to Locking Parklands, as well as to the western edge of the village of Locking, would be when viewed from the masterplanned Haywood Village. An example of this is when travelling along the Runway towards the A371, and when experienced from the area of open land to the south of the Runway. Even with all the housing within Haywood Village not being complete, I noticed this open land was highly popular with dog walkers and others exercising.
21. The gap at this point has already been compromised to some extent by the Helicopter Museum, the WBP and the ORP. However, the existence of these established uses, together with the relatively minor impact of the permitted development related to the Helicopter Museum, are not justification for the '*baby being thrown out with the bathwater*', by constructing housing at a particularly sensitive part of the Strategic Gap. This would further undermine its function as a means of ensuring that incremental development does not result in the loss of the separate identities of established villages such as, in this case, Locking, and the wider planned development, including the strategic sites at Locking Parklands and Haywood Village.
22. When viewed from Hutton, due to the distance and relative changes in height the proposed development would have little significant impact on the perception of the Gap.
23. The broad location of the Strategic Gaps had been set within the CS and were therefore not before the Examining Inspector who considered the soundness of the SAP. However, where changes to a policy, particular to a specific area, are required to make a plan sound, corresponding changes to the Policies Map follow. Indeed, such a change took place to land to the south and south east of ORP where the strategic gap was extended, and elsewhere, in another instance, where it was reduced.
24. Moreover, from the evidence before the Examining Inspector, she would have been well aware of the physical proximity of both the existing and planned developments, in the immediate environs of the appeal site, including the extent of the developable area of the WBP. All these considerations would be relevant to the delineation and purpose of the Strategic Gap, when she concluded, subject to Main Modifications, the extent of the boundaries to the Strategic Gaps, including Parcel B of the appeal site, are coherent, and justified.
25. It has also been put to me that there is no support for the principle of a Strategic Gap policy within the Framework, and Inspector Burden in her report into the SAP confirms, "*that there is no national policy for the provision of strategic gaps, or encouragement in Government policy*¹". However, she then goes on to conclude the review of the eJSP will be the arena in which to reconsider the principle of continuing with such a designation. Clearly, this is the correct approach. Similarly, it is not for me to consider whether such a

¹ CD5.2 North Somerset Council Sites and Allocations Plan, Inspector's Report February 2018, Paragraph 101

policy is Framework compliant. Moreover, as it stands, the current CS, which provides for the principle of a SG within Policy CS19, sits within a Framework compliant plan, which has then been refined through the SAP.

26. Consequently, I have sympathy with the Council's argument, that the Framework is not a compendium of approved policies to be inserted into local development plans. Otherwise, this flies in the face of Paragraph 150 of the Framework. Evidently, policies must be Framework compliant in order to have been found sound. However, they need not be Framework identical. I have been referred to the Crawley Down appeals², but consider the policy context to be different in the instance before me.
27. In this case, it is clear from what I have seen and heard and in particular when undertaking my site visits, that the planned development within North Somerset and close to Weston-super-Mare is such that this particular Strategic Gap, and this particular site within it, plays a significant role in ensuring that the environmental impact of unplanned growth does not cause significant and adverse harm.
28. I conclude that the location of the appeal site would not be an appropriate location for the specific development proposed, with particular reference to the effect of the proposal on the integrity and function of the Strategic Gap, and on the development strategy of the development plan. The appeal proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policies CS33 and CS19 of the CS, and Policy SA7 of the SAP, the requirements of which are outlined above.

Supply of housing

29. The main parties produced a Position Statement on Housing Land Supply in which they agreed that the appropriate quantum of housing, against which the five year supply of deliverable land is to be calculated is 20,985 dwellings from 2006- 2026. However, the appellant suggests that this figure may not be 'Framework compliant' and therefore the weight to be accorded to this policy must as a necessity be reduced³. However, I have taken a straightforward approach to this. The figure is derived from a plan, whose policies were finally adopted in 2017. The Secretary of State had concluded in his letter to the Leader of North Somerset Council (NSC) that he was, 'satisfied that the Inspector's recommendation, set out in his report of 11 March 2015, apply and reflect national policy correctly'⁴. There is no substantive evidence before me which would suggest that I should disregard this conclusion and, thus, treat the housing figures set out in CS13 of the adopted development plan, which was the subject of a 'thorough review' by the Government, as out-of-date, in principle.
30. A review of the adopted development plan has taken place, and the emerging policies are currently under examination. Clearly, by its very nature, additional evidence setting out housing needs has been submitted to support the Examination of the emerging Joint Spatial Plan and this will be the subject of debate. Going forward, the Examination in Public is the appropriate arena in which to consider the detailed arguments relating to the suitable quantum of

² CD3.11 App/D3830/V/16/3149759 and 314/5499

³ Neil Tiley Proof of Evidence paragraph 6.3

⁴ Natalie Richards Proof of Evidence Appendix 2 Paragraph 3.

objectively assessed need for housing, including consideration of the relevance or applicability of the Government's proposals for a standardised methodology.

31. There is also agreement between the main parties that the Sedgefield approach should be applied and a buffer of 20% is appropriate. I agree.
32. The Council considers that it has a deliverable supply of 5.00 years and the Appellant a supply of 3.41 years, when assessed against the period 1st October 2017 to 30th September 2022.
33. The main areas of dispute relate to the exact calculation of the five year requirement; the rate at which small sites with consent will lapse; the small site allowance; the contribution from the change of use of rural buildings and empty homes; and the level of housing to be delivered within large sites with consent, strategic sites and allocations.
34. Prior to the Inquiry, a Secretary of State decision was published which is of direct relevance to the appeal before me, given that the same witnesses had appeared before the Inspector at the Farnleigh Fields appeal⁵.

Exact calculation of requirement

35. There is a difference of five dwellings between the Council's calculation of the five year housing requirement and that of the appellant. The difference results from the Council rounding down the CS figure of 20,095 over 20 years to 1,049 dwellings per annum (dpa), rather than the more accurate 1,049.25 dpa. When this approach is used to calculate both the backlog and the future five year requirement, this has a marginal impact. However, the appellant's calculation is more accurate and should therefore be used. The resultant figure is a requirement of 9,751 deliverable dwellings to provide a five year supply. This reduces the Council's supply of deliverable housing to provide a surplus of two units.

Lapse rate

36. There was much discussion relating to the lapse rate of small consented sites. In common with the Farleigh Road Inspector, and the Secretary of State⁶, I am content given the short time period to which both parties evidence relates, that, notwithstanding Inspector Burden's comment within her Inspector's Report⁷, a 10% lapse rate for small sites would be reasonable and should be applied for the purposes of this appeal. As such, the 635 dwelling figure should be used.

Small site windfall allowance

37. The Council has taken a simple approach to setting out the small site windfall allowance. The plan period annual completion rate for small scale windfall sites has then been reduced by 17% to make allowance for windfall sites allowed on garden land. To ensure there is no double counting of sites that already benefit from planning permission the first three years are discounted from this figure.
38. This approach whilst different to that previously utilised by the Council appears logical, and as the average figure relates to completions rather than

⁵ APP/D0121/W/16/3153935

⁶ APP/D0121/W/16/3153935

⁷ North Somerset Council Sites and Policies Plan Part 2: Site Allocations Plan, Inspector's Report February 2018

permissions, is robust and not prone to double counting. As such, on the evidence before me the small site windfall allowance should be 274 dwellings.

Rural building conversions

39. I am aware that the provisions of the GPDO have recently changed to increase the number of dwellings that can be permitted without recourse to applying for planning permission. However, I am not convinced that an annual figure of 36 dpa will continue to be realistic over the next five years, nor that some of the dwellings which would be added to the supply from this source, would not, in the past, have been granted planning permission. Therefore, there is a strong possibility that they would previously have formed part of the small site windfall allowance. Consequently, I conclude, given the downward trajectory of sites coming forward that a lower rate would be more appropriate. The appellant's figure at 16 dwellings appears reasonable, albeit, perhaps cautious. Nonetheless, the impact of such a figure is marginal, and in the context of the wider picture, it would be a reasonable quantum of development to attribute to this source.

Empty Homes

40. The Council suggests that a contribution of 112 dwellings from the bringing back into use of empty homes and targeted interventions set out within its Empty Property Delivery Plan should be included within the supply. I have no doubt that this approach will make a contribution over the five year period. However, I, like my colleague in the Farleigh Road appeal, am not certain the evidence is sufficiently clear that this assumed supply would not be conflated with other sources of supply, and that the figure is not vulnerable to double counting. Consequently, I conclude that the allowance should be disregarded.

Deliverability of large sites

41. The Council and appellant have helpfully isolated the specific sites where there is disagreement as to whether they should be included in the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Footnote 11 to the Framework expands on what is meant to be deliverable as does the national Planning Practice Guidance. The so-called St Modwen Developments Limited judgements, confirmed that Paragraph 47 of the Framework requires that Councils have an obligation to provide a sufficient supply of land which is capable of being delivered to provide a five year housing supply. There is a clear distinction between what is capable of being delivered, and what will be delivered. Thus, for a site to be regarded as deliverable, it need not be necessarily certain or probable that housing will be delivered upon it, or that it would be delivered to the fullest extent possible within the five years. Rather, it should simply be capable of being delivered. As a consequence, there needs to be clear evidence to show not that there is simply doubt or improbability, but rather that there is no realistic prospect a site could come forward within the five year period for it to be discounted from the supply.

42. I have been referred to detailed national evidence relating to lead in times for development. Whilst this is useful as a general guide, I do not consider it to be determinative in considering the deliverability of specific sites in a given locality.

Large sites with consent

43. *Oxford Plasma and Bleadon Quarry*: I was asked to visit both these sites, where I was able to see that they both remain operational. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that I should come to a different conclusion than that drawn by Inspector Jones in the Fairleigh Road appeal, with which the Secretary of State did not disagree, that the sites should remain within the supply. In coming to this conclusion I note that this Inquiry took place over a year ago. Nonetheless, no additional site specific evidence was submitted to demonstrate that the schemes would not be implemented within the five year period, to enable me, to conclude, as stated by the appellant in cross examination, that both the Secretary of State and my colleague had made a mistake, in their interpretation of national policy, including the relevant elements of the PPG. As such, these sites should remain in the supply (51 and 42 dwellings respectively).
44. *Woodborough Farm*: This site has outline planning permission. It is a matter of dispute as to when the site is to be delivered, with the appellant suggesting a more conservative approach than that of the Council (125 vs 175 dwellings). Both the Council and the appellant argue that their particular trajectory has been agreed by the developer. This illustrates the futility of slavishly relying on such information, and that the speed of delivery of housing is, on the whole, in the gift of the developer, and is influenced by a number of variables. In the absence of clear evidence that the scheme will not be implemented, I favour the Council's figures (175 dwellings).

Saved Local Plan Allocations

45. These five, longstanding sites do not, as yet, benefit from planning permission, and have been brought forward from the previous local plan. By definition, they must be considered as developable. The Environment Agency has, in principle, no objection to the development of each of these sites, but is unable to confirm that they are capable of delivery. Given the flood risk issues related to them, sequential and exceptions tests are required and this is explicitly set out within the relevant part of Schedule 1 of the recently adopted SAP. This requirement will add time to the delivery of the sites, and an element of uncertainty that these sites will, in fact, come forward within five years or are capable of delivery. The Inspector at the Fairleigh Road Inquiry considered that legitimate concerns had been raised in relation to the delivery of the individual sites, yet considered these were not necessarily insurmountable. However, on the evidence before me, including the detailed site specific requirements to which I have been referred within the now adopted development plan, given the uncertainty, I favour the appellant's approach that there be a 0 dwelling contribution from this source. In coming to this conclusion, I am aware of the changes in circumstances for two of the sites. However, neither of these impacts on the flood risk related requirements for either of the sites, within the adopted SAP.
46. Clearly, in the future, and in the context of a different reporting period, circumstances will change, and these sites may become deliverable. This will become clear through active monitoring.

47. *Strategic Sites*: The appellant's evidence suggests that the forecast delivery rate put forward by the developers at the Weston villages (511 dpa) is of a substantially higher quantum per annum than normally achieved nationally⁸. It is further suggested that, as the Council's forecast rate is even higher (653 dpa), then this should be treated with caution. As such the development industry's trajectory should be given greater credibility in calculating the contribution to the five year supply of deliverable housing.
48. I have been referred to instances locally where the delivery of housing has outpaced that proposed by the developers, and where it has fallen below that considered likely by the Council. These instances illustrate the lack of certainty in forecasting the delivery rate of sites.
49. I am also aware that Inspector Burden suggested that there was a high level of uncertainty that the Weston Villages would deliver the level of housing anticipated in the SAP by 2026. Nonetheless, I have carefully considered the evidence before me in the context of the St Modwen judgements. I consider that there is not the clear evidence to suggest that the housing levels suggested by the Council are not capable of being delivered in the context of providing a supply of deliverable housing sites.
50. In coming to this conclusion, I am aware of the conclusions drawn by previous Inspectors to which I have been referred. However, I have made a distinction between the delivery of housing sites as set out within a developer's trajectory, which is influenced by a number of considerations, and the supply of housing sites which are capable of being delivered. As a consequence, I prefer the Council's figure of 3265 dwellings.
51. *Allocations in the SAP*: The Council was required to include further housing allocations to ensure that the SAP was found sound prior to its adoption. Of the allocated housing sites within the recently adopted SAP, the contribution to the five year housing land supply is in dispute in relation to sixteen sites.
52. These sites are allocated for development, and therefore, must be by definition developable. However, the adopted SAP requires that a sequential and exceptions test be undertaken for some of the allocated sites. Consequently, for the reasons set out above, I am unable to conclude that ten of the sites are necessarily capable of delivery within the next five years. This reduces the supply by 705 dwellings.
53. In relation to the other sites where there is dispute between the parties, on the balance of the evidence the Council's approach is to be favoured.

⁸ Neil Tiley Proof of Evidence Figures 9.2 and 9.3

Category of contribution	
1st October 2017 to 30th September 2022	
Large sites with consent	2430
Saved Local Plan allocations (brought forward to adopted SAP)	0
Strategic sites	3265
Other allocations in SAP	1945
Small sites with planning consent	635
Small sites windfall	274
Change of use from rural buildings	16
Empty homes brought brought back into use	0
Total	8,565

54. Therefore, on the evidence put to me at this Inquiry, I consider that the total five year supply of deliverable housing is 8,565 dwellings, or 4.4 years.

Other matters

55. I am aware of the local support for the proposal, including the desire for additional local housing, as well as the provision of convenient employment premises.

Planning balance and conclusion

56. I have found that the appeal proposal would conflict with policies CS19 and CS33 of the CS and with Policy SA7 of the SAP. I consider that the proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole. I afford this conflict very significant weight.

57. However, I have also found that the Council is unable, in the context of the evidence before me, and for the purpose of this Inquiry, to demonstrate a five-year deliverable supply of housing. As a consequence, the so-called 'tilted balance' in paragraph 14 of the Framework, which is a significant material consideration, applies. This is clear that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as whole. I now turn to the suggested benefits.

58. There are clear benefits to the scheme, namely, a mixed development, including up to 115 homes, of which 30% would be affordable (to be secured by planning obligation). Representatives of the local construction industry, who spoke in favour of the scheme, were clear that it was achievable within the next five years and I am aware of the pressure for development in the area⁹. Given the lack of a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites in the area, I accord this benefit substantial weight.

⁹ My attention was drawn specifically to 18/P/2652/OUT as an example of this

59. There would also be the opportunity to improve surface water run-off and reduce the risk of flooding. However, it is not clear to what extent the problems experienced by ORP are related to the site, therefore I accord this benefit moderate weight. It has also been put to me that the scheme would provide investment to regenerate the remaining element of the WBP, and thereby provide jobs over and above those which would be temporarily provided during the construction. However, there is no evidence before me to suggest that such investment could not be sourced by other means so I accord this very little weight in favour of the application.
60. In addition, I have been referred to the benefits to local biodiversity from the proposed scheme to which I accord minimal weight.
61. I conclude, therefore, that the adverse impacts of granting planning permission, namely the harms arising from the scheme's conflict with the development plan, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
62. In coming to this conclusion, I have had regard to the fact that I could issue a split decision if I concluded that the appeal proposals on sites A and C were acceptable and that permission should be granted, and that development on Site B was not, and permission should be withheld. However, the detailed evidence, including that relating to flood risk matters, which accompanied the outline application was predicated on all three sites being developed together. As a consequence, on the basis of the evidence before me, I do not consider that a split decision would be appropriate. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Timothy Leader, of Counsel	Instructed by Head of Development Management at North Somerset Council
He called	
Mr Michael J Muston BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI	Director, Muston Planning
Ms Natalie Richards	Principal Planning Policy Technical Officer, North Somerset Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Neil Cameron, of Queen's Counsel	Instructed by Rocke Associates
He called	
Neil Tiley Bsc (Hons), Assoc RTPI	Associate, Pegasus Group
Chris Enderby Dip LA, CMLI	Director, Enderby Associates Ltd
Thomas Rocke BA (Hons), Phd, BTP (Dist), MRPTI	Director, Rocke Associates.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Ap Rees	Local Ward Councillor and North Somerset Council Executive Member for Strategic Planning
Cllr Mike Cooper	Chair of Locking Parish Council
Mr Barrie Smith	Local Resident
Mr Vizor	Local Resident
Mr Andrew Pearson	On behalf of Mrs Davy, Local Resident
Mr Philip Hill	Director of PJ Hill Building Contractors, Local Builder
Mr Paul Brace	Weston Builders Ltd, Local Builder
Mr Robert Payne	Local Resident
Mr Gordon Sillence	Local Resident
Mr Clifford Dumbell	Local Resident
Mr Stephen Griffin	Local Resident
Mr Simon Terry	Notaro Care Homes
Mrs Marion Petty	Local Resident
Mrs Stella Thompson	Chair of The Oaktree Park Residents Association (TOPRA)
Mr Robins	Local Resident
Mr Werret	Local Resident (letter read out by Mr Cameron on his behalf).
Cllr Terry Porter	Local Ward Councillor and Hutton Parish Councillor
Frank Richards	Local Resident

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- 1 Letter from F J Tucker
- 2 Letter from Phil Jones
- 3 Letter from Sabato Notaro
- 4 Table setting out 5 year housing land supply position following receipt of Farleigh Fields Appeal decision
- 5 Bundle of papers including map indicating boundary of appeal site, and Elm Grove Nursery application (18/P/2652/OUT) superimposed on strategic gap, together with details of the planning application.
- 6 List of examples of post Framework policies relating to Strategic Gaps or similar
- 7 Opening submissions made on behalf of the appellant.
- 8 Opening statement on behalf of North Somerset Council.
- 9 Statement produced by Mr Barrie Smith
- 10 Local Development Scheme 2018- 2021 North Somerset Council
- 11 Plan illustrating the position of the wooden pegs which had been set out on the appeal site delineating illustrative layout of development.
- 12 Plans of proposed western hangar at the Helicopter Museum.
- 13 Copy of Unilateral Undertaking under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
- 14 Table of respective positions of land supply- with the Council's position on each disputed site.
- 15 Statement provided by Cllr Ap Rees, Ward Councillor and North Somerset Council Executive Member for Strategic Planning.
- 16 Statement provided by Stella Thompson, Chair of The Oaktree Park Residents' Association (TOPRA).
- 17 Email dated 26 February 2018, regarding the Inspector's Report into the Site Allocation Plan and implications thereof, sent on behalf of Inspector Bridgwater to appellant (APP/D0121/W/17/3186112).
- 18 Itinerary for Inspector's Site Visits
- 19 Statement by Mrs Marion Petty
- 20 Statement by Mr Werrett
- 21 Letter from Mr Raglan
- 22 Extract from Planning Practice Guidance relating to housing and economic land availability assessment.
- 23 Draft schedule of conditions.
- 24 Statement by Frank Richards
- 25 Plan of sites at Youngwood Lane, Nailsea.
- 26 Sites within DM process as of 26 June 2017 produced as evidence to EIP
- 27 Statement by Cllr Terry Porter, Ward and Parish Councillor.
- 28 Closing submissions made on behalf of North Somerset Council.
- 29 Closing submissions made on behalf of the appellant.

PHOTOGRAPHS

- 1 Missing photograph which forms part of Mr Muston's evidence: Photo 5.
- 2 Various photographs of the site, and environs provided by Mr Robins.

Richborough Estates