
Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 24-27 January 2017 and closed on 20 February 2017

Site visit made on 8 February 2017

by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/W/16/3150796

Land at Pashley Road, Upper Platts, Ticehurst, East Sussex

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Rydon Homes Ltd against the decision of Rother District Council.
 - The application Ref RR/2015/2151/P, dated 3 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2016.
 - The development proposed is residential development of 16 dwellings comprising 14 No. houses and 2 No. apartments, and associated access, roads, garaging / parking spaces, surface water attenuation basins, and ecological / landscape buffer areas.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the appeal scheme on the location strategy for new development in the District;
 - Its effect on the character and appearance of the area, including in terms of landscape character and visual impact;
 - Its effect on the historic environment, including on the settings of Singehurst and of the terrace of cottages to the north of the appeal site that are both grade II listed buildings; and
 - Whether any development plan conflict and harm arising is outweighed by any considerations, including the absence of a National Planning Policy Framework compliant supply of housing land in the area.

Background and Context

3. The appeal proposal is for the erection of 16 dwellings, comprising two apartments and 14 houses, at a site located close to the eastern edge of the village of Ticehurst. The site is an irregularly shaped piece of grassland of approximately 1ha with a northern frontage to Pashley Road, the B2099, of some 110 metres long. Although not far removed, it lies beyond the 'Development Boundary' of Ticehurst as identified in the development plan.
4. Ticehurst has a reasonable range of services including shops, a primary school, a village club and hall, a recreation ground and bus services to surrounding settlements including Tunbridge Wells, Hastings and Crowborough. The village

and the surrounding countryside lie within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB).

5. It is common ground between the main parties that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. During the Inquiry the appellant's representatives confirmed that it is content for me to determine the appeal on the basis of the Council's position that it currently has a 3.9 year supply of such sites. I have done so, given that I have found no overriding reason to do otherwise.

Reasons

Locational Strategy

6. The development plan includes the Rother District Local Plan Core Strategy September 2014 (the Core Strategy) and the saved policies of the Rother District Local Plan July 2006 that have not been superseded by the Core Strategy (the Local Plan).
7. The Council's 'Overall Spatial Development Strategy' is set out in Core Strategy Policy OSS1 and the supporting text. In summary, it plans for at least 5,700 dwellings (net) in the District over the plan period, 2011-2028, and the identification of suitable sites in accordance with a spatial distribution that focuses new development at Bexhill promoting economic regeneration and growth of the Hastings and Bexhill area, provides for some development in Battle and Rye that helps maintain their small market town roles, facilitates the limited growth of villages that contain a range of services and allows for small-scale infill and redevelopment. The broad locations for new housing are set out as 3,100 dwellings at Bexhill, 100-250 at Hastings fringes, 475-500 at Battle, 355-400 at Rye and 1,670 at 'Villages'.
8. The Core Strategy goes on, via Policy RA1, to plan for the provision of those 1,670 additional dwellings in rural villages, of which the evidence indicates that at April 2013 there was a residual requirement for the allocation of sites for some 800 dwellings. Policy RA1, along with the accompanying Figure 12, indicate how those new homes will be distributed among the villages including that 83 new dwellings are to be provided at Ticehurst, one of only two Rural Service Centres, over the plan period 'subject to refinement in the light of further investigation via the Development and Site Allocations DPD and/or Neighbourhood Plans'.
9. A further part of the District's location strategy for new development is expressed in Core Strategy Policy OSS2 concerning the use of Development Boundaries. The preamble explains that Development Boundaries around settlements are a well-established planning policy tool in East Sussex that provide a clear and readily understood indication of where development would, and would not, be allowed in principle. The Policy itself says, among other things, that 'Development Boundaries around settlements will continue to differentiate between areas where most forms of new development would be acceptable and where they would not'. It goes on to say that existing Development Boundaries will be reviewed by the Development and Sites Allocations DPD (the DPD) having regard to a number of considerations.
10. The current Development Boundary of Ticehurst is defined in the Local Plan. Saved Policy DS3 of the Local Plan is consistent with Core Strategy Policy OSS2

in that it states that the majority of all new development will take place within Development Boundaries of existing settlements. While reasonably close to it, the appeal site is located beyond the Ticehurst Development Boundary, which runs to the west beyond a pond and to the north beyond Pashley Road.

11. The development plan makes provision for housing development beyond the Development Boundary via the review mechanism that will form part of the DPD and potentially through the Neighbourhood Plan process, as well as via development that is expressly permitted under other policies of the Core Strategy, notably Policy RA3(iii). Policy RA3 allows for the creation of new dwellings in the countryside in 'extremely limited circumstances', which include those required for land-based industries including farming, certain forms of conversions and replacement dwellings, and rural exception site development to meet an identified local affordable housing need.
12. While it is proposed to deliver six affordable homes as part of the appeal development, I have no reason to believe that they would meet the full rural exception site requirements or any of the other criteria for dwellings in the countryside set out in the Core Strategy.
13. The DPD is emerging in the form of the Development and Site Allocations Local Plan (the eDSA). Like the emerging neighbourhood plan for Ticehurst, the eDSA is at an early stage such that they both carry very limited weight. Nonetheless, there is a clear commitment and mechanism for the review and, if necessary, amendment of the District's Development Boundaries, including that for Ticehurst. I have found no good reason to believe that that process will not take place or conclude within a reasonable timeframe. Indeed the Local Development Scheme¹ indicates that the Council is working towards an adoption target of June 2018 for the eDSA. In the meantime the Development Boundaries remain as expressed in the Local Plan.
14. In the circumstances, as the appeal site is located beyond the Development Boundary of Ticehurst and given that the proposed scheme would not meet the exception criteria for housing in the countryside, in those respects, the proposals are at odds with the Council's location strategy for new development in the District contrary to Policies OSS2 and RA3 of the Core Strategy and Policy DS3 of the Local Plan.
15. The Council's first refusal reason also alleges conflict with Core Strategy Policy OSS3. This Policy sets out criteria for the assessment of the suitability of a particular location for development when allocating land for development and when determining planning applications. It also states that sites and/or proposals should accord with the relevant policies of this Core Strategy. Given the identified conflict with Policies OSS2 and RA3, in that regard, the appeal development would also conflict with Policy OSS3.

Character and Appearance

16. The appeal site is comprised of a single irregularly shaped field, which is currently laid to grass and generally slopes gently north to south. The site and the surrounding area are located within the AONB. There is a mature hedge to the northern boundary with a screen of trees and hedgerow extending along the side of a private unsurfaced track that runs to the eastern site boundary.

¹ Inquiry Document No 2

- Beyond this lies a public footpath that runs southward from Pashley Road. To the south there is a dense wooded area that is designated as Ancient Woodland. Beyond to the south and east there is open countryside.
17. Also to the southern side of Pashley Road to the west and southwest of the site beyond a small area of open land, including a pond, lies a group of buildings including the Grade II Listed 17th Century dwelling known as Singehurst, along with the converted outbuildings known as Singehurst Barn, a group of converted and new build barns occupied as a single residence known as Heartswood, and a modern detached dwelling known as Greenacres.
 18. Opposite the site to the north of Pashley Road from west to east there is a line of residential properties comprised of a grade II listed terrace of four 19th Century cottages, Breckles, Carpenters Cottage, Meadow Cottage and The Homestead (Breckles et al), and two bungalows and a house. To the west and north of these dwellings is an undeveloped area including trees and ponds with a hedge to its Pashley Road frontage. This undeveloped area extends west and north to the predominantly residential development on and near to Lower Platts, the B2087. To the east is Upper Platts, a fairly uniform 20th Century development of 16 semi-detached two-storey houses set back from Pashley Road, accessed from a U-shaped service road and set behind a substantial hedge.
 19. Access to the site is currently via a shared private driveway to Heartswood and Greenacres and also directly from a field gate in the northern boundary onto a lay-by to the south of Pashley Road.
 20. Notwithstanding its apparent use for the keeping of horses, the field broadly has the appearance of a pasture used for agricultural purposes such that it has a rural feel comparable to the nearby countryside.
 21. On the evidence before me, I am not persuaded that the site stands on an ancient ridgetop drove way such that its historic significance to landscape and visual character, including that of the AONB, appears to be significantly overstated by the Council. Indeed the evidence, including The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2014-2019, indicates that rather than running adjacent to the site, the 'ridgeway' turns to the north along Lower Platts, and drove ways appear likely to lie elsewhere rather than in the vicinity of the appeal site. Moreover, the generally broad width of the roadside margins of Pashley Road near the site appear to be at least as likely to be due to the layout of the road as a turnpike as to use as a drove way, while the supporting claim that the site's hedge is species rich and of antiquity is disproved by the wider evidence.
 22. Nevertheless, the appeal site and nearby context do display some key characteristics of the AONB. For instance, Singehurst is, as was accepted in oral evidence by Mr Smith the appellant's heritage witness, a historic dispersed farmstead; albeit, for the reasons outlined above, the evidence does not indicate that it is a mediaeval driftway farmstead. Other characteristics present are that the site is a small irregularly shaped field and is bordered by hedgerows and ancient woodland.
 23. The appellant produced a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIA) for the appeal development. The Council is critical of some aspects of it, including in respect to the extent to which it deals with heritage features. While I note

the concerns raise in respect to the historic landscape, for largely the reasons outlined above, these are in my view overstated. Consequently, I broadly agree with the majority of the conclusions of the LVIA, particularly regarding the wider effects of the appeal development in terms of landscape character and visual impact.

24. This is primarily due to the reasonably modest size of the site and the extent of development proposed, as well as the degree to which the site is contained within the landscape, largely by existing mature planting and development. The remaining field pattern, in terms of its shape and containing boundaries and planting, would also be retained albeit that it would contain development. For these reasons the effect of the development in landscape and visual impact terms would be limited to the immediate area and setting of the village, and subject to mitigation the natural beauty of the AONB would be conserved. Consequently, there would be no conflict with the statutory purpose of AONBs or with para 115 of the Framework.
25. Nonetheless, the introduction of development to any undeveloped site would be very likely to alter its character. The appeal site is screened to a large extent by existing planting when viewed from nearby. It is, nonetheless, reasonably important insofar as it remains apparent from some nearby views and, notwithstanding the presence of nearby development, contributes to the countryside setting of the village. To a large extent, its value stems from the fact that it has remained open and undeveloped and retains its broadly agricultural appearance combined with its village edge location.
26. The proposed site layout incorporates a small buffer strip between the built development and the northern / eastern site boundaries, and landscape works are also proposed including supplementary planting. Nonetheless, the proposed development would be apparent from nearby public views. These would include from Pashley Road and the right of way to the east in filtered views through the hedge/planting, as well as in views of the roof forms over the boundary hedge and planting, and via the opening that would be formed for the proposed site access.
27. Therefore, notwithstanding the proposed mitigation measures, the fact that the site had largely become developed would be readily apparent, particularly as one moved around it along the highway and right of way. There would also be views of the developed site available from some nearby private properties. Consequently, the appeal development would undermine the contribution the site currently makes to the character and appearance of the area.
28. The Council has also raised concerns regarding the layout and detailed design of the proposed development. However, subject to further consideration of some of the detail, such as facing materials and boundary treatment, which could be controlled via planning conditions, these detailed aspects of the proposals need not of themselves be significantly out of harmony with nearby development. Consequently, in that specific regard there need be no conflict with Core Strategy Policies EN3 (Design Quality) or RA1 (Villages), although this takes nothing away from the harm as identified above.
29. Therefore, although the effects of the proposals in this regard would be fairly contained and the detailed design, layout and scale are of themselves unobjectionable, the harm to the immediate area's character and appearance would be reasonably significant. Consequently, the introduction of

development of the extent and type proposed to the site would, in that regard, be at odds with Policies OSS3 (i) & (vi), OSS4 (iii) (General Development Considerations), RA1 (i), RA2 (viii) (General Strategy for the Countryside) and EN1 (i) & (v) (Landscape Stewardship) of the Core Strategy.

Historic Environment

30. Singehurst is a mid-17th Century building of two storeys and attic. The ground floor is brick, with a tile hung first floor. It was originally thatched but is now roofed with clay tiles. It is an L-plan building with a four-bay main range and single-bay rear range at the eastern end. The internal layout has been altered. The house became formed of two dwellings from at least the mid-19th Century. The western part of the building was extended in the mid-19th Century, then demolished and the present Singehurst Cottage built between 1910 and 1930, and is now in separate ownership.
31. Singehurst Barn is located some 25 metres southeast of Singehurst and comprises two former barns with a single-storey connection. The northern barn dates to the first half of the 19th Century, with the southern barn built in the mid-20th Century. The connection appears to have been erected at the time of its conversion to one dwelling in the late-1980s or early-1990s. It is now common ground between the main parties that Singehurst Barn is curtilage listed to Singehurst. I have found no reason to disagree. The barns that now form parts of Singehurst Barn and the dwelling known as Heartwood appear to have been extensively altered and extended for their current uses.
32. Although the east elevation of Singehurst was once the main aspect overlooking the pond and the track which connected the farmhouse to the formerly associated agricultural buildings, the front doorway to this elevation has been removed and it is now a flank elevation adjacent to the access drive to Singehurst Barn. The neighbouring properties to Singehurst are also now in separate use and ownership and are physically segregated from it. Nonetheless, while it will no doubt have been eroded over the years, the farmstead appearance and feel, with Singehurst as the principal farmhouse, remains legible.
33. Beyond the surrounding dwellings, the setting of Singehurst includes some of the farmland once functionally associated with it, which extends to some 89 hectares and includes the appeal site. While some of that land is still in agricultural use none of it has retained a functional relationship with Singehurst. It is common ground between the main parties that the appeal site is within the setting of Singehurst. I agree, particularly given the intervisibility with the upper floors of the flank elevation and the proximity of the site as a former part of the historic farmland of Singehurst.
34. The site appears to have broadly assumed its current form after Singehurst ceased to be associated with the farm, which happened when the property now known as Greenacres, located a little to the south of Singehurst, became the farmhouse and Singehurst became a functionally independent dwelling. The evidence indicates that previously the site comprised all or part of three fields. Nonetheless, it retains a broadly agricultural appearance today.
35. The significance of Singehurst derives primarily from its evidential value as a mid-17th Century building with surviving original features. It also has aesthetic value as a vernacular former farmhouse, although that is somewhat diminished

- by extensions and alterations, including the replacement of the thatched roof. The significance of Singehurst Barn derives primarily from its evidential value as a building that includes remnants of 19th Century former barns, albeit that they are much altered, as well as from its historic association with Singehurst.
36. The contribution made by the appeal site to the significance of Singehurst and Singehurst Barn is diminished due to their functional dislocation from their former farm buildings and farmland, along with the constrained intervisibility between the heritage assets and the site, and the now residential use of these near neighbouring properties. Nonetheless, the farmstead remains legible to a reasonable extent, notwithstanding the fragmented residential uses, the alterations and the physical segregation. This is in part due to the broadly agricultural appearance of the surviving buildings and the setting offered by nearby undeveloped land that has a broadly agricultural appearance, which provided an important context to the listed building as a former farmhouse as well as to Singehurst Barn as its curtilage listed building. Consequently, the site makes a reasonably important contribution to the significance of these heritage assets.
 37. Breckles et al is a single building formed of four dwellings of two storeys and attic formed in brick and tile hung at first floor, with a tiled gable roof. Each dwelling has a separate front door within a projecting porch, and one window at ground and at first floor. It dates from the mid-19th Century and at that time was the only building on this immediate section of Pashley Road. The evidence suggests that it was erected to provide accommodation for the expanding operation at Singehurst Farm.
 38. It is common ground that the appeal site forms part of the setting of Breckles et al. I agree, particularly given its location immediately opposite the listed building to the south of Pashley Road and its apparent historical association with Singehurst Farm.
 39. The significance of Breckles et al is primarily evidential and aesthetic, relating to the fabric and form of the asset itself, being an example of mid-19th Century East Sussex agricultural workers' cottages. That it remains as four dwellings suggests likely good survival of the internal floorplan and, notwithstanding, external alterations there is a good degree of retained legibility. I recognise that part of its setting is dominated by 20th Century dwellings, that the site is segregated from it by a reasonably busy road and that there is no longer any functional relationship between the site and the cottages. Nonetheless, given the site's broadly agricultural appearance, and their proximity, intervisibility and historical association, the site still makes a reasonably important contribution to the significance of the listed building.
 40. Introducing the appeal development to the site would, therefore, detrimentally affect the contribution that that part of each setting makes to the significance of each of these three heritage assets. Notably, this would be as a result of its fundamental effect on the open, agricultural feel of the site and the associated significantly diminished intervisibility between the appeal site and those heritage assets from beyond and within the site thereby eroding the legibility of each of those listed buildings. Accordingly, in those respects the appeal development would conflict with Policy EN2 of the Core Strategy.
 41. The resulting harm to these listed buildings' significance would be less than substantial in the terms of para 134 of the Framework. While in my judgement

it would, in each case, fall to the lower end of the less than substantial range, given the statutory duty² to 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, the identified harm in each instance carries substantial weight against the proposal.

42. Again, in coming to this conclusion I have taken into account the appellant's wider evidence in respect to the heritage matters, including the site's inclusion in the SHLAA, and that development and listed building consent have been allowed at and in the vicinity of these listed buildings in the past. However, these matters do not alter my overall assessment as outlined above.

Other Issues and Planning Balance

43. In undertaking the planning balance I have considered the weight to be given to the relevant development plan policies and made an assessment of whether the appeal proposal would amount to sustainable development in the terms of the Framework. In doing so I have had regard to, among other things, the absence of a Framework compliant supply of housing land and the contents of the Framework as a whole.
44. It is common ground between the main parties that Policies OSS2, OSS3, RA1, RA2, RA3, EN1 and EN2 of the Core Strategy and Policy DS3 of the Local Plan are all relevant policies for the supply of housing in the terms of Framework para 49. I agree and consider that the weight carried by these Policies, with the exception of EN2, is limited particularly bearing in mind the appeal site's edge of settlement location. Nonetheless, in the context of the legal requirement to give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings, as well as the requirements of Framework Chapter 12, Core Strategy Policy EN2 carries considerable weight.
45. The identified harm to the significance of Singehurst, Singehurst Barn and Breckles et al as listed buildings should also be considered in the context of the legal requirement to give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings as well as the requirements of the Framework. I consider the public benefits along with the other main considerations under the three dimensions of sustainable development and then return to this matter.
46. The appeal development would offer a number of potential benefits. In terms of the social dimension of sustainable development, it would increase the supply and choice of housing, including six affordable homes on site plus a contribution to support further affordable provision, in an area where there is a significant need for both market and affordable housing. The built and living environment would also be good for residents, fostering mixed communities, with good access to services, including public transport.
47. The development would also contribute towards economic growth during the construction phase including in terms of employment and potentially an increase in local spending. It would also deliver new homes bonus and increase Council Tax revenue. In the longer term, the additional population would be likely to increase local spending power, for instance in local shops, and help support the sustainability of local services.

² S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

48. Regarding the environmental dimension, the scheme would incorporate energy efficiency and low carbon measures, the site is reasonably accessible thereby offering alternatives to use of the private car both locally and further afield, and additional planting and habitat enhancement would be delivered. I have, however, identified significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and to heritage assets, which affect the social as well as the environmental dimensions of sustainable development.
49. The collective weight of those benefits would be significant. However, I am not persuaded that they are collectively sufficient to outbalance the identified less than substantial harm to the significance of any of the listed buildings given that such harm should be given considerable importance and weight. In doing so I have taken into account that the scale of the proposed housing delivery would be reasonably modest and that although the housing land supply shortfall is substantial and as such likely to take some time to bridge, it is also likely to be only a temporary situation, whereas the harm to the significance of the heritage assets would be more permanent.
50. Although I have not done so, had I found in line with the appellant's best case position in respect to the heritage impact of the appeal development that the less than substantial harm to Breckles et al alone would be to the lower end of that scale, I would still have found that that harm would not be outbalanced by the public benefit given the considerations and circumstances I outline in the preceding paragraph.
51. In making my decision I have also been mindful of a number of other considerations arising from the evidence. For instance, I recognise that the site was included in the Council's SHLAA. However, I give that little weight in favour of the appeal development as it is not a policy document as such and as the process that informed it is unlikely to replicate the detailed level of assessment that can be undertaken in respect to an individual site during a s78 appeal and particularly via the inquiry process.
52. I also acknowledge that the 83 new dwellings identified for Ticehurst in the Core Strategy is a minimum number rather than a ceiling. Nonetheless, in view of the number of consents and other sites that appear likely to come forward for housing, there is good reason to believe that at least 83 homes will be delivered at Ticehurst during the plan period without the appeal development. Moreover, the eDSA and the neighbourhood plan processes also provide opportunities for further housing allocations should that prove to be necessary or desirable. Consequently, I see no pressing local need for the appeal development beyond that associated with the general need for housing delivery in the District associated with the evidence that the Council can only demonstrate a 3.9 year supply of deliverable housing land.
53. I have also taken into account the other development proposals referred to in the evidence, including an appeal decision for residential development elsewhere in Ticehurst³. However, I have determined the appeal primarily based on the merits and effects of the proposal rather than on its relative qualities and characteristics. I have done so principally because planning applications should be determined on their own merits and also because I may not be aware of all of the matters that were material to the determination of those other cases.

³ Appeal decision APP/U1430/W/15/3135953, dated 22 March 2016

54. In summary, for the reasons outlined above, the balancing exercise under a restrictive policy is not favourable to the proposal in the terms of Framework para 14 under the second indent of its fourth bullet point. Consequently, irrespective of the absence of a five-year supply of housing land, permission should be refused and the proposal would not represent sustainable development.

Other Matters

55. A legal agreement in the form of a Unilateral Undertaking made under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the UU) was submitted before I closed the Inquiry to secure affordable housing provision, ecological mitigation and highway works / measures. Having taken it into consideration and given due weight to the obligations therein the UU has not altered my overall decision. I have come to this view bearing in mind the matters set out above regarding affordable housing delivery and that the other planning obligations that would be secured are intended to respond to requirements arising from the proposed development rather than any existing need.

56. I have also taken into account the matters raised by interested parties, including those made orally at the Inquiry. However, for the reasons outlined above, they have not led me to any different overall conclusions.

Conclusion

57. I have found that the collective weight of the benefits of the appeal development, although significant, do not outbalance the identified less than substantial harm to the significance of Singehurst, Singehurst Barn or Breckles et al as listed buildings. Therefore, as the balancing exercise under a restrictive policy is not favourable to the proposal in the terms of Framework para 14, the proposal does not represent sustainable development.

58. I have also found that the proposed development would not comply with policies of the development plan. Had I found the result of the balancing exercise in respect to the significance of those listed buildings to be favourable to the proposal, the weight carried by Policies OSS2, OSS3, RA1, RA2, RA3 and EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policy DS3 of the Local Plan would have been very much reduced in view of the significant shortfall in housing delivery in the area. Consequently, in the context of the current housing land supply circumstances, the contribution to housing delivery offered by the appeal scheme would have outweighed those policy-breaches and the associated conflict with the Council's location strategy for new development in the District and the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

59. Nonetheless, while in many respects the proposal would contribute positively to sustainable development objectives as set out in the Framework, bearing in mind the harm that would be caused as a consequence of the proposed development to the significance of Singehurst, Singehurst Barn and Breckles et al, along with the associated conflict with Core Strategy Policy EN2, the appeal should be dismissed.

G D Jones

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Richard Humphreys of Queens Counsel	Instructed by the Solicitor to Rother District Council
He called	
Diane Russell BSc (Hons) Dip Arch Pg Dip Arch Cons	Conservation & Design Officer, Rother District Council
Sally Marsh BSc(Hons) MSc(Hons)	Co-Director, the High Weald AONB Unit
David Marlow MRTPI	Planning Policy Manager, Rother District Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Christopher Boyle of Queens Counsel	Instructed by Nicola Morris, Rydon Homes Limited
He called	
David Allen BA (Hons) DipLA MAUD CMLI	Director, Allen Scott Limited
Jonathan Smith BA (Hons) MA PGCE PGDip MCIfA IHBC	Director of Historic Buildings, RPS CgMs
Isabelle Blavier-Bennett RIBA	Designer, Rydon Homes Limited
Christopher Hough BSc FRICS	Principal, Sigma Planning Services

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Steve Barrass	Ticehurst Parish Council
---------------	--------------------------

DOCUMENTS submitted at the Inquiry

- 1 Briefing regarding curtilage listing of Singehurst Barn by Jonathan Smith, January 2017
- 2 Extract from the Development and Sites Allocations Local Plan, Local Development Scheme, Issued December 2016, Rother District Council
- 3 Extract from Rother District Local Plan July 2006: Inset Map Nos 1a (North East Bexhill) & 35 (Ticehurst)
- 4 Draft Exhibition document concerning the Ticehurst Parish Wide Neighbourhood Plan – “Development On Our Terms”, December 2016
- 5 Maps of Ticehurst, including annotation of historic routes
- 6 Consultancy Brief re a report on the value of the appeal site in terms of its contribution to the historic landscape character of the High Weald AONB, Rother District Council, July 2016
- 7 ‘Sally Marsh - Additional notes regarding the revised HW AONB Historic Routeway data layer’ and associated annotated metadata re R1 historic routeways roads and extract of ‘Historic routeways layer’
- 8 Extract from 192.com website concerning ‘Dr Nicola Bannister’

- 9 Committee Report in respect to planning application ref. RR/2015/225/P, land rear of 40/41 High Street, Ticehurst, 9 April 2015
- 10 Design and Access Statement for proposed development at land at 40 and 41 High Street, Ticehurst, January 2015
- 11 Addendum Design and Access Statement for development at Banky Field, Steellands Farm, Ticehurst, November 2014 and drawing 'Site Plan As Proposed', revised 7 April 2014
- 12 Design and Access Statement for development at Ticehurst Warrens, Hillbury Field, Ticehurst, November 2015 and drawing 'Outline Site Plan', 11 November 2016
- 13 Historic Farmsteads – A Manual for Mapping, English Heritage and Forum Heritage Services, January 2009
- 14 Mapped data including public right of way and road routeways
- 15 Extract from the Planning Practice Guidance - When should a 'local finance consideration' be taken into account as a material planning consideration?, Reference ID: 21b-011-20140612
- 16 Joint Statement on Development Plan Policies Regarded as Relevant for the Supply of Housing (NPPF 49)
- 17 Curriculum Vitae - Dr Nicola R. Banister
- 18 District Council Conservation & Design consultation response to planning application ref 2014/1652/P
- 19 Rural Areas, extract from Core Strategy – Consultation on Strategy Direction, November 2008
- 20 Phides Estates (Overseas) Limited v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government & Shepway District Council & David Plumstead, Government, Neutral Citation Number: [2015] EWHC 827 (Admin), 26 March 2015
- 21 Addendum to Statement of Common Ground – Matter arising during Cross-Examination of Mr C M Hough
- 22 Draft List of Conditions
- 23 Planning Obligations – CIL Compliance statement
- 24 Unilateral Undertaking made under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 dated 30 January 2017