



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 19-20, 24-27 and 31 July 2012; 1 August; 30-31 October 2012; and 1 November 2012

Site visits made on 30 April 2012; 18, 25 and 31 July 2012

by David Nicholson RIBA IHBC

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

Decision date: 17 December 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/D3315/A/12/2170249

Land west of Milverton Road, Wellington TA21 0BA

- 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 South Western Property Ltd. against the decision of Taunton Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/11/0004, dated 24 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2011.
 - The development proposed is residential development with ancillary retail together with landscaping and means of access.
-

Decision

1. **The appeal is dismissed.**

Application for costs

2. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by South Western Property Ltd. against Taunton Deane Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The application to which the appeal relates was made in outline form except for access and landscaping. All other matters (appearance, layout and scale) were reserved. A Design and Access Statement identifies the amount of development as 244 dwellings, 2 shops and a formal play area, with some 3 storey elements at the lower level.
4. Three drawings were submitted with the application: a site location plan, landscape proposals and an indicative site layout plan. The latter was for illustrative purposes only. It was pointed out near the end of the Inquiry that the landscape plan extends slightly beyond the appeal site and I have reached my Decision on the basis that the works would be restricted to the site boundary.
5. Proposals put forward by the appellant for a signalised site access, a new footway towards the town centre, and other works would be on land which forms part of the highway. Although not part of the application, the works (shown on dwg. nos. 21985/026/002 Rev C, 21985/026/007, 21985/037/002 and 21985/037/008) could be required prior to any other development proceeding. The merits of the scheme therefore depend in part on these additional drawings and I have taken them into account.

6. A Unilateral Undertaking, submitted by the appellant under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (s106), would contribute towards: recreational space and facilities, through an off-site playing field contribution and on-site play provision, and maintenance; early years and secondary education, and a school mini-coach shuttle service; and improvements to the town centre signalised junction. It also undertakes to provide 100 dwellings of affordable housing (41%) or otherwise an off-site contribution of £5m, and to comply with the requirements of an annexed Travel Plan.
7. I have dismissed this appeal so there is no requirement under Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 to consider these matters further and I have not done so except for the weight to be given to the Travel Plan, which I deal with below.

Main Issues

8. From the written evidence, the submissions at the Inquiry and from my site visits, I consider that the main issues are:
 - (a) whether the proposals would comply with the development plan and, if not, whether there are any material considerations which would outweigh any conflict such that the development should be allowed;
 - (b) whether the proposals would amount to sustainable development, with particular regard to the definitions in the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the *Framework*);
 - (c) whether the Local Planning Authority (LPA) can demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply (HLS), as defined in the *Framework*;
 - (d) the effects of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area, including the surrounding landscape;
 - (e) the effects of the scheme, and any consequential works, on highway safety;
 - (f) whether the proposals would preserve the setting of the listed buildings known as the Tone Works;
 - (g) the effects of the scheme on biodiversity.

Reasons

Development Plan

9. The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West 2006-2026 has not been approved and now never will be. Consequently, despite its age, Regional Planning Guidance for the South West (RPG10) 2001 is still part of the development plan. The Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan, April 2000, is even older. On account of their age, neither should be given significant weight.
10. The Taunton Deane Borough Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 (CS) was adopted on 11 September 2012. This is subject to legal challenge. Nonetheless, the parties have agreed that for the purpose of this Inquiry, given the timescale for decision making, that challenge does not alter the position that the adopted CS can be taken as the operative part of the development plan. The CS anticipates (paragraph 1.6) that work will start on a Strategic Allocations Development Plan Document (SA DPD) once the CS is adopted.

11. Of the material considerations which might outweigh conflict with the CS, the weightiest in this case is the *Framework*. In particular, the *Framework* provides policy on sustainable development and housing land supply (HLS) and I return to these below.

Sustainable development

12. Paragraph 7 of the *Framework* identifies three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions in turn give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles under each of these headings. Paragraph 6 indicates that policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the meaning of sustainable development. For this appeal, the relevant chapters are those on *Promoting sustainable transport, Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes, Requiring good design, Promoting healthy communities, and Meeting the challenge of climate change*. I shall therefore consider the merits of the proposals with regard to all these factors before reaching my conclusions on this issue.

Housing land supply (HLS)

13. Paragraph 49 of the *Framework* directs that: *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*. The CS is right up-to-date. Nevertheless, I see no reason in principle why a plan which has just been adopted could not contain policies which are out-of-date if they fall foul of the requirement for a 5 year HLS.
14. *Framework* footnote 11 (to paragraph 47) advises that, *To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, ... with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered ... within five years and ... that development ... is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans*. Footnote 12 continues that: *To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location ... and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged*.
15. Paragraph 14 of the *Framework* sets out that, at its heart, is **a presumption in favour of sustainable development**. For decision-taking this means: *where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless: any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole*. Consequently, if an LPA does not have a 5 year HLS, housing proposals which would amount to sustainable development should be allowed regardless of Local Plan policies which seek to restrict the location of new housing. For this appeal, paragraph 14 of the *Framework* means that any parts of the CS which deal with housing supply may be disregarded if there is not a 5 year HLS.
16. Paragraph 47 aims to *boost significantly the supply of housing and to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land*. It requires LPAs to provide a buffer of either 5% or 20%, subject to their record on delivery, on top of a 5 year HLS. The appellant has argued that where a LPA cannot meet this buffer,

paragraph 14 applies. I interpret this differently. I note that, for housing applications, *not ... up-to-date* is simply defined in paragraph 49 as where an LPA *cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites*. Paragraph 47, on the other hand, with its requirement for a buffer, is concerned with the treatment of Local Plans rather than applications.

17. Moreover, through its reference to a buffer *moved forward from later in the plan period*, paragraph 47 does not suggest that the buffer should come from unidentified sites, such as the appeal site, while the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) does identify future potential sites. Although the buffer was a contentious matter for the CS, and the SA DPD should now be underway, I have therefore limited my consideration to whether or not the LPA has a 5 year HLS.
18. The latest SHLAA, 2011 (Core Document 33), identifies the overall requirement in the plan period 2008 - 2028 as 17,000 dwellings, a developable supply of 17,255, and potential for sites to come forward after that. This was used as the basis for the CS Inspectors Report and the SoCG on HLS (Document 12).
19. The LPA acknowledged that there is a current shortfall, that needs to be taken into account and provided for, which was not addressed by the CS Inspector. There is no definitive method for dealing with a shortfall and there was disagreement at the Inquiry as to whether this should be 'spread' over the remaining plan period or 'rolled up' into the next 5 years. Both the *Framework* and the CS report are silent on this matter, although the report does acknowledge that momentum requires time to build up. In the absence of other guidance, I find that this choice is a matter of forward planning depending on local circumstances, rather than of assessing current supply, and so the LPA is entitled to decide how to deal with it. If the shortfall is spread over the full plan period, the 5 year requirement is 3,775.
20. Working from the SHLAA, the LPA has arrived at a supply figure of 4,022 (Documents 12 and 26). Having studied the evidence on the SHLAA sites with reference to the definitions in the *Framework*, including the treatment of windfalls (paragraph 48), I find that the differences are generally matters of professional opinion and optimism concerning the rate of delivery. While time will tell which opinion turns out to be more accurate, I find that these sites either have planning permission (footnote 11) or have a *reasonable prospect* of being delivered (footnote 12) and so should be counted.
21. An exception to this is Longrun Farm, next to the Somerset College of Art and Technology, where it was acknowledged by the LPA that part of the site may lie outside the settlement boundary, on unallocated greenfield land, and so is likely to deliver fewer than the 100 units identified in the SHLAA.
22. The evidence for the small sites was challenged on the basis that they may not have been visited for the SHLAA. However, given that permissions exist and that the LPA has applied an allowance to this, albeit 64 units lower than the average for the last 6 years, it would be wrong to exclude them.
23. The LPA has also put forward additional sites where permission has recently been granted. These include a figure of 84 units for the former Greaseworks, near the appeal site, and 30 affordable housing units at Henlade. While these might well be delivered in the next 5 years, I agree with the stance of the CS

Inspector that, as they are not in the SHLAA, and as the SHLAA is an annual process, it would be wrong to include them.

24. I acknowledge the general statement put forward¹ that the local housing market is uncertain due to wider economic difficulties. However, I do not consider that this can have been what was meant by the reference to viability in footnote 11. Rather, this should be a site specific matter. In my assessment, while there is always some doubt over the delivery of any construction project, sites should not be excluded on the grounds of viability just because of the overall state of the economy.
25. The appellant also argued that it was unlikely that all the sites would be delivered and that if the HLS fell short by just a few % then it would miss the target. As with viability, I do not agree that the probability that one or more unidentified sites might fall behind in their delivery would negate the *reasonable prospect* test in the *Framework* for each site.
26. Taken as a whole, I find that the supply amounts to 4,022, less 114 for recent permissions, or around 3,900 against a requirement of 3,775 dwellings. Even with reduced figures for part of Longrun Farm and some of the small sites, I find that the LPA does have a 5 year supply, albeit by a very small margin.
27. I have noted the point made by the Tone Action Group (TAG) that, regardless of the overall position, there is a substantial HLS around Wellington. However, I can find nothing in the *Framework* to suggest that the Borough's requirement can be sub-divided in this way.
28. As I have found that the Council does have a 5 year HLS, relevant policies in the CS should be considered up-to-date and given full weight. In the event I am wrong on this interpretation, and as it is part of the overall balance in any event, I have considered the other issues, and whether or not the proposals would amount to sustainable development, before reaching my overall conclusions.

Character and appearance/landscape

29. At a national level, the appeal site lies within an area designated as the Vale of Taunton and Quantock Fringe. Amongst other features, this is characterised as a lowland mixed farming landscape, with dense hedges, sparse woodland and frequent settlements, including scattered villages, farmsteads and hamlets linked by winding lanes. Locally, the most relevant landscape character area for the site is that of West Deane Wooded and Farmed Vale and Tone River Floodplain. This is a settled landscape of undulating pasture and arable farmland of small to medium sized fields interspersed with significant areas of woodland and with a strong network of native hedgerows punctuated with hedgerow trees.
30. From my site visits, I saw that the appeal site is within a landscape which accords with these designations. However, the site is not centrally located but on the cusp with the river floodplain, and close to the northern limit of Tonedale, on the edge of Wellington, both of which demonstrate very different characteristics. The redundant Tone Works complex is just across the river to the south and there is an electricity sub station to the east of

¹ By Mr Herridge, section 6

Milverton Road. There is also an extant permission for a garden centre adjoining the sub station, although works have not yet commenced, permission was granted under Local Plan Policy EC20 which has now been replaced, and the proposals include screening virtually the whole of the site from the road.

31. The appeal site rises to the north away from the river. Most of the site is a single field with hedgerows and some mature trees to its boundaries. It does not have any specific landscape designation. Its last use was mostly as Grade 1 best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land.
32. The proposed residential development would cover most of the site except for the areas close to the river which would be given over to an open space of meadow character, an area of orchard, and allotments. The houses would be mostly two storeys high with some three storey development on lower ground towards the river. Most of the existing boundary hedges would be retained and enhanced. A length of hedgerow from opposite the sub station to the southern boundary would be removed for the site access while a previously grubbed up hedgerow across the site would be largely reinstated.
33. There can be little doubt that the change from farmland to housing would have a dramatic effect on the character of the field. However, there are developments further to the south and may be more to the east. Given its location on the cusp of different designations, the change of use of the site would not so much alter the character of the areas within which it currently lies as to change the character of the site itself to that of the nearby urban areas of Wellington. While the site is part of the wider, pleasant countryside it is also unremarkable.
34. I saw that a number of views towards the site, including from nearby Runnington and the footpaths to the south west, would be affected but the changes would mostly be to quite long distance views. I note that the site is south facing, towards Wellington, but that there are few places from where this would be especially evident. Much of the site borders Milverton Road but, except for the southern length of hedgerow, conditions could require the existing hedges to be supplemented so that the site would be screened from most viewpoints. In particular, when approaching Wellington from the north, the new houses would be hidden until the last minute.
35. The buildings would be more prominent when leaving the town on account of the removal of some of the hedgerow, their part three-storey height and the signalised access. The garden centre would require an island in the road, as part of a new pedestrian crossing, but not traffic lights. In addition, I saw that the proposed emergency access, just north of the main entrance, would be through a bank with a change in level of around 1.5m. At the Inquiry the extent of visibility splay required for this access was not established, any works would be up to the Highway Authority, and this could add to the impact when approaching the town. Compared with the hedgerows, the new junction would be an incongruous feature in the rural section of this road, both entering and leaving. The juxtaposition of three storey houses and traffic lights next to a country lane would result in a sudden and unwelcome transition.
36. Although the Local Plan has now been superseded, CS Policy W14 has been retained, to be reviewed in a future DPD. This policy refers to *approach*

roads into Wellington and paragraph 9.103 explains that this is to maintain the attractive image of the town. Curiously, this policy does not refer to exit roads out of the town. While possibly unusual, the image of a town may rest more on appearance when entering than when leaving and so I do not share the LPA's interpretation that this policy covers impact in both directions.

37. Views of the houses when entering would be restricted to the last minute and so the harm that they would cause to the landscape setting on arrival would be limited. While the new junction and traffic lights on the road itself would have a much greater impact, they would only affect a short length of the road, have little effect on the setting of the town and only cause limited harm to its image or conflict with Policy W14.
38. The environmental parts of CS Policy CP8 include that *unallocated greenfield land outside of settlement boundaries will be protected and where possible enhanced. Development within such areas will be strictly controlled in order to conserve the environmental assets and open character of the area.* Given my finding on HLS, I conclude that the scheme would conflict with the aims of CS Policy CP8.
39. There is no definition of 'valued landscape' in the *Framework* (paragraph 109) and in my assessment the appeal site would not fall into this category. The proposals would not conflict with any specific policy in the *Framework*. However, the change of use from agricultural land to residential development would reduce the amount of greenfield countryside and this change would be relevant to the environmental role of sustainable development, to protect the natural environment, which I address below.
40. On this issue, I find that altering farmland to residential development would cause some harm to the character and appearance of the area and the wider landscape, contrary to CS Policy CP8. At the new road junction there would also be conflict with Policy W14. However, given the lack of specific landscape designation, the relatively restricted views of the site, and the limited length of impact of the new road junction, I give only moderate weight to the harm that would be caused. Although a matter for the overall balance, as there is a considerable need for new housing, and as much of this is likely to be on greenfield sites with similar landscape features, this concern alone would not outweigh the benefits of new housing or amount to sufficient reason that the appeal should be dismissed.

Highway safety

41. Access to the site is from the B3187 which connects Wellington to Milverton. The proposed access would be in roughly the same location as an existing gateway with a signalised junction and traffic island. The emergency access would be just to the north. All these changes would entail works within the existing highway, or its verges. Subject to conditions, and funded by the s106 undertaking, the works would be carried out under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 and could be required before any other development.
42. Most of the sequence of roads from the site to the centre of Wellington has a footway on at least one side. However, part of the length of Milverton Road through Tonedale, just south of the river, does not. There is also well established on-street parking along much of the route.

43. The proposed footway would connect the site access through to an existing footway which then leads continuously to the centre of Wellington. Proposals originally included two alternative arrangements for the narrow section of road along Milverton Road through Tonedale: the first would require traffic lights; the second a short priority system for the narrowest part only whereby drivers from each direction could see each other. Cycle lane marking could also be added to improve the safety of the route, including taking account of the priority system. At the Inquiry, an updated SoCG on highway matters confirmed agreement to the priority system.
44. I have noted concerns over where the displaced parking might go. I accept that the loss of spaces would be a severe inconvenience for existing residents. However, as public highway, there are no established parking rights. Alternatives, if inconvenient, would be unlikely to pose an increased risk to highway safety, particularly when there would be a new footway.
45. Subject to conditions and the s106 undertaking, I therefore accept that there is a technical solution available which would not impose unacceptable risks to highway safety. On this issue, the scheme would comply with Paragraph 32 of the *Framework* which notes that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

Historic environment

46. The Tone Works stand immediately to the south of the appeal site. These historic buildings were associated with the cloth finishing trade. The buildings to the north of the river are mostly listed at Grade II*; those to the south at Grade II. Associated buildings to the east of Milverton Road, known as the Greaseworks, are unlisted. Planning permission has been granted to demolish the Greaseworks for residential development subject to a legal undertaking to repair the listed buildings. This course of action was broadly supported by English Heritage.
47. There was no dispute that the residential development would affect the setting of the listed buildings. The appellant submitted a detailed Heritage Statement and a proof of evidence identifying the significance, and special interest, of the listed buildings. These concluded that the site is of national importance for its surviving machinery but that, as an industrial site, the significance of its setting is as a result of its position on the river not the wider landscape. At the Inquiry² the LPA conceded that it had no evidence that the proposals would harm any part of the significance of the listed buildings including that derived from their setting.
48. From studying the evidence, including representations from English Heritage and the TAG, and from my site visits, I agree. Unlike the adjacent Greaseworks, I find little association between the listed buildings and the appeal site. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposals would not constrict understanding, nor distract from the significance of the group of listed buildings, nor harm their setting. The scheme would comply with the part of CS Policy CP8 which aims to conserve the historic environment, and with paragraph 132 of the *Framework* which gives great weight to the conservation of heritage assets.

² Ms Hartnell in XX

Biodiversity

49. The River Tone and its well vegetated corridor is a local wildlife site of county importance. The appeal site lies adjacent to the river and is surrounded by a mature hedge network which is a UK, county and district biodiversity action plan habitat. It is common ground between the appellants and the LPA (Document 13) that the fields themselves within the appeal site are of low biodiversity value. The LPA is now satisfied that the surveys submitted are sufficient to form a decision with regard to ecology.
50. It is also agreed with the LPA and the TAG that the site is used by a number of protected species, European protected species and light-sensitive species including resident badgers, dormice, otters and several species of bat. The hedges, woodland and scrub vegetation, and the river are of district importance for dormice, and the River Tone of county importance for otters.
51. The proposals would result in the removal of approximately 70m of hedge, and a badger sett, and the introduction of lighting both within the site and, probably, along the road. These changes would reduce the habitat for dormice, disturb badgers, affect the connectivity of hedges for light sensitive bats, and remove some bird nesting habitat. New residents would be likely to bring dogs and cats with them which could disturb wildlife along the river bank and might prey on dormice and bats.
52. Proposed mitigation would include around 150m of new hedge, along an old hedge line within the site, and further buffer planting along the boundaries. Licences would be obtained for any necessary disturbance. Buffer planting would be introduced and nest boxes would be put up. Conditions could control new lighting and require filters on some fittings within the site, but not those in the highway outside the appellant's control. Subject to the proposed mitigation, the LPA agreed that there should not be any significant negative impacts and that, once planting has matured, the result would be a positive impact; the TAG did not agree.
53. I have noted that bats, dormice and otters are all principally protected under the Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and I have had regard to my duties under these Regulations.
54. Although predictions are difficult to make, in my assessment, over time and subject to suggested conditions (Document 40) being imposed on any permission, the probability is that the mitigation measures would compensate for the impacts of this development and that the species affected are likely to recover in numbers, occupy the new habitat and find new foraging routes. Other potential housing sites would also be likely to impact on wildlife. I therefore find that the harm caused would not be sufficient reason in itself to prevent the development proceeding. On the other hand, the mitigation is likely to take some time to have effect while the hedge removal and disturbance would be quite sudden. Given the extent of the site and the number and importance of the species involved, the short term impacts would not be insignificant.
55. On this issue I conclude that the proposals would be unlikely to cause lasting harm, and might provide some limited long term benefit, but would have a significant short term detrimental impact. The scheme would not conflict with CS Policy CP8 which includes the aim to conserve and enhance the natural

environment. It would not conflict with specific policy in the *Framework* (paragraph 109) which aims to minimise impacts on biodiversity. I consider the overall impact of the proposals on the natural environment and sustainability of the development below.

Other Sustainability factors

56. Before concluding on the issue of whether the proposals would amount to sustainable development I have considered the other relevant chapters in paragraphs 18-219 of the *Framework*.

TRAVEL PLAN (TP)

57. Wellington has a relatively compact town centre. The entrance to the appeal site lies approximately 2.2km from Wellington town centre. The first refusal reason alleges that the site is in an unsustainable location. The principles in paragraph 17 of the *Framework* include focusing significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.
58. Paragraph 29 of the *Framework* notes that *transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development, and that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel.* Paragraphs 34 and 35 expect that *decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised; and that developments should be located and designed where practical to ... give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, have access to high quality public transport facilities ...*
59. Given the distance to the town centre, the lack of an existing continuous footway and the limited existing bus service, I am in no doubt that the site is currently in an unsustainable location as defined in the *Framework*. Following policy in paragraph 17, I have therefore considered whether or not the location of the site could be made sustainable.
60. A Travel Plan (TP) has been submitted as part of the s106 undertaking. Based on journeys to work, using a weighted average for sites on the edge of Taunton and Wellington, the TP estimates the varying proportions of the use of different modes of transport, or modal split³, that would be likely to occur for future occupiers at the appeal site. It then sets out a target modal split and proposes a range of measures in order to try and achieve this.
61. The total cost of these measures would amount to around £800,000⁴. This would include the cost of the new access, which is more of a safety matter, and assumes that, bus passes, bicycles vouchers, and training offers, would all be taken up. The TP acknowledges that if the targets are not met then further, unspecified, mitigation measures would be necessary. It offers a default payment of £40,000 based on SCC guidelines. I have no details on what the penalty sum might fund.

³ In this case between car driver, car passenger, bus, walk or cycle

⁴ Ibid paragraph 7.1.1

62. The overall TP target would shift the proportion of single car occupancy journeys to work from an estimated 61.80% to 48.12%⁵. I consider the main measures below.
63. Through a funded TP co-ordinator, travel information packs, notice boards, newsletters, annual events and promotional material on car sharing would all be provided to new residents. With the exception of car sharing, while information would help other measures to take full effect, most of the actual impact is likely to depend on the measures themselves.
64. There are a couple of small shops and several employment sites within 1600m of the site entrance. Otherwise, the distance from future individual houses to supermarkets, banks and other services would be even further than the 2.2km to Wellington town centre⁶. As set out above (under *Highway safety*) the overall scheme would provide a safe and continuous footway from the appeal site to Wellington. The TP target is a modal shift from car driver to walking from an estimated 6.5%, without the TP, to 9.9% after 5 years with the TP.
65. Although not an upper limit, *Manual for Streets*⁷ advises that walkable neighbourhoods are typically up to about 800m, while the Institute of Highways and Transportation Guidelines *Providing for Journeys on Foot*⁸ (also referenced in *Manual for Streets 2*) indicates that the preferred maximum distance to town centres is 800m, elsewhere 1200m, and only commuting/school/sight-seeing should extend to a maximum of 2km. The route to the town centre would largely involve walking along suburban streets, with few interesting features, and the need to cross the road a number of times.
66. On account of the distance involved, I find it very unlikely that the new footway, information and vouchers for walking boots would overcome the resistance of future residents to walk into town. From what I saw, the limited attractiveness of the routes would reduce the prospect even further. I accept that one or two residents might be lucky enough to combine a new home at the appeal site with employment in Tonedale but, even with this possibility, I find it highly unlikely that enough people would walk to work, or make other journeys, to exceed the baseline of 6.5% let alone the projected shift in walking patterns to meet the target of almost 10% of future residents.
67. As well as the cycleway markings as part of the road improvements, and a short length of dedicated cycle route near the appeal site, the TP would supply vouchers and training. The distance to the town centre is perfectly reasonable for cycling. However, although now audited as acceptably safe, cyclists from the appeal site would still be without a dedicated cycleway for most of the route into town and, where a cycle lane would be demarcated, it would still run alongside a relatively narrow and busy road.
68. Evidence from the TAG is that only 3% of the residents of nearby Runnington (2 out of 70) have ever cycled to the centre of Wellington. By comparison, the TP suggests a shift from a baseline of nearly 3% to 5.5% from car drivers

⁵ Travel Plan Table 6.5 in s106

⁶ Document 5: Statement of Common Ground on Transportation and Highway Matters, paragraph 3.7 and Fig SOCG1, and shown on Figure 2 attached to the s106

⁷ Core Document 19, paragraph 4.4.1

⁸ See extract in Document 9, paragraph 3.36

to cycling as a result of the TP measures. Given the nature of the route, I consider that cycling would not be an attractive alternative for new residents and that the suggested modal shift is unrealistic.

69. The five year contribution to secure a bus service to the site would bring all new houses to within 400m of a proposed bus stop. The chance to acquire a season ticket would encourage new residents to make a positive start with a sustainable pattern of transport in their new homes. The contribution would be intended to double the current frequency of services and provide direct connections to new destinations, including Taunton railway station, not currently accessible from bus stops along the B3187 corridor.
70. Milverton Road is not currently well served by buses and SCC has recently withdrawn or curtailed a number of routes in the county. Although a substantial benefit in principle, the bus would still only run every 30 minutes and the subsidy would only guarantee five years provision. On account of the relatively low frequency of service, and the limited duration of subsidy, I find that the target modal shift from car drivers to buses would be hard to achieve from the TP measures and give only moderate weight to the sustainability benefits of the proposed service improvement.

CONCLUSION ON TRAVEL PLAN

71. I accept that the proposed highway improvements are acceptable and technically feasible. I note that SCC's comments focus on these physical measures but also that they refer to the distance from the town centre, and state that the modal shift targets are both ambitious and depend on making the routes into Wellington attractive for walkers and cyclists.
72. A large number of measures is proposed. However, in my judgement few of them would make a substantial difference to the choice of mode of transport. Even taken cumulatively, I find that they are very unlikely to achieve the reduction in the TP targets in the single occupancy use of private cars for journeys to work, let alone reduce the overall number of single occupancy car journeys to below 50%, as indicated in the projected modal shift. While I acknowledge that a default payment could be required, with little before me to suggest how it could be expended, or that it is anywhere near large enough to make any substantial difference, I give it limited weight.
73. Even taking full account of all the measures in the TP, the site would remain at a considerable distance from the mostly compact centre of Wellington with little real incentive to use transport modes other than the private car. The likelihood that most future residents would be able to exercise a real choice is therefore limited in which case the modal shifts would not be met. I conclude on this point that it is highly unlikely that the location of the site would be made sustainable as a result of the TP.

OTHER SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT MATTERS

74. I have noted that the measures put forward in the TP, particularly the foot/cycleway and bus subsidy, might also assist nearby existing residents in Tonedale and north Wellington, put at 3,000 by the appellant, and result in some modal shift for them as well. However, I have no modal split figures or targets on which to judge this claim and so give this indirect effect little weight.

75. CS policy SP3: *Realising the vision for Wellington* sets out an aspiration that Wellington railway station might one day be reopened and that, following relocation of employment uses, a new local centre might be developed close to the station (CS paragraph 4.24). I was told that the route of historic railway lines looping around the station still exist such that it might be feasible to rebuild the station and platforms without serious disruption to the main route from London to Exeter (via Bristol). There can be little doubt that if the station were to reopen, with regular stopping trains, it would be attractive to potential commuters. At some 800m from the entrance to the appeal site, it is only a relatively short distance to the station compared with the town centre. I therefore acknowledge that reopening the station, and creating a new local centre, would make Tonedale and surrounding parts of Wellington, including the appeal site, a significantly more sustainable location for future development.
76. However, I was also told that Network Rail has no interest in pursuing this option under the current franchise. No detailed feasibility study has been carried out. In the absence of evidence that reopening the station, and developing a new local centre next to it, is more than a long term aspiration, I give this possibility little weight in my Decision.
77. I have studied the Decision at Burgess Farm (Document 41) but note that there the site was within reasonable distance of rail and bus services, with its entrance some 850m from the town centre, and so in a much more sustainable location than the current appeal site.

DELIVERING A WIDE CHOICE OF HIGH QUALITY HOMES

78. There is no dispute that the proposals would deliver houses and, subject to conditions, these could meet all required standards. 41% would be affordable housing. This would exceed the LPA's requirement of 25% and I give substantial weight to this additional benefit.

REQUIRING GOOD DESIGN

79. The layout is a reserved matter. Consequently, the indicative site layout plan, which could otherwise be criticised, could be significantly revised and I have largely disregarded it. Appearance is also reserved and a suggested condition could require a design code to control other aspects including a proportion of renewable energy.
80. Landscaping is not reserved and the proposals aim to enhance the screening potential of existing hedges. In doing so, the drawing shows that there would be essentially a single entry and exit point and no routes to allow for permeability or linkages through the site to anywhere else. Two new shops are proposed and, at reserved matters stage, could be relocated from their indicative position to near the entrance. However, I have no details of how these would contribute to the streetscene and their viability was disputed. Indeed, the appellant advised that their presence or absence should not affect my consideration⁹, so I give little weight to them one way or the other.
81. Chapter 7 of the *Framework* attaches great importance to design, itself a key aspect of sustainable development and indivisible from good planning (paragraph 56), and requires that *permission should be refused for*

⁹ Closing submission paragraph 100

development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions (paragraph 64). It advises that (paragraph 61) *securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations*, and that decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development.

82. The appellant has referred to the need to shield development from the countryside beyond, and to preserve the rural setting of Runnington, while the proposed area of parkland below the houses would link the site to the listed mill. The taller buildings would stand near the entrance to the site.
83. As above, the proposals would only cause moderate harm to the landscape, in part as it would be screened so that views of it would be limited. On the other hand, the extent of hedgerows and new planting surrounding the site would also tend to isolate the scheme from both Wellington and Runnington. Even with the parkland proposals (which would not be quite as extensive as shown on the landscape drawing) the site would be separated from Wellington by the River Tone.
84. As well as the long distances to the town centre, Runnington church and Langford Budville village hall are 1km and 2.7km away respectively (Document 36) from the site entrance. Access to these would be via a road with no footway or by a rather tortuous footpath. Consequently, the site would be poorly connected to the neighbouring villages as well.
85. The upshot of this is that the proposed housing would not only be distant from the centre of Wellington but also rather cut off. Rather than contribute to the functional character and quality of the area it would be an isolated housing estate tenuously linked to the north of the town. Without any meaningful connections, other than the single entry point, there would be no permeability through the site. On this point I find that the proposals would be poorly integrated into the fabric of the built environment of the area.
86. On this aspect of sustainable development, I find that the proposals would be poorly designed, contrary to chapter 7 of the *Framework*, and I give considerable weight to this shortcoming.

PROMOTING HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

87. *To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs*, Paragraph 70 of the *Framework* expects planning decisions to ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.
88. Given my conclusions on design and integration, and apart from the two small shops of uncertain viability, I agree with the LPA¹⁰ that the scheme would do little to achieve an integrated approach, and this weighs heavily against the proposals.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF CLIMATE CHANGE

89. Paragraph 95 of the *Framework* aims to support the move to a low carbon future, by planning for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As I have found that the location would not be

¹⁰ Pick rebuttal paragraph 3.17

sustainable, even with the TP, and given the role of transport in greenhouse gas emissions, and carbon in particular, the scheme would perform poorly in this regard.

Sustainability balance

90. As above, paragraph 7 of the *Framework* identifies three dimensions to sustainable development. Together with all the factors set out above, I now consider these in turn before reaching an overall balance.

ECONOMIC

91. The *Framework*, and other government policy, put great emphasis on the need for economic growth. However, the glossary definition of economic development excludes housing. Other than ancillary retail development, of doubtful viability, the proposals would be largely residential. I therefore give limited weight to the economic role of the proposals.

SOCIAL

92. The *Framework* defines a social role as *supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being.*
93. I was told that the land ownership does not involve any tenancies or option agreements and that the residential scheme could be delivered without delay. An agreed condition could reduce the time limit for reserved matters and I give substantial weight to these positive benefits.
94. On the other hand, the site would have poor accessibility, even with an extended footway and the cumulative provisions of the TP, which would also benefit some existing residents. Allowing this appeal might also deter the LPA from bringing forward other, potentially better performing housing sites.
95. Overall, I find that the poor accessibility would outweigh the benefits of additional housing on this site and count against the proposals.

ENVIRONMENTAL

96. The *Framework* defines an environmental role as *contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, ... moving to a low carbon economy.*
97. As set out above, I find that the scheme would not harm the historic environment or biodiversity but that against both these factors it would be neutral or merit limited weight. Subject to conditions, including a design code, the construction could include some renewable energy and avoid pollution. The landscaping proposals include open space for recreation.
98. The development would be on greenfield land, rather than brownfield, on mostly Grade 1 BMV agricultural land, and cause moderate harm to the landscape. While these matters are likely to affect many sites in the Borough they would nonetheless conflict with paragraphs 111 and 112 of the *Framework*, which encourage re-using brownfield land and using poorer

agricultural land in preference to that of higher quality, and count against the proposals.

99. For the above reasons, I am not persuaded that the TP measures would achieve a significant modal shift for new residents. Despite the aims of the TP, the proposed new shops, and the proximity of the site to existing employers, the poor accessibility to the town centre is likely to significantly increase the number of journeys by private car. This would by far outweigh the unspecified benefits through construction tailored towards a low carbon economy, which should be expected anyway. Rather, given the distance from the centre of Wellington, future occupiers would be likely to be heavily reliant on the private car, and so increase the release of carbon into the atmosphere and exacerbate climate change. I therefore find that the balance on the environmental role weighs heavily against the scheme.

Conclusions on sustainable development

100. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed TP would not be sufficient to turn the appeal site into a sustainable location. Looking at the relevant chapters in paragraphs 18-219 as a whole, I find that the adverse impacts with regard to *sustainable transport, good design, healthy communities, and climate change* would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits from *high quality homes*.
101. Against the factors in paragraph 7, I give limited weight in favour of the proposals when measured against the economic role but the social and environmental effects would count against, and heavily against, the scheme. I therefore find overall that the proposals would not amount to sustainable development, as defined in the *Framework*.

Conclusions on the development plan

102. For the above reasons, I find that the proposals would accord with CS Policy CP4: *Housing* which aims to deliver at least 17,000 new homes over the period 2008 – 2028 with around 4,000, or 25%, as new affordable housing units, and I give this substantial weight. They are further supported by CS Policy DM2: *Development in the countryside* which allows affordable housing outside settlement boundaries. The scheme would be neutral, or gain limited support, against policies on highway safety, listed buildings and biodiversity.
103. The proposals would be contrary to: Policy CP1: *Climate Change* which expects that development proposals should result in a sustainable environment, and will be required to demonstrate that the issue of climate change has been addressed by, amongst other things, a) reducing the need to travel through locational decisions; Policy CP6: *Transport and Accessibility* which requires that development should contribute to reducing the need to travel, improve accessibility to jobs, services and community facilities, and mitigate and adapt to climate change; and Policy SP1; *Sustainable development locations* which expects development to be focused on the most accessible and sustainable locations, as shown on the Key Diagrams, including that for Wellington.
104. There would be limited conflict with Policy W14: *Approach routes into Wellington* which does not permit development which would harm the landscape setting of approach roads into the town. The scheme would conflict with both the environmental and settlement boundary aspects of CP8:

Environment which aims to protect unallocated greenfield land outside settlement boundaries.

105. The appeal site lies outside the settlement boundary, shown on CS Inset Map 3 (Wellington Area), and north of the river. The appellant has argued that Vision 3 and Policy SP3: *Realising the vision for Wellington*, which both exclude the appeal site for development, should relate to a planning matter and that this could only be a point concerning landscaping, accessibility or development control, all of which are contested.
106. To my mind Vision 3, unlike Policy CP8, is not just about restricting HLS, or other development, or just protecting the countryside. Rather, it is part of the spatial policies, looks wider than Policy CP8 and, via the reference to the key features of the vision being illustrated in Key Diagram 3 (the final line of Policy SP3), it identifies natural boundaries to development and expects new development to be within walking distance of the compact town centre. The natural boundary to the north is the River Tone. I heard evidence¹¹ that the vision for Wellington arose out of public consultation and therefore represented the local viewpoint. I therefore give considerable weight to the conflict with Vision 3 and Policy SP3.
107. As above, I give little weight to the elements of the development plan beyond the CS in this appeal. On balance on this issue, I find that the proposals would be contrary to several policies in the CS while only gain significant support from those on housing or affordable housing. I therefore conclude that the proposals would be contrary to the development plan as a whole.

Conditions

108. Additional concerns were raised by interested parties with regard to flooding and archaeology. Possible conditions were discussed which could prevent any rainwater running off into the river, and so avoid exacerbating the existing flooding problems. Although there was little evidence of archaeological remains on the site, if necessary a condition could require a watching brief over excavations.

Overall conclusions

109. For the above reasons, I find that the proposals would be contrary to the development plan as a whole. Paragraph 14 of the *Framework* expects proposals which accord with the development plan to be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It confirms that the *Framework* is such a material consideration. It goes on to state that where relevant policies in the development plan are out-of-date permission should be granted subject to an assessment against the *Framework*. I have found that the LPA does have a 5 year HLS. However, I found the matter finely balanced and so I have considered the scheme in the alternative.
110. Regardless of the HLS, I conclude that the conflict with the *Framework* is such that the appeal does not benefit from its presumption in favour of sustainable development. Consequently, even if I found that the HLS policies in the CS were out-of-date, the presumption does not apply and, for this appeal, would not outweigh the conflict with the development plan.

¹¹ From Mr Houghton of the Tone Action Group (TAG)

111. Parts of CS Policy CP8 are restrictive and, in the absence of a 5 year HLS, would not be up-to-date. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposals would not amount to sustainable development, as defined in paragraphs 18-219 of the *Framework*, that the balance under paragraph 7 weighs heavily against the scheme, and that the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Consequently, even if the LPA lacked a 5 year HLS, which it does not, the presumption in paragraph 14 of the *Framework* would not outweigh the requirement that the proposals should accord with the development plan as a whole. Either way, and taking account of the benefits of potentially quick delivery of housing and affordable housing, I find that, on balance, the appeal should fail.
112. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Nicholson

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Peter Wadsley of Counsel	instructed by Taunton Deane Borough Council (TDBC) solicitors dept.
He called	
John Gallimore MCInstCES	Somerset County Council (Highways and transportation)
Ian Clark BA DipLA CMLI	TDBC (Landscape)
Nick Bryant BA MTP MRTPI	TDBC (Housing land supply)
Diane Hartnell DipArchCons IHBC	TDBC (Historic environment)
Anthony Pick BA MA MRTPI	TDBC (Planning)

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Christopher Boyle of Counsel	instructed by Trevor Blaney, Lawrence Graham LLP, solicitors
He called	
Neil Thorne BSc MSc MILT MIHT	Senior Associate, Peter Brett Associates (Highways and transportation)
Clare Brockhurst BSc FLI	Partner, Tyler Grange (Landscape)
Steve Adams MSc CEnv MIEEM	Cornwall Environmental Consultants (Ecology)
Andrew Herridge	Director, Herridge Property Consulting (Market perspective on Housing land supply)
Ian Ayre BSc MA MRTPI	(Housing land supply)
Roger Mascall BSc DipBldgCons IHBC RTPI	Turley Associates (Historic environment)
Robert Selwood BA DipTP MRTPI FRICS	Selwood Planning (Planning)

FOR THE TONE ACTION GROUP:

John Houghton, solicitor	instructed by the Tone Action Group
He called	
Ian Loudon	Runnington resident (Traffic and transport)
Michael Bristow	Runnington resident (Ecology)
Kieron McGrath	Runnington resident (Community impact)
Himself	Runnington resident (Planning and landscaping)

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor Govier	Wellington Town Council
Tim Roper	Mendip Estates Limited
Councillor Bishop	Ward Councillor, TDBC
Howard Davies	Milverton resident
Simon Masters	Wellington resident

CORE DOCUMENTS

1. National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012
2. Draft Revised Regional Spatial Strategy Proposed Changes, July 2008
3. Somerset and Exmoor National Park Joint Structure Plan, April 2000
4. Taunton Deane Local Plan including Inset Map 3 for Wellington, November 2004
5. Core Strategy 2011-2028, Published Plan
6. Officer's Report to Committee for appeal proposal (Fox's Meadow) 8 Aug 2011
7. Officer's Report to Committee for application 43/11/0080 (the Grease works) 3 April 2012
8. "Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment" Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) 2002
9. "Landscape Character Assessment" The Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage (SDNH) 2006
10. Protected Species Survey 2011 Prepared by Cornwall Environmental Conservation
11. Travel Plan (v5) June 2012
12. Technical Note PED001, 8 February (Milverton Road Pedestrian Link Review) Technical Note PED001 (v2), June 2012 (PBA)
13. Technical Note SB001 School Bus Service, May 2012, (PBA)
14. PBA Technical Notes TN035.1, Jan 2012 (Bus Strategy)
15. PBA Technical Note 001 28 Feb 2011 (PERS audit)
16. PBA Technical Note MOVA001 24 Feb 2012 (Summary of Town Centre Traffic Signals)
18. DfT / DCLG Manual for Streets (2007)
19. Manual for Streets 2 (CIHT, 2010)
20. Somerset County Council Future Transport Plan (2011)
21. Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy (2011)
22. Somerset County Council Travel Plan Guidance (2011)
23. DCLG / DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment (2007)
24. DfT Making Residential Travel Plans Work (2005)
25. DfT Good Practice Guidelines: Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process (2009)
26. Somerset County Council Manual for Travel Plans (2008)
27. Regional Planning Guidance 10, 2001
28. Technical Guidance to NPPF, March 2012
29. The Plan for Growth, March 2011
30. The Plan for Growth Ministerial Statement, March 2011
31. Planning Inspectorate Model Conditions
32. SHLAA Practice Guidance, July 2007
33. TDBC Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), 2011
34. TDBC SHLAA, 2010
35. TDBC Housing Land Availability Summary 2011
36. Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations, 2010
37. Circular 11/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permission*
38. Report to TDBC Executive on 'Release of Further Interim Release Sites' 18 January 2012
39. Taunton Sub Area Study, 2005
40. Notice of Decision for Appeal Application, 8 August 2010
41. Site Location Plan
42. Indicative Site Layout Plan No. 4171-3 H Brewer Smith and Brewer
43. Landscape Proposals – New Planting No. 1187_2010/17 Tyler Grange
44. Design and Access Statement, January 2011

- 45 Ecological Assessment, December, 2010
- 46 Ecology Survey Update, July 2011
- 47 Tree Survey Report, February 2010
- 48 Phase I Ground Conditions Assessment, May 2009
- 49 Baseline Lighting Survey, March 2010
- 50 Flood Risk Assessment, January 2011
- 51 Addendum to Flood Risk Assessment, June 2011
- 52 Noise Assessment, January 2011
- 53 Site Management Plan, March 2010
- 54 Transport Assessment, January 2011
- 55 Travel Plan, January 2011
- 56 Transport Addendum, June 2011
- 57 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, January 2011
- 58 Heritage Statement, May 2011
- 59 Planning Statement, January 2011
- 60 Housing Requirement and Supply, May 2011
- 61 Housing Requirement Update, June 2011
- 62 Statement of Community Involvement, January 2011
- 63 The Setting of Heritage Assets, English Heritage Guidance, October 2011
- 64 Inspector's Pre-Inquiry Meeting Note, 1 May 2012
- 65 Council's letter to Inspectorate, 23 May 2012
- 66 Draft Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West 2006-2026
- 67 Council's response to the National Planning Policy Framework
- 68 Core Strategy Examination Main Matter 2: Adequacy of housing provision,
5 year supply and phasing
- 69 Core Strategy Submission Report
- 70 Core Strategy Regulation 25 Consultation Responses
- 71 Inspector's report on Core Strategy

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- 1 Letters of notification of appeal and Inquiry
- 2 Opening statement for the Appellant
- 3 Opening statement for TDBC
- 4 Opening statement for Tone Action Group
- 5 Statement of Common Ground on Transportation and Highway Matters
- 6 Agreed Updated Position on Footway Proposals
- 7 Draft planning obligations and planning conditions - TDBC
- 8 Somerset County Council Transport Policies Parking Strategy – March 2012
- 9 Review of Transport Assessment for Land at Killams, Taunton – 10 July 2012
- 10 Section 106 Agreement for Land East of Milverton Road & North of River Tone
(garden centre planning permission)
- 11 Guide to buses in and around Taunton and Wellington
- 12 Statement of Common Ground on Housing Land Supply – July 2012
- 13 Statements of Common Ground on Ecology – July 2012
- 14 Map of key points in Mr Waller's letter
- 15 Map of viewpoints in Mr Houghton's evidence Appendix C
- 16 Letter from Environment Agency to Mr Davies dated 28 May 2012
- 17 Aerial views of Cades Farm, 2006 and 2010
- 18 Plan of Tone Works, also referred to as the Greaseworks
- 19 Landscaping site visit maps
- 20 Wellington weekly news dated Wednesday May 2 2012

- 21 TAG document: Mitigation, compensation and enhancement
- 22 Extract from *A Review of the Impact of Artificial Light on Invertebrates* 2011
- 23 Extract from the *Biodiversity Action Plan for Birmingham and the Black Country* – Species Action Plan for Bats
- 24 Bat Conservation Trust: *Bats and Cats*
- 25 Cllr. Bishop's updated statement
- 26 Corrections to Table 3 of Mr Ayre's proof of evidence; new Table 7
- 27 Appeal Decision ref. APP/X1165/A/11/2165846 for Torquay by J Graham
- 28 Appeal Decision ref. APP/C1625/A/11/2165865 for Hardwicke by T Phillimore
- 29 Strategic Housing Market Assessments Final Report February 2009
- 30 Email confirming Notes of meeting between Messrs Ayre and Alder 20 October 2008
- 31 Draft Unilateral Undertaking under s106
- 32 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations compliance submission
- 33 Draft planning conditions 20 July 2012
- 34 Submission by Simon Masters
- 35 Routes from appeal site centre to Runnington Church
- 36 Distances to Runnington Church and Langford Budville Village Hall
- 37 Suggested modification to condition 3
- 38 Email representation from Barbara Cooper
- 39 Proof of evidence of Mr H Davies: *A brief history of Runnington*
- 40 Suggested conditions
- 41 Appeal Decision Ref. APP/U4230/A/11/2157433 For Burgess Farm, Worsley
- 42 Addendum to the SoCG on transportation and highways matters
- 43 Draft s106 unilateral undertaking
- 44 Suggested conditions on retail and access
- 45 Closing submissions on behalf of the TAG
- 46 Phased s106 costs
- 47 Closing submissions on behalf of TBDC
- 48 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant