
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 22 July 2015

Site visit made on 22 July 2015

by Peter Rose BA MRTPI DMS MCMi

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

Decision date: 19 August 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/W1850/W/15/3010446

Land adjacent to Burnt House, Bridstow, Ross-on-Wye, Herefordshire

- 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 Fortis Living against the decision of Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref: P142930/O, dated 26 September 2014, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is residential development for 35 dwellings of which 13 will be affordable (37%).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs has been made by Fortis Living against Herefordshire Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The application is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved for subsequent approval, except for access.
4. A completed Unilateral Undertaking dated 8 July 2015 was submitted prior to the hearing and is considered as part of the appeal.
5. It is agreed common ground between the main parties that the local policies of relevance to this appeal are the saved policies of the Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan Adopted March 2007 (the UDP) as set out in the Council's decision notice. Reference has also been made in evidence to the Council's Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031 Pre-Submission Publication Version Spring 2014 (the Core Strategy), and to the subsequent Proposed Main Modifications March 2015 (the Modifications). The Core Strategy has been submitted for examination in public and the Modifications have been subject to recent public consultation.
6. It was also noted at the hearing that a neighbourhood forum was designated in relation to Bridstow Parish on 23 September 2013, and that work has commenced towards a neighbourhood plan. This work is at a preliminary stage and it was agreed by the main parties at the hearing that progress is not yet sufficiently advanced such as to attract material weight.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

- (a) the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area which form part of the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and with particular regard to the proposal's location and scale;
- (b) the effect of the proposed development upon the free and safe movement of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the site;
- (c) whether the proposed scheme would constitute sustainable development;
- (d) the possible need or otherwise for a section 106 agreement.

Reasons

Character and appearance

- 8. The appeal site comprises a large area of open land within the village of Bridstow and within the Wye Valley AONB. The site is set behind the road frontage of the C1261, and is served by a vehicular access to the south of the adjacent Burnt House. The site provides access to a dwelling, Foxdale, which lies beyond to its northern boundary, and is also currently used for purposes incidental to Foxdale and for the grazing of horses. I note evidence submitted regarding the historical use of the site as grazing pasture.
- 9. Notwithstanding the access arrangement serving Foxdale and its accompanying fencing, the overall planning character of the site is generally one of an undeveloped rural field with intermittent vegetation. As such, the site appears as an attractive and integral part of the countryside and contributes both visually and in terms of its open form and character to a pattern of further open land to the south and east.
- 10. In terms of the wider setting, Bridstow comprises a rural settlement of varied character and appearance, and is a composite of a number of fairly distinct clusters of development. This includes relatively recent, fairly self-contained enclaves such as Claytons and Ashe Green, and some backland development.
- 11. The Council's Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Planning Guidance updated 2009 (the Landscape Assessment) identifies Bridstow as displaying a Principal Settled Farmlands character, reflecting rolling lowland areas of dispersed scattered farms and other settlements set within networks of small winding lanes. Notwithstanding later developments, I find this categorisation to accurately reflect the predominant character of the village.
- 12. The immediate setting of the appeal site is, however, more distinct and traditional than the later additions and it lies adjacent to a fairly sporadic linear development of varied buildings extending along the C1261 and typically enclosed by planting to the front and by open fields behind. The C1261 is a relatively narrow country road set slightly below the ground level of the appeal site, and this adds to the distinctive rural character of the setting.
- 13. Similarly to the Landscape Assessment, the Wye Valley AONB Management Plan 2009-2014 identifies the site as part of the Archenfield Lowlands, an area characterised in part by hedgerows, farms and a clustered settlement pattern.

14. The AONB is a landscape of national importance with the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. The Framework requires that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB. More generally, the Framework also places importance upon local distinctiveness.
15. At the local level, Policy LA1 of the UDP states that development will only be permitted in the AONB where it is small scale, does not adversely affect the intrinsic natural beauty of the landscape, and is compliant with a range of other criteria, including that any detrimental effect upon the landscape and biodiversity can be mitigated appropriately.
16. The Landscape Assessment advises that the dispersed settlement pattern of farmsteads and hamlets is capable of accommodating limited new development. It indicates that low densities of individual dwellings would be acceptable as long as they are not sited close enough to coalesce into a prominent wayside settlement pattern. It states that additional housing in hamlets and villages should be modest in size in order to preserve the character of the original settlement.
17. The appellant considers the site to be well contained and, whilst acknowledging partial visibility from the A49, suggests there are very limited views of the appeal site in the local area. The appellant considers the site to be well screened by existing mature vegetation as well as by existing residential properties to the north and west, and particularly by Burnt House to the front.
18. The scheme would extend the existing linear development eastwards behind its main C1261 frontage and a gap would still be maintained between this part of the village and Claytons. Nevertheless, the proposal would extend across a significant area of established open land and would introduce a considerable built form. This would be at the expense of the existing open character and appearance of the site and I consider would be significantly visible in surrounding, albeit predominantly localised, views.
19. The appeal site lies adjacent to a relatively modest wayside development along its C1261 which the Council estimates to include some 30 or so dwellings. Notwithstanding the designation of Bridstow in the Council's Core Strategy as a settlement for growth and the possible scale of development anticipated within the wider area, the effect of the appeal scheme would be very broadly in the order of doubling the number of dwellings within this part of Bridstow and on a single site. Such would be the immediate scale of the development in this location that the proposal would result in a fundamental change in landscape character from predominantly open countryside to built form, and the established character and appearance of this extensive part of the AONB and the quality of its landscape would thereby be seriously harmed.
20. The appellant maintains that the proposal would not only moderate environmental concerns, but also provide related benefits, including proposals for biodiversity. I note the biodiversity improvements proposed, and that the site is agreed by the main parties to be of low biodiversity value. I also note indications for future landscaping as part of the scheme, and of possible buffer zones/open space. Nevertheless, I do not find these matters would offset the substantial loss of the existing field to the local setting and as part of the wider

AONB, or otherwise significantly moderate the visual presence of a built development of the scale proposed.

21. I therefore conclude that the scale of the proposed development in this location would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area, and with particular regard to the quality of the landscape of the Wye Valley AONB. Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy LA1 of the UDP.

Free and safe movement of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists

22. The development would be served from the site's existing access to the C1261. The scheme includes proposals for traffic calming along the carriageway involving a gateway arrangement with coloured surfacing intended to reduce speeds of passing vehicles. Whilst the Council does not consider such a contribution to be necessary, the Unilateral Undertaking also includes an entitlement to a voucher to the value £200 per dwelling for purchase of bicycles. Various incidental actions are also proposed by the appellant to further promote sustainable modes of transport, as set out in its Transport Statement.
23. The setting of the site is distinctly rural. This part of the C1261 is not particularly wide, and it contains no footpaths or street lighting. Traffic surveys identify limited volumes but significant speeds both north-bound and south-bound, and I note the carriageway is used by both pedestrians and by agricultural vehicles. The existing access is relatively close to a blind bend to the south and the associated visibility of vehicles exiting the site is impeded by the presence of Burnt House and by nearby site boundaries.
24. The Framework encourages the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling. It also seeks to support a pattern of development which facilitates use of sustainable modes of transport and looks to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.
25. The Core Strategy divides the county into 7 Housing Market Areas (HMA's). Bridstow forms part of the Ross-on-Wye HMA, and the Council's Rural Housing Background Paper (March 2013) identifies public transport provision in Bridstow to be the joint highest of several settlements within the Ross-on-Wye HMA. Nevertheless, the bus service is limited and, from the evidence presented, there would seem little prospect of imminent improvements, and I note there are no nearby railway stations. Given the identification of Bridstow as a focus for growth, similar such transport constraints are also likely to be encountered by other future development of the village.
26. The appellant has explained how the scheme seeks to avoid heavy engineering solutions, such as the introduction of dedicated footpaths, and seeks instead to respect the existing rural character. Some limited additional pedestrian activity is likely to be generated along the carriageway. I agree that the immediate highway conditions for cyclists would incur some degree of risk and are only likely to be suitable for proficient or otherwise competent persons. Nonetheless, the option of cycling is there, and may be appropriate for some residents. Notwithstanding possible safety hazards, Ross-on-Wye is some 2.6km away and may represent a reasonable journey for a competent cyclist.

27. The Council has submitted details of accidents at the nearby Wilton roundabout which would also need to be negotiated by cyclists, and I note reference to a possible closure of a pedestrian underpass some distance to the east of the site. Whilst these factors may constrain the sustainability of the location, I find they would not in themselves necessarily contribute to material harm arising from the appeal scheme.
28. The appellant forecasts some 25 vehicular trips in each of the morning and afternoon peaks based on local census data, and I note there have been no officially recorded accidents in the vicinity between 2005 and 2012.
29. Even so, I am concerned that, given the particular highway conditions described, this relatively limited increase in vehicle generation would still significantly heighten the risk of accidents around the entrance.
30. I note that the scheme would not comply fully with the visibility standards of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation Manual for Streets 2 2010, and I have carefully considered the evidence suggesting why that should not be harmful. In particular, the submitted evidence questions the link between visibility and safety, and the suggestion is made that the road layout itself will dictate appropriate caution by drivers in the vicinity. Reference is made to the width of the carriageway and to the proposed traffic calming measures as also contributing to reduced speeds.
31. Nevertheless, the scale of development proposed, the proximity to a relatively blind bend, the form of the C1261 devoid of street lighting and footpaths, and adjacent boundaries as impediments to visibility, all indicate to me a prospect of significantly greater risk. The Council suggests there is little conclusive evidence to demonstrate that the proposed gateway arrangement would reduce the significant speeds of passing traffic but would instead need to be part of a wider speed reduction scheme, and I also remain to be convinced of its effectiveness in that regard.
32. The Framework seeks to ensure safe and suitable access for all people, and that proposals for development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. Given the scale of the scheme, and the highway conditions described, I find the likely impact would be severe.
33. I therefore conclude that the scale of the proposed development would be significantly harmful to the free and safe movement of vehicles in the vicinity of the appeal site. That impact, in turn, would also impede the free and safe movement of other road users in the immediate vicinity of the site, including cyclists and pedestrians. Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies DR3, T6, T7 and T8 of the UDP, and to the Framework. These seek, amongst other matters, for development to provide a safe pattern of movement, to maximise road safety, to respect the convenience and attractiveness of walking, and to reflect safe cycling facilities.

Sustainable development

34. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development is defined by the Framework with reference to the policies in paragraphs 18 to 219 taken as a whole. At the heart of the Framework in paragraph 14 is a presumption in

favour of sustainable development. The Framework further identifies economic, social and environmental dimensions to sustainable development.

35. The Core Strategy identifies Bridstow as a settlement for growth and is promoting an increase in the identified sustainable settlements within the Ross-on-Wye HMA of some 14%. The Council's Rural Housing Background Paper (March 2013) identifies Bridstow as comprising some 201 dwellings. Applying the Core Strategy's indicative growth figure of 14% suggests that Bridstow is anticipated to accommodate some 28 new dwellings during the plan period. The Modifications are accompanied by higher targets but these reflect a different, wider Parish database.
36. I have considered representations from interested parties questioning the sustainability of Bridstow, particularly in terms of availability of services and travel distances, but have little reason to question the principle of the village as a growth settlement in the development plan. I have noted evidence regarding the relative sustainability of the village, including both the availability of services, such as a school, and its access to other facilities. I have also had regard to various appeal decisions referred to by the appellant, and note the recognition of the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements as set out in the government's Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance).
37. The scheme would provide very significant housing benefits, including much-needed affordable housing in an area with a high affordability ratio of property prices to incomes and significant outstanding need, and such benefits would be consistent with the social dimension of sustainable development. The investment represented by the development would also be consistent with the economic dimension, and I note financial benefits in connection with the New Homes Bonus.
38. Notwithstanding my serious concerns regarding the implications of this particular development for local highway safety, I accept the broader and immediate reality is that future residents of an expanded Bridstow are likely to remain significantly car-dependent, and I note the lower journey distances between the appeal site and other services relative to UK averages. Despite the physical constraints presented by Bridstow, I also acknowledge the legitimate aims of the development in seeking to promote sustainable modes of transport.
39. In environmental terms, however, I find that the impact of the scheme upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area, and with particular regard to its location and scale and to the quality of the landscape of the Wye Valley AONB, to be unsustainable for the reasons described.
40. I am mindful that the Council's proposals for growth have been submitted for examination as part of the statutory development plan process, and that the underlying purpose set out in section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Implicit in the overall growth targets is therefore a submission that such expansion is considered to be sustainable, but that does not necessarily mean the same translates to the specific circumstances of the appeal site and of the scheme proposed.

41. The issues raised by the current proposal relate to site-specific questions about how and where strategic growth targets should be accommodated, and the localised form any such development should take. The appeal proposal would involve 35 dwellings on one site, some 7 more than for the entirety of Bridstow as indicated by the Core Strategy, and with the consequent harm identified.
42. I therefore conclude that, although the development would yield significant benefits in terms of the economic and social dimensions of sustainable development, other aspects of the scheme, particularly with regard to the site's environmental impact, and relating to highway safety, would not be sustainable. In overall terms, I find the proposed scheme would not be sustainable development in accordance with the expectations of Policy S1 of the UDP and of the Framework.

Section 106 agreement

43. The Unilateral Undertaking makes commitments to bicycle contributions, to education, indoor sports facilities, play space, sustainable transport, recycling, and to affordable housing.
44. Although the Undertaking provides for significant benefits, it is still incumbent upon me to assess the proposed contributions with regard to the tests identified in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 (the Regulations), and with reference to the advice of the Framework, of the Guidance, and with regard to the general expectations of the Planning Inspectorate's Procedural Guide Planning Appeals - England, published July 2015.
45. Regulation 122 makes clear that it is unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account in a planning decision that is capable of being charged CIL unless it meets three tests. These are that the obligation is necessary to make the proposal acceptable in planning terms, that it is directly related to the scheme, and that it is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, and these tests are more generally expressed in the Framework and Guidance. Further, Regulation 123 also places limitations upon the number of pooled contributions for particular projects.
46. I note the Council's case for the contributions and the justification provided by its Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, April 2008, and by Policy H9 of the UDP in relation to affordable housing. On this basis, I find the contributions in relation to affordable housing, primary education, play space, recycling and sustainable transport would all meet the appropriate tests.
47. The Council has confirmed that the contribution for secondary education does not meet the requirements for pooled contributions now set out in Regulation 123. Accordingly, this proposed contribution is not a factor I take into account as part of my decision. The Council has also explained that the contribution to recycling would not be a pooled contribution as such, but would be a commitment directed specifically to the development.
48. Whilst the Council does not find the bicycle and indoor facilities contributions to be necessary, these are proposed as reasonable benefits of the scheme and are relevant to the appellant's aspirations for a sustainable development.
49. The Undertaking also includes a commitment to works to the highway outside the application site as discussed.

50. The Council raises no issues regarding the form and drafting of the Undertaking which I find is fit-for-purpose.
51. I therefore have regard in my decision to the Undertaking insofar as it relates to all provisions excepting secondary education.

Other Matters

52. I have considered all other matters raised, including concerns relating to the impact upon local living conditions, and issues relating to flooding and drainage. The Council raises no objection in this regard and, given the outline status of the application with all matters reserved except access, I have little reason to disagree.
53. Concerns were raised at the hearing regarding the possible presence of bats within the site. Both the Council and the appellant consider this matter could be addressed by way of the appellant's proposed Habitat and Biodiversity Protection and Enhancement Scheme. Whilst that may prove appropriate in light of possible future survey work, the possible presence of bats as a protected species in this location is a significant issue which would require further attention as part of my decision should the proposed scheme be otherwise acceptable.
54. I have noted references made to pre-application discussions and to the appellant's Statement of Community Involvement. I also note the scheme has been assessed as not to involve Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development.
55. I have had regard to all other planning decisions and appeals as referred to in the submitted evidence, and to all other considerations raised at both the hearing and in written evidence.

Overall Planning Balance

Whether major development for the purposes of the Framework

56. Paragraph 116 of the Framework states that planning permission should be refused for major developments in AONB's except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that development is in the public interest. It further states that consideration of such applications should include three tests. The first is an assessment of the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy. The second is an assessment of the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way. The third is an assessment of any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that can be moderated.
57. Major development is not defined by the Framework. I agree with both the main parties that its interpretation should reflect an assessment of the scale of development relative to the locality, and similar advice is set out in the Guidance.
58. The appellant also maintains the proposal is not major development with particular regard to the Core Strategy's allocation of Bridstow as a settlement for growth by some 28 dwellings and with regard to further growth proposed

across the wider Parish. Modification Policy RA1 indicates a minimum rural housing target for the county of some 5,300 homes between 2011 and 2031.

59. I have also given careful consideration to references made by both the main parties to various appeal decisions offering differing interpretations of major development. Whilst the full details of each of those schemes are not before me, the appeal site is adjacent to a relatively modest wayside development of some 30 or so dwellings and surrounding fields. Notwithstanding the possible scale of development anticipated by the Core Strategy across the wider area, the effect of the appeal scheme would very broadly be in the order of doubling the number of dwellings within this part of Bridstow and on a single site. In that particular local context, I consider the scheme to be a major development.
60. Accordingly, it is necessary to consider whether, as major development, the scheme would constitute exceptional circumstances, and to be in the public interest, and with regard to the three tests of paragraph 116.

Possible exceptional circumstances and the public interest

61. The first test is the need for the development. It is agreed by both the main parties that Herefordshire Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply as required by paragraph 47 of the Framework, that saved policies within the UDP relating to the supply of housing are considered out-of-date in accordance with paragraph 49, and that the presumption in favour of sustainable development would thereby otherwise be engaged.
62. The Council considers it has a housing land supply of some 2.47 years, whilst the appellant contends that to be an over-estimate in view of the questionable deliverability of land identified. Nevertheless, the Council's need for new housing development is not disputed and, by its own admission, the extent of the shortfall is significant.
63. I also note the evidence of appeal Ref: APP/F1610/A/13/2196383 dated 15 January 2014 relating to a site at Bourton-on-the-Water where it was held that the lack of a 5-year supply of housing land was an exceptional circumstance, and that the urgent need to rectify that situation was a matter of public interest. I accept that, in principle, the absence of a 5-year housing land supply is capable of contributing to exceptional circumstances in that specific regard, and similarly as a possible matter of public interest in those specific housing terms.
64. The second test is scope for developing elsewhere outside the designated area or whether the need may be met in some other way. The AONB washes over Bridstow and the village itself is identified as a settlement for growth. Even so, and notwithstanding the Council's work in preparing housing evidence in support of its Core Strategy, no other sites have yet been formally identified for development within the settlement. The Parish Council did indicate at the hearing that discussions with other landowners were on-going as part of its preparation of a neighbourhood plan, but formal proposals have yet to emerge.
65. The third test is the effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, as already assessed.
66. I therefore find that the scheme is a major development to which exceptional circumstances and considerations of the public interest may apply in relation to the scheme's housing benefits. Nevertheless, such aspects would still remain

to be assessed in the round, and to be weighed alongside the other benefits of the scheme and against the other considerations identified, including the impact upon the local environment and landscape, and with regard to local highway implications.

Summary of overall balance

67. Policy LA1 of the UDP pre-dates the Framework but is largely consistent with the broad expectations of paragraph 116. Policy LA1 states that development will only be permitted in the AONB where it is small scale, does not adversely affect the intrinsic natural beauty of the landscape, and is necessary to facilitate the economic and social well-being of the designated areas and their communities or can enhance the quality of the landscape or biodiversity. Exceptions to this policy will need to demonstrate that the development is of greater national interest than the purpose of the AONB, that there is unlikely to be any adverse impact upon the local economy, that no alternative site is available, including outside the AONB, and that any detrimental effect upon the landscape and biodiversity can be mitigated adequately.
68. Notwithstanding the undoubted economic and social benefits of the scheme, and considerations of potentially exceptional circumstances and of the public interest served by helping to address the Council's acknowledged shortage of housing land supply, substantial harm would still be incurred by the scheme. In particular, substantial harm would arise to the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area, and with particular regard to its location and scale, and the quality of the landscape of the Wye Valley AONB, and in relation to the free and safe movement of vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the site. These adverse impacts reflect matters of acknowledged importance by the Framework. Further, the Framework particularly requires that great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.
69. Taken together, I therefore find that the adverse impacts of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole and, further, that there are specific policies in the Framework which indicate that development should be restricted.
70. Accordingly, the scheme does not represent, in overall terms, the exceptional circumstances necessary to outweigh the presumption set out in both the Framework and in the development plan that permission should be refused for major development in the AONB, and nor would it be development in the public interest.
71. The absence of a mechanism to accommodate the appellant's proposed contribution to secondary education means the scheme would also have an unaddressed impact in that regard, but that does not affect my overall assessment of the balance, and my conclusion does not require further attention to be given to the possible presence of bats as part of this decision.

Conclusion

72. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Peter Rose
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Michael Baggett	Fortis Living (appellant)
Philip Deeley	rca Regeneration
Sarah Loynes	rca Regeneration
Charles Potterton	Potterton Associates
Andy Baines	JMP Consultants Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Andrew Banks	Principal Planner
Elizabeth Duberley	Landscape Officer
Bruce Evans	Highway Engineer

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor Jenny Collin	Chair, Bridstow Parish Council
Councillor Elissa Singlehurst	Ward Councillor
Julie Joseph	Consultant on behalf of local residents
Julia Wilde	Local resident and spokesperson in relation to the proposed neighbourhood plan
Graham Thwaites	Local resident
Julie Thwaites	Local resident
Alexandra Bubb	Local resident
Sally Northcott	Local resident
Victoria Piechowiak	Local resident
D E Robbins	Local farmer

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Updated Statement of Common Ground dated July 2015
2. Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy Proposed Main Modifications March 2015 in relation to Policies RA1 and RA2
3. Council accident data in relation to the Wilton roundabout
4. Further copy of Appendix C to the Council's evidence
5. Revised settlement growth targets in response to the Core Strategy Modifications (update from appellant)
6. Map of Bridstow Parish boundary
7. Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document April 2008
8. Policy LD2 of the Core Strategy
9. Proposed modifications to Policy LD2
10. UDP Policy H9
11. Council update regarding pooled contributions

Richborough Estates