



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 17 December 2019

Site visit made on 18 December 2019

by Mr J P Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/W/19/3233882

Land to the rear of Clavering Primary School, Stortford Road, Clavering, Essex CB11 4PE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Pat Rowe against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/18/1256/OP, dated 5 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is outline permission for up to 31 dwellings (net gain of 30 units) with all matters but access reserved, comprising the demolition of 'Poppies', and alterations to the access onto Stortford Road to create an access road, together with the provision of 38 parking spaces for visitors to the adjacent school, the extension of the school playing field and the creation of a sports pitch and the provision of open space areas, balancing pond, and associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are
 - a) whether Clavering is a sustainable location for the development;
 - b) its effect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - c) its impact on highway safety;
 - d) whether it would address any impact it may impose on infrastructure;
 - e) whether it would cause other harm and
 - f) if any harm would be caused, whether this harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme.

Procedural matters

3. This is an outline application with only access being considered at this stage, and all other matters reserved for later consideration. For the avoidance of doubt, I have deemed 'access' as relating not just to the junction arrangement with Stortford Road, but also to the length of the 2-way carriageway (but not the parking bays shown on its northern side) from Stortford Road to what is

now the rear boundary of a dwelling called 'Poppies'. I have treated all other details as being indicative, mindful though that throughout proceedings the appellant has repeatedly confirmed a desire to build the scheme in a manner substantially in line with that shown on the submitted plans.

4. At the time of the Hearing the Council was awaiting the comments of the Inspectors who were examining its emerging Local Plan. Since the Hearing closed it has been confirmed that the examining Inspectors have found that, as things stand, the strategy set out in the emerging Local Plan is unsound. Given the extent of the modifications required, it cannot therefore be afforded any appreciable weight in my determination.

Reasons

a) Is Clavering a sustainable location?

5. The village of Clavering has few employment opportunities and is poorly served by public transport. Moreover, the closest towns are a few kilometres away with the connecting roads tending to be unlit and relatively winding, thereby discouraging cycle usage on a regular basis. However, it contains a primary school, a relatively large supermarket with post office, a number of public houses, a village hall and a church. Therefore, whilst in some respects it is unsuited to those who do not have access to private motorised transport, I nonetheless accept that it is one of the best served villages in this predominantly rural district.
6. Accordingly, I conclude that Clavering is a locationally sustainable village for additional housing and so in this regard accords with advice in the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework).

b) Character and appearance

7. Clavering is a historic settlement that grew up around the confluence of the River Stort and its tributaries. Its buildings are still generally contained within the valleys and on the valley sides, although there are some places, most notably to the north-west, where the housing rises to higher land.
8. Stortford Road runs southwards, following the route of the River Stort. On the west side of the road are relatively modern individually designed bungalows and houses, and many have very long back gardens rising up the slope to a field that is between 8m and 14m above the height of the road. The parts of these gardens furthest from the houses tend to be planted in a more informal manner and often contain mature trees. However, some of the houses have shorter gardens with Clavering Primary School (the school) behind. This has a playing field to the rear of the school buildings that extends as far as the western boundaries of the long gardens adjacent.
9. The proposal is to demolish 'Poppies', which stands immediately to the south of the school, and run an access road along its lengthy curtilage to the arable field behind. On that field would then be built up to 31 dwellings, the majority of which would be 2-storeys high and 12 would be affordable. The illustrative plan shows there would be a central open space with another open area running along the western side. As part of the scheme it is also intended to 'gift' land to the school to be an additional playing field.

10. In assessing this issue, I have taken into account the various landscape character assessments to which I was referred, as well as the appellant's *Landscape and Visual Appraisal* and the *Landscape and Visual Issues* document submitted on behalf of 'Hands off Clavering'.
11. The housing now proposed is shown as being in what is defined as the countryside in the *Uttlesford Local Plan* (2005). This is because it would be outside the identified settlement boundary of Clavering, which runs across the school grounds and through roughly the middle of the long curtilages of the houses on Stortford Road.
12. The village sits in a rural landscape that is crossed by an extensive, and seemingly well-used, network of public footpaths. Although not subject to any statutory designation, it is nonetheless a pleasing, expansive and relatively unpopulated landscape. When looking from the east and the west Clavering is currently concealed to a great extent as it generally lies within the valleys. As such, it does not intrude unduly into the expansive views from these directions, which tend to be of an open undulating upland that is characteristic of this area.
13. Seen from the east, although the houses on the west side of Stortford Road are apparent, they are down towards the valley bottom and contained by the hillside behind. The development would be located appreciably beyond this line of dwellings, separated by the lengthy intervening gardens, and would be some 10m higher up the slope. As such, from this direction the housing now proposed would not constitute a contiguous extension to the village, and it would not respect the apparent form of Clavering, which, at this point, appears to be confined within the valley. Rather, the houses would appear as isolated and notable features in the countryside, projecting as they would above the top of the valley, and the illustrative plan shows little substantive planting on this side to soften their impact. As a result, the development would be a notable and discordant intrusion into the expansive landscape.
14. From the west and north-west few if any of the Stortford Road houses are apparent. Some of the houses on Pelham Road and Saville Close can be seen from these directions. These though sit within dense planting and so are not especially noticeable and are perceived not as a block of housing within a larger settlement but as separate and relatively isolated elements. In contrast, the scheme, with the illustrative plan showing some 5 large, 2-storey dwellings along the western side, would introduce a significant block of development into the landscape where none now appears to exist. Again, given the fragmented nature of the housing that can be seen on Pelham Road and Saville Close, what is proposed would not be perceived as a natural and organic extension to the settlement but rather would be a distinct and new element.
15. Running along the western side of the site is Footpath 51, and as the development would be adjacent it would clearly have an effect on the character of this footpath. When approaching from the south, this is one of the few places where the site is perceived in the context of the village as, looking across the field, the houses on Skeins Way, Pelham Road and Saville Close can be seen. As a result, although there would be some harm in these views due to the loss of the open agricultural land this would be limited. Coming from the north the footpath opens up when past the rear fence of the house on the east side of the pathway. Extensive views would remain to the south-west and west,

but the eastward views over the Stort valley to the upland landscape beyond would be lost.

16. The appellant has placed great weight on the contained nature of the site when seen from the west and north-west. While I accept that broken tree lines are along its eastern and northern sides and a strip of woodland is on its southern boundary, these to my mind do not mean it is not now read as part of the wider landscape. It has also been said that in these views the site constitutes a small part of the landscape. Whilst this may be so, the isolated and discordant nature of the development would mean it would have a disproportionate impact in this regard and be particularly noticeable.
17. An area of open space with planting is proposed along the western side of the scheme. I am unclear though as to the precise form this would take, as at different points during the Hearing it was described as having various roles, not all of which would have resulted in the same level of vegetative cover. However, even assuming it is to involve a degree of relatively dense planting, it is unlikely that it would conceal the housing and so would not fully mitigate the effect of the development. At best it would soften the scheme, but on the evidence before me I am not satisfied this would be sufficient to allay my concerns in this regard.
18. As a consequence, from these directions the development would, once again, be a discordant intrusion into the wider landscape.
19. When on the footpaths and roads to the south, the site is concealed to a great extent, even in winter, by the woodland on its southern boundary. Again though, views of the village are also limited. While the new development around Oxleys Close is noticeable from some vantagepoints, that is down in the valley and to the east, and does not directly impinge on views towards the site. The church tower is also apparent but that is not out of place in a rural landscape. From some of these footpaths, for example Footpath 54, this limited awareness of the village would change as it would be possible to see the upper floors and roofs of the houses, even accounting for the effect of crops on the intervening fields during part of the year and the landscaped area on the site's western side. Once again, the presence of this new development, poorly related to the settlement pattern, would result in the rural landscape being harmfully eroded.
20. Finally, from Stortford Road itself, even though there would be a difference in land levels the housing element would not be readily visible, as it would be screened by the intervening dwellings and their planting. I accept that nothing similar to the long straight access exists on this side of the road, but to my mind it would not be a feature that was alien in a line of houses, particularly if softened with suitable landscaping.
21. Overall, what is proposed would be an appreciable departure from the existing settlement pattern, as it would introduce a sizeable block of housing in a prominent location at or near the hill top within a landscape where little housing is now apparent, and it would significantly intrude into the expansive nature of the views across Clavering. As a result, it would cause severe harm to the attractive, open and relatively undeveloped upland landscape that surrounds the village.

22. Although my attention was drawn to the recent development round Oxleys Close, being in the valley bottom I consider that does not intrude into the upland landscape in a comparable manner to the proposal before me and it is not such a departure from the settlement pattern.
23. The Council has cited specific harm from light pollution. However, I have no reason to consider the proposed lighting would not be the minimum necessary and so see no conflict with Local Plan Policy GEN5.
24. There was also a concern about the effect on the settings of the Grade I listed church and Clavering Conservation Area. No doubt the church tower has been a marker in the landscape for many years and that forms part of its significance as a heritage asset. However, given the separation I consider the proposal would not intrude into this in a manner that caused harm to the significance of the building. Moreover, whilst the new housing may well be visible from the top of the tower, views from there are no doubt over the village's houses now and in that sense the scheme is not causing an adverse change to its context.
25. Turning to the conservation area, the significance of this lies in the way it reflects the organic evolution of this historic rural settlement. The village has already extended well beyond this core. Furthermore, the older part of Clavering is separated from the appeal site by an area of modern housing and I am not satisfied it would be within the area from which the conservation area was experienced. I therefore find the proposal would not harm the setting of the conservation area.
26. I accept that in the Council's housing land assessments this site was dismissed for access reasons only. However, those assessments are a different exercise to that of a planning application and do not bind me in my decision.
27. Accordingly, I conclude the proposal would be outside the settlement boundary. Moreover, it would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area, as it would be a discordant development that unacceptably eroded the open rural landscape and would relate poorly to the existing settlement pattern of Clavering. It would therefore be contrary to the Framework, which seeks to protect the character and beauty of the countryside. It would also conflict with Local Plan Policy S7 that says in the countryside planning permission will be granted only for development that needs to take place there or is appropriate to a rural area. The purpose of this policy is to protect the countryside for its own sake. While the aims of countryside protection accord with the Framework, the policy itself is more negatively worded. As such, I can only afford this policy moderate weight.

c) Highway safety

28. The development would be served solely by the new access running along the current curtilage of 'Poppies' to link up to Stortford Road just to the south of the school. For much of the day Stortford Road is relatively quiet and, taking account of the agricultural traffic that may pass along, it could readily accommodate the additional flows associated with this scheme without any harm to highway safety. Moreover, even with intermittent parked cars visibility from the new access would be satisfactory.

29. However, the character of the road changes notably during the times when children are being brought to the school in the morning (an event I observed on 2 days) and collected again in the afternoon. Then the road is far more congested, with a greater amount of traffic, an increase in parked cars, a number of vehicles undertaking manoeuvres on the carriageway and many parents, carers and children crossing the road and walking along the pavements. Adding to this congestion is also the school coach, which reverses into the approach to the school. Whilst the road continues to be passable through these periods, extreme care has to be taken by drivers, though the apparent hazards tend to mean vehicles travel slowly. This congestion occurs because there is a lack of off-road parking for parents and carers to use.
30. The car park and parking bays shown on the proposal would be for use at these times, thereby relieving pressure on Stortford Road by giving parents and carers somewhere else to park. Works to the highway, to be secured by a Traffic Regulation Order, are also proposed to assist the existing situation and ensure the additional flows from the development were integrated satisfactorily. In this regard the appellant contends the scheme would be a benefit to the free flow of traffic and to highway safety.
31. Turning first to the lay-by spaces, I accept these do not form part of the access arrangements being considered at this stage. Nonetheless, the appellant is intending to provide them, and their usage directly impacts on the access and its suitability. It was contended that these would not be used in the manner envisaged, as drivers would manoeuvre into the first space they saw rather than turning around at the top and then coming back to park. As a result, congestion would occur as they crossed the carriageway onto the east-bound side of the road.
32. However, even if this happened, I see no reason why it would harm highway safety given the vehicle speeds involved. At worst it would seem to be relocating a problem from Stortford Road (which links Clavering to neighbouring towns and villages) to a quieter residential street that carried no through traffic. Such an arrangement would therefore relieve some of the congestion on Stortford Road, though this has to be balanced against the increase in vehicle speeds that would, in all probability, result. I accept that for those who walked to the school from the south there would be an extra road to cross, namely the access to the development. That in itself though need not be hazardous as it is reasonable to expect children to be supervised and appropriate dropped crossings could be provided.
33. As well as parents and carers who were seeking to park, the access would also be carrying the additional traffic associated with the development. This traffic would then be travelling either north or south along Stortford Road, passing those who were walking to and from the school and those who still chose to park at the kerbside there. However, the extra movements associated with 31 houses would not be that great. Indeed, whilst assumptions about work patterns are increasingly hard to make, if the residents of the development needed to be at work in, say, Bishops Stortford or Saffron Walden for 0900h, I expect they would have left before the school traffic reached its peak, and would, in all likelihood, be returning long after the children have been collected. It was also said that better parking facilities could result in an increase in parents and carers who chose to bring their children by car rather than on foot. I have no reason to consider any increase this would cause would be sufficient

to compromise highway safety unacceptably. Therefore, this additional traffic would not be sufficient to be a source of harm.

34. I have no evidence to show the school would supervise the use of the access road, and indeed it is difficult to see such supervision extending to how drivers approached parking spaces. Again though that is no different to what happens at the moment with unsupervised activity on Stortford Road.
35. Further concerns were raised about the safety of the car park, but that lies outside of this outline proposal.
36. As such, when factoring in the traffic from the new dwellings and allowing for possible additional traffic associated with the school, I am not satisfied that, even if the lay-bys were formed, there would be harm to highway safety.
37. If neither the parking bays nor the car park were provided (and that is a matter I discuss below), the scheme would result in an access on Stortford Road close to the school. This would be in the midst of the congestion at the beginning and end of the school day, but as stated above the proposal's traffic flows would not be great and in this scenario there would be no expectation of more parents and carers using their cars. It would therefore not exacerbate highway safety to any material degree. For this reason, the appellant accepted that without the parking provision for the school in the proposed development the effect on highway safety would not be unacceptable, and that is a view I share.
38. Turning to the effect on the wider area, traffic from the development would soon dissipate amongst the various lanes and roads running from Clavering and so, even if considered cumulatively with traffic from other recent schemes, I have no basis to find it would be harmful.
39. Accordingly, I conclude the development would not harm highway safety, and so in this regard would not conflict with Policy GEN1 in the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure safe accesses, and paragraph 109 in the Framework.

d) Infrastructure implications

40. The appellant has submitted an agreement under section 106 of the Act (a s106 agreement) securing affordable housing, and providing contributions towards education provision and a Traffic Regulation Order. Mindful of the policy basis and the submitted evidence, I am satisfied that these are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to it and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. I therefore give them weight in my considerations.
41. In relation to these, it was said that Clavering was an unsuitable place to put social housing due to its poor public transport and limited employment opportunities. However, I was given no policy basis for considering that would be a valid reason to seek a lower on-site affordable housing provision.
42. It was also said that the primary school was at capacity, but I have no grounds to find that this issue would justify resisting the development. Rather, the provision of monies in line with the accepted formula to fund extra school places, which could possibly include extensions where needed, is a suitable planning response.

43. Finally, concern was raised about the lack of contributions to medical facilities in the area. However, there is no policy requiring such contributions and no substantive justification for their provision has been given.

Accordingly, I conclude the development would make appropriate contributions towards infrastructure provisions and so in this regard would not conflict with Local Plan Policy GEN6 that requires infrastructure payments.

e) Other concerns

44. On the evidence before me the field where the houses are to be built appears to be being used productively, despite the appellant's concerns about spraying so close to the school and existing dwellings. However, I was not told it fell under the definition of Best and Most Versatile Land found in the Framework, and so its loss does not offer a basis to resist the scheme. Indeed, if a housing shortfall is to be addressed, which is a matter discussed later, it is realistic to expect that agricultural land will need to be developed.
45. The field itself, being used each year to grow a single crop, probably has little habitat value to wildlife. Despite that it is clear wildlife crosses it to access the back gardens of the Stortford Road houses. Whilst the development would probably restrict this, it has not been shown that harm to any protected species would result.
46. Turning to living conditions, the length of the gardens of the neighbouring houses to the east and north mean there would not, in principal, be an undue loss of privacy within those curtilages, though precise details of layout and design would be for a reserved matters application. Traffic and pedestrians on the access road would be passing close to the houses to either side. However, whilst this will no doubt result in a change to what is currently enjoyed, it is not uncommon for houses to have roads running along their side boundaries and it does not necessarily result in unsatisfactory living conditions. Moreover, I consider that the traffic on the access road would be limited for much of the time as it would be just the cars and vehicles associated with the 31 dwellings. Whilst there would be more activity at the beginning and end of the school day (if the parking arrangements were in fact provided) with acoustic fencing in place I am not satisfied that the scale or duration of this would be sufficient to cause unacceptable noise nuisance or pollution.
47. Furthermore, the tall boundary fence should safeguard the neighbours from overlooking while again I have no basis to consider personal conversations in the gardens to either side would be listened to by those on the access road.
48. Security and safeguarding the school children were further concerns raised by residents. This scheme would make the back of the school and the rear of a number of properties around the site easier to access. Again though, whilst a material consideration, I am not satisfied the effect of the development on security and safety would be so great as to justify resisting the scheme.
49. The residents' concern about surface water flooding, and Thames Water's comments about the capacity of the infrastructure to accommodate the proposal, can be addressed satisfactorily through a suitably worded drainage condition.

Conclusions on Issues (a)-(e)

50. I have only found harm in relation to Issue (b) – namely the effect on the character and appearance of the area. However, I consider this harm to be considerable and so afford it very significant weight.

f) The benefits of the scheme.

51. Section 38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* says

'the determination [of planning proposals]... must be made in accordance with the [development] plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'.

With this in mind a number of factors have been cited by the appellant as being material considerations to be balanced against any development plan conflict.

Housing land supply

52. The Framework states that a local planning authority should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of 5 years' worth of housing against its housing requirements. The parties agreed that the Council fell short of the 5-year supply of housing, and was only able to demonstrate 2.68 years. This to my mind is a significant shortfall that weighs in favour of the development. To rectify this situation, I acknowledge that there will have to be a reliance on the grant of planning permission for housing on suitable sites that are unallocated for that purpose and, in many cases, lie outside settlement development boundaries of the District's villages and towns.
53. I accept this site is available now and I have no reason to consider the development would not be deliverable.

Affordable housing

54. Although the level of affordable housing to be provided would be policy-compliant, again I consider this provision is nonetheless a benefit of the scheme, particularly given the shortfall in the District.

The playing field and parking provision

55. The s106 agreement stated the parking provision (namely the bays along the access road and the car park at the end) would be provided and made available to the school. It also outlined details of the transfer of the proposed playing field to the County Council, making clear this was in addition to the education contribution the developer was required to pay under Council policy. For them to be taken into account in my reasoning though I have to be confident they are justified in planning terms and can be secured legitimately and with certainty, having regard to the guidance concerning the inclusion of matters in a s106 agreement and the imposition of conditions.
56. The appellant has said these elements could be construed as benefits for the community. I share the view that the playing field would be beneficial, although the benefits of the parking are less clear. It is always open for these elements to be donated or made available by the developer. However, neither is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, as the field has been described as a gift that is not required for current expansion,

and if the parking was not provided the effect on highway safety would not be unacceptable. Put simply, had both been omitted from the scheme my reasoning would have been no different, as this omission would have led to no harm being caused and no policy conflict arising. As a result, having regard to Regulation 122 of the *Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations* their inclusion in the s106 agreement cannot be reasons for me granting permission. Furthermore, by not being necessary or relevant to planning they do not accord with a paragraph 55 of the Framework and so their provision cannot be secured by condition.

57. On this matter the appellant said that as the parking provision and the field were part of the application then a clause in the s106 agreement was needed to ensure their long-term use and maintenance. However, such clauses could be proposed for any element of a scheme that was unjustified under policy or did not resolve harm. To my mind the inclusion of this clause does not mean that they are necessary in planning terms to make the development acceptable.

58. Therefore, I accept they are part of the scheme and could be construed as having benefits, but as their delivery is not justified and cannot be secured, I cannot treat the parking provision or the proposed school field as reasons for me granting planning permission when assessing the planning merits of the scheme. Therefore, I cannot treat these aspects as benefits to be weighed in its favour.

Planning balance

59. Having regard to s38(6) of the *Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004* I therefore turn to balance the benefits against the development plan conflict. Moreover, as the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, then paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is engaged and planning permission should be granted 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. It is of note therefore that while paragraph 11(d) weighs in favour of the grant of planning permission it nonetheless accepts that some circumstances could exist where, despite the failure to demonstrate a suitable supply of housing sites, planning permission should still be refused.

60. The scale of the shortfall in housing land supply is acute, and this is made all the more pronounced by the emerging Local Plan being found unsound and so any means of addressing the situation through the development plan process being significantly delayed. As such I afford this significant weight. Moreover, notwithstanding the concerns about the suitability of Clavering for social accommodation, I also attach significant weight to the supply of affordable housing. For the reasons given above though I cannot attach any appreciable weight to the provision of the additional parking provision or the school field, while the scheme's effects on highway safety are neutral.

61. The only harm I have identified is to the character and appearance of the countryside, in conflict with a development plan policy to which I afford moderate weight and the Framework. In my view, and for the reasons stated under Issue (b) above, the scheme's adverse impact in this regard would be severe and I have afforded that very significant weight.

62. On balance, I therefore conclude that, although there is a great shortfall in the supply of open market housing sites in the District and a need for affordable housing, the adverse impacts of granting permission not only outweigh the benefits of these additional 30 dwellings, but do so significantly and demonstrably.

Conclusions

63. For the reasons given I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Jeremy Sargent

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr B Bampton	Pelham Structures
Mr S Bampton	Pelham Structures
Mr R Clews	Planning consultant
Mr N Cowlin	Landscape consultant
Ms K McMullen	Transport consultant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms A Hutchinson	Planning consultant
-----------------	---------------------

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr H Buckley	Local resident
Ms M Carter	Local resident
Ms S Cooper	Local resident
Ms S Gill	Chairperson of Clavering Parish Council
Mr J Jeffcock	Landscape consultant engaged by 'Hands off Clavering'
Mr P Kratz	Solicitor representing 'Hands off Clavering'
Mr S McCarthy	Local resident
Ms T McCarthy	Local resident
Councillor E Oliver	District Councillor for Clavering Ward
Mr C Swales	Local resident
Mr P Walters	Local resident
Mr F Woods	Local resident
Ms L Woods	Local resident

DOCUMENTS

SUBMITTED BY THE APPELLANT:

- APP1 KMC Technical Note (dated 12 December 2019)
- APP2 Clavering Primary School School Travel Plan dated November 2016
- APP3 OS Map of Clavering 1876-1877
- APP4 Drawing number 473.02
- APP5 Email to the Planning Inspectorate concerning the status and extent of highway land dated (19 December 2019)
- APP6 Email to the Planning Inspectorate concerning the s106 agreement dated (31 December 2019)
- APP7 Letter concerning Thames Water consultation response (dated 6 January 2020)
- APP8 Section 106 agreement signed and dated 6 January 2020
- APP9 Email to the Planning Inspectorate identifying the changes to the s106 agreement (dated 9 January 2020)
- APP10 Email to the Planning Inspectorate confirming the emerging Local Plan has been found unsound (dated 14 January 2020)
- APP11 Email to the Planning Inspectorate responding to Hands Off Clavering's comments concerning the s106 agreement dated (21 January 2020)
- APP12 Letter commenting on the effects of the emerging Local Plan being found unsound (dated 21 January 2020)

SUBMITTED BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

- LPA1 Policy S3 of the *Uttlesford Local Plan*
- LPA2 Policy GEN2 of the *Uttlesford Local Plan*
- LPA3 Map of Clavering Conservation Area
- LPA4 Map of the development limits of Clavering (small scale)
- LPA5 Map of the development limits of Clavering (large scale)
- LPA6 Suggested conditions
- LPA7 Email to the Planning Inspectorate regarding the signed s106 agreement (dated 13 January 2020)

SUBMITTED BY 'HANDS OFF CLAVERING':

- HOC1 Appendix 1 to the Hearing Statement of Mr Jeffcock
- HOC2 Map of viewpoints to be visited by the Inspector
- HOC3 Comments on the signed s106 agreement (dated 16 January 2020)

JOINTLY SUBMITTED BY THE APPELLANT & THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

- JNT1 Statement of Common Ground dated October 2019 and signed by the appellant on 2 October 2019 and by the Local Planning Authority on 16 December 2019