



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 9-12, 15-16 and 19 June 2026

Site visit made on 12 June 2026

by Michael Boniface PgDip MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004355

Land opposite Limewood Farm, Ashford Hill Road, Ashford Hill, RG19 8AZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sigma Strategic Land against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/01337/OUT.
 - The development proposed is up to 45 dwellings and a flexible workspace/community hub building together with a new access road from Ashford Hill Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters (landscaping, scale, siting and appearance) reserved except for access. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. In advance of the Inquiry, the main parties produced a series of Statements of Common Ground, which sought to narrow the issues for the appeal as far as possible. As a result, the Council confirmed that it would not defend its fifth reason for refusal, related to drainage matters, subject to the imposition of suitable conditions. Nevertheless, the appellant called a witness to answer any relevant questions.
4. The seventh reason for refusal was also resolved during the course of the appeal through the submission of planning obligations, in the form of a S106 agreement and separate Unilateral Undertaking, which were agreed to overcome the concerns raised, subject to a conclusion by me that the green infrastructure and open space provisions were acceptable. Signed and completed versions of the document were provided in accordance with an agreed timetable.
5. Both main parties agree that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply and that the supply currently falls somewhere within the range of 2.5 – 3.1 years. It is further agreed between the parties that, whichever figure is taken, this represents a serious and significant shortfall.

6. A resident's group, Residents Against Ashford Hill Development (RAAD), did not seek Rule 6 status at the Inquiry but gave evidence, asked questions of some witnesses and were, exceptionally, permitted to make a short closing statement.

Main Issues

7. In light of the above, the main issues are:
 - a) Whether the site is suitably located, with particular regard to accessibility to services and facilities;
 - b) The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - c) The effect on heritage assets, with particular regard to St Paul's Church (Grade II) and Limewood Farm (non-designated);
 - d) Whether suitable green infrastructure/open space is proposed;
 - e) Principle of development and the overall planning balance.

Reasons

Location and accessibility to services and facilities

8. The development plan, so far as relevant to the appeal proposal, comprises the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011 – 2029) (adopted May 2016) (LP) and the Ashford Hill with Headley Neighbourhood Plan 2022 – 2029 (made October 2022) (NP).
9. An objective of the LP is to focus the provision for new housing and supporting infrastructure within a number of development sites around Basingstoke town, with local level housing provision in other main settlements, and homes which respond to local needs in smaller settlements. Ashford Hill falls at the bottom of this hierarchy.
10. Policy SS1 of the LP sets out the expected scale and distribution of housing across the borough, making provision for 15,300 dwellings and associated infrastructure by applying a range of criteria. Amongst the criteria, is support for development and redevelopment within the defined Settlement Policy Boundaries, which contribute to social, economic and environmental well-being; the allocation of greenfield sites; and support for the delivery of new homes through Neighbourhood Planning in accordance with Policy SS5.
11. Policy SS6 of the LP deals specifically with new housing in the countryside, restricting development outside of Settlement Policy Boundaries to circumstances defined in the policy, none of which apply to the appeal proposal. There is no dispute between the parties that the site is outside the Settlement Policy Boundary and, therefore, in countryside. Policy HD1 of the NP broadly reflects and makes reference to the requirements of the LP.
12. These policies seek to deliver the spatial strategy for the area and are key to delivering LP objectives to facilitate development on a hierarchical basis, directing the majority of housing to the most sustainable locations, with more limited growth at smaller settlements that inherently benefit from less services and facilities. They are amongst the policies that are most important for determining the application, and this appeal, and the proposal would be in conflict.

13. Having regard to Policy SD1 of the LP, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), these policies are deemed out-of-date in this case because the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. This moderates the amount of weight that should be attached to any conflict with these policies, particularly bearing in mind that the lack of supply is longstanding in this area; that the emerging local plan is some way from adoption and so the situation is unlikely to be rectified for some time; and because the age of the LP means that the housing requirement has been uplifted for the area by application of the Framework's standard method, such that the plan does not provide for the number of houses now required. It is likely that, so far as the policies are restrictive, they will frustrate the delivery of housing contrary to the Framework's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.
14. None of this displaces the primacy of the development plan or the statutory requirement to determine applications in accordance with it, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Nevertheless, they are important material considerations to be taken into account in reaching an overall planning judgement.
15. There was much debate at the Inquiry as to whether Ashford Hill should be regarded as a sustainable settlement, as if there could be a binary answer to the question. Clearly that is not the case. Whether a settlement is appropriate for any particular form of development is entirely a matter of judgement, taking into account the type of development proposed and the particular circumstances involved. In this case, the development plan provides a hierarchical basis for any judgement of relative sustainability. However, what is key in this case is whether the settlement would be an appropriate location for the specific development proposed in terms of access to services and facilities.
16. The appellant accepts that there are a limited number of services and facilities available in the village accessible by walking or cycling; that cycling to settlements beyond Ashford Hill is unlikely to be feasible for all but the most competent cyclists given the nature of the surrounding road network; and that to all intents and purposes future residents would be reliant on private motorised vehicles if they wish to leave the village, which they would have to do frequently given the modest range of services available in Ashford Hill.
17. Ashford Hill currently benefits from a primary school, along with a pre-school, cricket club and a Church. There is no operating public transport, albeit that a bus does serve the school for its pupils. This is a very limited offering by any standard and is reflective of the size of the village, which has grown significantly in recent years, but is essentially a modest rural settlement with a commensurately small level of services and facilities.
18. The Council's Settlement Study¹ offers an indication of the relative accessibility to services and facilities for each settlement in the borough. On its own terms, it is designed to identify whether a settlement is sufficiently sustainable to be included in the settlement hierarchy (in addition to Basingstoke) and could potentially accommodate some limited growth in order to meet local social, economic and community needs and to maintain the vitality of these rural communities. This reflects the objectives of the Framework.

¹ DRAFT for Regulation 18 consultation, November 2025

19. Settlements, like Ashford Hill, which are considered as Small Villages (Category 4) have more limited access to services and facilities and are not considered to have an appropriate level of sustainability to be considered suitable for significant levels of growth. These settlements are particularly reliant on other settlements to fulfil their retail, education, healthcare, employment and leisure needs and generally have restricted public transport options. That is certainly the case for Ashford Hill.
20. Whilst I recognise that the Settlement Study involves a relatively comprehensive assessment of the relative sustainability of settlements in the Borough, I attach it only limited weight because it has not been tested through examination of the emerging local plan and has yet to influence any adopted policy, if indeed, it ever does. In any case, it does not support the appellant's proposition that Ashford Hill is a sustainable location, in accessibility terms of otherwise. Indeed, it seeks to apportion a future growth requirement to Ashford Hill of zero dwellings, reflecting the fact that the village has already grown significantly in recent years and fulfilled any local social, economic and community needs required for maintaining vitality. I note that there are settlements in the borough with less services and facilities than Ashford Hill, described as less sustainable, but the fact that there are worse alternatives is hardly an endorsement.
21. The Framework is clear that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. Ashford Hill is not a location that would meet this objective. I am in no doubt that 45 dwellings is a significant development in the context of a modest rural settlement, notwithstanding that it does not meet the local threshold for requiring a Transport Assessment and that no highway safety or capacity issues have been raised by the Council. This does not negate the need for careful consideration of a development's location for the purposes of promoting sustainable transport.
22. Of course, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, but sustainable transport modes should be prioritised, taking account of the type of development and its location. In this case, walking and cycling are only realistic within the village itself, with its very limited services and facilities. There is no public bus service.
23. The appellant proposes to deliver a bus service as a planning obligation that might allow commuting to larger settlements during the morning and evening peaks, but it would be limited, in that there would not be services throughout the day or at the weekend. This is likely to limit the attractiveness of the offering to those who need to commute at the times offered. The obligation is also limited to a period of four years and there is no certainty, or indeed likelihood, of its continuing thereafter. I heard that the previous bus service in the village had ceased due to a lack of viability and the local highway authority indicated that it is unlikely to be in a position to offer any funding. Consequently, I attach the proposed bus service limited weight, albeit that it weighs in favour of the proposal.
24. It is also proposed to deliver a community hub as part of the development that would provide a space for unspecified community activities, with the potential for spaces such as a retail unit, café or remote workspaces. Although a potential operator was identified, and examples given of similar spaces in the county, no firm commitments were made about what uses would be implemented, who would

run them or how they would be funded so as to remain viable in the long term. Whilst delivery of the building could be secured by way of a planning condition, there remains great uncertainty about the potential benefit that could be derived from it, particularly as local people question the need for such a space in the village, identifying other vacant buildings and an existing village hall. Again, I attach the provision of the community hub building only limited weight.

25. The appellant's highway witness sought to argue that the level of car ownership for a residential development in this location would be similar to that for a comparably sized scheme in a suburban location. Whilst this may be so, the relevance of this when making a judgement about whether future residents would be reliant on private vehicles remained unclear. Car ownership itself does not necessarily give an indication of the frequency of use, the distances travelled or the likelihood of meeting a proportion of journeys by more sustainable means.
26. Overall, it is clear to me that any future occupiers would have very limited access to services and facilities needed for day-to-day living. This would inevitably lead to a reliance on private vehicles for even the most basic of requirements, from commuting, shopping, medical provision, secondary education and other essential services and facilities. I accept that those living in a rural area might alter their behaviour to minimise the need to travel, link journeys, order online, work from home more, or simply go without certain things. However, this will not be possible in many cases, and it must be expected that future residents will seek to meet their individual needs.
27. The proposed residential development would be significant, both in transport terms (bearing in mind the number of journeys that would be generated) and in the context of a modest sized village (particularly bearing in mind the amount of growth in recent years) and would result in an overreliance on private vehicles. This would not reflect the policy in the Framework to actively manage patterns of growth, focus development on locations which are or can be made sustainable, or limit the need to travel. Ashford Hill does not offer a genuine choice of transport modes, nor would this be achieved by the proposed obligations.
28. The development would be in clear conflict with Policy CN9 of the LP, which amongst other things, requires that developments seek to minimise the need to travel, promote opportunities for sustainable transport modes, improve accessibility to services and support the transition to a low carbon future, offering maximum flexibility in the choice of travel modes, including walking and cycling. The proposal is also inconsistent with Hampshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (February 2024), which has similar objectives. These policies and objectives are broadly consistent with the Framework and so I attach this harm significant weight, notwithstanding that Policy CN9 is amongst the most important policies for determining the appeal and is deemed out of date.

Character and appearance

29. Ashford Hill is a modest sized village surrounded by countryside. It has seen significant growth in recent years, with two large residential developments close to the appeal site, known as Lilly Wood Lane and Oakfield Lane. If this scheme were to be granted and built, the combined developments would amount to 102% housing growth in recent years.

30. Historically, the village was characterised by small clusters of buildings and elements of linear development that followed the main roads through the village, though this settlement pattern has evolved in more recent times as larger clusters of dwellings have been built at depth from the main roads. Lilly Wood Lane and Oakfield Lane are examples of this.
31. Many of the older properties in the village are set back from the road behind tall boundary walls or fences, softened by hedgerows and other planting, maintaining a sense of rurality. Lilly Wood Lane and Oakfield Lane are much more suburban in their appearance and have significantly altered the character of the settlement.
32. That said, it is clear that efforts have been made, particularly in the case of Lilly Wood Lane, to minimise the effect of the scheme and integrate with the village and its setting. Houses are generally set back from Ashford Hill Road, on lower ground within the site. A generous area of open space stands between the buildings and the countryside beyond, which is separated by a tall hedgerow. The Council described efforts to achieve a soft and sensitive edge to the development, and this has clearly been a success, providing a transition between the built form of the village and the countryside beyond. It has achieved a rounding off of the village, with built development on three sides and a soft edge towards the countryside.
33. The Lilly Wood Lane development nestles below a natural ridge, such that the houses are visually screened by the topography of the land and the intervening hedgerow on approach to the village from the west. Only glimpsed views of the tops of houses are evident, with the exception of plot 1, which stands on higher ground but is seen in the context of other housing opposite on Ashford Hill Road.
34. In contrast, the appeal scheme would straddle the ridge, with development on the west facing slope. There is currently no hedgerow on the site's western boundary and whilst one would be planted, this would take time to mature. In addition, the scheme would be much denser, with less open space and a notably greater concentration of built form. No comparable soft edge is proposed. I acknowledge that the scheme is in outline form and the layout is indicative only, but I am not satisfied from the evidence available that a preferable or suitable design could be achieved at reserved matters stage.
35. The number of dwellings proposed was not justified in evidence and there does not appear to be any convincing rationale for the design decisions made, in contrast to the adjacent development. Some attempts have been made, to set buildings back from Ashford Hill Road and the highest ground within the site, and through proposed planting but this would do little to mitigate the effects of the scheme given the number of properties proposed and the steep topography.
36. The development would protrude from the existing village, eradicating the soft edge provided by Lilly Wood Lane and introducing a stark mass of buildings on the west facing slopes of the village, which are largely absent of built form at present. The impact is aptly demonstrated by the appellant's own visualisations. It would be at odds with the rural character of the fields beyond the village edge, currently defined by the Lilly Wood Lane development and would detract from the village's rural character.
37. The fields closest to the village, forming the appeal site, are currently being used as paddocks for grazing horses, with the attendant fencing and paraphernalia, such that they could not be described as part of an unspoilt rural landscape, as

suggested by the Council. However, horse paddocks are generally considered to be rural in nature, and they are well screened by roadside hedgerows. Their verdant appearance and openness are not inconsistent with the countryside, and they clearly form part of a pleasant rural scene. I was unpersuaded that their presence, along with road signs give any indication as to the location of the built edge of the settlement, albeit that they might signal a transition from open undisturbed countryside. Similarly, I do not accept assertions that Limewood Farm should be seen as built form integral to the village. It is clearly an isolated farmstead surrounded by countryside.

38. The introduction of such a mass of housing on the edge of the village would detract from its compact form, representing a clear and incongruous incursion into the countryside. The pleasant rural character of the village would be replaced with a sprawling suburban housing estate that would be seen to continue the recent development, albeit with a large area of open space between, in an ungainly fashion. The scheme would appear entirely disproportionate to the scale and form of the modest village.
39. The application was supported by a comprehensive landscape and visual impact assessment (LVIA) which was broadly in accordance with the methodology contained in the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3). The appellant's landscape witness accepted that it had not been updated to reflect Landscape Institute Notes and Clarifications (LITGN-2024-01) but this did not alter his conclusions within the LVIA. The Council's witness did not prepare a full LVIA but instead sought to challenge some of the conclusions reached by the appellant, though no detailed methodology supporting the process of reaching her conclusions was provided and she accepted that it did not entirely follow that set out in the LVIA.
40. Ultimately, there was relatively little between the parties, whose differing judgements centred on whether the conclusions reached should be considered significant in LVIA terms or not. Differing professional judgements in LVIA are not unusual and the distinction around whether an effect is significant in LVIA terms does not alter whether such effects should be taken into account in undertaking a planning balance. Any harm, some of which will be inevitable in developing a greenfield site, weighs against a scheme and there will consequently need to be benefits that outweigh such harm if approval is to be gained.
41. There is broad agreement between the parties that the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development would be localised, not widespread, and would affect a relatively small area of landscape and a limited number of views.
42. Despite the differences of opinion, I consider that the appellant's detailed LVIA and defined methodology is the soundest evidence available for making a decision in this case, forming a robust basis on which to assess the impacts of the scheme in landscape and visual terms. It identifies that the worst long-term effects on landscape character would occur within the site and its immediate context, where they would be of Medium Magnitude and Moderate Significance. Effects on visual receptors would be at their worst from Ashford Hill Road when passing the site, being of Medium – Low Magnitude and Slight.
43. Overall, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in urban design terms and LVIA terms. It would fail to recognise the intrinsic

character and beauty of the countryside and would conflict with Policy EM10 of the LP and HD3 of the NP, in so far as they seek high quality development that contributes to local distinctiveness and sense of place. Again, these policies are amongst the most important for determining the appeal and are deemed out of date, but they nevertheless secure important objectives that are broadly consistent with the Framework and I attribute this harm moderate weight.

Heritage assets

44. The parties agree that the appeal site is in the setting of two heritage assets, St Paul's Church (Grade II) and Limewood Farm (non-designated). Neither of the assets would be physically altered.
45. Ashford Hill emerged as a dispersed rural parish during the nineteenth century, and St Paul's Church was positioned on rising ground to serve a scattered agricultural community rather than a concentrated village centre. Intervening fields, including the land now forming the appeal site, historically contributed to the open rural context between the church and the surrounding settlements. The spire was intended to be seen, to orientate visitors, and to assert the presence of the parish church within a dispersed rural settlement and this landmark quality is of significance.
46. The appellant accepts that the surrounding land makes a contribution to significance and that its development could harmfully impact upon it, but suggests that this would be mitigated by setting the buildings back from Ashford Hill Road, maintaining the hedgerow (albeit with an opening for access) and ensuring that open views towards the church remain on leaving the village. Views would also become possible from within the new development.
47. I do not agree that this mitigation would avoid any harm. Notwithstanding the suggested measures, the development would become visible above the hedgerow and through the newly created opening such that its urban form would be clearly perceptible. The development would bring the built form of the village edge much closer to the church, detracting from its rural setting and somewhat splendid isolation.
48. S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that I must have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In this case, the impact on significance would be less than substantial in the terms of the Framework, at the lower end of the spectrum, but I nevertheless attach great weight to the asset's conservation. It is necessary to weigh the potential public benefits of the scheme against this harm, and in this case, I am satisfied that the delivery of 45 dwellings, in the context of a significant shortfall in supply, would be sufficient to outweigh the harm identified. In light of this, the requirements of the Act are satisfied.
49. Limewood Farm has been identified by the parties as a non-designated heritage asset. It is principally significant for its architectural interest, being a relatively complete traditional farmstead assemblage of the early to mid-19th century. Its location reflects a historic pattern of isolated rural holdings set within open fields and the appeal site historically had a functional relationship with the farm. The surrounding fields are clearly an important component of its significance, forming

the rural and agricultural setting within which the isolated farmstead is experienced.

50. The buildings are set back from the road behind hedgerow planting and are not prominent from the public realm, but glimpsed views are available from the access such that a rural farmstead is discernible. Although the appeal site is currently in use as paddocks, the openness of the fields and significant hedgerow boundaries maintain a rural character. Again, notwithstanding the mitigation measures proposed by the appellant, the development would be an unwelcome intrusion into the rural landscape in very close proximity to the farmstead, detracting from its setting and significance. This harm must be taken into account in reaching an overall planning balance.
51. So far as the development would harm the setting of heritage assets, the proposal is in conflict with Policy EM11 of the LP and Policy HA of the NP, which are broadly consistent with the requirements of the Framework and the Act, in seeking to protect heritage assets. Where there is inconsistency between Policy EM11 and the Framework and/or the Act, such as the distinction between designated and non-designated heritage assets, I defer to the latter.
52. Heritage impact does not provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed in and of itself, but the harm identified should be weighed in the overall planning balance and attracts moderate weight.

Green infrastructure/open space

53. Policy EM5 of the LP states that development proposals will be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that green infrastructure can be provided and phased to support the requirements of proposed development and they are in accordance with the council's adopted green space standards. The Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy sets out the relevant adopted green space standards. It is expected that schemes provide multi-functional green space (MFGS) which include an element of amenity green space suitable for team games and robust play including kickabout space (rectangular area of mown grass minimum 1600sqm plus a buffer of 10m to housing, minimum width 25m, maximum gradient 1:40), with tree and shrub planting.
54. Whilst the development would deliver a larger area of MFGS than is required, this would be spread around the development and it is accepted by the appellant, that the minimum dimensions for amenity green space would not be met by some margin. This would jeopardise the potential for future residents to engage in physical activities, particularly as the Council suggests a shortfall in appropriate provision in the ward within which the appeal site is located. Whilst the development would deliver an element of amenity green space that would be useful to some, and there may be other options for accessing suitable open space, such as the nearby recreation ground, this would not fully mitigate the deficiency, particularly given the distance from the site and relative convenience.
55. The development is in conflict with Policy EM5 and the objectives of the Framework to deliver good quality open spaces that support healthy lifestyles and wellbeing. This policy is amongst the most important for determining the appeal and is deemed out of date but its objectives broadly align with those of the Framework and I attach moderate weight to the matter.

Other Matters

56. I have had regard to the agreement between the parties relating to surface water drainage and accept that a suitable scheme could be secured by way of a condition, in the event that planning permission were to be granted.

Overall Planning Balance

57. The development would be in conflict with Policies SS1 and SS6 of the LP, along with Policy HD1 of the NP, and would be at odds with the spatial strategy for the area. This is consequential in a plan led system. The hierarchical approach to housing delivery in the borough has been found sound after examination. The policies are as they are for good reason, to ensure that development is directed to the most sustainable locations.
58. I recognise that in taking such an approach, these most important policies act to restrict development and are inconsistent with the Framework's objective to significantly boost housing supply. In short, the plan is not delivering sufficient housing to meet the requirement.
59. The deliverable housing land supply is agreed to be somewhere between 2.5 – 3.1 years, a serious and significant shortfall. It has not been necessary for me to seek to refine this figure for the purposes of this appeal as the exact level of supply is not consequential. For the purposes of this balancing exercise, I have adopted the appellant's figure of 2.5 years, as the worst-case scenario.
60. A consequence of this, is that the most important policies for determining the proposal are deemed to be out-of-date. As I have set out above, this does not mean that they should be ignored and having balanced the importance of the policy objectives (so far as they are consistent with the Framework), against the restrictive effect they are clearly having on housing supply, I have reduced the weight that I would otherwise attach to the conflict. I attach the conflict with these policies moderate weight.
61. In addition, I have found that the development would be in clear conflict with Policy CN9 of the LP, which amongst other things, requires that development seek to minimise the need to travel, promote opportunities for sustainable transport modes, improve accessibility to services and support the transition to a low carbon future, offering maximum flexibility in the choice of travel modes, including walking and cycling. In this case, future residents would be reliant on private vehicles to access services and facilities outside of the village. The proposed development is significant in scale, meaning that a large number of future residents would be generated. I attach significant weight to this matter.
62. Further policy conflicts are identified in relation to character and appearance; heritage and green infrastructure/open space provision, which together weigh moderately against the scheme.
63. I have had regard to the benefits that would arise from the proposal, in particular the delivery of market and affordable housing. 45 dwellings would make a relatively limited contribution to the overall housing requirement, but any such contribution is significant given the scale of the shortfall in supply and the identified need. As such, I attach significant weight to the delivery of housing. For the reasons set out above, I attach limited weight to the proposed community hub and

community bus. The scheme would also deliver improvements to a local public right of way, economic benefits (both during construction and through future resident expenditure) and biodiversity net gain, which together attract moderate weight.

64. Overall, I find that the adverse impacts arising from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. In reaching this conclusion, I have had particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes.
65. The appeal scheme would be in conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

66. In light of the above, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR

Richborough

APPEARANCES**FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Leanne Buckley-Thomson, Counsel, who called:

Paul Lishman MLPM MSc CMLI	Landscape	Director, LDA Design
Adriana Bonilla MSc	Urban Design	Director, Thrive Architects
Jason Morgans HND MCIHT	Drainage	Technical Director, Motion
Patrick Maguire MA MSc IHBC	Heritage	Director, Asset Heritage
Richard Allman MCIHT CILT IHE	Highways	Associate Director, Motion
Cameron Austin-Fell MRTPI	Housing	Director, Tetra Tech
Kevin Scott BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Planning	Managing Director, Solve

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

George Mackenzie, Counsel, who called:

Robyn Milliner BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Planning	Consultant, ET Planning
John Dawson BSc (Hons) Dip TP MA MRTPI	Urban Design	Principal Urban Designer
Anne Priscott BA (Hons) CMLI	Landscape	Consultant, Anne Priscott
Vashti Gooding BA (Hons) MA MRTPI	Housing	Principal Policy Officer
Jon Huggett BSc (Hons) MSc MCIHT	Highways	Transport Planner
Steven Handforth BA (Hons) MSc IHBC	Heritage	Consultant, Handforth

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Michael De Courcy	Planning Consultant appointed by Residents Against Ashford Hill Development (RAAD)
Ann Rixon	Local resident
Julian Sunley	Local resident
Ken Rhatigan	Local resident
Melissa Tayabali	Local resident
Peter Cunningham	Local resident
Katia Lindroth	Local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE INQUIRY

ID01	Appellant's house type comparison
ID02	Council's opening statement
ID03	Appellant's opening statement
ID04	Ann Rixon's speaking notes
ID05	Julian Sunley's speaking notes
ID06	Ken Rhatigan's speaking notes
ID07	Melissa Tayabali's speaking notes
ID08	Peter Cunningham's speaking notes (traffic)
ID09	Peter Cunningham's speaking notes (sustainability)
ID10	PPG extract on Neighbourhood Planning
ID11	PPG extract on Travel Plans and Transport Assessment/Statements
ID12	Agreed conditions
ID13	Table of settlements not included in Settlement Study hierarchy
ID14	Completed S106 agreement
ID15	Completed Unilateral Undertaking
ID16	Council's closing submissions
ID17	Appellant's closing submissions
ID18	RAAD's closing statement
ID19	HCC comments on PROW contribution
ID20	Appellant's closing submissions with postscript