



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 27, 28, 29 and 30 January 2015

Site visit made on 3 February 2015

by C Sproule BSc MSc MSc MRTPI MIEEnvSc CEnv

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

Decision date: 26 June 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Z2830/A/14/2224285

Land east of Poundfield Road, Potterspurty

- 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 Mr Jonathan Wood, Redrow Homes South Midlands against the decision of South Northamptonshire Council.
 - The application Ref S/2014/0390/MAO, dated 14 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2014.
 - The development proposed is outline planning application with means of site access from Poundfield Road to be determined (internal access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval) for the erection of up to 65 dwellings (Class C3); demolition of existing buildings; associated earthworks; retention of existing allotments and access thereto; provision of new public open space; balancing ponds; pumping station; car parking and all other ancillary and enabling works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. Following closure of the inquiry, the Government released the 2012-based household projections for England, 2012 to 2037. Both main parties were provided with the opportunity to comment on the implications of this for their cases.
3. The transitional period under Statutory Instrument 2010 No.948 – *The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010* ('the CIL Regulations') Regulation 123 (3) (as amended) ended on 6 April 2015. After this, planning obligations under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 may not lawfully be used to fund infrastructure which could be funded from Community Infrastructure Levy, and five or more separate planning obligations have been entered into within the area of the charging authority for that project. The main parties were also provided with an opportunity to comment on the implications of this for planning obligations in this case.
4. The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the main parties confirms that the appeal is to be determined on the basis of the following plans: Site Location Plan – Ref: 13128 (D) 098; Illustrative Framework Plan – Ref: 13128 (D) Rev. B; and, Proposed Site Access – Ref: 102016/1000 Rev. C.

Background and Main Issues

5. The Council's decision was made with reference to adopted policies within the South Northamptonshire Local Plan and 'emerging policies' of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The appeal is dated 21 August 2014, which is between the Council's decision on the application and the adoption of the JCS on 15 December 2014.
6. A proof of evidence addressing housing trajectory analysis had been supplied by Mr Hegan of Turner Morum Chartered Surveyors (TM) in support of the appellant's case. A trajectory was agreed prior to the opening of the inquiry that resulted in Inquiry document 2 (ID-2), and therefore Mr Hegan was not called to give evidence.
7. Based on the Council's reasons for refusal, and Section 7 of the SoCG 'Matters in Dispute', the main issues are considered to be: a) the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the village and the locality; b) whether the proposed development would accord with development plan and national policies regarding the provision of land for housing; c) whether the proposed development would make adequate provision for education infrastructure, affordable housing, Public Open Space (including play space and public open space maintenance), library infrastructure, refuse/recycling infrastructure, Fire and Rescue, and healthcare infrastructure; and, d) whether the appeal scheme would be a sustainable form of development.

Reasons

Character and appearance

Policy

8. JCS Policy S1 addresses the distribution of development, with criterion D) noting that new development in rural areas will be limited with the emphasis being on matters that include enhancing and maintaining the distinctive character and vitality of rural communities. JCS Policy H1 is titled *housing density and mix and type of dwellings* noting that, amongst other things, housing developments will be expected to make the most efficient use of land having regard to matters including the location and setting of the site, and the existing character and density of the local area. Criteria within JCS Policy R1, titled *spatial strategy for the rural areas*, include those that require residential development in rural areas to: not affect open land which is of particular significance to the form and character of the village; be of an appropriate scale to the existing settlement; and, be within the exiting confines of the village.
9. Policy EV1 of the South Northamptonshire Local Plan – Saved Policies – September 2007 (LP) indicates that development proposals will be expected to pay particular attention to elements of design that include, amongst other criteria that would be of relevance to reserved matters: existing site characteristics including landscape features and levels; and, the relationship with adjoining land and buildings. LP Policy G3 states that all proposals for development will be considered against the policy, which is permissive of a proposal, that amongst other things: is compatible with the existing character of the locality in terms of type, scale, siting and design; and, possesses a satisfactory means of access. LP Policy EV21 states that development

proposals will be expected to retain or replace trees, hedgerows and other landscape features that contribute to local character.

10. It is a clear objective of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') to boost significantly the supply of housing, with paragraph 49 of the document stating *Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development*. Paragraph 14 of the Framework confirms the presumption in favour of sustainable development to be at the heart of the guidance. For decision-taking, the paragraph notes the presumption to mean: approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and, where the development plan is absent, silent or out-of-date, granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies of the Framework indicate that development should be restricted.
11. Framework paragraph 56 states that *The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people*.

The locality

12. Potterspury lies immediately to the north of Watling Street ('the A5') and approximately 1 mile to the northwest of the roundabout junction with the A508 and Old Stratford to the south of the roundabout. Stony Stratford and Milton Keynes are to the southeast of this. From the roundabout at Old Stratford, the A508 carries traffic northwards to the M1 motorway and Northampton beyond. This journey can also be made by travelling along the A5 north westwards approximately 6 miles to Towcester and then via other highways to Northampton.
13. Despite the scale of Milton Keynes, Potterspury and the nearby villages of Deanshanger to the south and Yardley Gobion to the north are surrounded by gently rolling open countryside that clearly separates them from Old Stratford, Stony Stratford and Milton Keynes.¹
14. Development in Potterspury has occurred up to the boundary created by the A5, which provides the settlement with a somewhat elongated form along the northern side of the A5. Street lighting is present along the A5 next to Potterspury, which adds to the urbanising influence of the development immediately to the north of the highway. During night-time darkness the street lighting emphasises the presence of existing development at Potterspury, and especially as the open countryside on the southern side of the highway cannot be seen to its full extent.
15. The 4.07 ha appeal site is for the most part an area of paddocks to the east of Poundfield Road, with a number of allotments in the north western corner of the site next to Poundfield Road. This places the proposed development on the south eastern edge of the village on land that the Council notes the LP to have designated as open countryside.²

¹ LVIA Figure 2 shows this to be within County Landscape Character Area 6: Undulating Claylands

² Paragraph 5.4 of Mr Bennett's proof of evidence

16. There is development to the north of the appeal site between it and Furtho Lane. Recently developed affordable homes in Drovers Way occupy a rural exception site that has extended the scale of the built area to the east of Poundfield Road.³
17. Attention has also been drawn to a recently constructed two storey house at Swallow Fields Stud.⁴ However, in contrast to Drovers Way the house at Swallow Fields Stud has clear separation from the settlement and a rural context within the stables complex.
18. Recent residential development at Mansion Gardens now occupies the land to the west of Poundfield Road. It currently provides a clear edge to the village opposite to where the proposed entrance into the appeal scheme would be. This perceived limit to existing development within the village is emphasised by the presence of walling along the (western) side of Poundfield Road, along with the height and density of vegetation on the eastern side of the highway.
19. However, that walling extends up to the junction with Furtho Lane, which has established residential development on the eastern side of Poundfield Road. This includes Grafton Close, which abuts the much more recent development in Drovers Way. Potterspurty Village Hall also lies to the east of the junction with High Street. As Poundfield Road becomes Church End, housing with mature gardens is present to the north of the village hall. These dwellings are of sufficient age for them to have developed a degree of variety that could be described as residential 'patina'. They are to the east of the highway with boundary walling on the opposite (western) side of Church End.
20. This development to the east of Church End and Poundfield Road, is to the north of the open land that includes the appeal site. Vegetation screens views of the appeal site along much of Poundfield Road, and the land is set well back from the public right of way along Furtho Lane.⁵ Even so, there are opportunities for people travelling northwards along Poundfield Road from its junction with the A5 to see the open countryside that includes the appeal site. Topography and field boundaries cause the rural landscape to dominate these views, rather than development in Drovers Way and Grafton Close. Consequently, while the appellant considers these developments to form an 'unsympathetic and abrupt edge' to the village, it is not one that is prominent in these views.
21. Nor did I find the influence of Whitestone Stables on the 'sense of arrival' at the village in near views of the appeal site from Poundfield Road to be as significant as suggested.⁶ If the proposed development were to be built, the field that provides views past Whitestone Stables to the appeal site would remain. Planting to reinforce the existing hedgerows, and accordingly the field pattern at the site boundary, would mature over time reducing the views of the housing beyond it. Even so, the development of the appeal site would be evident in views from the entrance to the village on Poundfield Road.

³ Paragraph 5.9 of Mr Bennett's proof of evidence

⁴ Paragraph 2.35 of Mr Chard's proof of evidence and ID-10

⁵ Bridleway RV5

⁶ Paragraphs 2.3 and 2.38 of Mr Chard's proof of evidence

22. The Village Design Statement does not include this aspect as a 'view', but it does highlight the importance of the walls along Poundfield Road, Church End and other locations within the village.⁷
23. In 2008, the Inspector considering the appeal in relation to proposals for the Mansion Gardens development commented on the 'clear visual edge' provided by the existing wall and footway along the west side of Poundfield Road.⁸ This is the case at Mansion gardens, but the established character of the village also includes development beyond this walling at the northern end of Poundfield Road, and on Church End, where development extends eastwards beyond these features.

The proposal

24. It is the intention within the appeal scheme to reinforce existing planting along the eastern side of Poundfield Road. A suggested condition would require reserved matters to be submitted 'in general accordance with the principles set out on the Framework Plan (Drawing No: 13128 (D) 100 Rev.B) and the measures set out in Section 6.0' of the Design, Access and Justification Statement.⁹ Drawing No: 13128 (D) 100 Rev.B identifies the 'Buffer planting' along the street frontage and around the remainder of the site perimeter.
25. Once mature, this landscaping reasonably would be expected to substantially screen the development during summer months, with the proposed dwellings becoming more apparent in the absence of (what would be characteristic) deciduous foliage. This would help to retain the existing sylvan character along the eastern side of Poundfield Road. Even so, for the most part the proposed scale and depth of perimeter landscaping would visually separate the development from the remainder of the village, including the dwellings in Grafton Close, Drovers Way and Mansion Gardens.¹⁰
26. The appeal proposal would construct a new access onto Poundfield Road in the vicinity of the junction with Mansion Gardens. Views from this entrance into the appeal scheme would reveal the extent of the development, but the application's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) concludes that '*...views of Proposed Development would be largely restricted in all but the most immediate views...*'.¹¹ There are dwellings in the village positioned behind dense landscaping that restricts views of them, but it is not evident that this is a characteristic of the larger residential developments in the village.
27. Development at the junction of Poundfield Road and Furtho Lane reflects that along the eastern side of Church End and is an established part of the street scene in the vicinity of the village hall. This frontage development extends from the junction along Furtho Lane and into Grafton Close and Drovers Way. It results in a characteristic integration of residential development with the village's street scene. This is also apparent at Meadow View, and at Mansion Gardens which is readily apparent even though it is partly behind the consistent boundary provided by the wall along Poundfield Road.

⁷ CD-G.13

⁸ CD-H.1 – Paragraph 13 of appeal decision ref: APP/Z2830/A/08/2079946

⁹ Additional suggested conditions are within ID-27

¹⁰ Drawing provided at CD-C.1

¹¹ Paragraph 7.5 of the LVIA – section 13 of the planning application documents

28. The village boundary is set out on the LP Proposals map which dates from 1997, but the extent of the village now includes Mansion Gardens and Drovers Way.¹² It would appear that any additional housing in Potterspurty of the scale proposed would require the expansion of the built area beyond the current extent of the village. Even so, other locations around the village may not be as apparent within their landscape setting.
29. It is suggested that the stable blocks and paddocks, along with the allotment car park and sheds, are distracting features in this landscape. The relevant National Landscape Character Area 88 Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire Claylands notes paddocks to often be found on the edge of settlements and the appeal site is an example of this. While they are not agricultural land, they have similarities to farmland due to their open appearance, and provide a transition from the built extent of the village to purely agricultural land.¹³
30. Potterspurty sits within open countryside that has sections of Special Landscape Area, other villages and associated infrastructure. This, along with the degree of separation from the large settlement areas to the south east, indicate that describing the appeal site as an edge of village location within a rural landscape more effectively conveys its context than the term 'urban fringe'.
31. Equestrian facilities often erode agricultural character, but they are not features so 'incongruous', 'detracting' or 'piecemeal' in this rural landscape,¹⁴ that their presence affects local character in a manner similar to the presence of houses, even if the proposed development were to reflect existing housing next to it. Nor does a reduction in tranquillity due to the proximity of traffic on the A5 cause this edge of settlement landscape to have less value as open countryside.
32. Reinforcing hedgerows around the north, east and southern boundaries of the appeal site to provide a 'strong' and 'coherent' edge to the settlement, would do so at the expense of the existing rural character that these field boundaries and the openness within them currently contribute to. Nor would the reinforced hedges provide an edge to the settlement with the strength of the linear highway and associated stone walling at Mansion Gardens. This would be the case even if the access into the current proposal were to reflect themes in the entrance to Mansion Gardens.
33. The proposed development would encroach on land that currently contributes to the rural undulating character of the open countryside in this location. Proposed planting around the appeal site would, to a certain extent, screen the proposed housing in views from Furtho Lane and on the approach from the A5 junction with Poundfield Road. However, in the absence of characteristic deciduous foliage the appeal scheme would be apparent to people approaching the village from the south and east. In this respect, and even though the Village Design Statement does not highlight this as an important view, the appeal scheme would erode the rural setting of the village.
34. To some extent the second pedestrian access into the site, which would be in the area of the allotments, would increase permeability within the settlement. Nevertheless, the strength of the landscaped frontage¹⁵ would depart from the

¹² Paragraph 2.19 of Mr Chard's proof of evidence, and shown on the Site Context Plan at CD-A.13

¹³ Which Mr Bennett suggests in paragraph 5.6 of his proof of evidence

¹⁴ Paragraph 5.9 of Mr Chard's proof of evidence

¹⁵ That is currently 5m wide (paragraph 4.7 of Mr Chard's proof of evidence) with tall/full height vegetation

established character of residential developments within the village, and given its location, the departure would be very conspicuous. The scale of landscaping within the development is, in many respects, a separate matter.¹⁶ The sylvan frontage may reflect the extent of landscaping within the development, but not all of that landscaping would be as tall or as deep as that proposed along the site frontage. As a visual barrier, the reinforced vegetative boundary along Poundfield Road would cause the development to relate poorly to the village and be isolated from it.¹⁷

35. Recent developments at Mansion Gardens and within Drovers Way have caused Potterspurty to grow, but the scale, location and nature of that growth appears to have reinforced the character of the village. The appeal scheme would increase the number of households in Potterspurty by nearly 10%.¹⁸ This level of growth, within the context of the characteristic development at Mansion Gardens and Drovers Way, would not be sufficient to change local character in regard to the overall scale of the village.
36. No conflict or deficiency has been suggested,¹⁹ or shown to have occurred, in relation to LP Policy EV29, which addresses the requirements of a landscaping scheme.
37. The reasoned justification for JCS Policy R1 within JCS paragraph 16.9 is explicit that the village confines within LP Policy H5, and as shown on associated LP mapping, continue to apply in the interim between JCS adoption and the Part 2 Local Plan. Policies listed in JCS Appendix 5 as having been replaced by JCS policies do not include LP Policy H5 and consequently, the village confines for Potterspurty remain part of the development plan for this area.
38. The appeal scheme would be beyond the existing boundary of the village and it would affect land that is of particular significance to the form and character of the settlement at the southern entrance to the settlement. In these respects the appeal scheme would conflict with JCS Policy R1 if no exceptional circumstances are shown to exist.
39. In addition, the manner in which the appeal scheme would retain trees and hedgerows that contribute to the character of the area, which is the subject of LP Policies EV21 and EV1(I), the proposal would create residential development with an interface to the village that would not be compatible with the existing character of the locality and in this respect would conflict with LP Policy G3. It would fail to pay particular attention to the characteristic relationship of housing development in the village with adjoining land and buildings, and in this respect conflicts with LP Policy EV1(II). By failing to enhance or maintain this distinctive characteristic of residential developments within the village, the proposal conflicts with JCS Policy S1 D) 1); and by failing to have adequate regard to the location and setting of the site and the existing character of the locality, the appeal scheme conflicts with JCS Policy H1 a) and b). Accordingly, the outline scheme would not be an example of good design and in this respect conflicts with the Framework.

¹⁶ Appendix 5 to Mrs Ventham's proof of evidence indicates soft landscaping, including gardens, would be in the region of 2.05ha, or 50.4% of the site area

¹⁷ Even though there is a stated intention to draw people into the development through the main access from Poundfield Road

¹⁸ Paragraph 5.8 of Mr Bennett's proof of evidence

¹⁹ Including in regard to species of trees and shrubs native to Northamptonshire

Housing

40. The Council's first reason for refusal refers to both 'saved' LP Policy G2 and 'emerging' JCS Policy S1. JCS Appendix 5 notes LP Policy G2 to have been replaced by JCS Policy S1, which seeks the distribution of development and economic activity to be: A) concentrated primarily in and adjoining the principal urban area of Northampton; B) development of a lesser scale to be located in and around the sub-regional centre of Daventry town; C) the development needs of the rural service centres of Towcester and Brackley to be provided for; and, D) new development in the rural areas to be limited with the emphasis on four criteria, of which, criterion D) 1) is addressed above.
41. LP Policy H6 is not normally permissive of residential development in the open countryside, except where certain criteria are met in regard to matters that include dwellings associated with particular rural businesses or special needs, or the conversion or replacement of a dwelling. LP Policy EV2 is not permissive of development in the countryside unless exceptionally it would be for particular purposes similar to those stated in LP Policy H6 or particular sites. The appeal site is not one of the 'particular sites', nor would the proposed housing seek to address particular rural businesses, or involve conversion or replacement of existing dwellings. Accordingly, the appeal proposal conflicts with LP Policies EV2 and H6.
42. The LP was intended to cover the period until 2006.²⁰ Immediately prior to the start of this inquiry, an Inspector determining a nearby appeal came to clear conclusions regarding LP policies that include EV2 and H6.²¹ Those conclusions were that: it would appear the manner in which LP Policies EV2 and H6 seek to prevent development in the countryside could cause conflict with them to be easily outweighed by other considerations, such as the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the Framework; but JCS Policy R1, in common with other JCS policies, has recently been found sound, and is only permissive of residential development outside the confines of a village in certain circumstances. Following consideration of the evidence in this case, and the Framework, I see no reason to disagree with the Inspector's reasoning and conclusions in regard to LP Policies EV2 and H6 and JCS Policy R1.²²
43. Framework paragraph 47 is clear that national planning policy seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Paragraph 49 of the Framework confirms that housing applications should be considered within the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that 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.
44. The appellant highlights three 'requirements' of the bullet points within paragraph 47, which are that a local planning authority should: firstly, use its evidence base to ensure that the Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for housing in the market area, as far as consistent with the Framework; secondly, identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against its housing requirement with an additional buffer to provide a realistic prospect of

²⁰ Paragraphs 5.55 and 5.56 of Mrs Ventham's proof of evidence

²¹ CD-H.11 - Appeal ref: APP/Z2830/A/14/2216712 - Land off Grays Lane, Paulerspury, Towcester NN12 7NW including paragraphs 76-80

²² Conflict with JCS Policy R1 has been identified above in relation to the first main issue

- achieving planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land;²³ and thirdly, for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period and set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing describing how it will maintain delivery of a five-year supply of housing land to meet its housing target.
45. JCS Policy S3 addresses the *Scale and Distribution of Housing Development*. It states that: provision will be made for about 42,620 net additional dwellings in the plan area during the plan period 2011 to 2029; this provision is to be distributed 12,730, 18,870 and 11,020 between Daventry District, Northampton Borough and South Northamptonshire District Councils respectively. Just as the provision is expressed in mandatory terms by '*...provision will be made...*', the policy then subdivides these figures and again expresses this in mandatory terms as '*...Below the Borough and District level housing development will be distributed in the following way...*'. For the South Northamptonshire District Council area the provision is split between Brackley Town - about 2,160, Towcester Town - about 2,650, South Northants Rural Areas - about 2,360, and the Northampton Related Development Area (NRDA) - about 3,850.
46. JCS Policy S3 clearly contains three sets of figures (with the first 'set' just containing the '42,620'), and in doing so has addressed the housing market area, the duty to co-operate and spatial distribution. The appellant has focussed on the overall figure of about 11,020 for the South Northamptonshire District Council ('the Council') area,²⁴ but there is nothing in the wording of the policy to suggest that one set of figures is more important than another. Each figure is prefixed by 'about', and each of the three sets is prefixed by 'will be', therefore expressing in mandatory terms what the policy requires to be done.
47. Supporting text to JCS Policy S3 is within JCS paragraph 5.22 to 5.38. These set out the basis for the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) and its adjustment to become the (higher) delivery figures with the spatial distribution set out within JCS Policy S3. The OAHN figure for the JCS area has not been placed within an adopted policy, but it is nonetheless clearly stated to be 41,760.²⁵ Then following this, JCS Table 3 addresses the proposed delivery of housing within the plan, that is, what the JCS seeks to plan for and provide beyond its OAHN requirement, which is the subject of JCS Policy S3.
48. The 41,760 figure was inserted by the Examining Inspector as part of Main Modification 4, which addressed the reasoned justification for JCS Policy S3 between JCS (published) paragraphs 5.22 and 5.38, and inserted 'new' Tables 1-4. Both Tables 1 and 2 have titles that include *Objectively Assessed Housing Need*, and they are the Tables inserted by the Examining Inspector, as are Tables 3 and 4 which have titles that only refer to 'Delivery'. This Main Modification resulted from the Inspector's consideration of the JCS within the context of the evidence, the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance ('the Practice Guidance').

²³ An additional buffer of 5%, or 20% where there has been a record of persistent under delivery, moved forward from later in the plan period

²⁴ For example, paragraph 7.5 of Mrs Ventham's proof of evidence

²⁵ JCS Tables 1 and 2 and paragraph 5.29

49. Since 1992 it has been recognised that Northampton is unable to accommodate its own housing needs.²⁶ This is reflected in adopted planning policy, such as JCS Policy S3, which draws a distinction between the NRDA and the parts South Northamptonshire outside it.²⁷ The appeal decisions or High Court judgements referred to by the appellant have not found this approach to be inappropriate.²⁸
50. JCS Policy H1 is addressed above in relation to the first main issue. The policy also seeks to ensure that housing developments make the most efficient use of land through criteria that expect consideration to be given to, amongst other things, accessibility to services and facilities, and proximity to public transport routes.
51. Paragraph 6.3 of the SoCG confirms that the main parties agree: the relevant period for the consideration of the five year housing land supply is 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2019; it is appropriate to apply a 20% buffer;²⁹ and, it is appropriate to use the Sedgefield method to deal with any existing shortfall.
52. Paragraph 3-045-20141006 of the Practice Guidance states that local authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) to assess their full housing needs, and that assessing need is only the first stage in developing a Local Plan. Once need has been assessed, a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is necessary to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet identified housing need.
53. Whether a site would be 'deliverable' in years 1-5, or 'developable' in years 6-10 (or possibly in years 11-15) is the subject of the Practice Guidance³⁰, and paragraph 47 and Footnotes 11 and 12 of the Framework. For a site to be deliverable, it should be available now, be a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.
54. PPG is clear that '*...Considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light...*'.³¹
55. The JCS Examination Inspector's report confirms the '*net new housing requirement*' to be 41,760. It then addresses the justification for the overall JCS housing delivery of 42,620, and notes that it had been adjusted in accordance with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The report also concluded that the figure would boost significantly new housing delivery and that, along with Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) allocations, it would provide a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing land.³²
56. The appellant has sought to draw to support for its case from paragraphs 36 to 38 of the Examination Inspector's report, and the Examining Inspector's reference to taking *into account current market conditions* is noted. However,

²⁶ JCS paragraph 5.27

²⁷ The boundary of the NRDA is shown on JCS Figure 5, to which JCS Policy S4 refers, and Figure 4

²⁸ Paragraph 2.1 of Mr D'Arcy's Rebuttal Evidence

²⁹ In relation to paragraph 47 of the Framework

³⁰ Ref: ID 3-029-20140306

³¹ PPG Ref ID 3-030-20140306

³² Paragraphs 36 and 38-43 of CD-G.15

the wording of the JCS, for the most part, is specific. It draws a clear distinction between 'need' and 'delivery', not only in the supporting text to JCS Policy S3 which includes the OAHN 'requirement',³³ but also, for example, in Table 5 and paragraph 5.42 which confirms the 5 year housing land supply is to be calculated in regard to the 'need' figure, but that sufficient planning permissions will be granted to meet the planned 'delivery' within JCS Policy S3.³⁴

57. Then the Examination Inspector considered the distribution of housing within the proposed JCS policies and concluded that: the balance of housing between Northampton and Brackley, Daventry and Towcester is appropriate; the balance between the SUEs and rural areas is appropriate; that this had been borne out by Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment work; and, the same would not apply to a more dispersed pattern of new housing growth, incorporating smaller scale schemes at less significant settlements. In doing so, the Examination Inspector's conclusions set the JCS planned scale and distribution of the housing within the context of delivering sustainable development.³⁵

Annualised or Trajectory Approach

58. JCS Appendix 3 provides the proposed housing trajectory for West Northamptonshire, which includes the housing need and delivery between 2011 and 2029. The reasoned justification for JCS Policy S3 at paragraph 5.30 explains the trajectory to have taken into consideration market factors and shows a rapid increase in housing completions based on existing commitments and development of the SUEs. The appellant considers the housing target should be annualised over the plan period.³⁶
59. In paragraph 42 of the Report the Inspector states '*...Overall, and taking into account all the available evidence, statements and submissions, I conclude that, as modified, the plan is based on an objective assessment of housing need in the area to 2029, taking account of reasonable population and household projections, having regard to all relevant local factors, including current market conditions in the area. The modified new housing total, extended plan period and revised housing trajectory represent a reasonable and realistic, deliverable and justified, basis for meeting local needs over the plan period. This incorporates provision for the needs of the existing local population, including in respect of affordable housing...'*
60. Paragraph 199 of the Examination Inspector's report directly addresses the use of a housing trajectory, and is explicit that it is appropriate in a JCS area with housing targets that will require double digit percentage increases in delivery in future years. Also, the trajectory does not set a limit or cap to the delivery of housing, and unallocated sites are noted to provide a means to contributing to non-delivery of some strategic sites.
61. I have found nothing within the Examination Inspector's Report and Non-Technical Summary that suggests the Inspector regarded the housing trajectory as anything other than the identified housing delivery set out in JCS Policy S3, that consequently has an important role in the monitoring of the

³³ Which was the subject of the Examining Inspector's Main Modification 4

³⁴ The text of published JCS paragraph 5.42 was the subject of the Examining Inspector's Main Modification 9

³⁵ Paragraphs 44 and 45 of CD-G.15

³⁶ Paragraph 7.8 of Mrs Ventham's proof of evidence

- plan. The Inspector's conclusions resulted from his consideration of the JCS evidence base, including matters highlighted within paragraph 42 of his report and as updated during the Examination.
62. The evidence base for the updated position and adopted JCS includes the *Housing Technical Paper Second Update*.³⁷ This resulted in the JCS paragraph 5.31 explanation of why the proposed housing numbers are greater than the need in the Council's area and the matters that led to the higher delivery figures.³⁸ The *Housing Technical Paper Second Update* also explains how the OAHN proceeded beyond the household projections 'starting point' to take account of local factors.
63. JCS paragraphs 5.40 further emphasises why the adopted plan is based on a trajectory, and is to be preferred to an annualised approach. This, and subsequent text, is supporting text to JCS Policy S6 which deals with monitoring and review, but the trajectory is introduced through JCS paragraph 5.30 in relation to the housing delivery within JCS Policy S3.
64. A degree of flexibility results from the use of a trajectory,³⁹ but the overall requirement for the Council and its areas remains as stated in Tables 1 and 2 of the JCS, with the housing delivery set out in JCS Policy S3. Use of a housing trajectory is consistent with Framework paragraph 47 which explicitly recognises the role of a trajectory to illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery. The JCS trajectory is a planned approach that recognises the hurdles which need to be overcome to deliver the strategy within the JCS, and is appropriate within the context of the JCS when read as a whole.
65. In contrast, and the occasional references to annualised figures within the JCS are noted,⁴⁰ there is no persuasive evidence to suggest that the JCS would support the use of an annualised approach to the consideration of the delivery within JCS Policy S3.
66. The increasing rate of delivery described by the trajectory signals the possibility that market capacity could restrict the objectives of the JCS. The agreed trajectory within ID-2 addresses the deliverability of various sites, and therefore the likely overall capacity of the housing market in particular towns. Delivery rates of 121, 406, 596, 630 and 602 have been agreed for the Council's area in the years 2014/15 to 2018/19. The agreed trajectory includes rates well above the 498 in 2001/02, which the appellant indicates to be the previous peak year without 'recessionary' constraint.⁴¹
67. With this background, Mr Quelch addressed the market capacity of Towcester and Brackley, which given the employment patterns in the area would be expected to compete against each other and the relevant SUEs. There is no doubt that the appellant's evidence on this matter drew on considerable experience, which includes marketing new houses in the locality since 2011 and dealing with a development in Greens Norton
68. However, the Council highlights that the appellant's evidence on this matter: relies on experience that appears somewhat limited in regard to the specific

³⁷ CD-G.17 – Housing Technical Paper Second Update

³⁸ Although Appendix B to the *Housing Technical Paper Second Update* places this difference within the context of an analysis of site delivery

³⁹ Paragraph 199 of the JCS Examination Inspector's report

⁴⁰ For example, JCS paragraph 5.29

⁴¹ Paragraph 3.11 of Mr Hegan's proof of evidence

markets in Towcester and Brackley; and, failed to recognise the delivery of 627 dwellings in the Grange Park SUE during 2002/03, and over 250 units in each of the next two years.⁴² Grange Park is very close to the jobs and services in Northampton, and associated transport links. While Towcester and Brackley do not have a railway station, they would nonetheless be expected to be attractive to potential residents for other reasons, such as, their relative smaller scale as settlements.

69. The only current and direct evidence to the inquiry on market capacity was that of Mr Quelch. Nevertheless, the inquiry also has written evidence from 2013 in regard to potential delivery rates of 180 to 200 units in the Brackley market.⁴³ In addition, the Council has provided its understanding of developer expectations for delivery in Towcester which includes, for example, the Towcester South SUE at 150 units per annum during the period of the plan (and similar information has been supplied for Brackley). The Towcester South SUE exceeds the appellant's expectation of a maximum of 120 dwellings per annum for delivery and market capacity in Towcester.⁴⁴
70. Evidence indicates that the planned rates of delivery will challenge the housing market. That is to be expected when the supply of housing is boosted significantly within the context of the Framework and the JCS. However, it has not been shown that market capacity will be exceeded to impact significantly on the Council's forecast delivery rates.⁴⁵

The addition of the 20% buffer

71. It is agreed that an additional 20% buffer should be applied to the 5 year housing land supply. However, the main parties disagree on whether it should be applied to the shortfall, and a number of appeal decisions have been referred to that have contrasting conclusions on this matter.⁴⁶
72. Framework paragraph 47 refers to the 'buffer' in relation to bringing forward the supply of land, rather than housing requirement. As a consequence, it cannot result in double counting in regard to its application to a shortfall of unmet housing need/(requirement),⁴⁷ nor would it result in an increase in the total housing requirement over the lifetime of the plan.
73. Within the context of boosting significantly the supply of housing, paragraph 47 confirms the addition of a 20% buffer is to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. By adding the buffer to both the shortfall and the requirement, the appellant's method would do this and is the preferred approach.

⁴² Appendix 32 to Mr D'Arcy's proof of evidence

⁴³ Macintyres' letter in Appendix 17 to Mr D'Arcy's proof of evidence

⁴⁴ Pages 19 and 20 (and 21 to 24) of D'Arcy's proof of evidence; and, paragraph 4.11 of Mr Quelch's proof of evidence

⁴⁵ A matter also considered by the JCS Examining Inspector at paragraphs 18-20 of CD-G.15

⁴⁶ Including appeal refs: APP/H1840/A/13/2199085 & 2199426, APP/M1520/A/12/2177157 and APP/R3325/A/13/2210545

⁴⁷ Or in applying the 'Sedgefield method' to a current requirement, dealing with previous under-delivery

5 year housing land supply

74. As noted above, the JCS is unambiguous that it is the 'need' figures that should be used in the calculation of the 5 year housing land supply.⁴⁸ This reflects section 6 of the *Housing Technical Paper Second Update*.
75. The Council also highlights that the appellant's approach would result in a monitoring system having been found to be sound that would fail to trigger at the correct point. The Monitoring Framework in JCS Appendix 6 refers to delivery of a 5 year land supply against the 'need' (rather than 'delivery') provisions set in JCS Appendix 3, and JCS Policies S3 and S6. This Monitoring Framework aligns with the Council's interpretation of the JCS housing requirement.
76. The 'need' within the supporting text to JCS Policy S3 and the distribution of housing delivery within the policy, resulted from the evidence base that considered the housing market area. The appellant's suggested use of a requirement for the whole of the Council's area (and for this to be the 'delivery' figure within JCS Policy S3) fails to recognise the correctness of the 'need' approach within the context described above. JCS paragraph 5.27 highlights the necessity for co-operation to meet Northampton's housing needs and to provide for these 'in a sustainable way for all', which results in the OAHN *By Plan Area* within JCS Table 2. Those 'Plan Areas' are: Daventry District (excluding NRDA); the NRDA; and South Northamptonshire Council (excluding NRDA). The matters addressed above indicate that it is the *Plan Area* 'need' figures of Table 2 that should be used to calculate housing land supply.
77. Where the JCS is less clear on the context of *need*, *requirement* and *delivery* is in relation to JCS Policy R1 and its supporting text. These are within section 16 of the plan, entitled *Rural Areas*. In addressing the *Spatial Strategy for Rural Areas*, Policy R1 and its supporting text refer to the JCS Policy S3 *South Northants Rural Areas* delivery figure of 2,360 as a *rural housing requirement*. The reasons set out above indicate that the use of the JCS Policy S3 rural areas delivery figures as rural housing 'requirements' in JCS section 16 does not alter the approach to *need*, *requirement* and *delivery* within section 5 of the JCS.
78. JCS Policy R1 can be considered to have three parts: the first deals with the rural hierarchy; the second part provides criteria for residential development in rural areas and addresses development outside village confines;⁴⁹ and, the third part provides further criteria that apply when the housing requirement for rural areas has been met. Evidence from the Council indicates the JCS Policy R1 rural housing requirement to have been met.⁵⁰
79. The inclusion of windfalls within the calculation is consistent with: JCS paragraph 16.12 which is part of the reasoned justification to the policy; and, Framework paragraph 48 given the compelling evidence within the Council's Housing Land Availability Study (April 2014). This indicates that since 2001 there has been an annual average of 201 windfall completions, with approximately half of these on sites of less than 10 dwellings.⁵¹

⁴⁸ In relation to JCS Table 5 and paragraph 5.42

⁴⁹ Policy conflict identified in relation to the first main issue concerns the second part of the policy

⁵⁰ It was conceded that a 5% lapse rate should be used for outstanding permissions to reflect the approach described by CD-G.10 – paragraph 7.5 and Appendix 3

⁵¹ CD-G.10 – Including Section 7 and Appendix 2

80. Given the JCS objectives for housing provision and the spatial distribution within JCS Policy S3, any sites seeking to meet the needs of the NRDA reasonably would be expected to be within the NRDA (or in close proximity to it) to reduce the need for travel and support the distribution of development sought by the JCS.
81. In addition, the appellant's suggested use of a Council-wide assessment for supply, and requirement that ignores the NRDA boundary, is proposed without evidence of whether the objectives for the NRDA as a whole are being met.
82. The Council considered the 2012-based household projection figures published following closure of the inquiry supported its position, and that of the JCS, by indicating a reduced rate of household formation over the next 15 years. The appellant highlights the relevant part of Planning Practice Guidance that confirms the figures to be the starting point for estimating overall housing need, and therefore the publication of the 2012-based household projections have not caused the JCS requirements to be out of date.
83. During the inquiry the main parties produced a summary of their positions in relation to housing land supply and agreed tables that deal with the issues raised above.⁵² The final positions of the main parties are: for the Council 2,676 dwellings excluding the NRDA and 2,826 with the NRDA included; and for the appellant 2,431 dwellings excluding the NRDA and 2,581 with the NRDA included.
84. The tables address: a requirement based on JCS Policy S3 or the OAHN; the inclusion or exclusion of NRDA; an annualised rate or trajectory; and, the 20% buffer on or off the shortfall. For the reasons above, I consider Tables 5-7, under the title *OAN excl. NRDA and with trajectory approach (20% on shortfall)* to be appropriate which provides a 5 year agreed supply for 2014 to 2019 of 5.73 years (or 5.21 years with the appellant's 'market supply' position).
85. Accordingly, relevant policies for the supply of housing are up to date in relation to paragraph 49 of the Framework, and as noted above, the appeal proposal conflicts with LP Policies EV2 and H6.

Other matters

Highway Safety

86. The A5 is restricted to 50mph as it passes Potterspurty, and Poundfield Road is restricted to 30mph. The access to the appeal site would be created near to the existing junction with Mansion Gardens on the opposite side of Poundfield Road.
87. Existing highway conditions in the vicinity of the appeal site reflect the proximity of Potterspurty to the A5 and its use as a strategic route.⁵³
88. The appellant's Transport Statement provides a traffic assessment and addresses the safety of the Poundfield Road junction with the A5. It has taken into account rush hour traffic and queuing at the A5, and relevant accident records. The Transport Statement shows that the A5 junction will have periods of operation at overcapacity that will increase between 2014 and 2026.

⁵² ID-20

⁵³ Highways Agency consultation response at Core Document D.7, with congestion shown in ID-13

However, traffic associated with the proposed development would have a minor effect on both Poundfield Road and the operation of the A5.⁵⁴

89. Neither Northamptonshire County Council as Highway Authority, nor the Highways Agency, has objected to the appeal scheme in regard to the traffic that would be generated by it, or the revised design of the proposed access into the development.⁵⁵ The revised access proposal addresses the Highway Authority's concerns regarding pedestrian connections, crossing point and bus stop provision in relation to Poundfield Road.
90. Evidence in this case does not indicate that the proposed development would cause unacceptable levels of congestion, or significantly alter the potential for road traffic accidents to occur. Given the character of Poundfield Road and the traffic movements along the highway and at the Mansion Gardens junction, the proposed access would provide a safe and suitable means of entering and leaving the proposed housing. In these respects the proposal complies with LP Policy G3.

Ecology

91. Two of the eleven criteria within JCS Policy S10 – *Sustainable Development Principles* state that development will: protect, conserve and enhance the natural and built environment and heritage assets and their settings; and, promote the creation of green infrastructure networks, enhance biodiversity and reduce the fragmentation of habitats. JCS Policy BN2 supports development that will, amongst other things, deliver a net gain in biodiversity. JCS Policy BN1 seeks green infrastructure connections, which include allotments and private green spaces,⁵⁶ to be conserved, managed and enhanced.
92. Beyond the allotments, the vegetated areas of the appeal site have been found to principally consist of improved and semi-improved grassland and to be generally of low ecological value.⁵⁷ A number of bat species were found to commute across the appeal site, and forage in the southern parts of it. A number of hedgerows would be removed during the course of development, but given the scale of additional planting proposed, suitable habitat would be retained and improved.
93. As a result, the development proposals, along with the survey work and associated conclusions within the Ecological Assessment, indicate that the development could proceed without harming bats or any other protected species. By providing greater diversity of habitat and reinforcing existing vegetation, the development would be beneficial to local wildlife and in this regard, would comply with the objectives of JCS Policies S10 i) and j), BN2, and BN1. This attracts considerable weight in favour of the appeal scheme.

Precedent

94. Both main parties have referred to a number appeal decisions that were issued after the publication of the Framework, but given the inquiry timetable, these appeals pre-date the adoption of the JCS.⁵⁸ Only some details have been

⁵⁴ Paragraphs 5.14 and 5.15 of the appellant's Transport Assessment at Core Document A.6

⁵⁵ Paragraphs 6.4 and 6.5 of the SoCG

⁵⁶ JCS paragraph 10.9

⁵⁷ CD-A.9 - The application's *Ecological Assessment*, dated March 2014

⁵⁸ Except for APP/Z2830/A/14/2216712, dated 9 January 2015, at CD-H.11

provided in regard to the circumstances of the proposals in the cases referred to. Certain matters raised within the appeals are addressed above, but it has not been shown that these appeals act as a precedent in relation to the current appeal.

Planning obligations

95. The Council's third reason for refusal refers to LP Policy IMP1, which the JCS indicates to have been replaced by JCS Policies INF1 and INF2. JCS Policy INF1 states amongst other things that: new development will be supported by, and provide good access to, infrastructure including physical, green and social elements; and, where a development generates a need for new infrastructure developers will need to demonstrate that provision will be made to meet the necessary requirements arising from that development within an appropriate timescale.
96. A unilateral undertaking has been provided that would provide: an off site sports pitch contribution; an off site strategic facilities contribution; a health care contribution; and; contributions toward libraries, fire and rescue, and bus shelter. In addition, the unilateral undertaking would provide: not less than 40% of the dwellings as affordable housing; amenity open space; a play area; a primary education contribution; a monitoring contribution; and improvements to, and transfer of, the allotments. It has not been shown that the obligations would be inappropriate or fail to comply with adopted planning policy, although the Council did raise concerns in relation to the viability, and therefore deliverability, of the level of affordable housing included within the unilateral undertaking.

Sustainable development

97. The three dimensions to sustainable development are set out in Framework paragraph 7 and are the economic, social and environmental roles.
98. Developing the proposed housing would result in economic benefit through the economic activity associated with the construction of the dwellings and their subsequent occupation. Evidence to the inquiry indicated there to be a strong market in this location for housing of the type proposed, and the appeal site has been included within the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.⁵⁹ In accordance with Framework paragraph 19, economic growth through the provision of construction jobs and the sale of construction materials, and revenue and expenditure resulting from the occupation of the houses, attracts significant weight in this case.
99. There would be clear social benefits from the provision of new dwellings within the context of boosting significantly the supply of market and affordable housing in the locality.⁶⁰ The appeal proposals include improvements to bus service through the provision of two additional bus stops on Poundfield Road. Social benefit would also result from the retention of the existing allotments in the northern part of the appeal site, the provision of play and open space within the development, and the support the development would provide to

⁵⁹ As shown in ID-11

⁶⁰ CD-G.18 - Housing Needs Survey Report for Potterspurty - May 2012 - indicates a need for 34 affordable homes, whereas CD-D.12 - The consultation response from the Council's Strategic Housing Officer - May 2014 - indicates a need for 11 affordable dwellings in the village

- services within the village. All of these matters weigh in favour of the appeal scheme.
100. In relation to the environmental role of sustainable development, the appeal scheme would create new and improved wildlife habitats within the development which weighs in favour of the proposal.⁶¹ However, it would cause the loss of open countryside in the form of existing open and vegetated paddocks without an identified need for the housing in this location.
101. A suggested condition would ensure that there would be two pedestrian access points from the development onto Poundfield Road.⁶² The inquiry site visit provided the opportunity to walk through the area of the allotments, which would provide the most direct route from the proposed housing towards the village hall and high street. Such a direct route would encourage walking and in this respect would assist the integration of the proposal into the village through the permeability that it would provide.
102. Pedestrian routes would connect the development to the bus stops outside the appeal site on Poundfield Road. Potterspurty has an hourly bus service, but the service is limited in the evenings, only operates Monday to Saturday and recently has been reduced due to funding.⁶³ Use of the bus service by occupiers of the proposed dwellings would provide additional financial support for it.
103. The appellant highlights that Potterspurty has most of the services and facilities, and the population, identified by the Council's Interim Rural Housing Policy as being the most important in determining relative sustainability of a village.⁶⁴ These include a population over 1500, a primary school, secondary school, village hall, public house, primary health, Post Office, a general store, and readily accessible to a larger service centre (one hourly bus or train service). Potterspurty is noted to have all except a secondary school and doctor's surgery. Even so, development within Potterspurty would be expected to result in longer and less sustainable journeys than those associated with new dwellings in larger settlements, and that are in closer proximity to locations where jobs, shops and services are concentrated. Traffic levels on the A5 and the length of alternative routes would be likely to deter cycling. These factors reasonably would be expected to cause most residents of the proposed dwellings to be reliant on journeys by private car.
104. JCS Policy S10 contains sustainable design principles that require development to, amongst other things: achieve the highest standards of sustainable design incorporating safety and security considerations and a strong sense of place; be located where services and facilities can be easily accessed by walking, cycling or public transport; and, address matters of detailed design that would assist in the efficient use of resources.
105. The JCS spatial strategy is based on the principles of sustainable development. Evidence is clear that the appeal site is in the control of the appellant and therefore, if planning permission is granted, the scheme would be deliverable. Benefits of the scheme include: boosting the supply of housing,

⁶¹ As set out in the Ecological Assessment at CD-A.9, and the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy at CD-A.14

⁶² ID-27

⁶³ ID-21 and ID-25

⁶⁴ CD-G.7, page 22

with 40% affordable housing; additional landscaping; the provision of new bus stops on Poundfield Road; economic benefits; along with allotment and open space provision. Consideration has been given to the information within ID-22, which addresses the relative sustainability of villages in the locality. However, and with reference to the Framework,⁶⁵ the harm that would occur to the character and appearance of the locality attracts very significant weight against the appeal scheme, and conflicts with JCS Policy S10 a). This causes the character and appearance aspect of the environmental dimension to outweigh all other environmental, economic and social impacts.

106. The adverse impacts of granting planning permission in this case would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This confirms that the appeal scheme would not be a sustainable form of development, and therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply in this case.
107. Although benefits would result from the appeal scheme, the likely scale and nature of these have not been shown to meet the relevant criteria within JCS Policy R1. For the reasons above, no exceptional circumstances have been shown to exist in this case and the appeal scheme conflicts with JCS Policy R1. The appeal scheme also conflicts with: JCS Policies S1 D) 1), H1 a) and b), S10 a); LP Policies EV 1 (II), EV2, G3 A and H6; and, relevant parts of the Framework.
108. Matters that weigh in favour of the appeal scheme, including the scope of suggested conditions, have been taken into account. However, none have been found to outweigh the identified harm and policy conflict. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Clive Sproule

INSPECTOR

⁶⁵ Including Framework paragraph 56

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Hugh Flanagan of Counsel	instructed by Christopher Mace, Solicitor, South Northamptonshire Council
He called	
Andrew D'Arcy	Lead Officer, Planning Policy,
BA(Hons) MRTPI	South Northamptonshire Council
Sean Bennett	Principal Planning Officer,
MA MRTPI	South Northamptonshire Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Robin Purchas, Queens Counsel	Mrs Kathryn Ventham, Barton Willmore LLP
He called	
Matthew Chard	Barton Willmore LLP
BA(Hons) Dip(Hons)	
MAUD CMLI	
Paul Quelch	Connells Estate Agents
Dip Man (OU)	
Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore LLP

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr Judith Millidge	Potterspury Parish Council
Cllr Steve Parkin	Potterspury Parish Council
Cllr Rupert Fordham	South Northamptonshire Council

DOCUMENTS

1. Unilateral Undertaking Pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other powers in relation to land to the east side of Poundfield Road, Potterspury
2. TM and SNC agreed trajectory 1 April 2014 – 31 March 2019
3. Tables in regard to Policy S3 – later the subject of ID-20
4. Revised 5 year housing supply calculation based on revised agreed housing delivery figures (based on SNC calculation of requirement of 6,318 dwellings)
5. Forwarded e-mail of 23-Jan-15 with the position on agreed deliverable supply (as amended/clarified during the evidence in chief of Mr D'Arcy)
6. Revised housing land supply for the appellant, taking account of affordable provision (27/01/2015), including tables in regard to Policy S3
7. Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5 in regard to Policy S3 SNC NRDA annualised (with and without 20% on shortfall)
8. South Derbyshire Local Plan Part 1 – Inspector's Note of 16th December 2014

9. Report on Application No.: S/2008/0890/P, Item No.: 6 for Committee Date: 18/09/2008 – Erection of 10 dwellings and 8 apartments to provide affordable housing at land adjacent to Furtho Lane, Potterspurpy
10. Report on Application No.: S/2012/1137/FUL (Agenda Item No. 11) for a detached dwelling at Swallow Fields Stud, Furtho Lane, Potterspurpy
11. A plan titled 'SHLAA Sites: S50 – Potterspurpy', along with other settlement maps
12. A table with the title 'Affordable Provision of Key Sites'
13. Photographs supplied by the Parish Council showing queuing traffic on the A5 and Poundfield Road on the mornings of 22/01/2015 and 05/12/2015
14. Drawing No. SL-P-01 Revision B – *Local Facilities Plan* – dated 18.12.14 – showing the location of facilities in Potterspurpy with reference to 400m and 800m radii from the centre of the appeal site
15. A table of new home sites *By location radiating away from Brackley and Towcester*
16. Tables with the title *Detailed housing supply for the Council and the Appellant taking account of all factors (29/01/2015)* – later superseded by ID-20
17. 'New Homes' page from the Macintyres Estate Agents' website (<http://www.macintyres.co.uk>)
18. Planning Practice Guidance – *Housing and economic development needs assessments* – starting at Ref: ID 2a-001-20140306
19. Planning Practice Guidance – *Housing and economic land availability assessment* – starting at Ref: ID 3-001-20140306
20. Tables with the title *Detailed housing supply for the Council and the Appellant taking account of all factors (29/01/2015)*
21. E-mail dated 15:38hrs 05 January 2015 from Stagecoach Bus in relation to S/2014/2356/MAO Land off Sanders Lane, Potterspurpy regarding public transport availability from Potterspurpy
22. Tables listing IRHP 'Most sustainable' and IRHP 'Reasonably sustainable' villages (sorted by population)
23. Secretary of State's decision letter in relation to appeal ref: APP/M1520/A/12/2177157 – Land off Glebelands, Thundersley, Essex SS7 5TN
24. Decision letter in relation to appeal ref: APP/R3325/A/13/2210545 – Land at Gold Well Farm, Yeovil Road, Crewkerne, Somerset
25. Route 89 & 90 Timetable Change from Monday 23rd February 2015
26. Potterspurpy News (covering the period at the end of 2014 and early 2015)
27. Proposed conditions covering reserved matters, pedestrian access points and the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy

28. The Queen (on the application of Jonathan Mark Isherwood Carter) and City and County of Swansea and RWE Innogy UK Limited, [2015] EWHC 75 (Admin), CO/1793/2014

Richborough Estates