



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 29 September 2015

Site visit made on 29 September 2015

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 November 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/15/3060919

Land rear of 131 Winchester Road, Four Marks Hampshire

- 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 Hurlock Investments Ltd against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 30800/007, dated 25 July 2014, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2015.
 - The development proposed is residential development of up to 24 dwellings, new vehicular and pedestrian access off Lapwing Way, internal access roads and car parking including garages, public open space, drainage, landscaping and other associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application seeks outline planning permission with access to be determined at this stage. Layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are reserved matters to be considered in the future.
3. During the planning application process the proposal for up to 45 dwellings was amended with the number reduced and is for up to 24 dwellings. The description of development was amended to remove the proposed cycle way and pedestrian access from Winchester Road although it is still shown on the Proposed Priority Junction and Temporary Site Access (Figure 4.1).
4. Although the application plans include an indicative site layout plan the appellant has indicated that this is for illustrative purposes to demonstrate how the scale and form of development could be accommodated. I shall determine the appeal on this basis.
5. After the Hearing, the appellant submitted a certified copy of a signed section 106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 8 October 2015 in relation to contributions towards Alton Sports Centre, community facilities, education, public open space and transport improvements and an administration and monitoring fee. It also makes provision for an affordable housing contribution and 40% affordable housing to be provided on the site. I return to this matter below.

6. Following the close of the Hearing the Council submitted an appeal decision¹ at Blackberry/Telegraph Lane, Four Marks dated 1 October 2015. This was in support of arguments already made and the appellant was provided with an opportunity to comment. No party would be prejudiced by me taking this decision into account in my consideration of this appeal.
7. The development plan for the area consists of the East Hampshire Local Plan Joint Core Strategy (JCS) 2014 and the saved policies of the East Hampshire Local Plan Second Review (LP) 2006. The Council have recently submitted the Housing and Employment Allocations document for examination. The date for this was indicated to be some time in late October 2015. The plan is therefore at a fairly advanced stage in the process and carries some weight. The appeal site is not included within the Allocations Plan. I note that there are unresolved objections to the Allocations Plan including for the appeal site. The weight I attach to it is therefore moderate.
8. The Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan (NP) was submitted for consultation in August with the consultation ending in early October 2015. Given the stage in the process this has reached I consider that the weight I can attach to it is also moderate. I note that it is proposed to retain the settlement boundary in respect of the appeal site.

Main Issues

9. The main issues are:
 - i) Whether there is a five year supply of housing land within the District;
 - ii) Whether the principle of residential development is acceptable;
 - iv) The effect of the proposed development on protected species;
 - v) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area including protected trees.
 - iii) Whether the proposal development would make adequate provision for infrastructure and affordable housing, and;
 - vi) Whether the proposal would be sustainable development.

Reasons

Five year supply of housing land

10. The parties agree that the Council were unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land in April 2014. However, the 2015 housing land supply assessment indicated that the Council consider they now have a five year supply at 6.92 years² against the requirements of the JCS. The appellant does not agree that there is a five year supply.
11. The Council's and the appellant's approaches to the five year housing land supply differ on a number of matters. These include the approach to a buffer, the method to be used in calculating the five year housing land supply, base date and deliverable supply. I deal with each of these matters in turn.

¹ APP/M1710/W/15/3012061

² East Hampshire Five Year Housing Land Supply (As of 1st April, 2015) published July 2015

5% or 20% buffer

12. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that local planning authorities should add a buffer of 5% to the land needed to meet housing requirements. This is to allow choice and competition in the housing market. A 20% buffer should be applied where there has been a record of persistent under delivery.
13. The Guidance indicates that the approach to identifying a record of persistent under delivery involves matters of judgement. It is more likely to be robust if a longer term view is taken. This would account for peaks and troughs in the economy and housing market. The figures for the period 2013 to 2015 show that the Council have not delivered the requirement from the JCS. However, given the length of time since the adoption of the JCS I consider that this element cannot be interpreted as persistent under delivery.
14. From the period 2006 to 2013 the housing requirement within the District was measured against the South East Plan. Although delivery of housing fluctuated during that period the Council met the requirement. I acknowledge that the South East Plan requirement was constrained and did not take into account an objectively assessed need for housing (OAN). Nor did it reflect more recent population requirements which show a greater housing need.
15. I accept that the Inspector in the Lymington Bottom appeal³ concluded that housing delivery in the period 2006 to 2013 should be considered against an assessment of need. I have been referred to an extract from a High Court judgement (EWHC 3719) relating to whether an assessment should be made against housing needs rather than a requirement. I note that Lewis. J states that *'it would, in my judgment be open to a decision maker to identify an appropriate measure of housing needs'*. However, to my mind this only suggests the possibility of using housing needs, not that it should.
16. The appellant refers to including the strategic allocation of Whitehill and Bordon which would increase the requirement for the period 2006 to 2013. I accept that the position has now changed however, the allocation was meant to serve a wider area at that time. I consider it would not be appropriate to include it within the South East Plan requirement.
17. I acknowledge that the South East Plan was prepared before OAN and the need to address housing at a more local level. Nevertheless, it was the development plan in place at the time. The requirement was also made in accordance with relevant national and regional guidance. I consider therefore that the figures do not demonstrate a persistent record of under delivery. A 5% buffer is both reasonable and justified.

Approach to five year housing land supply

18. There are two recognised methods for dealing with a housing land supply shortfall. The Liverpool method addresses a shortfall over the plan period. The Sedgefield method would deal with a shortfall over the next five years of the plan period. The Council considers that the Liverpool method was used by the JCS Inspector and that this should continue to be used when addressing any existing housing shortfall. The JCS Inspector makes reference to the Planning Practice Guidance within his report. There was therefore a clear opportunity

³ APP/M1710/A/14/2226723

for the Inspector to consider the use of the Sedgefield method. The Council also refer to the delivery of the strategic allocation at Whitehill and Bordon. This would represent 27% of the requirement within the overall plan period and would be delivered towards the middle and end of the period.

19. The PPG sets out that '*local planning authorities should aim to deal with any shortfall in the first 5 years of the plan period where possible*'. It explains that where this cannot be done, local planning authorities should work with their neighbours under the duty to co-operate. However, I note that this part of the PPG refers particularly to plan making.
20. A number of appeal decisions and judgements have supported the application of either method depending on the circumstances of the case. I note that the Inspector in the Downhouse Road appeal considered that the Liverpool method should be applied. Other decisions including the Lymington Bottom appeal and Blendworth Lane have applied the Sedgefield method. However, the Whitehill and Bordon allocation represents only a quarter of the District's housing supply with reliance on other areas of the District to supply the rest. In the majority of cases where the Liverpool method was applied the size of the strategic allocations was significantly above that of the Whitehill and Bordon allocation.
21. The Council indicate that there is no realistic prospect of meeting an annual target with a shortfall figure. However, I note that they are seeking to increase the supply within the District as soon as possible. The government's objective is to significantly boost the supply of housing land. Therefore I consider that the shortfall should be made up within the next five years of the plan period.

Base date and deliverable supply

22. The Council have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA). The Memorandum refers to the authorities calculating housing land supply separately for the two areas (disaggregated). The Council now acknowledges that this approach has not been supported by a number of Inspectors and provided a revised set of figures with the SDNPA included.
23. The Council's figures for an aggregated approach, applying the Sedgefield method and a 5% buffer show a 5.84 years supply. Using the same approach the appellant considers this would be 4.77 years. The appellant questions the robustness of the Council's approach to the April 2015 supply figures in some matters. This includes sites permitted after 31 March 2015, the inclusion of sites where planning applications have been withdrawn or are not likely to come forward, the need to apply lapse rates and the robustness of the data from the SDNPA.
24. *Sites permitted after 31 March 2015.* The appellant refers to three sites which should be excluded as they were permitted after the base date. At the Hearing, the Council confirmed that the Council had a resolution to grant permission at Land at Cadmans Farm subject to a section 106 agreement in February 2015. The agreement was signed shortly afterwards. In respect of Land at Will Hall Farm this was also granted permission in February 2015 with the agreement signed in May. In respect of Dunsells Lane the site already has outline planning permission before the base date. I consider it would be reasonable to include these within the housing land supply figures.

25. *Withdrawn and other sites.* In respect of the site which had been withdrawn I understand that an application has been re-submitted. However, this was after the base date and should be excluded. The information provided by the Council on a large site which has not come forward for a number of years was not conclusive. I consider this should also be excluded.
26. *Lapse rates.* I note that the Council have applied a discount figure for small sites. The appellant considers that a lapse rate of 10% for larger permitted sites should also be applied. I accept that this has been applied in a number of cases. The Council have referred to this as not being needed and that they have been in contact with developers. On this basis it considers there is no clear evidence that the large sites included within the 2015 housing land supply would not be implemented in the next five years.
27. I acknowledge that there is not a detailed assessment of the deliverability of each site. However, at the Hearing the Council provided a breakdown of lapse rates for the District for the period 2008-2014. The rates for large sites were very low at between 1 and 3% with a total of just over 1%. I accept that the appellant did not agree with the calculations. Nevertheless, based on the evidence before me I consider it would not be appropriate in this instance to apply a lapse rate.
28. *SDNP figures.* In respect of the SDNPA the Council have supplied only indicative completions and commitments figures. The appellant indicates that the actual figure for the SDNPA could be anywhere between 0 and 782 dwellings. However, they also acknowledge that this is likely to be within the upper end of the range. Without any breakdown of this figure I cannot be certain where within this range this would be or whether it would be close to the maximum figure supplied by the Council. I agree with the parties that an aggregated approach to the housing land supply figures should be applied. I accept that due to the timing of the Hearing the Council were unable to undertake any analysis on these figures. However, taking a precautionary approach I consider that this element should not be counted.

Conclusion on five year housing land supply

29. The appellant considers that the April 2014 assessment should be applied for the purposes of the appeal. However, taking account of the fact that other elements of the Council's assessment are not disputed I consider it is reasonable to consider the five year supply against the Council's April 2015 housing land supply assessment.
30. I accept that the Council has made very strenuous efforts to increase the housing land supply. It is also making very good progress on the site allocations plan and is granting planning permission for sites within that emerging plan. That said, with the exclusion of the SDNPA commitment figures, withdrawn and non-implemented sites I conclude that there is unlikely to be a five year supply of housing land. That said this appears to be only marginally below five years.

Principle of residential development

31. Paragraph 49 of the Framework sets out 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 housing land.*' Paragraph 14 of the

Framework indicates that where relevant policies are out of date planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework as a whole.

32. In terms of whether the plan is silent on the location of future development, I note that the Boyneswood Lane appeal decision indicated that the JCS was silent on this matter. Since that decision considerable progress has been made on the Allocations Plan and is at a well advanced stage. Although the JCS does not refer to specific sites, it does point to allocations at specific settlements. In this regard, I consider that the plan is not silent.
33. The appellant argues that the settlement policy boundaries are out of date. Settlement policy boundaries are identified on the Council's Proposals Map. Saved Policy H14 sets out that development outside of these areas will only be permitted in certain circumstances.
34. Policy CP19 is also relevant to the settlement boundaries. This policy seeks to *protect the countryside for its own sake*⁴. Emerging Policy 1 of the NP indicates that land outside the settlement policy boundaries will be regarded as countryside and where development will not be permitted except in certain circumstances. In this regard these are consistent with the Framework where it recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
35. However, Policies H14 and CP19 seek to control development in the open countryside to certain uses, constraining the supply of housing. For the purposes of this appeal the policies may therefore be regarded in part as a relevant policy for the supply of housing. In the light of the above, I conclude that little weight should be attributed solely to the site being located in the countryside.

Protected species

36. The main parties agree that the issue in respect of ecology relates to the hazel dormouse and the Site of Important Nature Conservation (SINC). It is acknowledged that hazel dormice are present on the site. The population is likely to be small but the appellant refers to it as being well established. The SINC is designated for a pocket of woodland in the north and *for its mature hedgerows and plant species*. There are also badgers in the woodland.
37. As part of the planning application the appellant has submitted a Dormouse Mitigation Strategy⁴. The Council do not object to the proposed mitigation measures where it would provide additional buffering and native planting and some enhancements to the woodland. These elements would be of some benefit to biodiversity. The Council are also satisfied that the proposal no longer includes the use of the woodland as a public open space. Additional measures for badger protection would ensure that the impact on the population present would be reduced.
38. However, the Council is concerned that the partial removal of part of the SINC hedgerow on the west boundary of the site would sever the SINC and negatively affect the population of the dormice. This is because it relies on the plant species as a food source and relies on hedgerows to move from location to location. To mitigate this, the appellant has proposed the installation of a

⁴ EcoSupport, 2014

dormouse bridge above the access road to allow the dormice to move to the southern part of the site. This would be constructed at a high level between trees and would be vegetated. There are examples of this type of bridge being constructed locally although I note they have not been installed in the way the appellant proposes. I have also been referred to examples elsewhere within the District.

39. Nevertheless, the evidence surrounding the effectiveness of dormice bridges in helping to maintain a dormouse population is extremely limited. The population of Hazel Dormice is acknowledged to be low but persisting in the area despite recent development nearby. The reasons for this are not fully understood and it cannot be assumed that this would continue to be the case. Based on the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that the functionality of the hedgerow would be maintained and that the proposal would secure or enhance the population of hazel dormice.
40. I note there is no objection from Natural England. The appellant refers to discussions with Natural England in relation to issuing a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence. However, it is not clear from the discussions at the Hearing and the evidence before me that Natural England would issue a licence.
41. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the SINC and would fail to protect the hazel dormice. It would be in conflict with Policy CP21 which amongst other things seeks to maintain, enhance and protect district wide biodiversity and to protect and, where appropriate, strengthen populations of protected species.

Character and appearance

42. The Council does not object to the proposed development in terms of its visual impact and wider landscape effects. The site is not visible in the wider landscape. The appeal site has some recent higher density development to the south and west. The Council acknowledges that newer 'estate' style development has now become part of the context of the village. Lower density development with older style housing is to the north and east although I understand that there are proposals for small scale development to the east.
43. The development to the north and east in most instances retain long gardens. It is agreed by the parties that the site no longer fulfils a countryside function. The site is not visible within the wider landscape and I accept that it is not public open space. I accept that the appeal scheme would retain the woodland and some open space in the north of the site. However, when stood within the appeal site only the rooftops of the development to the south were visible. It is not evident that there is development surrounding the site. The mature hedgerows and trees and openness within the site make a significant contribution to the semi-rural character and context of the area.
44. However, although it would be at 13 dwellings per hectare the proposal would be at a higher density than the development to the north and east. Development would replace approximately half of the open field. The development would be visible through the access road off Lapwing Way and would alter the appearance of the streetscene to some extent. Overall, there would be an inevitable change of character from a semi-rural to suburban appearance which would be harmful to the area.

45. The appeal site is subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). The development proposes the removal of a silver birch tree (Tree T9). This is on the west boundary and is where the proposed access road would be located. The two parties do not agree on the quality or the life expectancy of the tree.
46. The hedgerow is thick and I note that there are a number of other tall trees within it including other silver birch trees. I note that tree planting is proposed for other areas as a compensatory measure. However, the silver birch is a tall tree and can be seen above the hedgerow from Lapwing Way. In spite of other trees in the hedgerow it is a particularly prominent feature in the streetscene. I accept that the removal of the tree is needed to provide access to the site. The appellant also refers to the life of the tree being one which is short-lived. However, I consider that due to its size and presence the effect of removing it would be detrimental to the overall appearance of the streetscene along Lapwing Way.
47. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area including the protected birch tree. It would be in conflict with Policy CP29 of the JCS this amongst other things seeks new development which respects the character identity and rural context of the district's villages. There would also be conflict with saved Policy C6 of the LP in respect of protected trees.
48. A protected oak tree is to the north of the proposed access road and footway. This would be partly within the root protection area of this tree and would require the removal of a small amount of roots. The submitted Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS)⁵ suggests a no-dig solution. The Council are concerned that the proposals may not be achievable and lacks the details of the levels of the existing footway. I am satisfied that were other matters acceptable a appropriate solution could be secured by a condition. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have found with regard to character and appearance and the protected silver birch tree.

Infrastructure and affordable housing

49. The UU makes provision for contributions towards Alton Sports Centre, community facilities, education, public open space and transport improvements and an administration and monitoring fee. It makes provision for an affordable housing contribution and 40 % affordable housing on the site. I have considered the UU in the light of the tests contained in regulations 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations 2010 and the tests of paragraph 204 of the Framework.
50. The provision for an affordable housing contribution and affordable housing on the site would be in accordance with Policies CP11 and CP13 of the JCS. In respect of the other contributions the sums are calculated on the basis of the Council's Guide to Developer Contributions. I am satisfied that the justification for the contributions towards the Alton Sports Centre, community facilities, public open space and transport improvements indicate that they would be directly related to the development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind and necessary to make the development acceptable.
51. In April 2015 Regulation 123(3) of the CIL regulations came into effect, this restricts the pooling of more than five planning obligations towards

5

infrastructure. In respect of the education contribution the Council confirmed at the Hearing that the planned expansion of the local primary school at Four Marks had received more than five pooled contributions. Notwithstanding, the UU education contribution specifically refers to the expansion plan for the school including a new classroom.

52. The Council have not provided any further comment on the contents of the UU. I note that the appellant indicates that the issues surrounding education have now been resolved although this is not explained. However, it is not clear to me whether this is a new project entirely separate from the expansion plans discussed at the Hearing. I therefore cannot be certain that the contribution would not be pooled towards a project which has already received five contributions. Therefore, I am unable to take the education contribution into account.
53. I have considered whether a 'Grampian' condition could be attached to prevent the occupation of development until the capacity of the school has been increased. This was a condition which was attached as part of the Boyneswood appeal decision. However, the PPG indicates that Grampian conditions should not be used where there are no prospects at all of the action in question being performed within the time-limit imposed by the permission. I have no information before me relating to the timing of the planned expansion and therefore I could not be certain when this would be achieved.

Whether sustainable development

54. The Framework identifies three dimensions to sustainable development – economic, social and environmental. The Framework makes it clear that the three roles the planning system is required to perform in respect of sustainable development should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent.
55. In terms of the economic role the proposal would provide temporary jobs during the construction phase. The new occupiers would contribute to an increase in spending locally within the village. These factors attract limited weight in favour of the appeal scheme. I note that there is also need for affordable housing within the village. The proposal would also result in delivery of much needed housing including affordable housing within the District. The provision of housing is therefore a significant benefit of the scheme. The site would also be available now and could be brought forward within a five year period.
56. In terms of the social role, the proposal would provide on-site public space and this would be a benefit of the proposal. Residents would also make use of the services and facilities which do exist in the village. I accept that there are local concerns about the effect of the proposal in terms of traffic and highway safety. However, the Council and the Highways Authority do not object to the proposal subject to suitable conditions. Based on the evidence before and observations on the site visit, I see no reason to disagree with this matter.
57. However, there is considerable local concern that the cumulative effects of the proposal and other development will result in excessive effects on local infrastructure. Policy CP2 of the JCS sets out that development growth will be directed to the most sustainable and accessible locations in the District. Four Marks and South Medstead is defined as a 'Small Local Service Centre'. These

have a more limited range of services and are capable of accepting some new development. The supporting text to the policy at paragraph 4.6 states that they play an important role in the life of their communities. Policy CP10 refers to development where it is consistent with maintaining and enhancing the character and quality of life.

58. Policy CP10 confirms how residential development will be delivered up to 2028. The policy refers to allocations of a minimum of 175 dwellings to be delivered at Four Marks/Medstead. The Council accepts that the number does not represent a cap on development. However, the Council refer to the development proposed and permitted since 2013 in Four Marks/Medstead as equating to 81% over the 175 minimum and that this is contrary to the spatial strategy of the JCS.
59. In the Boyneswood appeal the Inspector noted that the development being considered would increase the development by over 2.5% but that it would not alter the character in any fundamental way. In the Lymington Bottom appeal the Inspector considered concerns for the cumulative effect of housing development must be weighed against the need to deliver housing for the District and the national need to significantly boost the supply of housing. I note that the proposal on its own would only amount to 1% growth at the village. The appellant refers to the population of the villages as being close to the lower limits of a Large Local Service Centre. However, there was no argument that the level of services in the village was also commensurate to a Large Local Service Centre.
60. In this particular case it has not been demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on education provision within the village. I also understand the concerns of residents that the growth at the village is starting to affect community cohesion and is having a negative impact on existing residents. These factors weigh against the proposal. I accept that the proposal would provide other contributions for local infrastructure. However, as these simply fulfil policy requirements they are factors which would not weigh heavily in favour of the scheme.
61. In environmental terms the Council accept that the site is in an accessible location with a reasonable level of facilities within walking distance. The proposal would incorporate opportunities for native and replacement planting. These factors would weigh in favour of the appeal proposal. There would be no effect on the wider landscape although this would be an absence of harm and would not weigh in favour of the development.
62. Although there are some local employment opportunities and facilities and public transport which provide opportunities to travel further away. I consider that it reasonable to assume that the majority of journeys would still be undertaken by car. This would be to access the major services and employment centres of Alton, Basingstoke and Winchester. I have also found that the proposal would cause harm to the SINC and protected species to which I attach significant weight. There would also be harm to the character and appearance of the area, including a protected tree.
63. In conclusion when taken cumulatively the adverse effects of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits including the provision of affordable and market housing when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole. In accordance with

paragraph 14 of the Framework when the three dimensions of sustainable development are considered together, the proposal would not be sustainable development to which the presumption in favour applies.

Other matters

64. As well as the appeal decisions specifically referred to in my decision, my attention has been drawn to a number of other appeal decisions and High Court judgements within the District and elsewhere. Consistency between decision makers is important. Some of these decisions have some features in common with the appeal proposal and refer to housing land supply amongst other things. However, each of these cases also has different considerations which affect the nature of the development and the Inspectors' conclusions. In any event, I have considered the proposal before me on the specific circumstances and evidence which has been provided by the parties.

Conclusion and overall balance

65. There are significant benefits of the proposal particularly the contribution that it would bring to meeting the shortfall in housing supply and affordable housing in the wider area. However when compared to the adverse affects including the protected habitats and species and the effect on the character and appearance of the area, I conclude there is not a compelling case for allowing the appeal.
66. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr D Hurlock	Appellant
Mr D Hutchison (BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI)	Pegasus Planning
Mr N Tiley	Pegasus Planning
Mr A Jessop	Eco Support Limited
Mr M Welby	ACD Arboriculture

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Mr J Holmes	Principal Planning Officer, East Hampshire District Council
Mr I Mawer	Principal Policy Officer, East Hampshire District Council
Mr T Norton	Senior Ecologist, Hampshire County Council
Mr S Garside	Arboricultural Officer, East Hampshire District Council
Mrs J Mansi	Head of Development Management, East Hampshire District Council

INTERESTED PERSONS

Mrs I Thomas	Ward Councillor, East Hampshire District Council
Mrs J Foster	Four Marks Parish Council
Mr P Fenwick	Medstead Parish Council
Mr M Neeve	East Hampshire Badger Group
Mr N Stenning	Medstead and Four Marks Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Mr M Shakespeare	
Mr M Saunders	Fight For Four Marks
Mr J Pettegree	
Mr R Garrett	
Mrs D Tennyson	
Mrs C Whittle	

DOCUMENTS AND PLANS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- 1 Notification Letters for Hearing and Planning Application
- 2 Updated Table 9.1 from appellants Housing Land Supply Hearing Statement
- 3 Badger Sett Protection Zones and Badger Advice Sheets supplied by Mr Neeve
- 4 Lapse Rates across East Hampshire supplied by the Council
- 5 Draft Statement of Common Ground with specific reference to Appendix 1 supplied by the appellant
- 6 List of Conditions
- 7 Tree Life Expectancy supplied by the appellant
- 8 Extract from APP/Q3820/A/08/2092933 relating to conditions for landscape management plan and biodiversity management plans supplied by the appellant

Richborough Estates