

---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 21 January 2014

Site visit made on 6 February 2014

**by David Wildsmith BSc(Hons) MSc CEng MICE FCIHT MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 13 March 2014**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/A/13/2204544**

**Burlands Field, Selborne Road, Selborne, Alton, Hampshire, GU34 3JA**

- 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 Mr H Janson against the decision of the South Downs National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref SDNP/13/02650/OUT, dated 5 June 2013, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2013.
  - The development proposed is residential development of 30 2-storey houses comprising 12 affordable homes and 18 market price homes, together with new access to Selborne Road, internal roads, garages and parking spaces, landscaping and re-routing of public footpath.
  - The inquiry sat for 7 days on 21 to 24 January and 4 to 6 February 2014.
- 

### Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### Procedural matters

2. The application was submitted in outline, originally with just the means of access and scale of the development included for consideration. However, following a request by the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA), the layout and form, showing 30 dwellings with landscape and street design were also submitted for consideration, leaving only appearance as a reserved matter. I have determined this appeal on this basis.
3. Prior to the start of the inquiry the appellant discovered an error on the red-edged land ownership plan. A revised plan was prepared to address this matter, along with a revised site layout plan, and the appellant sought to have these substituted for the originally submitted plans. The SDNPA raised no objection to this, once additional consultation comments had been received from Natural England and the County Ecologist. I have therefore determined this appeal on the basis of these plans, along with the others as originally submitted, as I am satisfied that no-one with an interest in this case would be unduly prejudiced by this course of action.
4. A signed and completed legal agreement<sup>1</sup> was submitted at the inquiry. This makes provision for the supply of 12 affordable housing units, together with agreed financial contributions towards the provision and maintenance of public

---

<sup>1</sup> Under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, made between the appellant, Barclays Bank PLC as Mortgagee, the SDNPA as the Planning Authority and East Hampshire District Council (EHDC) as Housing Authority

open space and various transport facilities. The SDNPA has made it clear that this planning obligation satisfactorily addresses its concerns on these matters and that the original reasons for refusal relating to these topics are therefore no longer pursued. I discuss this S106 agreement in more detail later in this decision.

5. In addition, as a result of negotiations and the submission of additional information prior to the start of the inquiry, the SDNPA withdrew its reasons for refusal relating to matters of ecology, highways and archaeology, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.
6. The Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was published on 6 March 2014, after this inquiry was closed. However, no party's case relied to any significant extent on former guidance which has now been cancelled, nor on the "beta" version of the PPG. In these circumstances no party would be prejudiced by me considering this appeal on the basis of the information already submitted, and the publication of the PPG does not affect my conclusions.

### **Main issues**

7. In view of the above points, and having regard to the submission of the written and oral evidence and matters detailed in the agreed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG), I consider the main issues in this case to be:
  - 1) Whether the proposed development would conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the South Downs National Park (SDNP or "the Park");
  - 2) The effect of the proposed development on the cultural heritage of the SDNP and the village, including its effect on the setting of the adjacent conservation area and listed building (The Grange);
  - 3) Whether the proposal should be regarded as a "major development" and, if so, whether exceptional circumstances weigh in its favour;
  - 4) Whether the absence of details relating to the appearance of the proposed development is acceptable.
8. In the following paragraphs I first set out some details of the appeal site and its surroundings, the proposed development, and the relevant planning policy context, before turning to consider the main issues. I then deal with other matters, including those which the appellant considers weigh in favour of the appeal proposal and those raised by interested persons.

### **Description of the site and its surroundings**

9. The SoCG explains that Selborne lies within the SDNP and is one of the most celebrated villages in England on account of the 18th century curate, naturalist and chronicler, Gilbert White, who was born in the village and lived there nearly all his life. As a result it attracts tourists who are important to the local economy.
10. The village has a number of facilities, including a primary school, a village store and post office, 2 public houses, a number of craft galleries, an antique shop, village hall, recreation ground and a tea room. Gilbert White's House and the Oates Museum (The Wakes) lie in the centre of the village, along with a Centre for Field Studies. In addition there are 2 business sites to the north of the village at Norton Farm and Hartley Park Farm.
11. The Village Design Statement (VDS), adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in 2001, notes that the settlement pattern has 3 distinct zones or layouts. These are firstly, The Street, which is the three quarter of a mile length

of “straggling street” through the centre of the village, described by Gilbert White; secondly, a number of turnings off The Street described as Rural Lanes. These include Gracious Street which originally formed part of The Street, but which became a quiet lane when the new road to Alton (the B3006 Selborne Road) was built in the 19th Century; and thirdly, Goslings Croft on the northern edge of the village, built in the late 1940s as a council estate for agricultural workers.

12. The National Trust owns Selborne Common Site of Special Scientific Interest and the steep-sided wooded hill, known as Selborne Hanger, which frames the south-western side of the village. Rolling fields frame the northern and eastern sides of the village and provide a rural setting.
13. The appeal site, referred to variously as Burlands Field or Culverscroft, is a meadow of some 1.8 hectares (ha), lying adjacent to and outside the defined Selborne settlement policy boundary at the northern end of the village. It abuts the Selborne Conservation Area on its southern and south-western boundaries, where it is lined by the grounds of a few residential properties served by Gracious Street and Selborne Road. These include The Grange, a Grade II listed building. The site slopes gently downwards from the north-east corner to the south and south-west, with a fall of some 8m, and is crossed by 2 overhead electricity lines.
14. A tall hedgerow forms the site’s eastern boundary with the B3006, with residential properties in Goslings Croft lying across the B3006 further to the east. Strong hedgerows form the site’s north-western boundary, running either side of a public footpath in a sunken lane, known as Cow Lane. A further public footpath (Footpath 20) runs across the site from its south-western corner to its south-eastern corner, linking Gracious Street with Selborne Road.

### **Details of the proposed development**

15. The appeal proposal comprises 30 dwellings, made up of 12 affordable dwellings and 18 market homes, at a density of just under 17 dwellings per hectare. Three of the market houses would be single-storey 2-bedroom units, whilst the remaining 15 dwellings would all be 2-storey: 5 with 2 bedrooms, 5 with 3 bedrooms and 5 with 4 bedrooms. The 12 affordable units would all be 2-storey houses, with the proposed mix having changed from that originally submitted, following discussions between the appellant and one of the Housing Authority’s preferred Housing Associations. The current intention is to provide 5 1-bedroom homes, 4 with 2 bedrooms and 3 with 3 bedrooms.
16. The development would be served by a single vehicular access to Selborne Road, located towards the southern end of the eastern site boundary within an existing 20 mph zone. This access road would be 6m wide for the first part, reducing down to a shared surface within the development, comprising an informal road arrangement of culs-de-sac and private drives. Footpath 20 would be re-aligned within the site and there would also be a footpath link to the bus shelter just beyond the north-east corner of the site. Two pedestrian crossing points would be provided on Selborne Road to link with these footpaths.
17. The SoCG explains that the proposed layout incorporates about 0.37 ha of open space made up of the landscaped Footpath 20 running through the site as well as the northern hedgerow and buffer/ecology zones on the north-western and southern boundaries. These zones would lie between the rear hedging of gardens to the proposed units and the existing tree belts and site boundaries and would

allow for the retention of existing vegetation and the growth of new vegetation, in order to provide screening and encourage biodiversity and foraging.

### **Policy context**

18. Two statutory purposes for National Parks are set out in the Environment Act 1995: firstly, to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area; and secondly, to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Park by the public. In pursuing these purposes a National Park Authority has a duty to seek to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Park.
19. Defra Circular 2010<sup>2</sup> confirms that National Park designation confers the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty (along with the Broads and AONBs). This is reinforced in paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework"), which also reiterates that the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight.
20. The Framework also makes it clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development means proposals which accord with the development plan should be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It states that where the development plan is absent, silent or 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 policies in the Framework taken as a whole. However, there are exceptions to this general approach in cases where specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted, such as for sites within National Parks, as here.
21. The development plan comprises the saved policies of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (EHDLPSR). Although this was adopted some years ago, in 2006, paragraph 215 of the Framework indicates that due weight should still be given to its relevant policies, according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. A number of EHDLPSR policies were referred to in the SDNPA's reasons for refusal and I deal with these in my consideration of the main issues.
22. The SDNPA has also been working with EHDC to prepare a Joint Core Strategy (JCS) which is intended to guide development within the EHDC area up to 2028. This was the subject of an Examination in October/November 2012, following which the authorities undertook further work for which the consultation period ended in September 2013. The Inspector's Main Modifications, which he has recommended to make the JCS sound, were published in late December 2013 and were still subject to consultation whilst this inquiry was sitting. Following this consultation period the JCS Inspector will produce his final report and it is expected that the JCS will be adopted by both planning authorities in March 2014.
23. The JCS will set the housing targets for the 2 planning authorities, but will not allocate specific sites for housing. In the SDNP this will be undertaken through a new National Park Local Plan (NPLP) which will set the planning policy framework for the whole Park area for the period up to 2035. Current indications are that this NPLP is expected to be adopted by June 2017 and, once adopted, it will replace existing planning policies across the SDNP.

---

<sup>2</sup> Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs: "English National Parks and the Broads. UK Government Vision and Circular 2010"

## Reasons

24. As was apparent from the written and oral evidence presented by those who appeared at the inquiry, there is a certain amount of inevitable overlap between some of the main issues in this case. My reasoning, of necessity, reflects this, but I have tried, wherever possible, to deal with the issues discretely, before drawing all matters together in my overall conclusions.

### *Main issue 1 - the effect on the natural beauty of the SDNP*

25. Under this first main issue I restrict my consideration to matters of landscape and visual impact. In doing so I have had regard to the fact that the appeal site lies outside the settlement boundary of Selborne and is therefore considered to lie within the countryside for the purposes of planning policy. EHDLPSP Policy GS3 indicates that the countryside will be protected for its intrinsic character and beauty and that planning permission will not be granted for development in such areas unless all of a number of defined criteria are met. There is no dispute between the parties that the appeal proposal is in conflict with this policy, as it does not accord with the first of the listed criteria.
26. The appellant contends that as this policy acts as a significant constraint on the ability of both EHDC and the SDNPA to meet housing needs, it is inconsistent with the Framework and the weight to be attached to it should be reduced accordingly. In support of this view the appellant points out that EHDC has accepted that in order to meet its housing needs and demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land it will be necessary to grant planning permission for some development outside existing settlement boundaries. To this end it has adopted interim guidance on Facilitating Appropriate Development (FAD), which would otherwise be contrary to Policy GS3.
27. However, whilst this may well be an appropriate stance to take in those parts of the EHDC area which do not fall within the SDNP, development within the Park has to have regard to the fact that conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the area is part of the SDNP's statutory purposes. Moreover, the Framework attaches great weight to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and in these circumstances I see no material conflict between Policy GS3's aims and the Framework, or this statutory purpose. Accordingly I do not share the appellant's view that this policy should attract reduced weight.
28. In reaching my conclusions on this main issue I have had regard to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which accompanied the application, along with the further elaboration of landscape matters provided by the appellant and the conflicting views and criticisms of the LVIA from the SDNPA. I have also had regard to the Selborne VDS, which carries weight as extant SPG. In addition I undertook a comprehensive accompanied site visit of the appeal site, the village and the surrounding area.
29. As part of this site visit I was able to view the village from the Zig-Zag path which climbs up the Hanger, as well as from locations on the path along the Hanger's slope. From these elevated positions it was only possible to obtain limited views of the village and the appeal site, because of the screening provided by the extensive wooded nature of the Hanger. That said, I could see that development in the village generally comprises a thinnish band of built form, with trees, greenery and undeveloped land in the foreground and background, more or less defining the linear character of most of the village. It

seemed to me that this form of linear development was also present in the Gracious Street area.

30. The appeal site can only be seen in glimpsed views from these rather distant viewpoints, and the presence of trees within the proposed development means that views of the new houses would be interspersed with greenery. However, they would be seen over and beyond the less dense development at Gracious Street and, notwithstanding the proposed ecology zone on the north-western boundary, this would result in a much more densely developed edge to the village at this location than is currently the case. This impression of much greater development in depth would appear at odds with the thinner bands of linear-style development which represent the general form of the village, discernible from these viewpoints.
31. A similar impression would be gained, again from rather distant viewpoints, towards the western end of Footpath 13, which runs along the base of the Hanger. In current views from this footpath, development in the village is seen as a relatively thin band, comprising agricultural and domestic buildings of varied form, design and size, with open land in both the foreground and the background. However, the new dwellings would be seen at a somewhat higher elevation than the existing development in the Gracious Street area, because of the slightly sloping nature of the site. Once again I consider that the scale and form of the proposed buildings, on rising ground, would result in a denser grouping of development in depth, untypical of the general form of the village.
32. The greatest impact would, however, be from locations closer to the appeal site and within the appeal site itself. I acknowledge that views of the site from the B3006 to the north would generally be shielded by the double row of trees alongside the sunken footpath (Cow Lane), although some glimpses of dwellings could well be seen through or above this tree cover. Limited views into the site could be obtained at the time of my site visit through the gaps in the roadside hedging at the northern end of the site (by the bus shelter), and also at the southern end in the vicinity of the entrance to Lythe House. Glimpsed views into the site were also possible from Selborne Road through the roadside vegetation, which was not in leaf.
33. The change which the development would bring about would be most pronounced within the site, especially for users of Footpath 20, which seems to me to be reasonably seen as part of a circular route incorporating the Hanger, as was undertaken as part of my site visit. I acknowledge the appellant's point that change does not necessarily equate to harm, but in this case the appeal site clearly is a valued piece of land in the context of the form and setting of the village. Indeed it is specifically referred to in the VDS, where it is described as an open space extending into the village in the form of pasture, which is noted to be a desirable feature which needs to be protected as it contributes much to the sense of rural tranquillity.
34. This function would be eroded by the proposal which would introduce built development onto this currently open site, with the presence of new buildings negating any modest visual improvement arising from placing the existing power lines underground. Like the SDNPA I consider that the proposed development would impinge on views of important landscape features, such as the hedgerows and trees which surround the site, and change the perception and composition of

many views from countryside to a modern housing estate, out of keeping with the general form and style of the village.

35. I have noted the appellant's view that the appeal site should more accurately be described as an agricultural field than "open space", but this does not alter the physical appearance of this piece of land, nor does it alter its relationship to the built form of the village. I have also noted the appellant's comments that the VDS is predicated on providing guidance for small amounts of infill development and does not address the prospect of new housing needed to address any housing shortfall or deliver the quantum of affordable housing as identified from housing needs surveys. But these points do not alter the assessment of the physical impact of the proposed development, set out above.
36. I accept that general public access to the appeal site is currently limited to Footpath 20, and that in purely practical terms, the proposed re-routing of the footpath would be acceptable to Hampshire County Council's Countryside Service. However, the experience of walking this footpath would significantly change if the proposed development was to proceed. Although the re-aligned path would follow a landscaped and generally traffic-free route through the development, it would be clear that the path was part of a modern housing development, as new dwellings would be visible along its length, impinging on views towards the conservation area and the Hanger.
37. In this regard I have been mindful of the comments of the Local Plan Inspector who was required to consider whether this site would be a suitable location for development back in 2004. Amongst other matters he took the view that if the site was developed, the enjoyable rural experience of walking along this footpath would be replaced by a more urban or suburban one. He concluded that the present views and character need to be protected in their entirety and that because the site plays an important role in the countryside setting of the village, development on the site would fail to preserve the natural beauty of what was, at that time, the AONB.
38. Time has clearly moved on since 2004 and various circumstances have changed. Nonetheless, it seems to me that despite assertions to the contrary from the appellant's witnesses, the Local Plan Inspector's assessment of the landscape and visual characteristics of the site still stand, and his views and conclusions in this regard can still therefore be given weight.
39. Drawing all the above points together it is the case that by seeking to develop outside the village boundary, in the manner proposed, the appeal proposal would encroach into the countryside and in my assessment this would harm the rural character and setting of this part of the village. Moreover, by creating development in depth the proposed development would be at odds with the generally linear form of the settlement. These points lead me to conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to conserve the natural beauty of this part of the SDNP, to which great weight needs to be accorded, and accordingly it would conflict with one of the statutory purposes of the National Park.
40. It would also be in conflict with saved EHDLPSP Policy GS3, detailed above, and with EHDLPSP Policy C5 which, amongst other matters, indicates that planning permission will not be granted for development which would harm local landscape features such as important trees, hedgerows and open areas, including areas which extend into settlements.

*Main issue 2 - the effect on cultural heritage*

41. The setting of the conservation area. There has clearly been change in the village since Gilbert White's time, with the number of dwellings increasing from 60 or so in the 18<sup>th</sup> Century to the current total of more than 300. But much of the basic form of the village, which he described as "one single straggling street, three quarters of a mile in length, in a sheltered vale, and running parallel with the Hanger", still remains.
42. An extensive conservation area was designated in 1970 (and extended in 1976 and again in 1993), with some of the more modern development being within or close to what is generally termed the historic core of the village. This includes the small development areas at Huckers Lane, Hastards Lane and Maltbys, which all involved the construction of relatively modest numbers of new dwellings to the rear of development fronting the main street through the village. Relatively recent development at Ketchers Field, to the south of the village, lies outside the conservation area, as does the larger development at Goslings Croft at the northern end of the village.
43. Rather unusually, in light of English Heritage guidance that conservation area designation is not generally an appropriate means of protecting the wider landscape, much of the countryside around the village is also included in the designated conservation area. That said, this designation does not cover the appeal site itself and the appellant has commented that this cannot be an inadvertent "omission", in light of the fact that the conservation area has been reviewed and extended twice since first being designated. However, I am not persuaded that it automatically follows that the appeal site should be seen as less important in the context of the village's setting than the other fields which have been included in the conservation area, for reasons set out below.
44. The Framework makes clear the importance of identifying and assessing the particular significance of any heritage asset, and explains that this needs to be taken into account when considering the likely impact that development proposals may have. In this regard the appellant has drawn on information given in the Conservation Area Designation Statement to provide what he refers to as a "pithy but useful summary of the key aspects of Selborne's significance". These are its association with Gilbert White and his writings; its setting at the foot of the steeply rising wooded hangers, running down to the Oakhanger Stream; and the "strong sense of enclosure and tranquillity" created by the "small scale historic buildings set close up to the winding streets" in the centre of the village.
45. It is plain, however, that Selborne's attraction, in both physical and historic senses, extends beyond the built form of the village's historic core to include its wider setting and its relationship with the nearby Hanger, streams and open countryside. This is clearly borne out by the fact that the grounds of Gilbert White's house (The Wakes) are now designated as a registered park and garden, with this designation covering part of the Hanger, including the Zig-Zag Path cut by Gilbert White up its steep wooded slope.
46. Indeed it seems to me that this is also borne out by a further helpful summary of the character of the conservation area, contained in the Conservation Area Designation Statement. This states that it is the combination of a strong landscape setting, many historic buildings, narrow winding streets, the use of local materials and varied viewpoints and spaces which combine successfully to create the attractive character and setting of Selborne. The importance and significance



of open spaces in defining the character and setting of the village is carried forward in the VDS, as already noted, with the appeal site being specifically referred to (as Culverscroft) as a very desirable open space extending into the village in the form of pasture.

47. Because of this, whilst I share the appellant's view that the proposed development would have no visual impact on 4 of the 5 "main areas of interest" set out in the Conservation Area Designation Statement, I do consider that there would be an adverse impact on the setting of the wider Gracious Street area. I acknowledge that other than possible limited and distant glimpses of the proposed dwellings from Gracious Street itself, there would be little impact from within this area. However, the aforementioned Footpath 20 leads off from Gracious Street, passing alongside The Grange and into the appeal site, from where clear views are obtained of this northern edge of the conservation area.
48. By introducing new dwellings and vehicle manoeuvring and parking areas, the proposed development would harm the sense of rural tranquillity which currently exists. It would also have an adverse visual impact by effectively blocking views of the current low-density edge to the village from the realigned Footpath 20, as already noted above. Whilst the varying width ecology zone would undoubtedly have benefits from the point of view of protecting and supporting wildlife and flora, it would be located behind the new dwellings and, as such, it would do little to lessen their visual impact when viewed from Footpath 20.
49. In light of the above points, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an adverse impact on the setting of the village and the conservation area. It would therefore be in conflict with EHDLPSR Policy GS3, referred to above, and also with Policy HE8 which seeks to ensure that new development does not harm the setting of a conservation area, or views into or out of it. Furthermore, it would be at odds with those parts of the VDS which seek to protect important open spaces in and around the village, such as the appeal site.
50. Having regard to the conservation area as a whole, my assessment, in line with guidance in the Framework, is that the degree of harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset would be less than substantial. I therefore weigh this harm against any public benefits of the proposal, as put forward by the appellant, later in this decision.
51. The setting of The Grange. The Grange is a Grade II listed building dating from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, with 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century alterations and additions. It now serves as a private residence, but was originally a farmhouse. It was generally agreed that the heritage significance of The Grange is comprised of its special architectural interest in terms of design, decoration and craftsmanship as a vernacular building; and that it has some limited historic interest in reflecting the former farmstead and medieval grange that once existed on the site.
52. The building is set well back on its plot and is largely screened from Gracious Street by trees and other vegetation. Its once larger curtilage was reduced in the 1990s by the construction of 3 detached dwellings to its south-east; and the former farmyard to the north was redeveloped in the 1980s by conversion and new build, to provide 7 residential units. As a result, the relationship of The Grange with its surroundings has undergone considerable change in recent years, but self-evidently this change has been considered acceptable, as planning permission has been granted for the various projects summarised above.

53. However, the relationship of The Grange to the open field to its rear has undergone a much lesser change. The positioning of The Grange well towards the back of its plot means that it has a close physical relationship with the appeal site, as borne out by the various historic maps included in the evidence, together with extracts from Gilbert White's writings submitted by interested persons. That said, I acknowledge that this relationship is somewhat diminished by the current unlawful boundary treatment, referred to as a typically suburban close-boarded fence, and I further note that photographic evidence has indicated that at one time the boundary was formed by a high hedge or belt of trees. But notwithstanding these points, I share the SDNPA's view that because of the close, physical proximity and the open undeveloped nature of the appeal site, it is still possible to appreciate the historic, functional connection and relationship between the former farmhouse and the adjacent pastureland.
54. The historic significance of this relationship would be lost if the appeal site was to be developed in the manner currently proposed, as new housing would be constructed close to the common boundary with The Grange, leaving the listed building as an isolated historic remnant set amongst modern housing. Although the appellant has attempted to reduce any visual impact by proposing to place only single-storey dwellings closest to The Grange, as this property sits somewhat lower than the appeal site the proposed dwellings and associated garage buildings would still be prominent in views of the listed building.
55. Under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, decision makers are required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. In exercising this duty in this case, for the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal proposal would fail to preserve the listed building's setting and the features of historic interest associated with that setting. Accordingly the proposal would be at odds with EHDLPSP Policy HE12 which, in summary, indicates that development proposals will not be permitted if they would harm the setting of a listed building.
56. Nonetheless, as in the case of the impact on the setting of the conservation area, detailed above, I consider that in view of the changes which have already been permitted in the vicinity of The Grange in recent years, the overall extent of the harm to the setting of this listed building would be less than substantial. In accordance with Framework guidance this, again, is a matter which needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I undertake this balancing exercise later in this decision.

*Main issue 3 – whether "major development"*

57. The SDNPA's first reason for refusal alleges that the appeal proposal would be major development in the National Park. This is a significant point, as paragraph 116 of the Framework explicitly states that planning permission should be refused for major development in designated areas such as National Parks, except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development, would be in the public interest.
58. As the Framework does not provide a definition of what constitutes major development there was much debate on this matter at the inquiry. The SDNPA argued that the starting point should be to use the definition set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order

2010<sup>3</sup> (“the DMPO”), but then to consider whether the proposed development would have the potential to give rise to serious or significant adverse effects on the environment. The appellant did not take issue with this general approach, but the difference between the 2 parties centred on their differing views of the scale and extent of the likely impacts arising from the proposal.

59. In this regard the SDNPA argues that a development which would increase the size of a village which currently has some 311 dwellings, by about 10%, would lead to significant adverse effects, and that such a development could not be considered anything but major.
60. In contrast the appellant argues that that the origins of the phrase “major development” can be traced back to the former national planning guidance contained in PPG7<sup>4</sup> and PPS7<sup>5</sup>. Both of these indicated that major development proposals include those that raise issues of national significance. Whilst it is clear that this is not a comprehensive definition, and there is no suggestion that major developments can only relate to projects of national significance, it does provide some useful guidance concerning the likely scale of development to be considered as major in the National Park context.
61. With this in mind I take the view, in the current case, that although the appeal proposal would amount to a fairly significant development in the context of Selborne, its impact would be confined to the local area and, as already noted, would be less than substantial in terms of effects on heritage assets. This view is generally supported by the screening direction for Environmental Impact Assessment purposes<sup>6</sup>, issued by the Secretary of State, in which the proposed development is described as a small scale housing project.
62. It is also supported by the initial consultation response from Natural England, which took the view that the development would not be likely to adversely affect the purpose of the SDNP designation. However, this response was retracted shortly before the start of the inquiry, with comments on protected landscape matters being deferred to the SDNPA. Although this decision to defer does not appear to have been taken as a result of any detailed reassessment of the proposal, the fact that Natural England’s comments have now been retracted means that I cannot give them weight.
63. But notwithstanding this last point, having regard to all the matters detailed above I am not persuaded that the appeal proposal should be seen as a major development needing to be justified by exceptional circumstances, as discussed in paragraph 116 of the Framework. Because of this I shall treat the matters put forward in the appellant’s Exceptional Circumstances Statement simply as arguments which the appellant considers should carry weight in favour of the proposed development, and I deal with them later in this decision.

*Main issue 4 – the acceptability of “appearance” as a reserved matter*

64. One of the SDNPA’s reasons for refusal was that in the absence of details relating to the appearance of the development it cannot be shown that the development could be accommodated in a way which would not adversely

---

<sup>3</sup> That for residential developments, proposals for 10 or more dwellinghouses or where the site is 0.5ha or more should be regarded as “major”

<sup>4</sup> PPG7: Planning Policy Guidance Note 7: The Countryside – Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development

<sup>5</sup> PPS7: Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

<sup>6</sup> Under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011

impact on the natural beauty, wildlife or cultural heritage of the SDNP. The appellant had declined to submit details relating to external appearance, arguing that it was the principle of whether the site could be developed which was at issue and that appearance could and should remain as a reserved matter. In taking this stance the appellant has pointed out that there is nothing in the DMPO which suggests that outline planning applications are not appropriate in National Parks. He has also highlighted a number of other applications within the Park where the SDNPA has been content to determine the application without the absence of details of appearance forming a reason for refusal.

65. It seems to me that notwithstanding the SDNPA's detailed concerns regarding the design and layout of the proposed development, it has been able to come to a reasoned view on the acceptability or otherwise of this proposal, without details of appearance of the proposed dwellings and garage buildings being an insurmountable obstacle. Matters of scale and layout have defined the general form of the proposed development in what I consider to be an appropriate and acceptable level of detail, and I share the appellant's view that the VDS provides adequate guidance on the palette of materials that would be expected of new development in the village.
66. Moreover, neither of the SDNPA's witnesses dealing with design or heritage matters pointed to any particular example of the lack of appearance details causing them unacceptable difficulties in assessing the proposal. Finally on this matter, the SDNPA's heritage witness explicitly acknowledged that if other matters had been acceptable, his concerns regarding the impact of new buildings on the setting of The Grange could have been dealt with by a standard reserved matters condition.
67. Taking these points into account I conclude that had the proposal been acceptable on all other grounds, the appeal would not have failed simply because of the absence of details of the development's appearance.

*Other matters raised by the appellant*

68. In this section I deal with matters put forward in the Exceptional Circumstances Statement, which the appellant considers weigh in the proposal's favour.
69. 5-year housing land supply (HLS). The SoCG indicates that there is currently a deficit in the 5-year HLS for the EHDC area, including the SDNP. This is noted to be some 1,031 dwellings as at April 2012, with more recent information submitted to the inquiry showing that this deficit stands at 936 dwellings as at April 2013. Drawing on this point, the appellant maintains that this inability to demonstrate a 5-year HLS is a material consideration of great weight in the appeal proposal's favour.
70. However, despite the agreement in the SoCG, the SDNPA took the position in its evidence to the inquiry that a plain reading of the second bullet point to paragraph 47 of the Framework requires planning authorities to identify a 5-year supply of sites against their own housing requirements. This approach was not supported by the appellant, who pointed out that no Park-wide objective assessment of housing needs exists at the present time and that there is no support in the Framework for "salami-slicing" an authority's requirements into parts of its area.

71. Nevertheless, as a pragmatic way of securing an appropriate level of housing provision in the overall EHDC area (including the SDNP), having regard to the constraints imposed by the National Park and accepting that a Park-wide NPLP is unlikely to be in place until mid-2017 at the earliest, I consider that the SDNPA's suggested approach has merit. Indeed it is the case that although the overall market area considered for the purpose of the JCS housing figure was the EHDC area, the SDNPA made it clear that the requirement for housing within the Park has been arrived at by disaggregating this district-wide figure.
72. This disaggregation has drawn on information on housing need contained in an updated (August 2013) Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), commissioned jointly by EHDC and the SDNPA. On the basis of the SHMA assessments the authorities have adopted an annual requirement of 592 dwellings for the period 2011-2028 which has been split 70/30 (on the basis of population) between the EHDC area outside the Park, and that part of the EHDC area within the Park. This approach, which makes a clear distinction between housing requirements within the Park and outside it, has been incorporated into emerging JCS Policy CP8.
73. The Inspector conducting the hearings into the JCS has produced further modifications to a number of the JCS policies, including CP8, and as proposed to be modified this policy indicates that the allocation of sites should make provision for a minimum of 100 dwellings at other villages in the National Park. I have noted that the Supplementary SoCG indicates that the SDNPA's Planning Committee is being recommended to raise concern over the proposed introduction of the phrase "a minimum of" in place of "about", in relation to settlements within the National Park.
74. Nonetheless, the Inspector's modifications do not alter the general split of housing put forward by the SDNPA, which reflects the disaggregation detailed above and which is supported by the SDNPA. Consultation on these further modifications was still taking place whilst the current inquiry was sitting, but it is clear that the Inspector considered that the modifications would make the JCS sound. In light of the guidance in paragraph 216 of the Framework it is appropriate to give significant weight to this emerging policy.
75. Adopting the approach set out above, the SDNPA is able to demonstrate that there is no 5-year HLS deficit for the Park area within the EHDC area. This can only be achieved because EHDC has agreed to accommodate some of the need arising within the Park, but as this accords with the spirit to co-operate set out in the Framework it seems to me to be an acceptable approach. Although EHDC cannot, itself, demonstrate a 5-yr HLS, I have been mindful of the fact that it has put interim guidance in place (the previously mentioned FAD), which will assist in accommodating this extra requirement. In the particular circumstances of this case, and having regard to all the above points, I consider that the approach the SDNPA and EHDC have chosen to take can be justified.
76. On matters of detail the appellant argues that the SDNPA's figures are unduly optimistic, with particular concern being expressed regarding the assumed level of windfalls, which the appellant considers will decrease as things have "tightened up" since the National Park was designated. However, the figure for expected windfalls appears to me to be fairly robust, having been determined on an historical basis over an 11 year period (during which time many of the villages concerned would have been within the AONB), and with a discount rate

of 25% applied. In these circumstances I am not persuaded that it can be taken as certain that the number of windfalls will reduce.

77. Finally on this topic, I have noted the SDNPA's comment that as part of the EHDC Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), sites with a potential housing capacity of over 300 dwellings have been identified at villages with settlement boundaries within the National Park. This list currently includes the Burlands Field site, but the SDNPA maintains that even if this site was deleted, as part of the current review to provide a SDNP SHLAA, there would still be a substantial choice of sites to be allocated through the forthcoming SDNP Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans. In response, the appellant has undertaken a detailed assessment of these sites and maintains that the likely capacity would be significantly less than claimed by the SDNPA.
78. I have no way of verifying the positions of either party on this matter, but in my view the key point is that as an acceptable 5-yr HLS has been identified there is no pressing need, in housing supply terms, to approve development on the appeal site at this time. As a result I consider that the matters raised by the appellant under this overall heading do not add any material weight in favour of the appeal proposal.
79. Affordable Housing. There is no dispute that the provision of affordable housing is of great importance within rural areas such as National Parks. Indeed, Defra Circular 2010 notes that the lack of affordable housing in National Parks, has important implications for the sustainability of the Parks and their communities. It also makes it clear that National Park Authorities have an important role to play, as planning authorities, in the delivery of affordable housing.
80. Evidence submitted by the appellant indicates that there has been a long-standing demand for affordable housing in the Parish of Selborne with a total of 12 dwellings recorded as being needed in 1999 and the SoCG detailing a demand of 26 dwellings as at April 2013. However, more recent evidence indicates that the affordable housing need in Selborne and its 2 nearby "satellite" settlements of Oakhanger and Blackmoor has fallen back to 15, with 13 of the applicants seeking housing claiming a local connection to Selborne.
81. Whilst I accept the appellant's point that this may not present a complete picture of housing need in the Parish, it is the best and most up-to-date information available. What it appears to indicate is that although there is an undoubted and appreciable demand for affordable housing in Selborne, this demand has not increased significantly since 1999. That said, I acknowledge that despite the "strong support" for affordable housing for young families and first-time buyers contained within the VDS, there has been no affordable housing provision in Selborne since the Ketchers Field development in the early 1990s.
82. Relevant policies for affordable housing in the EHDLP SR are H11 and H12, but as H11 relates to proposals for residential development within settlement policy boundaries it is not applicable here. Policy H12 deals with residential proposals outside settlement boundaries, but expects any such development to provide 100% affordable housing on what would be termed a "rural exception site". However, the SoCG indicates that this policy is considered to be in conflict with paragraph 54 of the Framework as it does not allow for circumstances where market housing might help to bring affordable housing forward.

83. This situation is intended to be addressed through emerging JCS Policy CP12, which would allow residential development to be provided outside settlement boundaries subject to a number of criteria being met, and subject to no more than 30% of the dwellings being market housing. In addition, the policy expects any such market housing to normally be low-cost dwellings such as starter-homes. As the appeal proposal seeks to provide 60% market housing units, many of which would not fall into the low-cost starter home category, it would be at odds with this emerging policy.
84. At the inquiry the SDNPA pointed out that the appellant had not justified the provision of 60% market housing through any form of viability study, with the appellant responding that he had never been requested to produce any such study. Be that as it may, it is clear to me that there is no policy support for a residential development located outside a settlement boundary to provide such a high proportion of market housing, either in the adopted development plan or in the emerging JCS. In these circumstances it would not be unreasonable to expect a viability case to be put forward to support such a proposal, and the fact that no financial information of this sort has been submitted means that I am unable to form any clear view regarding the acceptability of the amount and type of market housing proposed.
85. Nevertheless, the appeal proposal would meet almost all of Selborne's affordable housing need, and this matter weighs strongly in the proposal's favour. But this is not to say that affordable housing could not be provided by other means. Indeed a number of proposals were referred to at the inquiry including a live planning application for 10 dwellings (to include 4 affordable) at a site adjacent to the settlement boundary but within the conservation area at Barnfield; a proposal to redevelop The Doone at Honey lane within the settlement boundary but outside the conservation area for a net gain of 3 or 4 dwellings; and a possible extension to the Ketchers Field development to provide 8 affordable homes adjacent to the settlement boundary and outside the conservation area.
86. There is clearly no certainty that any of these proposals will come to fruition, and I am aware that there is local opposition to the Barnfield proposal and that the Ketchers Field proposal would be likely to involve market housing (possibly elsewhere), as enabling development for the proposed affordable housing. I also accept that further affordable housing at Ketchers Field would be somewhat at odds with the aim of producing mixed communities. Nevertheless, there is no firm evidence before me to suggest that such developments could not come forward in policy compliant ways.
87. It is also the case that wholly affordable housing developments have come forward recently, with examples given of projects at West Tisted and Binstead. With these points in mind I see no good reason why the policy relaxation proposed through emerging JCS Policy CP12, albeit untested at this stage, should not allow more affordable housing to be delivered. In any case, despite the appellant's scepticism regarding the amount of affordable housing which would flow from the current 5-year HLS, it seems to me that a good number of affordable units (or a financial contribution towards such units) are likely to arise both from the allocations of a minimum of 100 new dwellings at villages, and from the anticipated windfalls.
88. Taking all the above points into account I conclude that although the affordable housing which the appeal proposal would provide weighs significantly in its

favour, this is offset to a large extent by the unjustified level of market housing of a type not consistent with emerging policy. On balance I therefore conclude that only moderate weight should be given to the affordable housing aspect of the appeal proposal.

89. The SDNPA's statutory duty. The appellant maintains that the SDNPA has ignored or avoided making any provision to fulfil its statutory duty of seeking to foster the economic and social well-being of local communities within the National Park. Much of this argument is linked to the general housing and affordable housing issues discussed above, and is directed against the JCS and its spatial vision which the appellant considers shows a failure on the part of the SDNPA to grasp the concept of supporting and enhancing the vitality and viability of rural settlements.
90. The appellant considers that the appeal proposal would be a welcome step towards correcting this failure as it would provide affordable homes for local people as well as opportunities for existing small households in large properties to trade down. Accordingly, the appellant argues that the appeal proposal accords with the National Park duty set out above and that, exceptionally, it would fill the void left by the SDNPA and would fulfil the aims of the Framework and be in the public interest.
91. It seems to me, however, that the points made by the appellant in this regard add little of any substance to the matters already discussed above. In terms of the proposed spatial strategy for housing proposed through the JCS I have already commented on the JCS Inspector's proposed further modifications to Policy CP8, and the fact that he considers these modifications would make the JCS sound. In this regard I share the Planning Authority's view that the JCS should be the correct vehicle to provide for local communities, along with future Site Allocation Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Neighbourhood Plans.
92. From the evidence before me it is clear that the local community in Selborne has been proactive in preparing documents to assist in planning for its future development, with the Selborne Village Community Plan and the Local Landscape Character Assessment having been adopted by the Parish Council; and the VDS already referred to, being adopted by EHDC as SPG.
93. There is clearly still a need for further affordable housing in the village, as detailed above, and in this regard I have noted those representations from interested persons who are in favour of the proposed development as it would provide some of these much needed affordable dwellings. But I have already concluded on this affordable housing matter above, and there is no firm evidence before me to suggest that the village is not already vital and viable as a community. Because of this I do not share the appellant's view that the SDNPA is failing in its statutory duty, and accordingly I conclude that the appellant's arguments in this regard carry little weight.
94. The suitability of Selborne as a location for future development. Insofar as this topic is concerned, it is clear from the SDNP Settlement Hierarchy Study submitted in evidence that the village is one of the highest scoring settlements in Tier 4. As such, in accordance with the wording of emerging JCS Policy CP8, it should be one of the settlements considered for an allocation of some of the minimum of 100 dwellings which the policy seeks to place in National Park villages. However, this is not to say that Selborne would automatically be



chosen for an allocation, as that would be a matter for a future Site Allocation DPD to consider.

95. In making this comment I have been mindful of the fact that the appeal site has been included in the EHDC SHLAA as a site with a notional capacity for 51 dwellings, but it is clear that a detailed assessment would be needed of any SHLAA site before it could be firmly assumed to be suitable for development. Indeed, individual development proposals would have to be assessed against the 3 dimensions of sustainable development detailed in the Framework – economic, social and environmental.
96. It is clear from my conclusions on the first and second main issues that the appeal proposal cannot be considered sustainable development as it would not accord with the environmental role set out in the Framework. Accordingly, whilst the village of Selborne scores well as a sustainable location, this does not translate into support for the appeal proposal, for the reasons just given.

*Other matters, including those raised by interested persons*

97. Highway concerns. One of the original reasons for refusal maintained that inadequate footways and visibility splays were proposed at the site access and at pedestrian crossing points; and that it had not been demonstrated that the development could be accommodated in a manner which would not cause increased danger and inconvenience to highway users and pedestrians.
98. Traffic and highway concerns also featured in many of the written representations made by interested persons, as well as in the oral submissions of some of those who spoke at the inquiry. These concerns covered such matters as difficulties of access to and egress from the proposed development by residents, visitors and construction traffic, with particular difficulties envisaged with heavy goods vehicles (HGVs); dangers arising from the proposed positioning of the site access close to the school crossing point and within the 20mph area; an increased risk of accidents as a result of increased traffic through the village; and increased pollution from vehicles, especially HGVs during the construction period.
99. However, whilst such concerns are understandable, there is no firm evidence before me to demonstrate that they are justified. Using trip rates from the widely accepted TRICS7 database, the proposed development is predicted to give rise to some 162 vehicle trips on a daily basis, with 17 in the morning peak hour and 19 in the evening peak hour. These are not excessive volumes of additional traffic, and it is clearly the case that traffic already joins the main road from existing side roads such as Gracious Street, with no evidence submitted to indicate that this causes undue problems.
100. In these circumstances I see no reason why a new junction should not operate safely and satisfactorily, provided adequate visibility could be provided for vehicles wishing to enter the main road. This is also the view of Hampshire County Council as local Highway Authority, which has withdrawn its objection to this proposal as it is satisfied that the necessary visibility splays could be provided. I share that view. I have also noted that a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit for the proposed access and pedestrian infrastructure improvement works did not identify any highway concerns which could not be addressed.

---

<sup>7</sup> TRICS – Trip Rate Information Computer System

101. Insofar as disruption may be caused during any construction period, this would be an inevitable consequence of any new development. But this would only be of relatively limited duration and, with careful and considerate management of the construction process, there is no reason why any undue problems should arise. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not give rise to unacceptable traffic or highway problems. Accordingly I find no conflict with EHDLPSR Policies T4, T6, T9 and T10 which, in summary, require new developments to provide safe and adequate access arrangements for all users.
102. Financial contributions. As well as making provision for the 12 affordable housing units, the submitted S106 agreement also provides for financial contributions covering matters of public open space, transport and monitoring. The SDNPA is satisfied that these contributions would accord with EHDLPSR Policy GS4 which requires developers to provide or improve necessary on and off-site infrastructure, services and facilities.
103. From the evidence before me I consider that the contributions would accord with paragraph 204 of the Framework. This makes it plain that for planning obligations to be taken into account they must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. However, although the S106 agreement satisfactorily addresses matters included in the SDNPA's reasons for refusal, it adds no specific weight to the proposed development as it is simply required to make the aforementioned aspects of the proposal acceptable.

### **Planning balance and overall conclusions**

104. Drawing together my conclusions and findings detailed above, with regard to the third and fourth main issues I have concluded that the appeal proposal would not amount to major development in the National Park and that, on its own, the absence of details of the appearance of the proposed development would not be unacceptable. However, on the first main issue I have concluded that the proposal would fail to conserve the scenic beauty of the SDNP and this point carries great weight against the proposed development.
105. On the second main issue I have found that the proposal would fail to preserve the setting of The Grange and the features of historic interest associated with that setting, and would also have an adverse impact on the setting of the village and the conservation area. Overall the harm to heritage assets would be less than substantial, and in such cases the Framework requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. But in this case I have concluded that only the benefits arising from the provision of affordable housing would weigh materially in the proposal's favour, and even that weight would only be moderate when other matters are taken into account.
106. On balance, the limited benefits of the proposal would clearly not outweigh the harm I have identified and the proposal is therefore not acceptable. I have had regard to all other matters raised, but they are not sufficient to outweigh the considerations which have led me to my conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

*David Wildsmith*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE SOUTH DOWNS NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY:**

Mr M Reed of Counsel	instructed by the Head of Legal and Democratic Services of West Sussex County Council
He called	
Mr K Reed BA(Hons) MA MRTPI, MRICS FCIHT	Deputy Director of Planning, South Downs National Park Authority
Mr R Dollamore BA(Hons) MA(Hons)	Design Officer, South Downs National Park Authority
Miss V Craddock BA DipLA CMLI	Landscape Officer, South Downs National Park Authority
Mr M Scammell BA(Hons) DipCons(Arch) IHBC	Historic Buildings Officer, South Downs National Park Authority
Mr T Bettany-Simmons BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Development Management Officer, South Downs National Park Authority

### **FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Mr P Brown QC	instructed by Mr I Ellis of Southern Planning Practice Ltd
He called	
Mr R Mascall BSc(Hons) DipBldgCons (RICS) MRTPI IHBC	Director and Head of Heritage, Turley Associates
Mr G Goodman BA(Hons) DipArch RIBA	Director, HGP Architects Limited
Mrs C Brockhurst BSc(Hons) DipLA FLI	Partner, Tyler Grange LLP
Mr I Ellis BA MRTPI	Director, Southern Planning Practice Ltd

### **INTERESTED PERSONS OPPOSING THE PROPOSAL:**

Cllr M Palmer	On behalf of Selborne Parish Council
Sir T Blackburn	On behalf of 77 local residents
Mr P Lewis-Jones	Local resident
Mr R Davidson-Houston	Local resident
Mr T Cartwright	Local resident
Cllr D Ashcroft	Local resident, Parish Councillor and local Ward Councillor
Mrs C Dibden	On behalf of CPRE Hampshire (the Campaign to Protect Rural England)

## **DOCUMENTS AND PLANS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY**

- Document 1 Opening statement on behalf of the appellant
- Document 2 Opening statement on behalf of the SDNPA
- Document 3 Completed and signed S106 Agreement
- Document 4 Revised Table 1 from page 16 of Mr K Reed's evidence
- Document 5 Plan showing the locations of photo-viewpoints referred to in Miss Craddock's evidence
- Document 6 Bundle of Joint Core Strategy documents, submitted by the appellant
- Document 7 Letter from Selborne Parish Council to the Planning Inspectorate dated 13 November 2013
- Document 8 Written statement and attachment submitted by Sir T Blackburn
- Document 9 Written statement and addendum submitted by Mr Lewis-Jones
- Document 10 Written statement submitted by Mr Davidson-Houston
- Document 11 Copies of photographs 6 to 14 from Appendix 8 of Miss Craddock's evidence, with the appeal site highlighted
- Document 12 Email trail relating to Natural England's consultation response, submitted by the appellant
- Document 13 Table explaining the status of the various plans, agreed between the SDNPA and the appellant
- Document 14 Written statement and attachments submitted by Cllr Palmer on behalf of Selborne Parish Council
- Document 15 Written statement submitted by Mr Cartwright
- Document 16 Revised Photoviewpoints C and D from Mrs Brockhurst's evidence, submitted by the SDNPA
- Document 17 Larger version of Figure 4 from Mr Dollarmore's evidence
- Document 18 Revised Site Plan – Drg No 12.142.010.RevC
- Document 19 Judgment in the case of Aston & Westcott Meadow Action Group Ltd v SSCLG & Mole Valley DC & Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd [2013] EWHC 1936 (Admin), 10 July 2013
- Document 20 Appeal decision Ref APP/F1610/A/13/2196383 relating to land off Station Road, Bourton-on-the-Water, Gloucestershire, submitted by the appellant
- Document 21 Alternative version of Table 1 from Mr K Reed's evidence, submitted by the appellant
- Document 22 Written Statement by Cllr Ashcroft
- Document 23 Written statement by Mrs Dibden on behalf of CPRE Hampshire
- Document 24 Further emails relating to the Natural England consultation response, submitted by the appellant
- Document 25 Appeal decision Ref APP/K2420/A/13/2202261 relating to land east of Wolvey Road, Three Pots, Burbage, Leicestershire, submitted by the SDNPA
- Document 26 Extracts from Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd edition, published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment
- Document 27 Revised list of suggested, agreed conditions
- Document 28 Closing submissions by Cllr Palmer on behalf of Selborne Parish Council
- Document 29 Closing submissions on behalf of the SDNPA
- Document 30 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer

Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: [customers@english-heritage.org.uk](mailto:customers@english-heritage.org.uk)