



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 14-16 January, 20-23 January and 12-13 March 2015

Site visits made on 13 and 16 March 2015

by Susan Heywood BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 July 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/A/14/2218137

Land off Station Road, Great Ayton

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of Hambleton District Council.
 - The application Ref 13/02275/OUT, dated 25 October 2013, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2014.
 - The development proposed is "*outline planning application for a residential development of up to 113 dwellings with associated access with all other matters reserved, including retention of an existing barn for B1 use and demolition of outbuildings on land off Station Road, Great Ayton TS9 6HB*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The inquiry was adjourned on 23 January to allow further evidence to be presented in relation to the existing farm business being carried out on the appeal site. I heard that further evidence when the inquiry resumed. I carried out an accompanied inspection of the site and its surroundings on 13 March and unaccompanied inspections before the inquiry opened and after the close of the inquiry.
3. The application is made in outline with all matters except for means of access reserved for future determination. I have considered the appeal on that basis, although I note the illustrative masterplan which demonstrates how the appellants envisage the development being carried out.
4. The application was refused for 10 reasons. The Council are satisfied that reasons 4 (affordable housing provision), 5 (public open space contribution) and 6 (footpath and cycleway links) can be overcome by the imposition of conditions or by the submitted planning obligation. Other than in relation to the planning obligation, these matters no longer require consideration in this decision.
5. The Council consider that reasons 7 (flood risk), 8 (drainage) and 9 (highway impact) have been overcome by the submission of further information and

agreement with statutory bodies. However, interested parties remain concerned about these matters which are addressed in this decision.

6. A public inquiry was held in November 2014 into the proposed development of 175 dwellings, by the same appellants, on land to the north of Stillington Road, Easingwold (Appeal ref: APP/G2713/A/14/2217056). The decision (the Easingwold decision) was issued shortly before the inquiry into the current appeal opened but was challenged by the appellants and subsequently quashed shortly before the inquiry closed. That decision reflected the Council's position on some matters and the appellants on others and provided a useful focus for the evidence in the case before me. However, given its subsequent quashing, it has no legal effect and I will not consider it further.
7. I should also note that as a result of the Easingwold decision, the appellants did not pursue the issue of whether regard should be had to market signals in determining the housing requirement. Following the quashing of that decision they confirmed that, whilst they reserved the right to raise this matter at forthcoming inquiries in Hambleton, they did not seek to reopen consideration of that matter in this inquiry.
8. Prior to the resumption of the inquiry in March the Government published the 2012-based Household Projections for England, 2012-2037. The main parties agreed that these did not have any significant impact on the housing requirement evidence presented to the inquiry prior to the adjournment.
9. After the close of the inquiry a further appeal decision relating to housing land supply in Hambleton was issued (APP/G2713/A/13/2194376). This is referred to hereafter as the Huby decision. The parties were given the opportunity to make any further comments on that decision and I have had regard to those representations.

Main Issues

10. The main issues in this case are:
 - i. whether the Council are able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites sufficient to meet the full objectively assessed need (FOAN) for housing;
 - ii. the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - iii. the effect of the development on the existing farming enterprise on the site;
 - iv. other material factors including site sustainability, the provision of affordable housing, flooding and highway matters.

Reasons

The Policy Background

11. The development plan includes the Core Strategy 2007, the Development Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) 2008 and the Allocations DPD 2010. Relevant Core Strategy policies (CP policies) include CP1, which is a generic policy setting out a number of criteria which seek to achieve sustainable development and CP2, which seeks to minimise the need to travel. Policy CP4 sets out the settlement hierarchy and aims to restrict development

- outside development limits. Policy CP5 sets the target number of dwellings to be built per annum based on the now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). CP5A provides for the distribution of dwellings within five sub-areas, CP6 sets out the method to achieve the target number of dwellings per sub-area and CP7 relates to the phased release of land for housing.
12. In the Development Policies DPD relevant policies (DP policies) include DP8 which aims to ensure that development is contained within settlement development limits and DP9 which states that exceptional circumstances will be required for development outside development limits.
 13. The Council have recently adopted an Interim Planning Policy Guidance Note relating to Settlement Hierarchy and Housing Development outside of Development Limits (the Interim Policy Guidance). The document recognises that policy CP4 was written at a time when national policy was more restrictive and focused on sustainable travel than the Framework. In light of the Framework the document advocates greater flexibility with respect to development within smaller settlements, outside the settlement hierarchy set out in policy CP4, and outside defined development limits. The document was formally adopted following consultation and modification to reflect the responses. A significant amount of weight can be attached to this document.
 14. The development plan documents were adopted prior to the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In these circumstances the latter advises that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework.
 15. Other than in its requirement to assess development against the now out of date housing figures, policy CP1 accords with the Framework as does policy CP2. Policy CP4 requires 'an exceptional case' to be made for development outside the settlement hierarchy and in the countryside outside development limits. DP8 and DP9 have similar requirements. In these respects the policies are not in accordance with the Framework. However policies CP4, CP5A and CP6 also relate to the settlement hierarchy and the distribution of housing to meet the aims set out in Spatial Principle 3 of the Core Strategy. This seeks to direct development to sustainable locations. In so far as these policies deal with the sustainable distribution of development I consider them to be consistent with the Framework. CP7, in seeking to restrict the release of land, is not consistent with the Framework and the Council accept this.
 16. Other policies have been drawn to my attention. I deal with other relevant policies under the various issues below.
 17. Paragraph 14 of the Framework sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay and, where relevant policies are absent, silent or out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Paragraph 49 of the Framework states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

18. In this case, I consider that the following policies, at least in part, are relevant to the supply of housing: policies CP4, CP5, CP5A, CP6, CP7, DP8 and DP9.
19. It is first necessary for me to consider what the housing requirement is for the area and then to determine whether there is a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against that requirement. Only then will I be able to determine whether relevant policies for the supply of housing are up-to-date.

Housing land considerations

Objectively assessed housing need

20. The parties agree that the housing requirement of 280 dpa set out in policy CP5 is based on the now revoked RSS. This was not a FOAN as it was based on a constrained figure which sought to restrict development in 'areas of restraint'. There is therefore no dispute that this no longer represents the up-to-date objective assessment of need. The Council have begun to update its evidence base for the review of the emerging Local Plan. The analysis carried out leads the Council to conclude that the FOAN is 398 dpa.¹ The appellants consider that the figure should be 458 dpa.
21. Both parties use the 2012 sub-national population projections as the basis for their assumptions. The Council and appellants agree that the differences between the two figures for the FOAN are a result of using different unemployment rates and commuting ratios in the modelling. These aspects therefore require further consideration in order to determine which figure for FOAN is likely to be the more accurate.

Unemployment rates

22. The appellants adopt an unemployment rate of 3.8% as a starting point, falling to 3% by 2016. The figure of 3.8% is derived from the 2011 Census. The Council agree with the end point of 3%, but use a starting point unemployment rate of 5.8%. This figure is taken from the Annual Population Survey (APS) and is an average for the years 2009-2012. The Council's scenario assumes that there is more flexibility for the existing population to take up an increase in jobs growth, thus leading to a more conservative assessment of the housing requirement.
23. Both starting point figures have their limitations; the Census figure is a snapshot in time and the APS data is based on such small samples that every estimate is flagged as being "unreliable". Additional evidence was submitted to the inquiry in the form of the ONS data showing the Modelled Unemployment Rate in Hambleton. This improves on the APS estimate by 'borrowing strength' from the claimant count to give an estimate that is more precise than the APS data alone.
24. The modelling indicates that, at no time has the unemployment rate reached a high of 5.8%, as suggested by the Council. Indeed, the Council's witness conceded that this figure was probably too high. In addition, the modelling does not reflect the actual Census figure of 3.8% in 2011, but rather shows a

¹ The Council accept that 30 dpa should be added to their initial starting point of 368 dpa, in order to account for an under-estimate in the number of self-employed workers. This uplift leads to the Council's position that the FOAN is 398 dpa.

higher unemployment rate during that year. I accept that modelling may be a better indicator to use in the situation where the starting point date is a number of years away from the Census date. But in this case, the starting point of 2012 is sufficiently close to the Census date of 2011 for me to reach the conclusion that 3.8% is a reasonably reliable starting point to use.

25. The parties agree that, in this scenario, 30 dpa should be added to the Council's estimate of 398 dpa giving a total of 428 dpa as the FOAN.

Commuting ratio

26. The commuting ratio in the 2001 Census was 1.03, meaning that there was a net outflow of 3% of workers from Hambleton. By the 2011 Census, this had changed to 0.93, meaning that there was a net inflow of 7% of workers to Hambleton. The Council's assumed commuting ratio falls from 1.03, at the starting point of 2012, to 1.00 whereas the appellants have used a balanced ratio of 1.00 throughout.
27. The Council have assumed a continuation of the existing situation, which sees the commuting ratio falling. They argue that, in reality, the situation is not as black and white as a balanced commuting ratio suggests. Furthermore, they argue that the increase in the number of self-employed workers would lead to a greater self-containment as these would be older people who are more likely to live and work in the same district.
28. Using a commuting ratio of greater or less than 1.00 will have an impact on other local authority areas. This is because there will be either a net in-commute, in which case there will be more jobs in Hambleton than there are dwellings to accommodate the workers, or a net out-commute, where people living in Hambleton would be working elsewhere. In the plan-making process, the implications of this for housing land supply can be considered through the duty to co-operate with adjoining local authorities. However, there is no mechanism for this to take place in the consideration of individual development proposals. The Planning Advisory Service advice² states that it is risky to plan for the ratio of workplace jobs to resident workers rising over the plan period, ie. the approach of greater self-containment that the Council advocate. It advises that for the shift in commuting ratio to be believable there would have to be supporting evidence to show what economic factors or policy action will bring it about. No such evidence is provided in this case. Neither is there any evidence to justify the Council's assumptions regarding the impact of the increased number of self-employed workers on commuting rates.
29. Accordingly, I accept the appellants' approach of using a flat-rate ratio of 1.00 throughout for the purposes of this appeal. The parties agree that the forecast growth in jobs in this scenario means that a further 30 dpa should be added to the Council's estimate, taking the FOAN to 458 dpa, ie. equivalent to the appellants' assessment in this appeal.

Conclusion on housing need

30. Bringing together the above factors, I conclude that the FOAN for the purposes of this decision should be 458 dpa which equates to a five year requirement of 2,290 dwellings. The parties agree that the shortfall in delivery since 2012

² Objectively Assessed Need and Housing Targets Technical advice note - CD133

should be added which, based on a FOAN of 458 dpa, amounts to 604³ dwellings. Consequently the five year housing requirement for the purposes of this decision should be considered to be 2,894 dwellings. This is the starting point for considering whether or not there is a five year supply of housing. I deal with the supply of housing below including the need for a buffer to ensure choice and competition in the market for land, in accordance with the Framework.

Housing land supply

31. The Framework requires authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% or 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period). The parties agree that a buffer of 5% should be added in this case. Adding the buffer at this stage, ie. after adding the shortfall in supply from previous years, would entail the provision of a sufficient supply of sites to provide 3,039 dwellings in the five year period, or 608 dpa over the five year period.
32. I note the recent Secretary of State decision that states that the buffer should not be applied to the shortfall from previous years' under-delivery. I also note that my colleague in the Huby decision adopts this approach. However, with the greatest of respect, the purpose of the buffer is to increase the supply of land in the first five year period; it is not to alter the demand side of the equation. The housing requirement, ie. the demand, is the FOAN plus the shortfall from previous years. The Framework states that authorities are required to identify a five year supply against their housing requirement plus a buffer of 5%. Consequently, the buffer can only be added to the requirement once the shortfall has been added on. To do otherwise would be to ignore a part of the requirement (the shortfall) in ensuring that there is a sufficient supply to meet that requirement, plus an additional 5%.
33. In this case however, even if I were to accept that the buffer should be added to the 'basic' figure of 2,290 dwellings and the shortfall should be added later, there would be only a nominal change to the above figure in paragraph 30 ie. $2,290 + 115 (5\%) = 2,405 + 604 (shortfall) = 3,009$ dwellings or 602 dwellings per annum. Consequently, both methods lead to the need for a supply of just over 600 dpa over the five year period.
34. Against a five year requirement of 3,039 dwellings, the Council considers that it can demonstrate a supply of sites sufficient for 3,012 dwellings over that period, which includes 500 dwellings on windfall sites. This equates to around 4.95 years' worth of supply. The appellants do not agree that a windfall allowance should be included and consider the supply from specific sites amounts to just 1,974 dwellings.
35. In the absence of windfall sites, the Council, on their own figures, are only able to demonstrate a deliverable five year supply of sites for just over 2,500 dwellings. This is clearly not sufficient to provide for the requirement of over 3,000 dwellings over the five year period. Accordingly it is necessary for me to

³ This figure is significantly different to the shortfall identified in the Huby decision. That decision states that the parties agreed the backlog to be 468 in that case. That is different to the agreement between the parties in the appeal before me. I have based my assessment on the evidence before me in this inquiry.

consider whether an allowance should be made for around 500 dwellings to be provided on windfall sites as the Council suggests.

Windfall Sites

36. The Framework is clear that local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five year supply where there is compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply.
37. The 2012/13 Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)⁴ indicates that on average there have been 257 net windfall completions per annum between 2004/5 and 2012/13. However, the parties agree that the figures for the three years 2008/9 to 2010/11 are unreliable as during that time there were no allocations in the former Local Plan and no adopted Allocations DPD. All completions during those years were therefore recorded as windfall completions. Nevertheless, even excluding those years from the calculation, an average of 277 dpa were provided between 2004/5 and 2007/8, and 136 dpa average in the two years 2011/12 and 2012/13. The rate also remained at a level just above 100 dwellings in the final year of available monitoring, 2012/13, albeit at a lesser rate than in previous years. I therefore accept that windfall rates have historically been high although the 'gap' of three years diminishes the consistency in the figures to an extent. On balance however, the evidence would allow me to conclude that windfall sites have consistently become available in the local area.
38. The appellants raised concern regarding a number of completions which the Council had 'found' from previous years and added into the completions figures for the 2012/13 AMR. The Council's explanation for this was a change in the system for monitoring completions. However, even without the 'extra' dwellings, windfall completions exceeded 100 dwellings each year in their original monitoring year.
39. The Council point to recent national and local policy changes that they say will boost the level of windfall developments in future. These are the recent addition to the PPG removing small scale developments from the requirement to provide affordable housing, recent changes in permitted development rights and the Council's Interim Policy Guidance Note.
40. Within the Service Centres, in Hambleton's settlement hierarchy, Core Strategy policy CP9 only seeks affordable housing on developments of 15 or more dwellings. The Government's change to affordable housing thresholds will not therefore affect development within the Service Centres. Nevertheless, there are large parts of the district which lie outside Service Centres where the current threshold is to seek affordable housing on sites of 2 or more dwellings. The Ministerial Statement introducing the affordable housing change states that the Government expects the measures "to have a significant positive impact on housing numbers". The aim is to reduce burdens on developers of small sites and so increase the supply and speed up delivery of housing development. There is no reason to consider that the Government's aim will not be realised in Hambleton. Consequently, I accept that this change will be likely to boost the number of schemes coming forward as windfall sites. Similarly, I accept that the changes to permitted development rights are likely to increase the number

⁴ CD122

of schemes coming forward through conversions and change of use of agricultural, commercial or retail buildings.

41. The aim of the Council's Interim Policy Guidance Note is to provide small scale development, defined as up to 5 dwellings, to take place in a gradual, incremental and organic manner. I agree that this is likely to increase the number of small sites coming forward and it is highly likely to add to the number of windfall permissions granted by the Council.
42. I consider that there is compelling evidence to conclude that a windfall allowance can be included in the five year supply. I do not consider 100 dpa to be an overly optimistic figure having regard to the above evidence, although the actual numbers per annum are likely to fluctuate. I am therefore satisfied on balance that there is sufficient evidence to enable me to conclude that it is reasonable to include this as a windfall allowance.

Specific sites within the five year supply

43. The sites within the Council's five year housing land supply are set out in the 2014 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Whilst this followed a survey with owners, agents and developers with interest in allocated sites, it was not formally sanctioned by the local Housing Market Partnership as previous versions of the SHLAA had been. The appellants criticise the build-out rates and lead-in times used for some of the sites. Whilst I do not find the alternative build-out estimates submitted by the appellants to be particularly conclusive, the PPG says that the advice of developers and local agents will be important in assessing lead-in times and build-out rates by year. The lack of endorsement by the Housing Market Partnership diminishes the certainty that can be placed on the Council's assessment in some circumstances.
44. The PPG states that Local Plans are the appropriate place for the examination of the deliverability of sites to meet the five year supply. This thorough process cannot be replicated in the course of determining individual appeals where only the appellants' evidence is before me. This is particularly highlighted in this case where the evidence presented to this inquiry has differed, in some respects, to that presented in the Huby inquiry and will therefore lead me to different conclusions to my colleague inspector in the Huby case. In addition, much of the evidence is based on forecasting and assumptions and it is not therefore an exact science. Consequently, where the evidence in relation to the disputed sites before me leads me to reduce the potential supply from that site, I have accepted my colleague's judgement in the Huby decision where that seems reasonable based on the evidence before me.
45. There are four sites in north Northallerton allocated in the Allocations DPD: sites 798, 797, 795 and 787. Site 798 is not in dispute. The remaining sites are reliant on the delivery of a link road and railway bridge crossing. Whilst agreement with Network Rail has moved forward recently, the likelihood of the required infrastructure being provided on time cannot be assured. During the inquiry the Council increased its assessment of deliverability from the three disputed sites from 264 dwellings to 337 dwellings based on pre-application discussions with the developer on site 797. I consider that this should be treated cautiously however as it is to be expected that developers will 'talk-up' the likely housing deliverability in pre-application discussions. This will not necessarily translate into a grant of planning permission. The appellants

estimate a delivery of just 140 from these sites, but there is little conclusive evidence to lead me to be so pessimistic of delivery from these sites. My colleague inspector in the Huby decision estimated a delivery of 250 dwellings on the three sites by March 2019. I consider this to be a reasonable judgement which falls somewhere between the Council and appellants' estimates.

46. Site 769 has a capacity of 55 dwellings as identified in the SHLAA. There is an issue regarding relocating the existing allotments which occupy part of the site and the Council have consequently reduced the capacity to 15 dwellings. However, the appellants have submitted further information from Persimmon Homes, who have an interest in the land, which indicates that there can be no certainty regarding delivery within the five year period. On this basis I consider that it would not be prudent to include this site within the five year supply.
47. The Council consider that three sites in Aiskew - 762, 765 and 767 - will provide 183 dwellings within the five year period compared to the appellants' estimate of 40. This seems optimistic particularly as the largest yielding site, 762, does not yet have outline planning permission. I also heard that site 765 has been available since 2010 but there has been no action in taking development of the site forward. My colleague in the Huby decision reached a conclusion of 120 from these three sites which seems to be a reasonable assumption under these circumstances.
48. On sites 778 and 779, the appellants' assessment of lead-in times and build-out rates differ from the Council's and result in a reduction from the Council's estimate of 134 dwellings to 106. I am not satisfied that the appellants' evidence is sufficiently conclusive to significantly reduce the Council's estimates from these sites. Planning permission has been granted for part of site 778 and an application for the remainder of site 778 and for site 779 has been submitted. I am not aware of any barriers to delivery on these sites. My colleague in the Huby decision estimated 130 from these sites and I consider this to be a reasonable estimate on the evidence before me.
49. On site 803, the Council expect 70 dwellings compared to the appellants' 56. A planning application has yet to be submitted on the site and it appears to be dependent upon the provision of road infrastructure through the adjoining site. Given the uncertainty regarding timing of the delivery of the road, I am sympathetic to the appellants' view as to the likely yield from this site within the five year period.
50. 44 dwellings are included at Cleveland Lodge, Great Ayton, site 804. The site is allocated for housing within the Allocations DPD with a requirement that it provides "very sheltered housing" (independent housing with an element of close/extra care for the elderly). The appellants submitted evidence of the intention to submit an application for an 'elderly care establishment' falling within Use Class C2. However, the Council consider that this is likely to be in addition to the 44 dwellings. In any case, it is far from certain that such an application would be approved by the Council in light of the Allocations DPD policy. Consequently, I agree with the Council that 44 dwellings is a reasonable estimate from this site.⁵

⁵ The Huby decision refers to 70 dwellings for this site but that is not the evidence that is before me.

51. Outline planning permission has been granted for 925 dwellings on site 808 and work has begun on phase 1 for which a detailed permission for 107 dwellings has also been granted. I note that there have been pre-application discussions for phase 2 and approval has been granted for a sports village. The Framework states that sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. No such clear evidence has been submitted. There are currently two builders operating on this site and I consider that the Council's estimate of 420 dwellings from this site is not unreasonable.
52. Site 815 also has planning permission for 183 dwellings and is allocated in the Allocations DPD. There is no conclusive evidence to demonstrate that the site is not deliverable. I see no reason to doubt the Council's estimate of 90 dwellings from this site.
53. The Council increased the delivery on site 801 from 40 to 48 units as a result of pre-application discussions with the developer. As stated above, this will not necessarily translate into a planning permission and I have therefore retained the delivery from that site at 40 as initially suggested by the Council.

Conclusion on housing land considerations

54. In light of the above, the five year supply of housing sites falls to 2,691. Against a requirement of 3,039 dwellings this equates to a supply of just under 4.4 years.⁶ If I had added the buffer of 5% before adding the shortfall, as agreed by the parties, this would have equated to a marginally increased supply of 4.45 years (3,009 dwelling requirement against a supply of 2,691 dwellings). Had I agreed with the appellants that a windfall allowance should not be included, this would have reduced the supply to around 3.6 years.
55. Even on the best estimate therefore, I conclude that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites sufficient to meet the requirement. In accordance with paragraph 49 of the Framework, relevant policies for the supply of housing, identified above, should not be considered up to date and there is a requirement to consider applications in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Accordingly, before carrying out the balance required by the Framework I will turn to consider the other issues of relevance in this appeal.

Character and appearance

56. Although the Council did not raise any concerns regarding the impact of the development on the character or appearance of the surroundings, this matter was raised by interested parties. The appellants therefore presented evidence on this matter.
57. The appeal site lies on greenfield land on the eastern edge of Great Ayton. It comprises an agricultural field, a paddock and, on its western edge, various farm buildings. To the north lie an agricultural field and the grounds and woodland belonging to Cleveland Lodge. To the east lies open countryside, an area of relatively flat or gently undulating lowland which rises to the North York Moors National Park further to the east.

⁶ This is different to the conclusion reached by my colleague in the Huby decision due to the differences in some elements of the evidence.

58. The site falls within various landscape character types produced at national, county and district level. However, in practice, it is not necessary to focus on the specific character types as the character of the site and its surroundings is clear from the site inspection. Beyond the village to the east the medium scale arable fields bounded by hedgerows and trees, the relatively flat nature of the landscape which rises to the escarpment of the North York Moors and the enclosure created by belts and copses of mature woodland provides an attractive rural character. This contrasts with the harder edge of the village seen on the western and part of the southern boundaries of the site which have a semi-rural character with a small number of medium density houses and the agricultural buildings of School Farm abutting these boundaries.
59. The viewer walking along the footpath that runs to the north of the site, from the village towards Cliff Rigg to the east, has a sense of leaving the village and entering a rural area. Initially the edge of the village is not evident as it is screened by the woodland belt to the north of the site. The village becomes visible the further east along that footpath one travels. But it is not prominent or significant in the landscape due to the distance from the viewer, intervening landscape features and topography and its medium density built form.
60. The village of Great Ayton is known, at least locally if not further afield, for its historic association to Captain Cook. The Cook museum lies in the village as does his former school and what is believed to be his family home lies at Aireyholme Farm to the east. The footpath is understood to be the route he took on his walk to and from school. On leaving the village along that footpath the viewer is presented with a view of Captain Cook's Monument, located on the escarpment at Easby Moor. This view is framed by a woodland belt on the northern edge of the site and a copse of trees within the grounds of Cleveland Lodge⁷. This striking view is a reminder of the heritage of the village.
61. The built development on the site would intrude significantly into this framed view of the rural landscape towards the escarpment and Captain Cook's Monument. I acknowledge that proposed landscaping on the boundary of the site would soften the appearance of the development over time, but nevertheless, there is no escaping the fact that the land would take on a more urban character when seen from this vantage point. The village is well-visited by walkers. The Parish Council provides information leaflets identifying walking routes out of the village, including along the footpath to the north of the site. It is reasonable to consider that the receptors, those walking along that footpath, will be highly sensitive to change. The proposed development would cause a significant adverse effect on the character of the locality. I accept that the effect becomes less harmful as the viewer travels further east along this footpath, but the change would nonetheless be substantial in a localised area.
62. I consider that in assessing viewpoints 6 and 7 together in the landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) and in considering viewpoint 8 also to be similar, the appellants have underestimated the impact of the development from viewpoint 6.
63. When viewed from the escarpment of Cliff Rigg to the east, the main extent of the built form of the village is located to the north of the site. It is separated from the site by the mature woodland in and around Cleveland Lodge. The existing dwellings and buildings on Station Road are visible but appear as little

⁷ Approximately equivalent to viewpoint 6 in the appellants' LVIA

more than a ribbon of development forming a subsidiary part of the village. That area acts as a transition between the main built form of the village to the north and the open countryside to the south and east of the site. The proposed development would not be a natural rounding off of the village. It would be seen as an intrusion of built development into the open countryside which would consolidate the built form of the village in this location. Again the users of the footpath to Cliff Rigg would be highly susceptible to change. In the short to medium term the development would have a moderate adverse effect on the character of the area. This would reduce in time and the LVIA gives an indication of the view 10 years after completion. By that time the landscaping on the edges of the site would have softened its impact. Nonetheless, as an elevated view into the site over the boundary landscaping would be gained from this vantage point, the adverse effect would remain, albeit at a more diminished level.

64. I conclude that the proposed development would result in a significant and harmful change to the character and appearance of the countryside. This would be contrary to policy CP1 and policy DP30 which respectively seek to protect the natural environment and character and appearance of the countryside. These aspects of the policies are in compliance with one of the core planning principles in the Framework to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Impact on existing farming enterprise

65. The appeal site, at School Farm, comprises a field in agricultural use, together with a yard containing a number of farm buildings and a farm shop. Mr Phalp senior owns the farm tenancy. Whilst I understand that he still takes an active role in the farm operations, it is mainly farmed by his son, Mr Phalp junior, and his son's wife. The family also farm other holdings in the area: Southbrook Farm, Aireyholme Farm and Ayton Banks Farm. The appellants pointed out that the tenancy does not automatically pass to Mr Phalp jnr on the demise of his father. However, it is clear that the operations at School Farm are currently interlinked with the other farm holdings, and in any case the evidence was presented on behalf of the Phalp family as a whole.
66. I heard that the facilities at the farm yard, including the agricultural buildings, are vital to the farming operations at all four of the holdings operated by the tenants. They describe School Farm as being the 'hub' of the enterprise, its 'shop window' and 'gateway to the markets'. The agricultural buildings on the appeal site are used both for the keeping of livestock and for storage of crops. One of the buildings houses a farm shop with an adjacent barn used for egg grading and packaging. The eggs are produced at Southbrook Farm. Due to its central location and ease of access, School Farm is used to accept and store deliveries for each of the farms. These are then transported to the other holdings by tractor and trailer. Conversely, crops and produce from the other farms are taken to School Farm where they are loaded onto articulated vehicles for distribution elsewhere.
67. As well as housing livestock which needs extra care during calving or lambing, I heard that one of the existing large barns provides the only storage building on any of the holdings which is large enough, or of the correct specifications and in the correct location, for the storage of grain. The tenants claim that none of the other holdings has a building of sufficient size to accommodate the grain

store and this was not disputed by the appellants. I saw that access to both Aireyholme Farm and Ayton Banks Farm for large vehicles would be problematic due to the narrow, winding and steep nature of the access roads. I also note that, with the exception of Southbrook Farm, the other holdings are situated in the North York Moors National Park where planning policies for new buildings are likely to be more restrictive.

68. The farm shop is housed in part of one of the large agricultural buildings. It sells a variety of produce. Some of that produce, such as the eggs, is produced on the various farm holdings but the shop also sells other items which are bought in to sell. The evidence provided by the tenants' accountant states that the sales from the farm shop, including the egg sales, accounted for 51% of the total sales of the farming business in 2013. This evidence concludes that the farm shop and egg sales at School Farm are critical to the viability and sustainability of the whole farming business. The tenants also point to the loss of at least 2 jobs employed directly in the farm shop and egg production that would result from the proposal.
69. It transpired during the course of the inquiry that the farm shop does not have the benefit of planning permission. Accordingly, the appellants argue that I can place no weight on the loss of an unauthorised business and the revenue that it generates. The Council provided an explanatory note for the inquiry on this matter. This sets out the Council's view that planning permission would have been required to use the existing storage building as a farm shop, because much of the produce being sold is not produced on the farm. The note states that planning permission was granted in 1993 for a farm shop within the farm yard, close to the location of the existing shop. It goes on to say that, because the existing shop provides local employment and no complaints have been received, they do not consider it expedient to take enforcement action against this unauthorised use.
70. The use appears to be compatible with the surrounding area; it is clearly a valued facility in the village. Furthermore, it would comply with advice in the Framework regarding farm diversification and it is evidently important to the viability of the farming enterprise. Thus, having regard to the Council's confirmation that it is unlikely to take enforcement action, the balance of probability lies in the likelihood that the farm shop will remain. Whereas, if the appeal were to be allowed, the shop could not remain in its current location and there are no proposals for its replacement.
71. Even if this approach were not correct, the loss of the shop would result in a drop in egg sales which would have an adverse effect on the revenue received by the egg business. The farm yard is located close to the centre of the village and is therefore a convenient location from which to sell the eggs. Sales from Southbrook Farm would not be as viable due to the distance of that farm from the centre of the village. The tenants stated that before the shop opened, they used to sell the eggs from School Farm on the basis of an 'honesty box'. It is also a consideration that the egg grading and packaging operations are located adjacent to the shop and as such, in operational terms, it appears efficient to sell the eggs from this location. Accordingly, even if circumstances changed and the Council decided that it was expedient to take action against the existing shop use, it is reasonable to consider that the sales of eggs from this location would continue. This of itself would be considered to be an ancillary use which would not require planning permission.

72. The evidence demonstrates that the eggs sold from this location through the farm shop are significantly more profitable than they would be if sold as contract production. The proposal would lead to the loss of the egg grading and packaging facility and there would be no land remaining within the site from which the eggs could be sold. Consequently, the tenants would have no option but to sell most of their eggs via contract. This would be likely to reduce the revenue received.
73. The appellants have stated that it would be possible to contract out operations housed in the agricultural buildings (the crop storage and livestock housing), but this would be at a financial cost to the business. They have also suggested that the buildings could be replaced elsewhere on School Farm. However, there is no suggested alternative location before me, although I note that an alternative location was offered to the tenants but was rejected as being unsuitable. For the reasons set out above, it is far from clear where alternative, suitable buildings could be provided.
74. I have considered whether it would be possible to impose a condition that would require the replacement of these buildings before development commences. However, I am concerned that in seeking to discharge such a condition the appellants could provide replacement buildings in a location which is not suitable for the farm operations. The suggested condition would require the Council to make a judgement on the suitability of the buildings to the farm enterprise. Yet they may not be in possession of the necessary information to enable them to make that judgement. If it was possible to word the condition such that it required the agreement of the tenants to the siting of the buildings (and I am not convinced that this would be the case), that agreement could be withheld thus preventing or significantly delaying the development. Accordingly, I am not satisfied that such a condition would be a workable proposition and I do not consider that it would meet the tests set out in the PPG.
75. The land is classified as best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land. This is a finite resource and the Framework makes it clear that regard should be had to the economic and other benefits of such land. Nevertheless, in the context of Hambleton as a whole, the loss of BMV as a result of this development would be small. In the context of a need for additional housing development within the district, in all likelihood, some loss of such land is inevitable. In terms of the impact on the viability of the farm, although it is a high yielding field, the tenant confirmed that its loss, on its own, would not be insurmountable for the business. However, I note that the appellants attribute a financial loss to the business from the loss of yield from this field.
76. In addition to the financial and operational impact on the farming enterprise, there is also evidence that the farm yard is a part of the village community. The tenants hold open days for school children to undertake farm visits and one of the barns is used for making floats for the village fête. It is clearly a facility which is valued by the community. The Framework seeks to ensure that the planning system facilitates social interaction and creates healthy, inclusive communities. It seems to me that the activities which take place at School Farm do just that.
77. I conclude therefore that the loss of the existing buildings and yard at School Farm would be likely to place financial and operational constraints on an

existing agricultural business. This would be contrary to the Framework's aim of supporting economic growth in rural areas by promoting the development and diversification of agricultural businesses. It would also have a social impact through the loss of a facility which, on the evidence before me, is of value to the community. These factors weigh against the proposed development.

Other Material Factors

Location of development

78. In locational terms, Great Ayton is a Service Village which is described in the Core Strategy as being the "main location of services to supplement those provided by the Service Centres, to help meet the needs of the rural communities throughout the hinterland". Policy CP6 states that new housing will be supported in Service Villages, at a level appropriate to the needs of the local communities and within the defined development limits. The restriction on development outside development limits is not in accordance with the Framework. But, as stated earlier, those parts of the policy which relate to the settlement hierarchy and the sustainable location of development do accord with the Framework's aims. Spatial Principle 3 of the Core Strategy envisages limited development in Service Villages. I do not consider that the development of up to 113 dwellings falls into the definition of 'limited development'.
79. The Interim Policy Guidance sets out the support for small scale housing development in villages, including outside Development Limits, where it contributes to maintaining and enhancing the vitality of the local community. Service Villages are defined in the Interim Policy Guidance as being 'sustainable settlements'. However, the Guidance encourages small scale development, up to 5 dwellings, adjacent to the main built form of a settlement and where it results in incremental and organic growth. The scale of the proposed development would clearly be contrary to this Interim Policy Guidance.
80. The Council acknowledge that Great Ayton is a sustainable settlement and I accept that it does have a good level of service provision. Nevertheless, it is not as sustainable as other locations within the district such as the Principal Service Centres of Northallerton and Thirsk and the Service Centres of Bedale, Easingwold and Stokesley. Residents of the proposed dwellings would need to travel further afield for many of their daily or weekly needs. This would include travel to secondary schools, larger supermarkets, banks and a wide range of employment facilities. Public transport is available in the form of bus and train services, although given their frequency in this rural area and the fact that they do not extend into the evening, residents of the site would be largely dependent on their cars for access to services further afield and for evening entertainment.
81. The Framework gives guidance for housing in rural areas. It states that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. It also states that it should reflect local needs, particularly for affordable housing. However, it also aims to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. Developments that generate significant movements should be

located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.

82. The development would meet a local need for affordable housing and, given the lack of a five year housing supply, it would help to meet the district's need for market housing. It would increase the mix of housing in Great Ayton and add to the vitality of the village. I expand on these matters below. However, the scale of development would not be in accordance with Spatial Principle 3 of the Core Strategy. It would also fail to comply with policy CP1 which seeks the use of previously developed land, where that is in a sustainable location, in preference to greenfield sites. Furthermore, it would fail to comply with policy CP2 which seeks to locate development where the need to travel will be minimised. No support for the proposal can therefore be claimed in relation to the location of the development; indeed the failure to comply with the development plan strategy for the distribution of development is a factor weighing against the appeal.

Other sustainability considerations

83. The Framework sets out the three dimensions of sustainable development. These are economic social and environmental. In economic terms I have set out above the impact on the existing farm business which is a factor weighing against the development. Nevertheless, there are also economic factors in its favour. The development would provide direct economic benefits in supporting jobs through the four year construction phase. It would also support the local economy indirectly through increased expenditure in the village shops and other businesses. This weighs heavily in favour of the appeal.
84. The proposal also includes the conversion of one of the existing agricultural buildings to offices and it is claimed that this would provide the opportunity for 15 jobs within the village although the appellants accepted that these were speculative office jobs. Furthermore, against the potential job creation must be balanced the actual loss of jobs through the loss of the farm shop. This would provide only a limited amount of weight in favour of the appeal.
85. The new homes bonus and increased Council tax receipts and business rates would bring additional resources to the Council, although I consider these matters to be incentives for Councils to provide housing and other developments rather than attracting weight in the planning balance.
86. 50% of the dwellings would be affordable housing. This would be in accordance with policy CP9 and the appellants presented evidence on the benefits of this in an area in great need of such provision. This is an important matter which adds significant weight in favour of the appeal.
87. The provision of more housing would clearly fulfil a social and economic role in terms of the continued vitality of the village. This would be in accordance with the Framework's advice regarding development in rural areas. A high proportion of the population of Great Ayton is of retirement age. The development would add to the mix of housing, providing housing opportunities for families with young children. However, Great Ayton appears to be a thriving community and there is no evidence that existing shops and services are under threat in the absence of the development. The number of pupils at Roseberry Community Primary School is below its capacity, but not significantly so and there is no evidence that the school is under threat of closure. It is also

the case that the Interim Policy Guidance will be likely to increase the number of dwellings in the village thus providing additional dwellings to add to the vitality of the village. Nevertheless, this provides some weight in favour of the appeal. There would also be open space and a play area on the site and this would provide some further social benefit, although this would be of a very minor nature.

88. In environmental terms, I have set out above that the proposal would cause significant harm to the natural environment. Nevertheless, the upgrading of the existing stone barn would enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area. This would be in accordance with DP8, itself in compliance with the Framework, which seeks to conserve the historic environment. This would add a limited amount of weight in its favour. I do not agree that the removal of the modern barn would improve the appearance of the conservation area as this is part of the rural and agricultural character of the village and is a neutral factor.
89. Other matters put forward in favour of the development include the increases in biodiversity from the retention of existing trees and hedgerows and the new planting proposed; the energy efficiency of the dwellings; the proposed sustainable drainage scheme; new and upgraded links to the station and the pedestrian crossings. However, I consider these to be mitigating factors rather than benefits and the weight to be given to them is marginal.
90. The above matters weigh in favour of the development to varying degrees and I have regard to them in the overall planning balance which I set out below.

Flooding

91. The site is bounded to the north by what is known as the 'Northern Boundary Ditch' and Dikes Beck runs to the south of the site adjacent to Station Road. The Environment Agency (EA) have confirmed⁸ that the site effectively lies within Flood Zone 1, outside any area identified as being at medium and high risk of flooding. The evidence confirms that surface water from the site would be directed to the Northern Boundary Ditch and would be at or below greenfield run-off rates. The appellants consider that this would be a benefit of the scheme, but the reduction in surface water to Dikes Beck would appear to be minimal. The appellants' drainage advisors state that the total impact on the flows in Dikes Beck would be "minimal if not negligible".
92. Foul water would be directed to the combined sewer which runs alongside Station Road. Northumbrian Water confirm that there is sufficient capacity within that sewer to accommodate foul water from the development. Both the EA and Northumbrian Water have confirmed that they have no objections to the proposed development.
93. However, it is clear from the evidence presented by the interested parties in this appeal that there are understandable concerns regarding the potential flood risk impacts from the proposal on the surrounding roads. I note that significant flooding does occur on Station Road as a result of surcharge from two manholes within that road. Concern was therefore expressed that the development would increase the amount of foul water in the combined sewer upstream of these manholes, thus increasing the concentration of foul water during a flooding event. As a result of these concerns the appellants confirmed

⁸ Statement of Common Ground between the EA and appellants

that the foul water connection would take place downstream of these manholes. This could be secured by a suitable condition. Concern was expressed regarding safe access to and egress from the site during flooding events. The site itself and its access road onto Station Road are outside of any flood risk area. Whilst, during flood events, there is likely to be flooding on routes to and from the site, there is no evidence that this is likely to be a significant problem which would weigh against this appeal. It is important to note that the EA have raised no concerns in this regard.

94. I appreciate the strength of feeling held by the local community. I can also understand the frustration experienced by local residents in relation to the existing flooding situation and the lack of remedy provided by the regulatory bodies to date. Nevertheless, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the development would exacerbate this existing problem. The proposal would not therefore conflict with polices CP21 and DP43, both of which are in compliance with the Framework and which seek to ensure that development does not have an adverse impact on flooding. This matter does not therefore weigh against the appeal.

Highway considerations

95. The Highway Authority and appellants have reached agreement on highway matters based on a number of off-site improvements to the surrounding road network. However, local residents' concerns remain.
96. The development would undoubtedly increase the amount of traffic travelling along Station Road, High Street and Newton Road. On my site visits I noted that parked cars restrict the width of the carriageways on these roads in places and, at times, traffic needs to stop to give way to oncoming vehicles. With the increase in vehicle movements to and from the site, this would be likely to occur more frequently. However, there is no evidence to demonstrate that this would lead to undue queuing along these roads, nor would it result in significant safety concerns.
97. The appellants propose improvement schemes along Station Road and at the junction with Station Road / High Street / Newton Road. Vehicles currently park somewhat haphazardly along Station Road resulting in traffic weaving in and out of parked cars. It is proposed to introduce parking bays on one side of the road only, with parking restrictions opposite. This would enable two way flows of traffic along Station Road. At the junction, the size of the bell-mouth would be reduced and a pedestrian crossing point introduced. I note that both improvement schemes would result in a reduction in the number of parking spaces available. Whilst any loss of parking in an area where spaces are at a premium is not ideal, the number of spaces to be lost (around 5) would not be unduly large and there is no evidence that this is likely to result in any significant harm to highway safety. Nor do I consider that it is likely to significantly diminish the attractiveness of Great Ayton as a destination for walkers or visitors.
98. In addition to the highway improvements noted above, improved pedestrian and cycle links are also proposed. All of these improvements could be secured by a suitable condition or the submitted S106 agreement, which I deal with later.

99. In light of the proposed improvements, I am satisfied that the impact of the proposed development would be mitigated. Overall, I have no reason to disagree with the Highway Authority's professional opinion, expressed in the Statements of Common Ground, that the traffic generated would not have an adverse impact on the local road network. There is therefore no conflict with CS policy CP1 which seeks to restrict development which has an adverse traffic impact. The proposed highway, footpath and cycleway improvements are also in accordance with policies DP2 and DP3⁹ which require contributions and provision to be made for sustainable development and transport.
100. The Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. That is a high bar. On the basis of the evidence, I do not consider that case to be made. This matter does not therefore weigh against the appeal.

Community involvement

101. Reason for refusal No. 10 refers to the Framework's advice that applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. The Council and local residents claim that this did not take place. The Framework goes on to say that where it can be demonstrated that this community involvement took place, proposals should be looked on more favourably. Thus, whilst weight can be given in favour of a development where it has followed this advice, I do not agree that the lack of such engagement would in itself weigh against a proposed development. Clearly if the community raise legitimate planning concerns that have not been addressed by a development proposal then those outstanding matters are capable of weighing against the development in the overall planning balance. But, it is not unusual for local communities to be opposed to development, even where extensive engagement has taken place. Furthermore, it is possible that the views of the local community may not accord with the requirements of a particular development plan. Accordingly, in this case I have taken on board the planning concerns raised by the local community and have attached weight to each of these matters one way or the other. But, in itself, the lack of extensive community involvement is not a matter which weighs against this appeal.

Other appeal decisions

102. I have been provided with a number of other appeal decisions by the parties in this case. It is rarely the case that appeal decisions elsewhere will be directly comparable to the development under consideration in another appeal so as to provide the justification for a particular decision. Apart from the Huby decision which has clear relevance to the appeal before me, I have not referred to any other decisions here. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the evidence presented to me and on its own merits.

Overall Balance

103. I have concluded that the Council are currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of specific deliverable housing land. The Framework states that in such circumstances planning permission should be granted unless any adverse

⁹ Both policies comply with the Framework in so far as they seek contributions towards infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development.

impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

104. The proposal would have the social and economic benefits of addressing the current under-supply, this includes the support to the local economy and increasing the mix of housing in the area. The provision of much needed affordable housing is also a matter of significant weight. There are other factors which provide weight in favour of the development; the speculative office jobs, the upgrading of the stone barn, and factors that mitigate the impact of the development. But these matters are not determinative.
105. On the other hand, the proposal would cause serious environmental harm to the character and appearance of the countryside. It would also cause considerable social and economic harm due to its impact on the farming enterprise at School Farm. The failure to comply with the development plan strategy for the distribution of development is also a factor weighing against the appeal.
106. The lack of a five year supply of housing land does not automatically lead to the grant of planning permission, even where there are substantial benefits from the provision of affordable housing and other benefits such as in this case. Paragraph 8 of the Framework states that the three sustainability roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. To achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously. In this instance the harm to the character and appearance of the area, the impact on the farm enterprise and the location of the development leads me to conclude that the proposal is not sustainable development. These impacts are significant and demonstrable and they therefore outweigh the benefits in this case.

Planning Obligation

107. As I set out earlier, a S106 obligation was submitted by the appellants. This would trigger the provision of open space as well as the provision of other contributions towards infrastructure. I have no reason to consider that the terms of the obligation would not accord with the requirements of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations. However, given that I have reached the conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed there is no need for me to consider this matter in greater detail.

Final Conclusion

108. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Susan Heywood

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Jonathan Easton of Counsel	Instructed by Hambleton District Council
He called:	
Peter Boden	Director, Edge Analytics Ltd
Mark Harbottle	Hambleton District Council
Andrew McCormack	Hambleton District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Barrett of Counsel	Instructed by Phil Bamford, Gladman Developments Ltd
He called:	
Darren Wisher	Regeneris Consulting
Michael Gary Holliday	FPCR Environment and Design Ltd
Robert Hindle	Rural Solutions
Michael Palmer	Land Research Associates Ltd
Chris Patmore	WSP UK Ltd
Jonathan Cracknell	Hydrock Consultants
Michael Watts	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Richard Taylor	Strutt & Parker LLP
Paul Cornfoot	Fore Consulting Ltd

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mark Phalp	School Farm
Kath Phalp	School Farm
Cllr Greenwell	District Councillor
Cllr Moorhouse	County Councillor
John Fletcher	Great Ayton Parish Council
Mr Bennett	CPRE
Kevin Price	Save School Farm Action Group
Marion Button	Local resident
David Greer	Local resident
Peter Morgan	Local resident
Stephen Stokeld	Local resident
Richard Lines	Local resident
Mr Bisby	Local resident
John Robinson	Local resident
Mr Moody	Local resident
Mr Jackson	Local resident
Mr Stevens	Local resident

DOCUMENTS

Council Documents

- 1 Opening statement
- 2 Paragraph 19 of PPG – Market Signals
- 3 Paragraph 35 of PPG – How to deal with past under-supply
- 4 Written Ministerial Statement 28 November 2014

- 5 Note on windfall allowance
- 6 Network Rail e-mail correspondence
- 7 North Northallerton Development Area – Delivery Position Statement Nov 14
- 8 Cleveland Lodge e-mail correspondence
- 9 Comparison of village services
- 10 Secretary of State Decision, Gresty Lane APP/R0660/A/13/2209335
- 11 Amended 5 year supply position statement
- 12 CIL compliance statement
- 13 Peter Boden – Comments on new evidence on Hambleton’s OAN
- 14 Roseberry Community Primary School Ofsted extract
- 15 Paragraph 001 PPG – character of landscapes
- 16 The Endeavour Way Cycle Route study
- 17 Housing requirement tables
- 18 Report to Cabinet 17 March 2015 – Interim Policy Guidance Note
- 19 Note regarding the changes to the Interim Policy Guidance Note
- 20 Note regarding the planning status of the farm shop
- 21 LDS
- 22 Closing submissions

Appellants’ documents

- 23 Opening statement
- 23a Appearances
- 24 Rebuttal statement by Chris Patmore to Mark Harbottle Proof of Evidence
- 25 Jonathan Cracknell rebuttal to Mark Harbottle Proof of Evidence
- 26 Michael Watts Supplementary Evidence 1 – the Easingwold decision
- 27 Michael Watts Supplementary Evidence 2 – windfall allowance
- 28 Letter from Gladman Developments dated 13 January 2015
- 29 Farm land map
- 30 Retained access map
- 31 Note by Darren Wisler
- 32 Position statement relating to highways and transport – Paul Cornfoot
- 33 Cleveland Lodge letter dated 14 January 2015
- 34 Supply round table Agenda
- 35 Chris Patmore Rebuttal to Save School Farm Action Group
- 36 Jonathan Cracknell introduction
- 37 Catchment descriptors
- 38 Paul Cornfoot introduction
- 39 5 year housing land supply position summary
- 40 Appeal decision APP/N1350/A/14/2217552
- 41 Completed S106
- 42 Chris Patmore Response to Inspector’s Note
- 43 Paul Cornfoot Response to Mr Greer
- 44 Addendum to Statement of Common Ground – parking on Station Road
- 45 Richard Taylor Proof of Evidence
- 46 Consent Order quashing the Easingwold decision
- 47 Closing submissions

Joint documents

- 48 Response to Inspector 7 January 2015
- 49 Response to Inspector 3 March 2015
- 50 Response to Inspector – Housing Supply Position (Update)
- 51 Agreed Joint Statement – Implications of 2012 Household Projections
- 52 Flood Risk (Safe Access and Egress) – Statement of Common Ground
- 53 Suggested conditions

Interested parties' documents

- 54 Mark Phalp statement
- 55 Kath Phalp statement
- 56 Save School Farm Action Group statement
- 57 Mr Morgan statement
- 58 Mr Jackson plan
- 59 Mr Stevens – vacancies at Stokesley Business Park
- 60 Mr Greer – correspondence with Yorkshire County Council
- 61 Mr Lines – flooding in Great Ayton
- 62 Mr Price – statement on behalf of Save School Farm Action Group
- 63 John Robinson statement
- 63a List of third party speakers
- 64 John Fletcher – statement on behalf of Great Ayton Parish Council
- 65 Letter from Judith and Alan Skerry
- 66 Statement from Ms Button
- 67 Letter dated 9 March 2015 from Farmoor Services on behalf of School Farm landowner
- 68 Mr Finch letter
- 69 Information regarding School Farm as a community asset
- 70 Suggested points of interest for site visit
- 71 Rishi Sunak MP letter
- 72 Mr Greer further evidence
- 73 Closing statement – Mr Price for Save School Farm Action Group
- 74 Closing statement – Great Ayton Parish Council

Documents submitted since the close of the inquiry

- 75 Council's comments on the Huby decision
- 76 Appellants' comments on the Huby decision