

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 22-24 April 2015

Accompanied site visit made on 24 April 2015

by John Felgate BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 June 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/A/14/2223330

Land at 'Goats Gambol', off Beech Lane, Woodcote, Oxfordshire RG8 0PY

- 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 Jumquest Ltd and Beenlore Ltd against the decision of South Oxfordshire District Council.
- The application Ref P13/S3798/O, dated 5 December 2013, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2014.
- The development proposed is: "Widen existing access and erection of 10 houses, including 4 affordable units, plus retention of 'Goats Gambol', with new estate roads".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The appeal seeks outline permission with all matters reserved except access. In so far as the submitted plans include other details, such as layout and landscaping, it was agreed at the inquiry that these are purely illustrative.
3. Planning permission was originally refused by the Council for six reasons. Refusal reasons (RRs) Nos 3 and 4 were based on a lack of information relating to highway safety and ecological impacts. In the light of information submitted by the appellants subsequently, the Council has now withdrawn RRs 3 and 4. However, matters relating to highway safety have been raised by other objectors, and these remain before me for consideration.
4. RRs Nos 5 and 6 related to affordable housing and a lack of infrastructure contributions. Subsequently, new regulations governing such contributions have come into force¹, and in the light of this change, the Council now accepts that some of the contributions originally sought can no longer be required. On 10 April 2015, the appellants entered into a legal undertaking with regard to the remaining contributions, and the proposed affordable housing. At the inquiry, the Council confirmed that it was satisfied with this undertaking, and that it no longer wished to pursue RRs 5 or 6.
5. In May 2014, subsequent to the Council's refusal of permission for the appeal proposal, the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan (WNP) was 'made', and thus became part of the development plan for the area. I have had regard for the WNP's policies, where relevant.

¹ Regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 ('the CIL Regulations'), which came into effect on 6 April 2015

6. After the close of the inquiry, the appellants drew my attention to a recent appeal decision relating to another proposed development in South Oxfordshire District, at Thames Farm, Shiplake². I have taken this decision into account.

Planning policies

The development plan

7. For the purposes of this appeal, the development plan comprises the WNP, the Core Strategy³ (the CS), and the saved policies of the Local Plan⁴ (the LP).

The Core Strategy

8. In the CS, Policy CSS1 seeks to focus most of the District's new housing and economic development at the 'growth point' of Didcot, with some development also at the towns of Henley, Thame and Wallingford. Woodcote is identified as one of the next tier of 'larger villages', where development will be permitted on a more limited scale, to support and enhance their role as local service centres.
9. The scale and location of development in villages is dealt with in more detail in Policy CSR1. In the larger villages, development is to be permitted on allocated sites and through infilling. Outside the towns and villages, the policy states that any change will need to relate to very specific needs, such as for agriculture, or for environmental enhancement.
10. For the purposes of Policy CSR1, infill development is defined as the filling of a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage, or other sites within settlements where the site is closely surrounded by buildings⁵. No limit is put on the size of infill sites or the overall amount of infill development that may be permitted, but developments should protect local character and distinctiveness.
11. The appeal site is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Within that area, both Policy CSR1 and also Policy CSEN1 give high priority to the conservation and enhancement of the area's natural beauty, whilst also supporting proposals which benefit economic and social well-being.

The Neighbourhood Plan

12. The WNP identifies land for a up to 76 dwellings on five allocated sites, and provides for two further contingency sites, with capacity for up to 36 dwellings if required.
13. In addition, Policy HS10 allows for small residential developments on infill and redevelopment sites within the village, subject to various provisos. These include a definition of infill which is similar to that in the CS, and that developments should not involve the outward extension of the existing built-up area.

The Local Plan

14. In the LP, saved Policies G2 and G4 seek to protect the District's countryside for its own sake. Policy C4 also seeks to protect the landscape setting of local settlements.

² Appeal ref. APP/Q3115/A/14/2217931, dated 20 May 2015

³ The 'South Oxfordshire Core Strategy', adopted December 2012

⁴ The 'South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011', adopted January 2006

⁵ Paragraph 13.10 of the LP explanatory text

Emerging policies

15. The Council has started work on a replacement local plan. However, in view of its early stage, all parties agree that no weight attaches to this new plan in the present appeal.

National policies

16. National policy is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF), and elaborated upon in the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG). I have had regard for these where relevant.

Main issues

17. In the light of all the submissions before me, the main issues in the appeal are:

- in principle, whether the appeal site is a suitable location for housing development, having regard to the relevant planning policies;
- the proposed development's effects on the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard for the site's inclusion in the AONB;
- whether there would be any significant effects on highway safety that could not be adequately addressed by conditions;
- and whether the area has a 5-year supply of housing land.

Reasons for decision

The principle of development

18. Although Woodcote is not one of the main locations in South Oxfordshire for housing development, a development on the limited scale now proposed would be in keeping with the village's role as a local service centre, as envisaged in Policy CSS1. The development would therefore not be in conflict with the overall planning strategy for the area, if only the appeal site came within the types of site permissible under Policies CSR1 and HS10.
19. However, the site is situated behind rather than within the existing developed frontage. It therefore cannot be a frontage gap, either small or otherwise. Nor is the site surrounded by buildings; indeed it currently has development only on one side, and although planning permission has recently been granted for a new dwelling on the Lovells/Conifers site, that would still only amount to one-and-a-half sides in total. And in addition, the proposed development would result in the outward expansion of the village's built-up area. The development would therefore not constitute infilling, within the terms set out in the CS and WNP. Furthermore, the site is not allocated for development, and the proposal is not in any way related to agricultural or other special needs. Consequently, the proposed development would not come within any of the categories allowed by Policies CSR1 or HS10.
20. As a result, the scheme conflicts with those policies, and also with LP Policies G2 and G4 which exist to control unnecessary development in the countryside.
21. I have some sympathy with the appellants' view that the appeal site is no less well located than many of those allocated in the WNP, and indeed it may be better than some. But the decisions on those sites have now been made, and the present appeal does not turn on a comparison with these or any other

sites. I must consider the appeal site on its own merits, against the policies that apply to unallocated sites.

22. I accept that the proposed development would be likely to have some benefits to the village's social and economic well-being, but this does not change the fact that the site is not in a policy-compliant location.
23. I conclude on this first issue that, as a matter of principle, the proposed development would conflict with the aims of the relevant policies governing the location of housing development in the district, and in particular Policies CSR1, HS10, G2 and G4.

Effects on the area's character and appearance

24. The landscape of the Chiltern escarpment in South Oxfordshire is described in the Character Assessment report⁶ as the most visually distinctive in the district, with gentle slopes and a mosaic of woodland, scrub and open grassland, which give it an intimate, enclosed character. The appeal site comprises an enclosed area of grass paddocks, bounded by woodland and a tree belt, and thus exhibits several of these characteristics. As such, it seems to me that the site represents a good example of the type of landscape that the AONB designation, and CS Policy CSEN1, are intended to recognise and protect.
25. The effect of the development would be to change the site from its present mainly undeveloped state, into a fully developed housing site with roads and buildings. This would mean the loss of those characteristics which best reflect the local landscape's prevailing character and distinctiveness. The effect would thus be damaging to the AONB, and to the character and appearance of the area generally.
26. It is true that the site is not particularly prominent. However, the proposed development would be clearly seen from the site entrance in Beech Lane, especially since, as was established at the site visit, the existing hedge alongside the access would have to be removed, and could not be replaced on land within the appellants' control. The development would also be visible from the attractive public footpath that runs just to the east, from Wood Lane to Lambourne's Wood. Both of these are public views of some significance. I agree that in these views, the site appears as a discrete, self-contained landscape compartment, rather than as part of a wider open landscape. But in this respect the site is typical of this part of the AONB. This reinforces my view that the impact on the AONB would be harmful.
27. I acknowledge that much the same could be said of some of the other housing developments planned in the WNP. But as I have already noted, such comparisons have little relevance to the present appeal. I accept that the character of the footpath from Wood Lane is almost certain to be changed by the development of WNP site 19, referred to as the 'smallholding site'. But that does not necessarily mean that the views from that path would become less important, or less vulnerable to the further adverse change that the present appeal proposal would bring.
28. I appreciate that the Chilterns Conservation Board declined to comment either on the planning application or on the appeal. The Board is a statutory consultee body with responsibility for the AONB's conservation and

⁶ The South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment (SOLA), 2003

enhancement, and had it chosen to comment, its views would undoubtedly have carried some weight. But its lack of comment cannot be interpreted as either approval or disapproval. And in any event, I must come to my own decision.

29. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not conserve or enhance the area's natural beauty, but would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the local landscape and on the setting of the village of Woodcote. As such, it would conflict with Policies CSEN1 of the CS and C4 of the LP, and also with the relevant provisions of CS Poly CSR1 relating to local character and distinctiveness.

Highway safety

30. Woodcote Parish Council draws my attention to the WNP's transport policies. Policy T1 states that proposals which would require new access points or generate traffic should demonstrate that they would not inhibit traffic flows or exacerbate parking stress, particularly around the junction of Beech Lane with Goring Road. Policy T5 states that developments in Beech Lane or Wood Lane will be required to contribute to safety improvements at the junction of those two roads. Policy T7 requires that all housing developments should provide new pedestrian footways where needed to link up with the existing network.
31. The appeal scheme provides no technical evidence on any of these matters, and the legal undertaking makes no provision for any financial contributions or off-site works. Contributions of the type that would be needed to comply with Policy T5 cannot be required by condition. The proposed scheme therefore does not demonstrate compliance with these WNP policies.
32. However, NPPF paragraph 32 requires that development should only be refused on transport grounds where the impact would be severe. Here, there is no evidence that any of the existing local roads are overloaded or dangerous, and from my own observations, there is nothing to suggest that this is the case. All of the roads concerned are minor roads, rural lanes, or residential streets, and at the times of my numerous informal and unaccompanied visits, which took place at differing times of the day and evening, traffic volumes and speeds throughout the village were generally low. I also note that there is no suggestion that the proposed development falls foul of any highway-related policies in the CS or LP. The Highway Authority has withdrawn its initial objection. Consequently, whilst I appreciate how sensitive traffic issues may be to local residents, objectively there is no evidence of any existing highway problems.
33. Furthermore, the appeal proposal is for only 10 dwellings, and consequently the likely traffic generation would be relatively small. In my view there is no reason to expect that a development on this scale would be likely to have any significant effects on traffic flows, pedestrian numbers, car parking, or safety. In these circumstances, it would not be reasonable to suggest that the proposed development's impact would be severe.
34. I also note that there is no longer any dispute that the widening of the access, and the provision of adequate visibility splays, could be achieved by conditions. In all the circumstances, I find no reason why the proposed development should have any significant effects on the highway network, or on highway safety. In my view these matters could all be dealt with by conditions.

Housing land supply

35. For the period 2006-27, the CS requires provision to be made for 11,487 dwellings. Of these, 6,300 are to be provided at Didcot, and 5,187 in the rest of the district (the RoD). Up to March 2015, the total number of completions in the RoD area was 2,236 dwellings, which was slightly ahead of the cumulative requirement for that date. The residual requirement for the period up to year 2027 was therefore 2,951 units, or 246 units per annum. Adding a 5% buffer, the overall requirement for the next 5-year period, 2015-20, is 1,291 units. Against this requirement, the Council claims a deliverable land supply in the RoD area with capacity for around 2,276 units, equivalent to 8.8 years' supply.
36. The appellants dispute the use of the CS housing policies as the basis for the land supply calculations. They point out that the CS was originally prepared more than four years ago, in the context of the former Regional Strategy (the South East Plan, or SEP), which has since been revoked. Much of the CS examination took place prior to the publication of the NPPF. Since the plan's adoption, a series of judgements in the Courts have highlighted the need for local plans to start from an objective assessment of full, unconstrained housing needs. In South Oxfordshire, more up-to-date evidence of need is now available in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in April 2014. Advice in the PPG (ID 3-030) warns that, even where there is an adopted local plan, if the plan is based on evidence that dates back several years, it may not adequately reflect current needs; and that where significant new evidence comes to light, such as in a housing needs assessment, this may outweigh the local plan.
37. I recognise the strength of these arguments. However, the CS is part of the statutory development plan, and its adoption is still relatively recent. Its examination was extended to allow the plan to be modified to take account of the NPPF, and the evidence put to the examining Inspector included up-to-date evidence on housing needs, against which to test the housing policy requirement figures. The revocation of the SEP was already well under way by then. The Inspector's report makes it clear that he was satisfied that the CS in its final version took account of these matters and was compliant with the NPPF. And although the new SHMA figures suggest that the full objectively assessed need is likely to exceed the CS provisions, the SHMA itself is as yet untested and unmoderated; essentially, it is only the first stage in the process towards formulating a new housing strategy, as part of the District's intended new local plan.
38. The PPG advice referred to above makes it clear that, except where a plan has become out-of-date, the housing figures in adopted plans should be given considerable weight. And whilst more recent evidence may also be considered, if that evidence has not been tested or moderated, the weight to be given to it should be tempered accordingly. The recent Ministerial letter⁷ makes it clear that the publication of a SHMA does not immediately or in itself invalidate the housing figures in existing local plans. In the light of this guidance, and all the evidence before me, it seems to me that in the particular circumstances of this case, the Council is justified in carrying out its 5-year supply calculations based on the adopted CS provisions, rather than the SHMA figures.

⁷ Letter from the Minister of State for Housing and Planning, dated 19 December 2014

39. Secondly, the appellants also dispute the Council's approach in basing their land supply calculations on just the RoD area, rather than South Oxfordshire as a whole. Again, this argument is not without merit. The NPPF's overarching aim for housing is to increase supply across the board, in order to meet needs and support economic recovery. At Didcot, housing delivery has lagged behind the required rate for that area, and when the whole District is looked at together, there has been a net shortfall to date. The Council's disaggregated approach could be seen as allowing that situation to continue.
40. However, it seems from the evidence before me that the circumstances relating to Didcot are rather unusual. On the one hand, Didcot is seen as the location best able to support the area's planned employment growth, based on the economic potential of the existing Milton Technology Park and the cluster of major research laboratories nearby, known as the 'Science Vale'. And on the other, the town is identified as needing what the CS refers to as transformational change in its infrastructure, facilities, and physical environment. In addition, there is the particular opportunity presented by the closure of one of the town's two power stations in 2013, and the possible closure of the other by 2023. In these circumstances, I see considerable force in the Council's argument, that if some of the housing planned for Didcot were siphoned off to other parts of the District, there is a danger that the much-needed regeneration would be fatally undermined.
41. And in any event, it is evident that Didcot's role as a growth point has always been intended to serve the needs of the wider sub-region, rather than just South Oxfordshire alone. Allowing this kind of planned growth to be replaced by scattered small developments in the rural parts of the District, and particularly in the AONB, would not serve that strategic purpose.
42. The emphasis in the NPPF (paragraph 47), and in the PPG (ID 3-007), is on relating housing provision to housing market areas. Such areas need not be the same as local authority districts. As far as I can see, nothing in either document rules out a disaggregated approach to the land supply calculation, and nothing prevents the 'ring-fencing' of the separate housing provisions for Didcot and the RoD. And furthermore, in the present case, the Council's approach is based directly on the policies of the adopted CS. In these circumstances, and particularly those specifically relating to South Oxfordshire, I consider that the Council has provided sufficient justification for the use of the disaggregated approach in the present appeal.
43. I appreciate that my conclusion on this issue of disaggregation is different from that reached by the inspector in the Thames Farm appeal. But there is also evidence regarding other appeals where different approaches have been taken. I acknowledge that the issue is finely balanced, and that there are reasonable arguments to be made on both sides. However, I must base my decision on the evidence and submissions presented to me in this appeal, and in the light of the circumstances that exist now. For the reasons explained above, I find the disaggregated approach acceptable in this case.
44. Although the appellants also dispute certain other aspects of the Council's methodology, including the size of the buffer, the timescale for making up any backlog, and the order in which these adjustments should be applied, these arguments are all predicated on the basis that housing provision should be measured either against the SHMA figures or on a district-wide basis.

Whereas, for the reasons given above I consider that the Council's approach, in using the CS figures and the RoD area, is acceptable. On this basis, there is no backlog, and no record of past under-delivery, and thus no reason to alter the buffer percentage. And whilst the appellants question the deliverability or delivery rates on some of the Council's supply sites, so far as the RoD area is concerned, those sites total around 600 units at most, which is not enough to change the final outcome. In any event, the appellants do not dispute⁸ that, if the Council's methodology is used, a 5-year supply has been demonstrated.

45. I accept that the Council's preferred methodology is not the only way that a 5-year land supply assessment could be carried out in this part of South Oxfordshire. The NPPF and PPG are not prescriptive, and the fact that I have found the Council's method to be acceptable does not necessarily mean that any other alternatives are wrong. But the requirement in NPPF paragraph 49 is simply that the local planning authority should be able to show a 5-year supply. In the present case, the Council has done that, and for the reasons that I have given, I find their assessment to be satisfactory. On that basis a 5-year supply has been adequately demonstrated.

Other matters

Local facilities

46. Woodcote has a good range of facilities for a village of its size, including a health centre, public library, and schools for all age groups up to age 16. There are also bus services from the village to several nearby towns, including Reading. These considerations count modestly in favour of the development, but they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the AONB, or the conflict with development plan policies.

The legal undertaking and planning obligations

47. The undertaking firstly secures the provision of four of the proposed new dwellings as affordable housing, including three for 'affordable rented' tenure and one for shared ownership. It is not disputed that the affordable housing would help to meet local needs, and I note that the level of provision and tenure mix accord with CS Policy CSH3. This is a potential benefit that carries some weight.
48. Secondly, the undertaking provides for financial contributions towards extensions and improvements to the village primary school and library. From the information provided, it appears that no other obligations have yet been entered into in respect of these projects, although other planned developments in Woodcote may be required to do so in the future. There is no dispute that these contributions are necessary to mitigate the proposed development's impacts on local infrastructure, or that they are directly and fairly related to the scheme. These items therefore meet all of the relevant tests under both Regulations 123 and 122 of the CIL Regulations, and I have taken them into account in my decision.
49. Thirdly, the undertaking requires payments in respect of street naming and numbering, and the provision of waste collection bins, and finally it includes provision for monitoring and administration fees. I appreciate that again these sums are not in dispute between the parties, but nonetheless, I am required to

⁸ As agreed by Mr Bolton, in answer to cross-examination

consider whether they meet the tests in the Regulations. In this case, whilst I acknowledge that street naming and waste bins need to be provided, and that Council services including monitoring need to be financed somehow, none of the evidence before me suggests that any of these items can properly be said to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They therefore do not meet the tests in Regulation 122, and I cannot take them into account. With regard to the monitoring and administration fees, I note that a similar view was reached in a recent High Court judgement⁹, but my decision is based on the facts of the present case and the evidence before me.

Other matters raised by Woodcote Parish Council

50. Representatives of the Parish Council raise a number of issues arising from other policies in the WNP (in addition to Policy HS10), including Policies HS1, H6, H7, and T8. However, with regard to HS1, although the appeal site is not one of the sites allocated for development, the policy is silent on the question of any other sites that may come forward, and no conflict therefore arises in this respect. The other policies cited relate to the desired mix of housing types and sizes, and to car parking. In the present case, all of these are reserved matters, and are therefore not for determination in this appeal.

Conclusions

51. Section 38(6) of the 1990 Act requires that the appeal be determined in accordance with the relevant development plan policies, unless outweighed by other material considerations. In the present case, because of its location outside the existing village, the proposed development conflicts with the relevant policies for housing in villages and in the countryside, including Policies CSR1, HS10, G2 and G4. And in addition, the scheme would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the AONB, and to the setting of the village, contrary to Policies CSEN1 and C4. These conflicts with development plan policies clearly weigh against the proposal.
52. On the other side of the equation, the proposed development would provide 10 new dwellings, including four affordable units, in a location reasonably well served by local facilities. This would be of some benefit, but since an adequate supply of housing land has been shown to exist already, that benefit would be relatively limited. None of the other considerations discussed above, including the lack of harm to highway safety, and the mitigation of the impacts on local schools and libraries, counts as anything more than neutral.
53. The balance that has to be drawn therefore is simply between a modest increase in the local housing stock, against the combined weight of the loss of countryside, plus the harm to the area's character and appearance, and the resulting policy conflicts. In this context, I note in particular that in AONBs, NPPF paragraph 115 requires that the conservation of the landscape should be given great weight. Overall, taking account of this and all the other considerations above, it is difficult to see any reasonable basis on which the planning balance in this case could be said to favour the appellant. On the contrary, it is clear to me that the harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits.

⁹ Oxfordshire County Council v SoS, Cala Management Ltd and others, [2015] EWHC 186 (Admin)

54. I have given full consideration to the NPPF's aim of encouraging sustainable development. But given the harm that I have identified, and especially the harm to the AONB, it seems to me that the development now proposed cannot properly be considered as sustainable. And in any event, the presumption in favour of such development, as set out in NPPF paragraph 14, does not apply in AONBs.
55. In the absence of a demonstrable housing shortfall, there is nothing to suggest that any of the relevant development plan policies are either out of date or inconsistent with national policy in any way. Had I come to a different view on the question of the 5-year supply, the Council's housing policies would then have had to be treated as out of date, but that would not necessarily have meant that those policies carried no weight. And in any event, other policies such as those relating to the AONB, would have been unaffected. For the avoidance of doubt, even if the housing supply had been only 2.1 – 2.4 years, as argued by the appellants, in my view the harm to the AONB would still have significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits of the housing provision.
56. I have considered all the other matters raised, but none alters the above conclusions. For the reasons set out in this decision, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Felgate

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Tom Cosgrove, of Counsel Instructed by Ms Margaret Reid, Head of Legal Services

He called:

Mr Mark Flood, Consultant, Insight Town Planning
BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Ms Beryl Guiver, Principal Planning Officer
MSc DipTP MRTPI

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr David Denham, Jumquest Ltd
BSC DipTP FRICS MRTPI

He called:

Mr Roland Bolton, DLP Planning
BSc(Hons) MRTPI

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Malcolm Smith	Woodcote Parish Council
Ms Catherine Hall	Architect (on behalf of Mr & Mrs Stacey, adjoining land owners)
Cllr Bob Lewin	Woodcote Parish Council
Mr Jerry Green	Local resident and member of the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Cllr Dr Geoffrey Botting	Vice-Chairman, Woodcote Parish Council
Cllr Robin Pierce	Chairman, Woodcote Parish Council
Ms Judith Coates	Planning Officer, Oxfordshire County Council

DOCUMENTS

THE APPELLANTS

AP-1	Design and Access Statement
AP-2	Ecological Survey report
AP-3	Housing land supply report and appendices, in 4 volumes, dated July 2014
AP-4	Grounds of Appeal
AP-5	Comments on 5-year land supply, submitted 23 Sept 2014
AP-6	Comments on consultee responses, submitted 23 Sept 2014
AP-7	Mr Denham's proof and appendices
AP-8	Mr Denham's addendum; and appeal decision relating to the 'Conifers' site
AP-9	Mr Bolton's proof and 2 volumes of appendices
AP-10	Mr Bolton's revised Tables 15, 19 and 20
AP-11	Unilateral undertaking dated 10 April 2015
AP-12	Final submissions by Mr Denham
AP-13	Final written submissions by Mr Bolton

THE COUNCIL

CO-1	Mr Flood's proof and volume of appendices
CO-2	Ms Guiver's proof and appendices numbered 1-13
CO-3	Position Statement dated 11 March 2015
CO-4	Additional information on housing land supply, dated 17 April 2015 (tabled by Ms Guiver)
CO-5	Amendment to Ms Guiver's proof – para 3.1
CU-6	SOLA Fig 15.1: landscape types
CO-7	Extract from GVLVIA 3 rd Edition
CO-8	Briefing note on RR6 - contributions
CO-9	Statement of justification for planning obligations - Oxfordshire County Council
CO-10	Note by Mr Howard Cox re monitoring and admin fees
CO-11	Explanation of Oxfordshire County Council contribution requests
CO-12	Contribution request spreadsheet
CO-13	Primary schools – location map
CO-14	Proposed draft conditions
CO-15	Additional proposed draft condition – No.15
CO-16	Phides Estates (Overseas) Ltd v SoS: [2015] EWHC 827 (Admin)
CO-17	Closing submissions by Mr Cosgrove

OTHER PARTIES

OP-1	Letter from Cllr Pierce, dated 22 April 2015 (requesting to speak)
OP-2	Proof of evidence by Cllr Dr Botting, on behalf of Woodcote Parish Council, with appendices A-N; and bundle of supporting documents A-F
OP-3	Email from Chilterns Conservation Board, dated 24 Feb 2015 (tabled by Cllr Botting)
OP-4	Survey plan of access area, tabled by Mrs Hall

JOINTLY AGREED DOCUMENTS

J-1	General Statement of Common Ground, dated March 2015
J-2	Statement of Common Ground - housing land supply, dated March 2015

GENERAL DOCUMENTS

G-1	Notification letters regarding the appeal, dated 13 August and 3 December 2014, and 19 March 2015
-----	---