

Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 22 February 2017

Site visit made on 22 February 2017

by Peter Rose BA MRTPI DMS MCMI

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

Decision date: 12th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/W/16/3157918

Land south of Leicester Road, Hinckley, Leicestershire, LE9 8BB

- 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 Mr Fred Price against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/00113/COU, dated 4 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land to use as a gypsy caravan site for two families with a total of 3 caravans, including no more than two static caravans, together with laying of hardstanding and erection of two amenity buildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

Adjournment

2. The Hearing was adjourned on 22 February 2017 to allow further written comments relating to previously unsubmitted evidence from the appellant. This concerned the Borough's five-year supply of sites and the Council's Hinckley and Bosworth Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment Final Report November 2016 prepared by Opinion Research Services (the GTAA). The GTAA post-dated the appellant's original written statement. The Hearing was subsequently closed in writing on 27 February 2017.

Temporary and/or personal permission

3. The application which is the subject of this appeal is for full planning permission for gypsy and traveller use, but the appellant confirmed at the Hearing that further possibilities for a temporary and/or personal permission should be considered if appropriate. The appellant advised that a temporary permission would need to be for a minimum period of three years.

Gypsy status

4. The Council questions whether the proposed occupiers fall within the definition of a gypsy and traveller for the purposes of Annex 1 of the government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, August 2015 (the PPTS).
 5. Further procedural issues therefore arise regarding the extent to which the PPTS may apply to this scheme, the extent to which the scheme should instead
-

be regarded as a general caravan site, and the implications this may have for the original description of development set out in the application.

6. I consider the appeal on the above basis.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

(a) the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding countryside, and;

(b) if harm would arise from (a) above, and in relation to any other matters, what other material considerations are to be weighed as part of the planning balance including, if appropriate, the need for, and provision of, accommodation for gypsies and travellers within the area, and the accommodation needs and personal circumstances of the proposed occupiers.

8. Whilst I do not define the possible gypsy and traveller status of the occupants as a main issue, it is, nonetheless, a determining issue for the policy context against which the proposal is to be considered, and I address this at the outset accordingly.

Reasons

Planning status of the proposed occupiers

9. There is no dispute that the appellant is a Romany Gypsy Traveller by birth, culture and descent, and has been resident in the county for some 20 years.

10. Gypsies and travellers are defined in Annex 1 to the PPTS as persons of a nomadic habit of life whatever their race or origin. Mr Price gave evidence to the Hearing that he continued to travel for some six months a year, both to fairs and in connection with other buying and selling. He also advised the same pattern of activity applied to the husband of his wife's niece, Dickens Connors. He explained that Dickens Connors and Sharon Connors, his wife's niece, have four children and are proposing to occupy the second pitch.

11. Whilst little specific tangible evidence was offered of the appellant's nomadic existence, for example, relevant business receipts or other documents, I also have little evidence to the contrary, or other basis to question the information provided by Mr Price. Neither Dickens Connors nor Sharon Connors were present or gave evidence to the Hearing, but I have little reason to doubt the limited information provided in person by Mr Price.

12. I am therefore satisfied the proposed occupiers meet the terms of Annex 1 and, accordingly, I consider the proposed scheme in the context of the PPTS.

13. A previous appeal decision relating to the site concerns an application for two mobile homes and a toilet and laundry room for a gypsy family (Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/A/11/2161662 dated 29 February 2012). Circumstances and definitions may change, and that decision pre-dated the revised PPTS published in August 2015, but I note that decision also accepted Mr Price's status for planning purposes as a gypsy and traveller.

Character and appearance

14. The appeal site comprises a grassed field some 0.17 hectares in area on the south-eastern side of Leicester Road (the B4668). Whilst set within wider countryside, the site is relatively enclosed by hedgerows. The appeal site is generally characteristic of land to the south of this part of Leicester Road which is predominantly open and undeveloped, but punctuated by occasional buildings and other uses. This contrasts with land use to the north which accommodates a range large-scale recreational facilities, additional to associated open land.
15. The appeal site is defined by the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy Adopted December 2009 (the Core Strategy) as part of the Hinckley/Barwell/Earl Shilton/Burbage Green Wedge. Policy 6 of the Core Strategy states that uses will be encouraged that provide appropriate recreational facilities and promote the positive management of land to ensure that the Green Wedge remains or is enhanced as an attractive contribution to the quality of life of nearby urban residents. The policy lists uses acceptable in the Green Wedge and, whilst not inclusive of gypsy and traveller accommodation or other residential use, also makes no express presumption against other development. Nevertheless, it identifies that any land use or associated development in the Green Wedge should, amongst other things, retain the function of the Green Wedge and, of particular relevance to this appeal, retain the visual appearance of the area.
16. A related Policy 20 (Green Infrastructure) identifies a need for the wedge to be retained as it is seen to play an important environmental and landscape protection role. In this respect, a more recent review of the wedge set out in the Council's Hinckley & Bosworth Green Wedge Review December 2011 identifies the site within Area G which it defines as serving the role of preventing the merging of settlements in the wider context when considered alongside other areas.
17. Policy 18 deals specifically with development for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and states that permission will be granted for sites which, amongst other criteria, are within or adjacent to relevant settlement boundaries, and can be capable of sympathetic assimilation into the surroundings.
18. The site is served by an existing shared field access from Leicester Road which also supports an adjacent smallholding. The field gate is set back approximately 7.5 metres from the carriageway. There is no public footway immediately outside the site but there is a pedestrian footway/cycle route along the northern side of the road linking Hinckley and Barwell. Although the appeal site is relatively flat, there is a marked change in levels at the front and the access rises towards the slightly higher ground of Leicester Road.
19. The appeal scheme, excluding the proposed access drive leading from Leicester Road, would be set back approximately 60 metres from the highway boundary, and would comprise a varied collection of structures and other features. Two static caravans would be located to the rear of the site and their smallest elevations would face towards Leicester Road. The proposed touring caravan would be positioned along the proposed north-east side boundary. The two amenity buildings would be of pitched roof design and would be finished in timber framing and would be positioned towards the front of the site. A

- grassed amenity area would be formed adjacent to the two proposed static caravans.
20. The existing access would be widened and the drive would be surfaced in crushed stone/gravel with an area of similar hardstanding for parking and turning within the main site. Post and rail fencing 1.2 metres in height would be erected around the boundary, and a 10 metre long screen fence of concrete posts and gravel boards and vertical timber boarding to a height of 2 metres would link the two amenity buildings. A new 5 metre wide hedgerow (Hornbeam) would be planted around the outside of the site to screen the north-west and north-east boundaries.
21. Policy H of the PPTS states that new gypsy and traveller development should be very strictly limited in open countryside that is away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated in the development plan. Nevertheless, the PPTS does not preclude development of gypsy and traveller accommodation in the countryside as a matter of principle. I note the appellant's reference to Appeal decision Ref: APP/F4410/C/12/2177807 dated 8 March 2013 relating to use of Land at Flashley Carr Lane, Sykehouse, Doncaster DN14 9BD. Given the mixed pattern of surrounding land-use, I am satisfied the appeal site could not be reasonably regarded as located away from existing settlements for the purposes of Policy H, although it is outside a settlement boundary, it does form part of the countryside and is not allocated for residential development.
22. The appeal site is visible from higher land in Barwell and Earl Shilton but, in distant views, is set within a wider landscape of open fields, hedgerows and trees, and in close proximity to the more prominent leisure buildings and associated uses to the north. Although I consider any impact upon character and appearance in such distant views not to be harmful, I concur with the previous appeal decision that views of the site at closer quarters would be more significant.
23. The site is largely enclosed by existing planting along its road frontage, the development would be set further back from the road relative to the previous scheme subject to appeal, and aspects of its detailed design do seek to minimise its visual impact. Nonetheless, the site is clearly visible at its entrance as an otherwise undeveloped, attractive open field set behind relatively inconspicuous field gates. Whilst undistinguished in itself, the site forms an integral part of a predominantly open rural landscape.
24. Although the main area of occupation would be some distance from the road, the access would need to be improved and consolidated in accordance with the submitted details and the specified requirements of the highway authority. The use would be served by a new hard surface leading from the road and towards the development. The combined effect of the improved entrance and the clear view of structures and features and of comings and goings both through the main access and in glimpsed views along the road, would be to create a relatively urbanised and developed presence contrasting markedly with the existing rural openness of the site and its surroundings.
25. Proposed hedgerows and other planting would not offset the loss of openness and, whilst the site is adjacent to some relatively small buildings to the south-west, these are not unduly exposed in views from the road.

26. The previous appeal decision refers to both the localised effect upon views at close quarters, and to a resulting loss of openness, and I consider both impacts remain common to this appeal proposal.
27. The scale and disparate nature of the proposed use, in combination with the relatively exposed setting described, would lead to the harmful replacement of an open rural character and appearance by incongruous physical encroachment and attendant domestic activity. The scheme would appear as a discordant intrusion into the local countryside.
28. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. Although the appeal site itself enjoys no such specific recognition in relation to any intrinsic landscape quality beyond its contribution to the Green Wedge, for the reasons indicated, it still makes an important contribution to the distinctive countryside character and appearance of the setting, and as further acknowledged by the representations of local interested parties. Not only would that contribution be lost to the proposed use, but the impact would also undermine similar attractive qualities of its wider surroundings.
29. The scheme would cause unacceptable harm to the countryside which cannot be mitigated by landscaping. It would involve loss of a significant public window to attractive open, undeveloped countryside and one which contributes to the generally pleasant ambience and overall character of the surrounding area. As referred to in one of the representations from local interested parties, the natural beauty of the open countryside is there to be generally appreciated, and this is conferred upon pedestrians and other passers-by through such viewing opportunities as currently available from the road.
30. I therefore conclude that the proposed change of use of the site would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding countryside and thereby contrary to Policy 6, Policy 18 and Policy 20 of the Core Strategy. In particular, the site lies within the Green Wedge outside the relevant settlement boundaries of Hinckley, Burbage, Barwell and Earl Shilton, would not retain the visual appearance of the area, and would not be capable of sympathetic assimilation into the surroundings. I find these policies broadly consistent with the PPTS and Framework. I attach substantial weight accordingly.

Need for sites for gypsy and traveller accommodation, and proposed supply

31. The periodical review of housing needs under section 8 of the Housing Act 1985 is a statutory requirement upon local housing authorities. This requires local housing authorities to assess and understand the accommodation needs of people residing in or resorting to their district, including the needs of people with respect to sites for caravans.
32. Policy B of the PPTS requires local planning authorities, in preparing local plans, to set targets which address the likely permanent and transit site accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers in their area. Local planning authorities are encouraged to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five-years' worth of sites against their locally set targets, whilst protecting local amenity and the environment.

33. The Council's GTAA is an up-to-date assessment and asserts there is no need for additional pitches in the Borough to meet the PPTS's revised Annex 1 definition, but also indicates this excludes a possible need for some 15 pitches reflecting households who were unavailable for survey. The GTAA suggests, however, that if a fairly crude national average of 10% were to be applied, this could require as few as one additional pitch.
34. Notwithstanding the up-to-date findings of the GTAA, the document and its detailed underlying methodologies have not been subject to public examination and the robustness of its evidence remains to be tested as part of the wider development plan process. Upon reading, there are certainly various questions which remain to be considered. I note, for example, that the findings appear to be based upon only 21 interviews with gypsies and travellers and yet a further 43 households were acknowledged to be either unavailable or unwilling to be interviewed. Repeated efforts were made to contact those households, but I also note that the fieldwork was conducted in May and June when any such residents satisfying the Annex 1 definition may well have been travelling. The GTAA also explains how no households came forward for interview in current occupation of bricks and mortar accommodation.
35. I cannot therefore be satisfied on the evidence before this particular Hearing that the Council is able to demonstrate a five-year supply of sites. Nevertheless, it is clear that significant progress is being made by the Council to make future provision. Policy 18 the Core Strategy commits the Council to allocate 42 residential pitches until 2017, and I heard evidence of how planning permission has been granted for 20 pitches at Dalebrook Farm in Earl Shilton, and of how that scheme is now being implemented sufficient to meet the findings of the GTAA. The Hearing also received photographs showing the very advanced stage of development at Dalebrook Farm.
36. I acknowledge the Council is able to demonstrate a future supply of sites consistent with the scale of likely future need as identified by its GTAA but, in the absence of a full and thorough assessment of those findings and their underlying methodologies, I remain to be satisfied that that particular level of provision is necessarily sufficient to meet the Borough's full five-year requirements.
37. The appellant raises a number of particular issues in this regard, and general concerns regarding the manner and methodology of the interviews. The appellant challenges the GTAA's treatment of natural growth rates and of members of the community no longer travelling and so no longer falling within the Annex 1 definition, and my attention has been drawn to appeal decision Ref: APP/V2255/W/16/3153751 dated 21 February 2017 relating to a residential caravan site at Greyhound Road, Minster-on-Sea, Kent ME12 3SP. The appellant also maintains five of the pitches at Dalebrook Farm would be for transit tenants and questions the factual accuracy of GTAA references made to the Costalot site.
38. The appellant also draws attention to the unilateral undertaking and other details accompanying the development of Dalebrook Farm and refers to the requirement for future occupiers to be either registered on the County Gypsy and Traveller Waiting List or be residents needing to vacate existing sites in the Borough. Nevertheless, the Council advised that the terms of that undertaking are now being revised to allow a broader accommodation and, besides,

suggests there is no reason why, in any case, the appellant could not register with the County. I was advised that discussions regarding an amended wording of the undertaking are proceeding and that such discussions also reflect new ownership of the development. The Council's policy witness referred to the previously agreed terms as a 'moveable feast' needing to reflect a broader definition of ethnic gypsies and travellers, and indicated that work was progressing to that effect.

39. The appellant considers the GTAA to be unreliable and instead refers to previous evidence submitted by Opinion Research Services dated April 2014 and relating to other appeals in the Borough at the Good Friday Caravan site. (Appeals Ref: APP/K2420/C/13/2205393 and /2205416). It is maintained that the authority does not have a five-year supply of sites and still has a deficit to mid-2019 of 17 pitches. The Council's contrary submission, however, is that the appellant's information is now out-of-date and has been formally superseded by the findings of the GTAA.
40. In summary, whilst I cannot be satisfied that the authority is able to demonstrate a five-year supply, it is clear that significant progress is being made and that a substantial number of pitches will shortly be available in the Borough at Dalebrook Farm.

The accommodation needs and personal circumstances of the occupants

41. Mr Price currently lives with his brother some distance away in Market Harborough, whilst his wife's niece and her family also live some distance from the appeal site in Castle Donnington. Whilst neither currently has their own lawful home, there was little evidence of any imminent threat of homelessness, and nor do I have any particular reason to necessarily conclude that the appeal site would represent their only opportunity for future accommodation.
42. Dismissal of this appeal would be likely to interfere with the proposed occupiers' rights in relation to respect for private and family life as required by Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights. Even so, Article 8 rights are qualified, and interference may be permissible where there is a clear legal basis as set out in the relevant article. This requires balancing the rights of the individual against the legitimate interests of others and of the wider community/public interest.
43. Where Article 8 rights are those of children, as in this case, they must also be seen in the context of Article 3 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Hearing received little information regarding the children proposed to occupy the site, or of their needs. I have little specific reason to conclude this particular site would necessarily serve their best interests, or that such interests could not be served elsewhere and in a manner less harmful to the other matters of acknowledged importance before this appeal.
44. The government's Planning Practice Guidance (the Guidance) advises that decision makers need to consider whether children's best interests are relevant to any planning issue under consideration. In doing so, it advises they will want to ensure their approach is proportionate. They need to consider the case before them, and need to be mindful that the best interests of a particular child will not always outweigh other considerations including those that impact negatively on the environment or the wider community.

45. For the above reasons, I attach relatively little weight to the personal circumstances of the proposed occupants as a factor in favour of the scheme.

Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)

46. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not.
47. I am mindful that the Framework seeks to deliver a wide choice of quality homes and that this general expectation would apply to the gypsy and traveller community in the same way as it does to the settled community. In terms of the qualitative implications of available land within the Borough, it remains to be seen whether the choice only available at Dalebrook Farm is satisfactory for the particular purposes of the appellant and his extended family. Nevertheless, possibilities for sites outside the Borough may also be relevant given the proposed occupiers' current locations.
48. I also note reference made to the significance of available choice in Appeal decisions Ref: APP/H2265/C/12/2179640 and APP/H2265/A/12/2179737 dated 8 March 2013 and relating to use of Old Orchard, Rochester Road, Aylesford, Kent ME20 7ED as a residential caravan site.
49. It is also relevant that the closest public site, Aston Firs Caravan Site in the Borough of Blaby, is at capacity.
50. I therefore find that the equality implications relating to the need for comparable choice, and open questions around that as it relates to the appellant's circumstances, add moderate weight to the factors in favour of the scheme.

Other matters

51. It is common ground between the main parties that, whilst outside a defined settlement boundary, the site would have reasonable access to local services and facilities provided within the settlements of Barwell and Hinckley.
52. The site does not form part of a defined Flood Zone. Subject to proposed access and related improvements to be realised through appropriate planning conditions should the appeal be allowed, there is no objection in terms of traffic or highway safety from the highway authority. The Council confirmed there was no evidence to suggest any particular wildlife or biodiversity significance attaching to the appeal site.
53. Concerns have been expressed regarding the implications for the image of the adjacent recreational facilities as important county resources. I have no clear evidence to conclude the use would be harmful in that regard.
54. Given the relatively detached location of the site, and the absence of any proposed commercial activity as part of the use, I have no reason to find the scheme would be harmful to the living conditions of other local residents. Particular reference was made to previous problems in connection with a former nearby scrapyard, but no such activity is proposed to be undertaken as part of this proposal.

55. Concerns have been raised about possible non-compliance with any planning conditions, but I have no reason to come to such a conclusion. Besides, this is not directly relevant, in the first instance, to the principle of the scheme as proposed.
56. Whilst matters of possible anti-social behaviour have been raised, these have not been identified by the Council in objection, and there was no specific evidence before the Hearing in connection with the appeal scheme.
57. I note references made to previous officer views and recommendations relating to the site, but such matters are given without prejudice to the authority's subsequent formal consideration and determination of applications.
58. I have also noted reference made to a recent Appeal decision Ref: APP/K2420/C/15/3132569 dated 10 August 2016 and relating to use of Land north-west of Cold Comfort Farm, Rogues Lane, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 3DX as a residential caravan site.
59. In summary, I have carefully considered the above and all other matters raised, both at the Hearing and in written submissions, but they do not dissuade me from the conclusions I have reached on the main issues, either individually or cumulatively.

Sustainable development

60. The Framework makes clear that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development is defined by the Framework with reference to the policies in paragraphs 18 to 219 taken as a whole.
61. Policy B of the PPTS states, in relation to plan-making, that local planning authorities should ensure that gypsy and traveller sites are sustainable economically, socially and environmentally.
62. Policy H of the PPTS requires applications for gypsy and traveller sites to be assessed in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and with regard to the application of specific policies in the Framework and the PPTS. Paragraph 4 of the Framework similarly requires applications for traveller sites to have regard to the policies in the Framework so far as relevant.
63. In summary, the scheme would undoubtedly provide much needed housing with accompanying social benefits for the occupants. Weighed against that, there would be very serious environmental harm in terms of local character and appearance contrary to the expectations of the development plan.

Overall planning balances

Full planning permission

64. In accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the 2004 Act), this appeal is required to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

65. Aside from relevant provisions of the development plan as identified, Policy H of the PPTS indicates a range of specific factors to be considered in relation to gypsy and traveller development as already set out in this decision.
66. Within this overall policy context, the specific harm arising from the development must be weighed against the identified benefits. Further, any interference with the rights of the occupants must be proportionate and be balanced against the wider public interest in pursuing the legitimate aims of the development plan and of national planning policy.
67. In summary, I find that the little weight attaching to personal circumstances, the moderate weight to equality considerations and my findings in relation to a five-year supply of sites, are significantly out-weighed by the countervailing weight to be attached to the harmful effect upon local character and appearance.
68. In accordance with section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, I find the proposal to be contrary to the development plan and that material considerations do not indicate a decision in this instance other than in accordance with the plan's expectations. Accordingly, the scheme would not constitute sustainable development and would also be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Hinckley and Bosworth Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD July 2016 (the DPD). Policy DM1 mirrors locally the terms of the Framework in relation to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Temporary planning permission

69. Possibilities for a temporary permission require a second balancing exercise taking into account the reduced harm arising from the limited duration of any permission.
70. The Guidance states that circumstances where a temporary permission may be appropriate include where it is expected that the planning factors will change in a particular way at the end of that period. This might include, for example, the availability of further sites.
71. I have regard to my findings in relation to a five-year supply of sites in the Borough as a significant material consideration in accordance with Policy H of the PPTS, and to all other matters in favour of the scheme. Nevertheless, I find that the scale of the harm to character and appearance arising over a minimum period of three years would still out-weigh the factors in favour of the development.
72. Rejection of a time-limited permission would still interfere with the appellant's rights as identified, but interference would again be in accordance with the law and in the public interest, and would be both necessary and proportionate.

Conclusions

73. My overall conclusion, therefore, is that the proposal contravenes the development plan and national planning policy, and that both permanent and temporary permissions are inappropriate and should be resisted.
74. The protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering of the proposed occupiers' rights. In the overall balance of considerations, such interference in dismissing this appeal would be

proportionate and necessary in the circumstances, and hence would not result in a violation of their rights under Article 3 or Article 8, and would not be inconsistent with the expectations of the Equality Act, 2010.

75. For the above reasons, and with regard to the development plan and the Framework and the PPTS as a whole, and in accordance with section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the appeal is dismissed.

Peter Rose
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

For the appellant:

Philip Brown
Fred Price

Philip Brown Associates
Appellant

For the local planning authority:

Richard Wright
Gemma Dennis

Area Planning Officer
Principal Planning Officer

By other interested parties:

Councillor David Bill
Khalid Ansari
Michael Burgess
Ms N Hill

Joy Jelfs
Mr R Smart
Stuart Pemberton

County and Borough Councillor
Chairman, Leicester Road Residents Group
Hinckley RFC
Representative of adjoining landowner
(Hissar House Farm)
Hinckley Stadium Ltd
Local resident
Local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE HEARING

By the appellant:

1. Unilateral undertaking dated 8 February 2016 and relating to Dalebrook Farm
2. Letter from Romany Homes dated 8 October 2015
3. Appeal decision Ref: APP/K2420/C/15/3132569 dated 10 August 2016 and relating to use of Land north-west of Cold Comfort Farm, Rogues Lane, Hinckley, Leicestershire LE10 3DX as a residential caravan site
4. Appeal decisions Ref: APP/H2265/C/12/2179640 and APP/H2265/A/12/2179737 dated 8 March 2013 and relating to use of Old Orchard, Rochester Road, Aylesford, Kent ME20 7ED as a residential caravan site
5. Extract from proof of evidence prepared by Opinion Research Services dated April 2014 and relating to Appeals Ref: APP/K2420/C/13/2205393 and /2205416

By the local planning authority:

6. Appeal notification letter dated 6 February 2017
7. Extracts from drawings accompanying application Ref: 11/00377/FUL
8. Extracts from drawings accompanying application Ref: 13/01044/FUL
9. Borough Wide Policies Map
10. Photographs of Dalebrook Farm

Jointly by the local planning authority and appellant:

11. Statement of Common Ground signed and dated 22 February 2017

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENTLY

By the appellant:

12. Final comments and enclosure pursuant to Council email of 27 February 2017, and dated 27 February 2017

By the local planning:

13. Comments pursuant to extract from proof of evidence by Opinion Research Services dated April 2014 and relating to Appeals Ref: APP/K2420/C/13/2205393 and /2205416, and submitted by email dated 27 February 2017