



## Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 1 May 2018

Site visit made on 3 May 2018

**by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 13 November 2018**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/17/3185997**

#### **Land off Peppard Road, Emmer Green**

- 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 Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
  - The application Ref P16/S3630/O, dated 31 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2017.
  - The development proposed is residential development of up to 245 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play areas, vehicular access from Peppard Road and Kiln Road and associated ancillary works.
- 

#### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

#### **Procedural Matters**

2. The application is for outline permission with details of means of access to be considered and all other detailed matters reserved. The application includes a Development Framework Plan which is illustrative of a possible layout but that layout does not form part of the proposal. I shall consider the appeal on this basis.
3. A Unilateral Undertaking was submitted at the Inquiry. This would secure provision of affordable housing, public transport improvements, open space and mitigation measures in respect of a local wildlife site at Clayfield Copse. Consequently the Council has agreed that reasons 2 to 4 in its decision have been satisfactorily addressed. I shall not therefore consider those matters as main issues.
4. Following the close of the Inquiry, on 12 September 2018 the Government issued a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) which temporarily amends national planning policy as it applies to Oxfordshire. The main parties provided further written submissions on the WMS and on changes to Planning Practice Guidance after the close of the Inquiry and I shall take those submissions into account.

#### **Main Issues**

5. The main issues in the appeal are:

- i) whether or not the proposal would accord with development plan policies for the location of housing development and if not, whether other material considerations indicate that permission ought to be granted; and
- ii) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## **Reasons**

### *Development Plan Policies*

6. The appeal site forms part of an open agricultural landscape which is to the immediate north of Emmer Green and the urban area of Reading. To the north-east the landscape is designated as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This designation is about 0.75km from the site. The site adjoins the boundary of South Oxfordshire District with Reading Borough Council.
7. The development plan consists of the saved policies of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan (2006) (LP) and the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (2012) (CS). Policy CSS1 of the CS requires development proposals to be consistent with the overall strategy of the plan. This states that major new development will be focussed at Didcot and that development will be supported in the towns and villages. The site falls to be considered under criterion (v) of that policy. This states that, outside towns and villages development is to be limited to that relating to specific needs such as agriculture or enhancement of the environment. The parties agree that the proposal would not accord with that policy.
8. The draft South Oxfordshire Local Plan was published in 2017 for consultation. The overall strategy in draft Policy STRAT1 would focus major new development in Science Vale including Didcot Garden Town and Culham and further major development at Chalgrove and Berinsfield. That draft strategy included the protection and enhancement of the countryside by ensuring that outside of the towns and villages any change relates to specific needs. Following objections to that strategy in respect of development at Chalgrove the Council is reviewing alternative options. As part of this review the Council is considering three sites adjoining the urban area of Reading. Because this is merely a review of options it does not amount to a change in the Council's policy regarding development in the countryside adjacent to Reading. In any case the draft Local Plan is yet to be examined and I can only give it limited weight.
9. Policy CSH1 of the CS together with Tables 7.1 to 7.3 provides details of the number of homes to be provided and their locations, in accordance with the overall strategy in Policy CSS1. No site allocations document was progressed. The parties agree that Policy CSH1 is out-of-date on the basis that the amount of housing development provided for by the policy was based on the South East Plan which has been revoked.
10. Policy CSC1 of the CS provides for contingency if allocated sites do not come forward in a timely manner. This would include identification of alternative deliverable sites through a plan or other mechanism in accordance with the distribution strategy of the plan. Housing development has not come forward at some of the locations identified in Policy CSH1 to the extent envisaged in

that policy. As the proposal would not accord with the distribution strategy however it would not accord with Policy CSC1. My attention has been drawn to an appeal<sup>1</sup> in which that policy supported development of an unallocated site. That site is in Chinnor, a village specifically identified in the distribution strategy as a larger village to be supported and enhanced in the overall strategy.

11. It is agreed between the parties that the proposal would not accord with Policy CSR1 of the CS which makes provision for infill housing of limited scale in villages. However that policy is of limited relevance as the site is not within, or related to any village.
12. Other development plan policies require protection of the countryside and landscape character. Saved Policy G2 of the LP requires protection from adverse developments and so does not necessarily restrict all development in the countryside. Policy CSEN1 of the CS requires protection of the district's distinct landscape character and key features against inappropriate development. This policy would similarly allow for development to take place in the countryside provided that the policy requirements are met. These policies are generally consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and protection of valued landscapes.
13. Saved Policy G4 of the LP is more restrictive than national policy in that it requires protection of the countryside for its own sake. However saved Policy G2 and Policy CSEN1 complement the overall strategy in Policy CSS1 in terms of restricting development in the countryside.
14. Policy CSH1 is out-of-date in terms of housing numbers but the distribution of housing under that policy follows the strategy in Policy CSS1 and this strategy is not out-of-date. In conjunction with the policies which restrict development in the countryside and given that no provision is made for new development adjoining the urban area of Reading, this is an important part of the development plan.
15. For the reasons given above the proposal would not accord with development plan policies for the location of housing development. The policies which are most important in my decision are not out-of-date and paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is not engaged on this basis.

#### *The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal*

16. The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal (OHGD) which has been agreed between the Government and the Oxfordshire authorities is intended to facilitate housing delivery in Oxfordshire of 100,000 homes between 2011 and 2031. The OHGD expects the authorities to jointly and strategically plan for housing growth by means of a Joint Statutory Spatial Plan (JSSP) and allocations in local plans. In return the Government is to provide up to £215m of funding to support delivery of infrastructure and affordable housing as well as the cost of delivering on the agreement.
17. The WMS fulfils a Government commitment as part of the OHGD to introduce a temporary planning flexibility on housing land supply pending preparation of the JSSP. Through the WMS planning policy is amended so that for the

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/Q3115/W/14/3001839

purposes of decision-taking under paragraph 11(d), footnote 7 of the Framework will apply where the authorities in Oxfordshire cannot demonstrate a three year supply of deliverable housing sites with the appropriate buffer.

18. The WMS states that the Government recognises that in the short term this will result in fewer permissions being granted under paragraph 11 but the Government believes that it is important to support the ambitious plans (for Oxfordshire) that will deliver more housing in the longer term. The OHGD Delivery Plan<sup>2</sup> states that one of its key objectives is to avoid incremental, speculative and unplanned development. It is thus clear that the ambitious level of planned growth in Oxfordshire is primarily to be achieved through the development plan process.
19. Furthermore the OHGD Outline Agreement makes clear that the deal and any distribution of funds via it, does not constitute Government weight or approval for any scheme which is subject to the planning system. Although the proposal would boost the housing supply and in this respect would accord with the overall objective of growth in Oxfordshire it is not supported by the OHGD for the reasons given.

#### *Housing Land Supply*

20. The housing land supply position is influenced by an identified need to apportion unmet housing need from Oxford City Council to the other four Oxfordshire districts. Extensive studies have been undertaken in this respect and the authorities agree the need to apportion this unmet need. A Memorandum of Co-operation (MoC) sets out the apportionment figures but South Oxfordshire District Council has not formally agreed to this. The MoC is based on a working assumption that the level of unmet need is 15,000 homes. The proportion of that unmet need to be provided in South Oxfordshire is yet to be agreed.
21. The Statement of Common Ground on Housing Land Supply sets out the Council's and the appellant's positions in respect of housing supply and housing need using the standard method as set out in Planning Practice Guidance. It also provides the parties' positions on three other assessments which use the figures identified in the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and include the apportionment figure from the MoC. With respect to the latter, respective calculations are included depending on whether unmet need is monitored from 2011 or 2021.
22. It is agreed between the parties that there is a 5 year housing land supply on the basis of the standard method irrespective of whether a 5% or 20% buffer is included. The Framework requires that any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for. The Oxfordshire authorities are working in co-operation to provide for the unmet need of Oxford City. Although the apportionment figure has not been agreed by the Council, the figure of 4,950 homes in the MoC would be a robust basis for assessment of this requirement.
23. The Council disputes whether the SHMA should be used as a basis for calculating need. This was undertaken in 2014 but the Council says that it contains evidence dating from 2011 and may be outdated. The OHGD overall

---

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 1.2.3

figure is also based on the overall level of need identified in the SHMA. The SHMA has been used as the basis for calculating need in other Oxfordshire authorities. The method to be used in calculating local need will require examination as part of the emerging Local Plan. However for the purposes of this appeal the use of the figure identified in the SHMA of 793 dwellings per annum including an allowance for institutional bed spaces is relevant.

24. On the basis of the assessments in the Statement of Common Ground there would be less than a 3 year supply of deliverable housing sites if unmet need were to be monitored from 2011. The MoC apportionment does not preclude provision before 2021 but the figures are based upon a common assumed start date of 2021 for the commencement of development. For this reason, the monitoring of unmet need from 2021 would be appropriate for the calculation of the housing requirement. On this basis the parties agree that there would be a 3 year housing land supply if a 5% buffer were to be used, but the parties differ on this point if a 20% buffer were used.
25. In the past 3 years, on the Council's figures, overall housing delivery has amounted to 1,918 dwellings. This exceeds the overall requirement of 1,881 dwellings calculated using the standard method and on this basis a 5% buffer would be appropriate.
26. Housing delivery over the past 3 years has been less than the requirement using the SHMA figure which would amount to 2,379 dwellings, the shortfall amounting to 461 homes. This level of shortfall would not necessarily be of such significance to justify the use of a 20% buffer.
27. From November 2018 the Housing Delivery Test is to be used to determine whether or not there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous 3 years. For the purposes of that test household projections should be used. The overall provision in the last 3 years has exceeded the housing requirement using those projections. I give weight to this consideration as introduction of the Housing Delivery Test is imminent.
28. For these reasons I find that the Council can demonstrate a three year supply of deliverable housing sites with an appropriate buffer. The tilted balance in paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is not engaged on this basis.

#### *Character and Appearance*

29. The site comprises three arable fields which are to the immediate north of the built up area of Emmer Green. It adjoins Peppard Road which leads north from the urban area towards the village of Sonning Common. The site also extends up to Kiln Road which is a narrow road extending from the built-up area into the countryside. The fields are enclosed by hedgerows with trees, including protected trees and there is a wooded area immediately to the north of the site. The topography in the area generally is varied and land levels fall across the site from the south-east towards the north-west.
30. It is common ground between the Council and the appellant that the site forms part of the setting of the AONB. The proposed development would be visible from the AONB but at some distance. Because the nearest part of the AONB is 750m from the site the development would have a limited effect in views from the AONB. However the development would clearly affect views from the

existing urban area towards the AONB. It would also be experienced by users of footpaths between the urban area and the AONB.

31. The site forms part of a landscape that is typical of the landscape character type as defined in the Landscaper Character Assessments.<sup>3</sup> This is semi-enclosed dipslope which forms part of the Chilterns Plateau with Valleys Landscape Area. This landscape character type also forms a significant part of the AONB. Although the landscape including the site is not formally designated it forms part of a wider setting including land that is formally designated for its value at a national level.
32. The value of the site as part of this landscape is influenced by its close proximity to the urban area. I saw that houses and their gardens adjoin the site along its southern boundary but that their appearance is softened by trees and vegetation including the wooded area at Clayfield Copse which is seen on the skyline. This development reduces any sense of remoteness or tranquillity but the landscape is of value in terms of providing a rural setting to the adjacent developed area. Recreational uses to the west of Peppard Road including a rugby club and stables do not affect this setting as they are visually separated by trees along that road.
33. The hedgerows and trees which separate the fields are generally in good condition. Although the Council and the appellant have identified a need for hedgerow management this does not significantly affect the overall condition or quality of the landscape features.
34. There are a number of public footpath routes in the area from which the proposed development would be seen. In particular a footpath crosses the south-eastern part of the site. This route is currently across a field but would be absorbed into the development. There are also public footpath routes to the north-east of the site and to the south-east of Kiln Road from which the development would be visible. The development would also be visible from part of the Chilterns Way to the north. While the extent to which the development would affect views from those routes would vary, having walked the routes it is clear to me that the development would have very significant effects from a number of public viewpoints.
35. Furthermore the development would be prominent when seen from Peppard Road given its proximity to the road and its higher level in relation to part of that road. Provision would be made for green space and landscaping within the development which could soften its appearance but nonetheless it is likely that the development would be particularly intrusive when seen from that route.
36. The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, in Box 5.1 identify factors that can help in the identification of valued landscapes. These include the landscape quality or condition, scenic quality and recreation value. For the reasons given above the landscape is of good quality and in good condition. Its features are typical of the landscape character of the area, including land within the AONB. It has scenic value as it is appreciated from public footpaths which are used for recreational purposes. For the reasons given I consider that the landscape of which the site forms part has significant value.

---

<sup>3</sup> South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment (2003) and South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment for the Local Plan 2033 (2017)



37. This does not mean that the landscape constitutes a valued landscape such that it would require protection under paragraph 170 of the Framework however. Many landscapes adjoining urban areas have the attributes described above and the site and its immediate surroundings are not out of the ordinary in this respect. For these reasons the landscape including the site and its immediate surroundings is not a valued landscape within the meaning of national policy. Having said this the significant value of the landscape attracts weight in my decision.
38. The First World War poet Wilfred Owen lived nearby at Dunsden and cycled around the area. There is a Wilfred Owen Trail which includes buildings in Dunsden which he was associated with. Although the site is close to that village and to the places he regularly visited, it has not been demonstrated that the site had any direct association with him and any cultural association in this respect is inconclusive.
39. There are listed buildings in the area but these are some distance from the site and their settings would not be affected. The proposed development would be adjacent to a non-designated heritage asset at Bryant's Farm which is off Kiln Road. The setting of that asset would be likely to be affected by the development but it is likely that landscaping measures could be used to mitigate any harmful effect.
40. The site undoubtedly forms part of an attractive landscape which is enjoyed by users of the footpaths in the area. Because of the varied topography the development would be prominent and intrusive in that landscape. For these reasons the proposal would not accord with saved Policy G2 of the LP or with saved Policy C4 of the LP which restricts development that would damage the attractive landscape setting of settlements. The appellant accepts that this would be the case. The proposal would also not accord with saved Policy G4 of the LP but the weight that I give to that conflict is limited by the inconsistency of the policy with national policy.
41. While the proposal would include green spaces and landscaping measures, its overall scale would be such that those measures would have limited effect in integrating the development into the landscape. The development would erode the open setting of the AONB and would be harmful in this respect. For these reasons the proposal would not accord with Policy CSEN1 of the CS. I conclude on this main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.

#### *Other Matters*

42. At present traffic congestion occurs within Reading and Caversham as a result of the limited number of bridges crossing the Thames. The proposal would add to that traffic albeit through a small percentage increase in traffic. I acknowledge the concerns of the Rule 6 party and interested parties on this matter but the Highway Authorities of Oxfordshire County Council and Reading Borough Council have not objected to the development and highway safety did not form a reason for refusal. Consequently this does not form a main issue in my decision.

### *Benefits of the Development*

43. The Council and appellant agree that there is less than 5 years' worth of deliverable housing sites on the basis of the SHMA figure. They differ on the extent of the shortfall, the appellant saying that the supply stands at 3.71 years and the Council saying that this is 4.6 years. The extent of the shortfall on the basis of these figures is not excessive but nonetheless this is important in the context of the ambitious level of growth in the OHGD. There is also a significant shortage of affordable housing in the area. Considering the benefits from provision of up to 245 new homes including 40% affordable housing in this context, those benefits would be significant.
44. As the development would adjoin the urban area of Reading and would be served by public transport it would allow for accessibility by sustainable means of transport. There are a number of facilities in the nearby suburb of Emmer Green which would be within walking distance for some residents. Interested parties pointed out at the Inquiry that there are to be cuts to public transport services. However, the Unilateral Undertaking would secure improvements to those services. Considered overall the site is in an accessible location which would favour the proposal. Overall I give very significant weight to the social benefits from provision of market and affordable housing in a reasonably accessible location.
45. The development would be beneficial to the economy by providing construction jobs with associated economic benefits during the construction phase. The residents of the proposed houses would be likely to support local businesses through their expenditure. The construction jobs and economic benefits from construction would however be temporary. There would be longer term economic benefits from expenditure of the new residents but the development would result in the loss of over 13 ha of best and most versatile agricultural land which would run counter to those benefits.
46. The Council would benefit financially from New Homes Bonus, Council tax revenue and Community Infrastructure Levy payments. The latter would be required to fund infrastructure including that which may be necessary as a result of the development. Taking all of these considerations into account I give limited to moderate weight to the economic benefits of the proposal.
47. Although the proposal may provide opportunities for biodiversity enhancement through provision of landscaping and green spaces I am not convinced that this would be of any more than limited benefit given that a significant area of countryside would be lost. I give limited weight to this consideration.
48. The measures to be secured by the Unilateral Undertaking would be necessary to address the needs of the development. The improvements to public transport services would also be of wider benefit but the primary purpose would be to serve residents of the development. I give limited weight to this consideration.

### *Overall Balance*

49. Because the proposal would be at odds with the overall strategy of the development plan and because it would harm the landscape character it would not accord with the development plan as a whole. The benefits that I have identified are not of sufficient weight to outweigh the policy conflict.



50. Notwithstanding this and my finding that paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is not engaged, I shall consider whether the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits if the proposal.
51. The distribution strategy in the CS is key to providing a sustainable distribution of development overall. The proposal would undermine that strategy and for this reason I give substantial weight to that harm. I give further substantial weight to the harm to the character and appearance of the area because of the value of the site to landscape character including its location within the setting of the AONB and the visual effect of the development within that landscape. This includes consideration of the potential effect on the setting of the adjacent non-designated heritage asset. The substantial weights that I give to the harms would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the very significant, limited to moderate and limited weights that I have given to the benefits of the proposal.

### **Conclusion**

52. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Nick Palmer*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Barrett of Counsel instructed by Diana Richardson of Gladman Developments Ltd

He called

Jonathan Berry BA (Hons), DipLA, CMLI, AIEMA, M.Arbor.A	Partner, Tyler Grange LLP
Gail Stoten MCIfA	Heritage Director, Pegasus Group
Simon Helme B Eng, MSc MCIHT	Director, Ashley Helme Associates Ltd
Neil Tiley Assoc RTPI	Pegasus Group
Diana Richardson BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI	Gladman Developments Ltd

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Robin Green of Counsel instructed by Tracy Smith of South Oxfordshire District Council

He called

Peter Radmall MA, B.Phil, CMLI	Chartered Landscape Architect
Tracy Smith BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI	Principal Appeals Officer, South Oxfordshire and Vale of White Horse District Councils
Phillippa Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Principal of PJPC Planning Consultancy

### FOR THE RULE 6 PARTY:

John Fitzsimons of Counsel instructed by Kim Eccles on behalf of Campaign Against Gladman in Eye and Dunsden (CAGE)

He called

Bettina Kirkham DipTP CMLI Ltd	Director, Kirkham Landscape Planning
Paul Matthews BSc CEng MICE MCIHT	Traffic Consultant
David Woodward	Chairman, Eye & Dunsden Parish Council
Leigh Rawlins	Chartered Management Accountant and Parish Councillor, Sonning Common Parish Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

David Bartholomew	Councillor, Oxfordshire County Council
Eric Yarrow	Local resident
Richard Hulme	Local resident and Parish Councillor, Eye and Dunsden Parish Council
John Goodall	Local resident
Linda Glithro	Emmer Green Residents Association and Parish of Shiplake with Dunsden
Rhys Joyce	Local resident
Annette Fairweather	Chair, Emmer Green Residents Association
Richard Berkley	Local resident
Carole Lewis	Chair, Sonning Common Parish Council
Clare Grashoff	Ward Councillor, Reading Borough Council
Kim Pearce	Caversham and District Residents Association
Kay Matthews	Local resident
Richard Hawkins	Local resident
Clive Leeke	Director, Hedgecraft
Caroline Tonder	Local resident
Susan Biggs	Chairman, Kidmore End Parish Council
Hugh Lacey	Binfield Heath Parish Council
John Coleman	Local resident
Oliver Makower	Local resident
Lorna Andrew	Local resident
Gemma Miller	Local resident
Barry Prior	Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport and local resident
Helen Lambert	Chair, Caversham and District Residents Association

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY:

Core Documents

- CD13.1 Land to the east of Benson Lane, Crowmarsh Gifford (APP/Q3115/W/17/3186858)
- CD13.2 SODC Alternative and Additional Capacities Map (June 2018)
- CD13.3 Gladman letter to SODC (1st June 2018)
- CD13.4 SODC letter response to Gladman (29th June 2018)
- CD13.5 Oxfordshire Growth Board (3 Year Housing Supply Consultation Document)
- CD13.6 SODC Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (April 2018)
- CD13.7 Iron Acton Way and North Road, Yate, South Gloucestershire (APP/P0119/A/12/2186546)
- CD13.8 Land south of Filands, Malmesbury, Wiltshire (APP/Y3940/A/12/2183526)
- CD13.9 Start to Finish Report (Lichfields)
- CD13.10 SODC Annual Monitoring Report 2016/17
- CD13.11 Barratt Developments - Building Excellence Annual Reports and Accounts 2017
- CD13.12 Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Housing Implementation Strategy
- CD13.13 Stroud Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2017
- CD13.14 Wiltshire Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2018
- CD13.15 Constraints Map for 15 Re-Assessed Sites
- CD13.16 SODC Council Leader's Statement (19th July 2018)
- CD13.17 Appeal Decision, Kenneylands Rd, Sonning Common (18th July 2018)
- CD13.18 GDL reps on Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, 3yr HLS (July 2018)
- CD13.19 Consortium response to Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, 3 Yr HLS consultation (July 2018)
- CD13.20 SODC Local Development Scheme (August 2018)
- CD13.21 Cabinet Report (2nd August 2018)
- CD13.22 Berkshire Fire Station Response
- CD13.23 Additional SHELAA Sites
- CD13.24 Wainhomes vs the SoS 2013
- CD13.25 Memorandum of Cooperation (September 2016)
- CD13.26 Oxfordshire Housing Deal - Delivery Plan
- CD13.27 Housing & Growth Deal Update (11th June 2018)

CD13.28 MHCLG response to SODC

CD13.29 Oxfordshire Growth Board Meeting (11th June 2018)

CD13.30 Freedom of Information Request

CD13.31 Budgens Store, Emmer Green Webpage Info

CD13.32 Further Correspondence between Appellant and the Council (August 2018)

CD13.33 Land east of Park Road, Didcot (APP/Q3115/W/17/3188474)

CD13.34 Minutes of SODC Cabinet Meeting (2nd August 2018)

CD13.35 Oxfordshire Growth Board - Agenda Item 8 (31st July 2018)

CD13.36 Oxfordshire Growth Deal supplementary papers (31st July 2018)

CD13.37 SODC Supplementary Papers - Oxfordshire Growth Board (31st July 2018)

CD13.38 Email from SODC + Site Proforma to Developers / Agents of the 15 Re-assessed sites for potential inclusion in the emerging South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2033

CD13.39 Housing Delivery Test Measurement Rule Book (July 2018)

CD13.40 Watery Lane, Lichfield SoS Appeal Decision

CD13.41 How is the minimum annual local housing need figure calculated using the standard methodology?

CD13.42 Housing and economic land availability assessment

#### Other Documents

- 1 Opening on behalf of the appellant
- 2 Opening Statement on behalf of South Oxfordshire District Council
- 3 Opening Submissions on behalf of Campaign Against Gladman in Eye and Dunsden
- 4 Supplementary Landscape Rebuttal Evidence of Jonathan Berry
- 5 Proof of Evidence on Housing Need and Supply Matters of Neil Tiley
- 6 Appendices to Proof of Evidence of Neil Tiley
- 7 Rebuttal Proof of Evidence of Neil Tiley
- 8 Updated Proof of Evidence of Diana Richardson
- 9 Supplementary Proof of Evidence of Phillippa Jarvis
- 10 Housing Land Supply Proof of Evidence of Tracy Smith
- 11 Housing Land Supply Rebuttal Proof of Evidence of Tracy Smith
- 12 Review by CAGE of New National Planning Policy Framework as relating to the appeal

- 13 Response with Regard to Proposed Additional Condition to Facilitate Translocation of Hedgerows on the Site by Clive Leeke of Hedgecraft
- 14 Response to Jonathan Berry Rebuttal by Clive Leeke of Hedgecraft
- 15 Updated Planning Statement of Common Ground between the Appellant and South Oxfordshire District Council, signed 17 August 2018
- 16 Statement of Common Ground on Housing Land Supply between the appellant and South Oxfordshire District Council
- 17 Unilateral Undertaking dated 30 August 2018
- 18 Signed letters from South Oxfordshire District Council (17.08.2018) and Oxfordshire County Council (15.08.2018) to Reading Borough Council accompanying the Unilateral Undertaking
- 19 Planning Obligation Summary
- 20 Note on Unilateral Undertaking
- 21 List of Conditions
- 22 Technical Note 1502/SJH/1 by Simon Helme
- 23 Extracts from 2017 Budget
- 24 Extract from the Report on the Examination of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031
- 25 Government response to the Planning for the right homes in the right places consultation March 2018
- 26 Oxfordshire HDOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER INQUIRY CLOSED:
- 47 Letter from John Howell OBE MP
- 48 Letter from Gladman Developments Ltd dated 10 September 2018 and attached appeal decision Ref: AP/F2360/W/18/3198822
- 49 Position Statement of South Oxfordshire District Council
- 50 Position Statement of Campaign Against Gladman in Eye and Dunsden
- 51 Appellant's Position Statement
- 52 South Oxfordshire District Council's response to the appellant's position statement
- 53 The appellant's response to the Council's position statement
- 54 The appellant's statement on MHCLG's technical updates to national planning policy and guidance consultation
- 55 South Oxfordshire District Council's submission on the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government's consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance
- 56 CAGE's review of the MHCLG's technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance



