

---

# Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 23 January 2018

**by William Fieldhouse BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 19 February 2018**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/W/17/3175193**

### **Land east of Buckingham, Stratford Road MK18 1YN**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure of Aylesbury Vale District Council to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Catesby Estates Ltd.
  - The application ref 16/02320/AOP is dated 22 June 2016.
  - The proposal is an outline planning application with all matters reserved except access for up to 170 dwellings; general amenity space including open space; landscaped areas; sustainable drainage measures including balancing ponds for surface water attenuation; new access points for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists; associated engineering operation and all enabling and ancillary works
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused for development comprising up to 170 dwellings; general amenity space including open space; landscaped areas; sustainable drainage measures including balancing ponds for surface water attenuation; new access points for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists; associated engineering operation and all enabling and ancillary works.

### **Preliminary Matters**

2. The Inquiry opened on 23 January 2018, sat for five days<sup>1</sup>, and closed on 2 February 2018. I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the surrounding area on 22 January, and an accompanied visit to the site and surroundings on 31 January.
3. The application sought outline planning permission for up to 170 dwellings and associated landscaping and works with all matters reserved for subsequent approval other than means of access which would be provided from a new junction on Stratford Road (A422)<sup>2</sup>. An "application masterplan"<sup>3</sup>, which defines the areas for housing development, public and structural open space, and SUDS basins, was treated as being a formal part of the proposal. An illustrative masterplan<sup>4</sup> and site sections<sup>5</sup> were also submitted with the application but for indicative purposes only. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. As stated in the header above, the appeal is against the failure of the Council to determine the application in the prescribed period. The Council has advised

---

<sup>1</sup> 23, 24 and 25 January and 1 and 2 February 2018.

<sup>2</sup> Proposed site access plan Drawing 16118-18 rev A.

<sup>3</sup> CSA/2476/132 rev B.

<sup>4</sup> CSA/2476/131 rev B.

<sup>5</sup> CSA/2476/137, CSA/2476/142 and CSA/2476/144.

that, had it been in a position to make a decision, it would have refused the application for two reasons. The first relates to the effect that the Council considers that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area, whereas the second refers to the absence of planning obligations relating to affordable housing, open space, sustainable drainage, leisure and recreation, education, and transport. An executed planning agreement<sup>6</sup>, dated 13 February 2018, was submitted shortly after the close of the inquiry in accordance with my agreed timetable and the Council is satisfied with its provisions. However, in order for me to take the obligations that it contains into account in the determination of this appeal it is necessary for the legal requirements set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy ("CIL") Regulations (2010, as amended) to be met. I deal with this later in my decision.

5. The statutory development plan consists of the remnants of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan 2001-2011 ("AVDLP") which was adopted in 2004 with a limited number of policies being saved in 2007. There are no saved policies relating to the spatial strategy, settlement boundaries or the supply of housing. However, both main parties agree that the policies referred to in the Council's putative reasons for refusal are relevant and I concur.
6. The Council has been working on a replacement plan for several years, and the regulation 19<sup>7</sup> version of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 ("VALP") was published in November 2017. The examination of the VALP has yet to commence, and there is a substantial number of unresolved objections to relevant policies meaning that it carries very little weight at the present time<sup>8</sup>.

### **Main Issues**

7. Having regard to all of the evidence, including that which I heard at the Inquiry, I consider the main issues in the determination of this appeal to be:
  - the effect that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area; and
  - whether the Council is currently able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.

### **Reasons**

#### *The Site and Surroundings*

8. The 11 hectare site comprises one field of arable farmland; a fallow field with an area of rough grassland and scrub vegetation on a former landfill site in the south west corner; and an historic bridleway, the Holloway, which runs along the full length of its western edge. There are substantial hedgerows and trees on the field boundaries and along the Holloway. The top of the site is part of a minor ridge which continues in a north easterly direction before the land falls to the Foxcote Valley. The southern part of the site slopes steeply to the south and south west from a height of around 105 metres to 87 metres Above Ordnance Datum<sup>9</sup>. Overall, the landscape quality of the site is moderate.

---

<sup>6</sup> INQ20.

<sup>7</sup> Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

<sup>8</sup> National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") paragraph 216.

<sup>9</sup> Design and Access Statement Figure 3.4.

9. To the west of the site is the Page Hill residential area on the edge of Buckingham and a small block of woodland known as Holloway Spinney. To the north is Maids Moreton recreation ground and the village of that name which includes St Edmunds Church, a grade 1 listed building, close to the recreation ground. Sloping down gently to the east is open farmland which is crossed by a public footpath that connects to the Holloway via the recreation ground. Immediately to the south of the site is the busy A422 and, on the other side, an extensive complex of buildings and outside storage at Lockmeadow Farm. Beyond the main road and that farm the land continues to fall quite steeply to the wide floor of the Lower Great Ouse Valley along which runs part of a long distance recreational route known as the Ouse Valley Way. There are also other public rights of way in the valley bottom to the south of the river.

### *Character and Appearance*

10. The site lies in the south west corner of the Foxcote Valley Landscape Character Area ("LCA")<sup>10</sup>. However, due to its location and the topography, the site seems quite separate from that small enclosed valley and possesses very few of the key characteristics or distinctive features of that LCA.
11. The site is separated from the Lower Great Ouse Valley LCA<sup>11</sup> by the A422, but the topography means that the site is physically orientated to that area as its sloping landform continues beyond the main road down to the river. Despite forming only a small part of the surrounding landscape it is clearly visible from a number of vantage points in the valley bottom. Thus whilst the site is outside the defined LCA and shares none of its identified key characteristics or distinctive features, physically and visually it does form part of the wider landscape of the Great Ouse valley. Furthermore, the fact that it remains an undeveloped part of the valley side means that it makes a positive contribution to the rural setting of the river which is no doubt enjoyed by users of the public rights of way in the valley bottom.
12. The historic town centre of Buckingham is approximately 1.5 kilometres to the west of the site. The town has expanded considerably since the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century on both sides of the Great Ouse including on the northern slopes up to Maids Moreton on land of similar or greater elevation to the appeal site. The site adjoins the current eastern edge of Buckingham which essentially runs in a northerly direction until it adjoins Maids Moreton and in a southerly direction for a considerable distance beyond the A422. The eastern edge of the town in the proximity of the appeal site is characterised by late 20<sup>th</sup> century housing interspersed with trees on sloping and elevated land. Between the A422 and Maids Moreton, the built up area is clearly separated from the open countryside by the tree-lined Holloway which defines the historic parish boundary.
13. The application masterplan proposes that the top field and the upper part of the eastern side of the southern field would be developed with houses. An access road would be formed from the western part of the site frontage which would curve up the hillside in a north easterly direction before reaching the new houses on the minor ridge. Almost 5 hectares of public and structural

---

<sup>10</sup> Aylesbury Vale Landscape Character Assessment 2008 LCA2.5 (CD-F.4).

<sup>11</sup> LCA3.1 (CD-F.4).

open space would be created on the sloping, south west quarter of the site, and 30 metre wide strips around the two areas of new housing would be planted with trees and other vegetation to supplement the existing hedgerows<sup>12</sup>. The Holloway would be upgraded to a surfaced, unsegregated shared use path of 3 metres in width with concrete edgings and low level lighting in a landscaped green corridor<sup>13</sup>. Two links would be created from the housing area on the northern part of the site into the upgraded Holloway. The A422 would be widened to create a right turning lane; visibility splays would be provided; and a 3 metre wide footpath would be built along the site frontage between the access and Page Hill Avenue and onward towards the town centre.

14. Clearly the proposal would fundamentally change the character and appearance of the site. The Holloway, which at present retains the essence of its historic rural character despite some houses in Page Hill being partially visible beyond the trees for part of its length, would be transformed into a suburban path. The top field and the upper eastern part of the southern field would be developed with houses, and the access road would cut diagonally across the hillside on the bottom part of the site.
15. The works to create safe and suitable access from the A422 would require the removal of a certain amount of vegetation and markedly alter the character of the site frontage which at present forms part of the open countryside quite separate from the urban area which is not readily apparent until closer to the roundabout at the bottom of Page Hill Avenue. Even there, the area around that road junction has an open, green character that provides an attractive entrance point to the town.
16. Even when the proposed landscaping has matured after several years, parts of the development would be visible from various vantage points, particularly in winter months when the vegetation would at best have a filtering effect. Looking north east from the bottom of the Holloway or from the A422 close to the south west corner of the site, houses would be seen against the skyline quite divorced from existing housing. From the upper parts of the Holloway, development on the top part of the site would be clearly visible through the existing and proposed landscaping and would intrude on views towards the Lower Great Ouse Valley. Approaching through the countryside from the east along the footpath on the adjoining field, development on the ridge would be more prominent than the existing houses in Page Hill and would be seen within the same vista as St Edmunds Church.
17. From parts of the Ouse Valley Way and other footpaths in the valley bottom the development would be seen, including parts of it against the skyline. The intervening distance and the openness of the existing views particularly along the valley mean that the proposal would form only a small component in a wide panorama. Furthermore, the character of the development, which would comprise houses amongst trees, would not be dissimilar to that which currently exists on the eastern edge of Buckingham. However, the proposal would extend the urban area into the countryside beyond a currently well defined

---

<sup>12</sup> Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy Plan (Figure LT6 included with Lisa Toyne's proof of evidence).

<sup>13</sup> Indicative Bridleway Upgrade Options ref 23723/LP2/A5/LT/slh January 2018.

boundary, and the town would become apparent from some vantage points in the valley bottom from where at present it is not seen.

18. In summary, the proposal would harm the rural setting of Buckingham and the rural character of the Holloway, and introduce a substantial amount of development into the countryside on the upper slopes of the Lower Great Ouse Valley which would appear visually intrusive from a number of public vantage points in the surrounding area.
19. I therefore conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would cause very substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to saved AVDLP policy GP.35 which requires development to respect and complement the physical characteristics of the site and the surroundings; the historic scale and context of the setting; the natural qualities and features of the area; and the effect on important public views. The changes to the Holloway would mean that the proposal would also be contrary to saved AVDLP policy GP.84 which requires regard to be had to the amenity and public enjoyment of public rights of way affected by development. The proposal would also fail to adhere to the NPPF's core planning principle that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and it would be contrary to NPPF paragraph 58 which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area.

#### *Housing Land Supply*

20. National policy advises that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements<sup>14</sup>. The parties agree that on 1 April 2017 there was a deliverable supply of 7,175 dwellings available and I have no reason to come to a different conclusion.
21. As the saved policies of the AVDLP are silent on the issue of housing requirements and because relevant policies in the emerging VALP are not yet capable of carrying sufficient weight, I need to consider the information provided in the latest full assessment of housing needs in order to determine an appropriate five year requirement<sup>15</sup>. The Council's latest full assessment is set out in the *Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update* (December 2016) and *Addendum Report* (September 2017) (collectively, "the HEDNA") which identifies a need for 970 dwellings per year between 2013 and 2033. The HEDNA is up to date and has been found to form a reasonable basis on which to calculate the five year housing land requirement in a number of recent appeals, including by the Secretary of State<sup>16</sup>.
22. However, the appellant does not accept that the HEDNA represents a robust assessment, and I have been referred to a recent appeal decision that concluded that as it is hotly contested and has not been examined through the local plan process it should be treated with a degree of caution<sup>17</sup>. During the current inquiry, I was presented with a substantial amount of evidence and heard a considerable amount of discussion about the HEDNA. This focused

---

<sup>14</sup> NPPF paragraph 47.

<sup>15</sup> PPG ID-3-030.

<sup>16</sup> Castlemilk appeal decision 19 July 2017 (CD-H.3) and Winslow appeal decision 15 November 2017 (CD-H.2).

<sup>17</sup> Wendover appeal decision 9 October 2017 (CD-H.4).

mainly on whether the significant downward adjustments made in the HEDNA to the Government's 2014-based household projections, due to revised assumptions about population growth, were clearly explained and justified on the basis of established sources of robust evidence<sup>18</sup>. There is also disagreement between the parties over whether a 10% upward adjustment for market signals, as proposed in the HEDNA, could reasonably be expected to improve affordability<sup>19</sup>.

23. These, and other issues associated with housing need and requirements (including accommodating unmet need from other areas), will be subject to independent testing through the forthcoming VALP examination which will benefit from input by a range of stakeholders. In advance of this, I attach considerable weight to the recent findings of the Secretary of State with regard to the HEDNA.
24. Following the 2011 census, the Office for National Statistics identified that the population estimates for the district between 2001 and 2011 had been too high. Whilst part of the discrepancy is likely to be explained by errors in the 2001 census, there are significant uncertainties around net migration to the district during that period. The HEDNA's analysis indicates that the ONS assumptions about net in-migration from 2005 onwards are unrealistically high, and that this is despite the improvements that were made to the national methodology for estimating international migration around that time<sup>20</sup>. Furthermore, any such error will have been carried forward in subsequent ONS population estimates. If this were the case, the 2014-based household projections for the district would be significantly inflated as they are largely based on migration trends in the preceding 5 or 6 years. However, the fact that statistics may indicate a large increase in net in migration to the district around 2005 does not necessarily mean that they are wrong. That said, the scale and timing of the apparent sudden increase is such that it is unlikely to be adequately explained by EU accession in 2004 and economic recovery after 2013. As was apparent from the discussion at the Inquiry, there is considerable uncertainty around this matter.
25. In this context, I consider that it is entirely reasonable to look at other evidence about the realism of the 2014-based projections, and to make adjustments if necessary in light of this. Published data sources relating to net migration to the district over the longer term; population changes likely to be associated with the number of houses actually built in the district; and administrative sources comprising the NHS patient register, school census and state pensions register all suggest significantly lower population growth than assumed in the 2014-based projections. Whilst none of those sources of information could be relied on individually to provide a sound basis for projecting future population growth, collectively they support the downward adjustment made in the HEDNA. Despite the adjustment, the population growth assumed for Aylesbury Vale in the HEDNA is considerable, being higher than occurred between 1991 and 2011 in the district and within the upper

---

<sup>18</sup> PPG ID-2a-017.

<sup>19</sup> PPG ID-2a-020.

<sup>20</sup> Office for National Statistics Migration Statistics Improvement Programme.

quartile nationally when compared to Government projections 2013-2033 for other areas<sup>21</sup>.

26. Whilst the HEDNA does not attempt to quantify the effect that a 10% market signals uplift would have on affordability, it does consider this in the context of longer term trends, the housing market area, other comparator areas and nationally<sup>22</sup>. In that context, and because national guidance advises against attempting to estimate the precise impact of an increase in housing supply<sup>23</sup>, I consider the HEDNA's response to market signals to be reasonable.
27. Establishing future housing need is not an exact science, and no single approach will provide a definitive answer<sup>24</sup>. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the HEDNA provides reasonable evidence of housing need at the present time. Based on an annual requirement of 970 dwellings per year, even if no account were taken of completions since 2013 (which have been above that level) and assuming a 20% buffer, there would be over 6 years supply of deliverable housing sites<sup>25</sup>.
28. I therefore conclude on the second main issue that, for the purposes of this appeal, there is at least 6 years supply of deliverable housing sites.

#### *Planning Obligations*

29. A planning obligation would ensure that 35% of the houses built on the site would be affordable homes integrated appropriately into the development. This is in excess of the requirement of saved AVDLP policy GP.2, but the overall amount and tenure split reflect up to date evidence of needs as identified in the HEDNA.
30. Obligations would ensure the provision of an appropriate amount of on-site public open space which would include an equipped play area for younger children along with appropriate arrangements including financial contributions for future maintainance. This would be in accordance with saved AVDLP policies GP.38, GP.86 and GP.88 and associated guidance<sup>26</sup>.
31. Financial contributions would also be provided through a formula based on the number and size of dwellings to improve indoor and outdoor sport, leisure and community facilities and provide a new equipped play area for older children on the Maids Moreton recreation ground. This would be necessary as the proposal would be likely to significantly increase the demand to use such facilities and the existing village hall is at full capacity. The proximity of the recreation ground, and the proposed upgrading of the Holloway, would mean that the facilities would be readily accessible on foot or by bicycle to future residents of the site. The amount of the contributions is based on the Council's guidance<sup>27</sup> and also the likely cost of the improvements required<sup>28</sup>. This would be in accordance with saved AVDLP policies GP.88, GP.90 and GP.94.

---

<sup>21</sup> Jonathan Lee proof of evidence paragraph 3.32 and rebuttal evidence paragraph 51.

<sup>22</sup> PPG ID-2a-019.

<sup>23</sup> PPG ID-2a-020.

<sup>24</sup> PPG ID-2a-014.

<sup>25</sup> INQ12.

<sup>26</sup> Sport and Leisure Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) and Ready Reckoner (2005).

<sup>27</sup> Sport and Leisure Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) and Ready Reckoner (2005).

<sup>28</sup> INQ14(a).

32. Financial contributions would be provided to increase capacity at Maids Moreton Primary School and Buckingham Secondary School which would be required to accommodate the additional children likely to use those education facilities as a consequence of the development. This would be in accordance with saved AVDLP policy GP.94, and the scale of the contributions would be based on relevant County Council and Department for Education guidance<sup>29</sup>.
33. There are various planning obligations relating to transport. A financial contribution of £340,000 would be made to help fund elements of the Buckingham Transport Strategy including a left turn filter at the A422 roundabout a short distance to the west of the site. This scheme is identified as being necessary due to the cumulative impact of a number of developments around the town, including the current proposal, and would encourage traffic coming from the east to use the by-pass rather than go through the congested town centre. A contribution of £15,000 would be made to fund the cost of extending the 40mph speed limit area to include the A422 along the site frontage. A contribution of £170,000 would be made towards improving the frequency of bus services serving the site, and a £200 voucher would be provided for each new household on the site to be used to purchase public transport services. Finally, obligations would ensure the effective implementation of a travel plan, including through the appointment of a travel plan coordinator. Collectively, these obligations are necessary to ensure that the residual cumulative transport impacts of the development would be less than severe<sup>30</sup>, and they would be in accordance with saved AVDLP policy GP.24.
34. Contributions of £1,800 would be made to both the District and County Council towards the cost of monitoring the implementation of the various planning obligations; this would be necessary to ensure their effectiveness.
35. The Council advises that none of the financial obligations would breach the "five obligation limit" set by CIL regulation 123(3). Furthermore, for the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that all of the planning obligations are 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. I will, therefore, take them into account in determining this appeal.

### *Benefits of the Proposal*

36. The HEDNA identifies a need for at least 4,200 additional affordable homes between 2013 and 2033 or at least 210 per year. The proposal would make a valuable contribution in this regard notwithstanding the fact that the number of affordable homes built in the district in the last four years has exceeded the proportionate requirement for that period by over 300 dwellings<sup>31</sup>.
37. Total housing completions in the district have increased significantly in recent years, and have averaged around 1,300 per annum since 2014<sup>32</sup>. I have already found that there is currently 6 years supply of deliverable housing sites

---

<sup>29</sup> Guidance on Planning Obligations for Education Provision (2010) and INQ14(b).

<sup>30</sup> NPPF paragraph 32.

<sup>31</sup> Table under paragraph 4.5 of Philippa Jarvis rebuttal proof of evidence.

<sup>32</sup> Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement August 2017 Table 2 (CD-F.1).

in the district based on the HEDNA, although if I were to accept the appellant's case in full there would be just under 4.5 years supply<sup>33</sup>. Whilst work has been on-going for many years to prepare a new local plan, the VALP has now reached a relatively advanced stage with the examination expected to start shortly<sup>34</sup>. Even though the relevant policies carry little weight at this stage, it is relevant that there is a reasonable prospect that the VALP, modified if necessary, will be adopted in the not too distant future as it would then provide up to date policies to meet identified housing requirements to 2033. The proposed development of up to 170 homes would make only a relatively modest contribution in the context of the current deliverable supply of nearly 7,200 dwellings, irrespective of whether that represents a full five years worth of sites.

38. Having regard to the above, even if I were to accept the worst case scenario that there is currently around 4.5 years supply, I am not persuaded that the social benefits arising from the development of up to 170 dwellings, 35% of which would be affordable, should be described as anything more than significant.
39. There would be significant economic benefits during the construction phase, and in the long term due to additional households supporting local businesses and services.
40. Whilst landscaping is a reserved matter, the proposal would present the opportunity to include measures to make some enhancements to the ecology of the area<sup>35</sup>. I attach some weight to these benefits.
41. The improvements to sport, leisure and community facilities at Maids Moreton recreation ground, whilst required to respond to the extra demand arising from the proposal, would also be of some social and environmental benefit to the wider public.
42. The proposed upgrade to the Holloway would make the route easier to use for pedestrians and cyclists and would therefore encourage some additional use, including by future residents of the site travelling to and from Maids Moreton and the recreation ground. I attach moderate weight to the benefit that would bring in terms of health and wellbeing and reducing the need to travel by motor vehicle.
43. Other than where I have identified above, the various planning obligations are intended to mitigate potential adverse impacts of the development and they would be unlikely to create net public benefits meaning that they do not add additional support for the proposal.
44. Buckingham is the second largest settlement in the district and identified as a main focus for development and growth in the VALP which includes a number of greenfield allocations for residential development around the town. In broad locational terms, the proposal would accord with this emerging spatial strategy, and help to minimise the need to travel by private car compared to development in more rural parts of the district. However, the VALP proposes to

---

<sup>33</sup> INQ12.

<sup>34</sup> Philippa Jarvis proof of evidence paragraph 2.16.

<sup>35</sup> Landscape and Biodiversity Management Strategy, December 2017 (Appendix LT7 to Lisa Toyne's proof of evidence).

meet its housing requirements without the need to develop the appeal site which means that this argument in favour of the proposal carries very little weight in the context of this appeal.

### *Overall Assessment*

45. By virtue of the conflict with local plan policies GP.35 and GP.84, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan meaning that planning permission should not be granted unless material considerations indicate otherwise<sup>36</sup>.
46. As the remnants of the AVDLP are silent on the issue of housing supply, the fourth bullet point of NPPF paragraph 14 is engaged. There was much debate at the Inquiry about whether the site is part of a valued landscape as referred to in NPPF paragraph 109 and, if so, whether there are specific policies which indicate that development should be restricted. However, even if I were to conclude that this was not so, in the context of the housing land supply situation in the district at the present time, it is clear to me that the very substantial harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the social, economic and environmental benefits that the proposal would bring when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.
47. The proposal would not, therefore, represent sustainable development and material considerations do not indicate that planning permission should be granted.

### **Conclusion**

48. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission should be refused.

*William Fieldhouse*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>36</sup> NPPF paragraph 11.

**Appearances at the Inquiry**

*For Catesby Estates Ltd*

Rupert Warren	of Queen's Counsel
<i>called:</i>	
Lisa Toyne BA (Hons) DipLA DipTP CMLI	Landscape Planning Director, Barton Willmore
Matthew Spry BSc (Hons) DipTP (Dist) MRTPI MIED FRSA	Senior Director, Lichfields
Mark Sitch BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Senior Partner, Barton Willmore

*For Aylesbury Vale District Council*

Isabella Tafur	of Counsel
<i>called:</i>	
Jonathan Lee BSc (Hons)	Managing Director, Opinion Research Services
Simon White DipLA DipUD (Dist) MA CMLI	Director, White Consultants
Philippa Jarvis BSc DipTP RTPI	Principal, PJPC Ltd

*Interested Persons*

Councillor Mark Cole JP	Buckingham Town Council
Councillor Warren Whyte	Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council

**Documents Submitted at the Inquiry**

- INQ1 Agreed list of plans (revision to SOCG paras 2.5 and 2.6).
- INQ2 List of appearances on behalf of the Council.
- INQ3 Appellant's opening points by Rupert Warren QC.
- INQ4 Opening statement on behalf of Aylesbury Vale by Isabella Tafur.
- INQ5 Deed of planning obligation (undated and unsigned).
- INQ6 "Barwood" court of appeal judgment (CI/2016/4569).
- INQ7 GLIVIA3 extracts pages 80-92 (landscape value and landscape effects) and pages 112-116 (visual effects).
- INQ8 "Leckhampton" appeal: application for permission to apply for Judicial Review: Notification of the Judge's decision (CO/3029/2016).
- INQ9 Extract from South East Plan: Policy H1 Housing Provision 2006-2026.
- INQ10 "Bromham" appeal decision ref 3167566 (5 October 2017).
- INQ11 Appellant's response to Inspector's request relating to five year housing requirement and deliverable supply dated 30 January 2018.
- INQ12 Council's response to Inspector's request relating to five year housing requirement and deliverable supply dated 30 January 2018.
- INQ13 Schedule of proposed draft planning conditions v4 30 January 2018.
- INQ14 Planning obligations CIL compliance schedule ref PJ1v2 and attachments:
- (a) Memo from AVDC Parks and Recreation dated 20 January 2018.
  - (b) Justification of education planning obligations and Appendix 1: DfE guidance on setting targets for surplus places.
  - (c) Sustainable transport contributions note dated 25 January 2018, emails from Buckinghamshire County Council dated 17 January 2018 and 25 January 2018, and Buckingham Transport Strategy 2016 Summary.
- INQ15 PPG ID-8-025 (soil) and ID-8-026 (agricultural land).
- INQ16 Revised schedule of proposed draft planning conditions and plans referred to ref 16118-18 rev A (proposed site access) and 16118-18-2 (proposed walking and cycling improvements).
- INQ17 Closing statement on behalf of Aylesbury Vale by Isabella Tafur.
- INQ18 Appellant's closing submissions by Rupert Warren QC.

**Documents Submitted after the close of the Inquiry**

INQ19 Agreed list of planning conditions.

INQ20 Deed of planning obligation (signed and dated 13 February 2018).