
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 1 & 2 April 2015

Site visit made on 2 April 2015

by Paul Freer BA (Hons) LL.M MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 June 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/W/14/3000991

Land to the south of Highmead House, Old Odiham Road, Alton, Hampshire GU34 4BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Carrington of Foreman Homes against East Hampshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 55250/001, is dated 22 August 2014.
 - The development proposed is the construction of 120 houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and outline planning permission is refused.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by East Hampshire District Council against Mr S Carrington of Foreman Homes. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. As part of the appeal documentation, the appellant submitted an amended illustrative site layout (Drawing No 13.114.SK06). I understand that this drawing had previously been submitted to the Council, but that the Council had declined to accept it and, for that reason, the receipt of this drawing was not formally publicised. It follows that local residents and other interested parties have not had an opportunity to comment formally on the amended layout. I consider that these parties would be prejudiced should I have regard to the amended layout shown on Drawing No 13.114.SK06 and I have therefore not taken this drawing into account in reaching my decision.
4. At the Hearing, the appellant submitted a drawing showing the proposed site access, including details of an indicative retaining structure at the proposed site entrance (Drawing No 5983/SK/010). This was a new drawing, which neither the Council nor local residents had seen before. The proposed retaining wall could have also implications in terms in sight lines upon which the County Highways Authority have not had an opportunity to comment. I consider that all these parties would be prejudiced should I have regard to Drawing No 5983/SK/010 and I have therefore not taken this drawing into account in reaching my decision.

5. At the close of the Hearing, the Agreed Statement of Highways and Transport Matters had not been signed by the County Highways Authority. However, very shortly after the Hearing had closed, confirmation was received from the County Highways Authority that this statement was agreed. Given that the highways matters covered by this statement were discussed at the Hearing, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by taking this document into account in reaching my decision.
6. I have been referred in the appeal documents and in representations from interested parties to views of the appeal site from various locations in and around Alton. I carried out unaccompanied visits to these locations, including all the sites identified in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prepared by the appellant, on 20 April 2015.

Main Issues

7. Although this appeal was lodged against the failure of the Council to give notice of its decision on the application within the prescribed period, the Council has subsequently resolved that planning permission would have been refused for a total of seven reasons. From these putative reasons and from the representations received, I consider that the main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would conflict with local and national policies designed to promote sustainable development
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and
 - whether financial contributions towards the provision of infrastructure required to serve the development are necessary.

Preliminary Matters

8. The appellant concedes that the Council can demonstrate that it has a five year housing supply. However, the appellant points out that the Inspector's report on the examination onto the East Hampshire District Local Plan Joint Core Strategy (Joint Core Strategy) emphasised that the requirement for 700 dwellings in Alton over the plan period should be regarded as a minimum requirement. The appellant also points out that the Council has resolved to grant planning permission subject to the completion of legal agreements for housing schemes since declaring the availability of a five year housing supply and considers that, in the interests of consistency, the same approach should be adopted in relation to the appeal site.
9. One of the schemes recently granted planning permission was for 529 houses at the Treloar Hospital site, in relation to which I note that the Secretary of State is considering a request from Alton Town Council to call in the application but declined to issue a direction under Article 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010. The resolution to grant planning permission in that case was subject to a Section 106 Agreement that required, amongst other things, the demolition and replacement of Butts Bridge, the construction of new roundabouts at the Butts Junction and at Selborne Road, and the construction of a new access onto Chawton Park Road. Another of the housing schemes recently granted planning permission, for 275 houses at Cadnam Farm, requires an Order for stopping up a road. The appellant therefore questions whether the minimum of

700 houses required for Alton, and which the Council claims can be provided, is in fact deliverable.

10. The Framework indicates at paragraph 47 that to be considered deliverable sites should, amongst other things, be achievable with a realistic prospect that the housing will be delivered on the site within five years. The Framework also indicates that sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until planning permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. I recognise that the schemes referred to by the appellant are subject to the completion to legal agreements and as such do not have the benefit of planning permission, although the Council indicates that these legal agreements are likely to be completed in the near future. It is in this context that I consider the deliverability of these sites should be assessed.
11. Although the works required in connection with the development of the Treloar Hospital site are not insignificant, I have been provided with no evidence to indicate that these works are not technically viable or incapable of being implemented in the required timescale, or that there is any legal impediment to these works being carried out. Similarly, I have no reason to believe that the securing the stopping up of the road is an insurmountable obstacle to the timely implementation of the Cadnam Farm scheme. It follows that there is a realistic prospect that these housing schemes will be delivered within five years, such that the appellant's contention that the consented housing schemes are not deliverable has not been substantiated. On the information available to me, I am therefore satisfied that the Council has a five year housing supply and that this is deliverable in the terms set out the Framework.

Reasons

Whether the proposed development would conflict with local and national policies designed to promote sustainable development

12. The appeal site is outside of the settlement boundary of Alton, towards the top of a hill. The main shopping area, including the main supermarkets, is located at the bottom of the valley. To reach these shops and services from the appeal site requires a walk of approximately 16 minutes at an average walking pace, with the closest supermarket (Sainsbury's) being closer to a 25 minutes walk. The return journey is up a gradient that is relatively steep in places and whilst the route is on well lit pavements it does involve crossing one main road (Old Odiham Road), albeit there is a pedestrian refuge at a convenient crossing point.
13. Whilst this route would present no difficulties to many, the return journey in particular would be problematic for those with reduced mobility, including the elderly, and also for those escorting young children, with pushchairs or carrying heavy shopping. Moreover, accessing the shops and services on foot would be impractical to all in adverse weather conditions. I also consider that access to other facilities, including doctors surgeries and schools, would present similar difficulties
14. The site is served by only one bus route, the 64, with the closest bus stop on Old Odiham Road. This route provides hourly services to the town centre as well as other destinations such as Alresford and Winchester, but there are no services after 18:00 on Mondays to Saturdays and no services at all on

Sundays. I accept that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from one location to another, but in my view this level of bus service is not sufficient to obviate the reliance on a private car by occupiers of the proposed development for most journeys, including main shopping trips.

15. The railway station in Alton serves routes to several destinations, including Farnham, Aldershot, Woking and Central London. However, the Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application for the proposed development does not stipulate a walking time from the appeal site to the railway station, but rather indicates that the rail station can be accessed within 20 minutes by public transport. This is a tacit admission that access to the railway station from the appeal site on foot is not a viable proposition. Moreover, although the 20 minute travel time is said to include the time to walk to the bus stop, average waiting time and the journey time on the bus, this must be viewed in the context that the 64 bus route operates only a limited service.
16. Having regard to the above, I consider that the appeal site is not in a sustainable location for residential development, such that the proposed development would conflict with local and national policies designed to promote sustainable development. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would conflict with Policies CP1, CP2 and CP10 of the Joint Core Strategy, as well as Policy H14 of the East Hampshire District Local Plan: Second Review (Local Plan). These policies require, amongst other things, that new development will be directed to the most sustainable and accessible locations in the District, and that housing should be accommodated through development opportunities within existing settlement policy boundaries in the first instance. The proposed development would also be contrary to the objectives of Paragraph 17 of the Framework, in terms of actively managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling.

Character and appearance

17. The Alton Study Final Report and the Alton Town Design Statement both indicate that the essence of Alton resides in the fact that the town is 'hidden' from the landscape whilst being an integral part of it. The Alton Study Final Report goes on to indicate that development has been constrained from breaking the green skyline formed by the hills that surround the town. My own observations confirmed that in every view of the appeal site from the south or south-east the edge of the built-up area of Alton is framed by a line of fields and woodland. This accords with the character assessment set out in the Alton Study Final Report and the Alton Town Design Statement, and confirms the importance of retaining this green skyline to the character and identity of Alton as a settlement.
18. The appellant has prepared a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which establishes a Theoretical Zone of Visual Influence with a radius of 2.5 kilometres from the appeal site. The LVIA identifies a number of locations from which the appeal site would be visible from within this zone. From some of these locations, such as Brockham Hill Lane in Holybourne and from the Alton Bypass (A31), the appeal site would either be largely obscured by intervening woodland or would only be seen in the background in transient views. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not have a significant impact of the setting of Alton in these views.

19. In views from the south and east identified in the LVIA, the appeal site would be visible to varying degrees. In views from Calendar Close, St Mary's Close and in the vicinity of the Windmill Hill railway bridge, I accept that views of the appeal site would be partially obscured by intervening vegetation and that, in the summer months, this would significantly reduce the extent to which views of the appeal site would be possible. However, at the time of my site visit, the appeal site was clearly visible through this vegetation. In these views, the built-up form of the appeal proposal would be apparent and this would have a significant effect on the green skyline. In this respect, I do not accept the conclusion in the LVIA that the significance of the effect would be minor or moderate.
20. The views from Kings View would be largely unrestricted and, whilst the number of receptors would be limited, this would not reduce the significance of the effect of these views. However, in views from the south, it is the view from the public footpath above Salisbury Close that would be most adversely affected by the proposed development. This location affords clear views of the appeal site and, as shown by the photomontages produced by the appellant, the houses proposed would substantially infill the line of fields above the existing limit of the settlement boundary. This would erode the green skyline that frames this part of the settlement of Alton. Moreover, because this is a public footpath, this harmful effect would be experienced by many receptors. For that reason, I do not accept the assessment of significance in the LVIA as being 'minor' and consider that the proposed development would be significantly harmful to the setting of Alton in this view.
21. As well as the views identified in the LVIA, there are a number of other views from the south from where the appeal site would be visible. This includes the view from the Sainsbury's multi-storey car park which, although not a location from which receptors would be primarily concerned with enjoying the view, nonetheless contributes to the way in which the setting of Alton is generally experienced and appreciated by local residents.
22. Of more significance is the view from the Hangers Way public footpath to the north of East Worldham. Although beyond the Theoretical Zone of Visual Influence established by the LVIA, the appeal site was clearly discernible to the naked eye from this footpath at the time of my site visit. I accept that the detail of the proposed development would not be discernible at this distance although, just as the current settlement boundary may be identified in the existing view, in my judgement the proposed development would noticeably extend the settlement boundary of Alton and would erode the line of fields and woodland that frames the town. The proposed development would be harmful in that respect. However, in my judgement, the appeal site was not discernible in views from the Selborne Hanger under similar weather conditions.
23. In addition to the views from the south, which tend to be at medium or long range, the proposed development would also have a significant effect from Grebe Close and Gilbert White Way. In these views, particularly that from Grebe Close, the skyline is dominated by crest of the hill and the line of trees on that crest. Although at short range, these views of open field and woodland nonetheless reinforce the fact the settlement boundary does not extend to the upper limits of the hills that surround the town. The proposed development would fundamentally change the way in which the settlement boundary is

- experienced in these close range views and this would also be harmful to the prevailing character of the town in terms breaking the green skyline.
24. At present, the public footpath that runs down the slope of the appeal site affords panoramic views from the north-east to the south west. This view takes in some significant landscape features including, but not limited to, Neatham Down, the Selborne Hanger and (in the distance) the Surrey Hills. From the open field at the top of the public footpath, the proposed development would largely obscure this view and, although distance views would be possible over the proposed houses, the latter would be dominant features in the foreground. This would fundamentally alter the way in which this view was perceived and experienced.
25. Moreover, even these longer distance views would be obscured from a short distance below the top of this field and would be entirely lost from the footpath from within the proposed development on the lower slope of the appeal site. The LVIA categorises the significance of effect as being 'significant' in relation to this view, this outcome being defined in the LVIA as being severe, major or major/moderate in terms of magnitude of change and sensitivity to change. I concur with that assessment, and consider that the proposed development would unacceptably harm this important view.
26. The LVIA summarises the landscape character as having a low sensitivity to change. However, this assessment fails to give sufficient weight to the fact that Alton is hidden from the wider landscape. By infringing the green skyline that surrounds the town, the proposed development would cause the town of Alton to emerge from the wider landscape such that, in some views at least, the town would cease to be hidden. This would fundamentally change the way in which Alton is appreciated in the wider landscape and, for that reason, I do not accept the overall conclusion in the LVIA that the significance of effect would be negligible. Indeed, on the contrary, for the reasons set out above I consider that the significance of effect of the proposed development would be both major and harmful.
27. I acknowledge that housing developments have been approved at Cadnam Farm to the east of the appeal site, and at Will Hall Farm just to the west. However, the Council explain that the development at Cadnam Farm was amended to keep the built development below the 145 metre contour in order to reduce the visual impact and protect the important skyline. I have been provided with a copy of the layout plan for the Cadnam Farm scheme and I was able to assess the visual impact of that scheme as part of my site visit. It is evident that the houses are confined to the lower levels and would not infringe the green skyline. By contrast, the appeal site is on higher ground, rising from 145 metres to 165 metres on the western edge. As a result, the proposed development would have a much greater impact on the green skyline than the scheme at Cadnam Farm.
28. In relation to Will Harm Farm, I note that the Council's Landscape Officer considered that the development then proposed would extend too far up the slope and would for that reason have an unacceptable effect on the landscape. The fact that planning permission was ultimately granted because, on balance, other considerations attracted greater weight does not negate the conclusion that the scheme then proposed was considered unacceptable in landscape terms.

29. It follows that these two schemes are, for varying reasons, not directly comparable to the appeal proposal and do not provide justification for it. Indeed, these two schemes demonstrate a consistent concern on the part of the Council to resist any development that would erode the green skyline that surrounds Alton and which the proposed development would itself infringe.
30. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies CP19 and CP20 of the Joint Core Strategy. These policies require, amongst other things, that new development should protect and enhance settlements in the wider landscape, including land at the urban edge. The proposed development would also be contrary to Policy DE1 of the emerging Alton Neighbourhood Development Plan although, because this Plan is still at a relatively early stage towards adoption, I have attached only limited weight to this policy at this time.

Infrastructure

31. The Joint Core Strategy includes a number of policies that require, respectively, the provision of affordable housing (Policy CP13) and contributions towards the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities (Policy CP18), sustainable transport improvements (Policy CP31) and community facilities (Policy CP32). These policies are supported by the Council's Guide to Developer's Contributions (as amended in September 2014) which, together with an Addendum to that document dated December 2014, sets out the formulae by which contributions are calculated.
32. In accordance with Policy CP13 of the Joint Core Strategy, the Council expects that 40% of the proposed new dwellings would be affordable. The supporting text to this policy explains that the Council's Strategic Housing Assessment identified a high level of affordable need and that a level of 40% can be justified on the basis of economic viability in the District. I therefore consider that the provision of affordable housing sought is justified in the context of Policy CP13.
33. The Council has provided a list of priorities for open space and recreation in Alton to which the contributions sought could be put, and also made specific reference at the Hearing to a long-established proposal, in conjunction with funds provided by Sport England, to provide a sports pitch at Anstey Park. Projects that could benefit from the contribution in relation to education facilities include a mezzanine floor at St Lawrence School and the expansion of Eggers School. The contributions sought in relation to transport improvements would potentially be used to secure improvements to the Paper Mill Lane/Wilson Road/Ashdown Road junction and traffic calming measures near Wootey Schools in Alton, both of which are on a list of 'live' transport schemes produced by the Council.
34. All the above are local projects and I am satisfied that they are directly related to the proposed development. Having regard to the formulae set out in the Council's Guide to Developer's Contributions, I am also satisfied that the contributions sought are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. Moreover, having regard to the policies in the Joint Core Strategy, I am satisfied that the contributions sought are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

35. In addition to the contributions described above, the Council is also seeking a specific contribution towards the replacement of the Alton Sports Centre, which has reached the end of its useful life. I was advised at the Hearing that the new sports centre is anticipated to be completed within the next four to five years. The Council seeks contributions towards the cost of the replacement Alton Sports Centre from all developments of 10 units or more within a 15 minute drive time, which includes the current appeal site.
36. The appellant has disputed the justification for this contribution, partly on the basis that the contribution sought applies to all the units in the proposed scheme, including the affordable housing element. Given that all the future occupiers of the proposed development, including the occupiers of the affordable units, would benefit from the enhanced facilities provided by the new sports centre, I consider that in principle such a contribution would be justified in relation to the proposed development. However, whilst the Council's Guide to Developer's Contributions stipulates that a sum of £10,000 per dwelling will be sought for this contribution, there is no indication in the document as to how that sum had been calculated, either in terms of the total cost of the replacement sports centre or the percentage of that cost that would be met from developer contributions in relation to contributions from existing residents of the town. I am therefore unable to assess whether that contribution is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and, on that basis, consider that this contribution has not been shown to be justified.
37. I conclude that, with the exception of the contribution towards the replacement Alton Sports Centre, the financial contributions sought by the Council towards the provision of infrastructure required to serve the development are necessary. The appellant has now provided two signed and dated Unilateral Undertakings to provide the affordable housing and contributions sought by the Council. These Unilateral Undertakings differ only insofar as one includes a contribution towards the replacement Alton Sports Centre and one does not. On the basis of these Unilateral Undertakings, I conclude that the required contributions have been met and that Policies CP13, CP18, CP31 and CP32 of the Joint Core Strategy have been complied with.

Other Matters

38. The planning application for the proposed development was submitted in outline, with access being the only reserved matter for which approval was sought. In this context, I note that the County Highways Authority has confirmed in the Agreed Statement of Highways and Transport Matters (Agreed Statement) that the highway and transportation matters that it previously challenged have now been resolved. Although not expressly stated as such, I take this to mean that the County Highways Authority does not object to the proposed development in principle.
39. The Agreed Statement includes a plan that shows an access from the site onto Gilbert White Way. By agreeing to the Statement of Highways and Transport Matters, I must assume that the County Highways Authority is content that an access in this position is capable of satisfying all the technical requirements in terms of gradient and visibility splays. I am aware that other detailed matters, such as surface water run-off, need to be taken into account and had I been minded to allow the appeal these could have been the subject of appropriate conditions.

40. I am mindful that local residents have expressed concerns about the location of the proposed access, particularly given the access would have a gradient to accommodate the change in ground levels between the appeal site and the surface of the public highway. Whilst I have had careful regard to these concerns and note the difficulties experienced by local residents in winter conditions, I have not been provided with any technical evidence to counter that provided by the appellant's highway consultants and agreed by the County Highway Authority. Similarly, I am also mindful that there is a mature Ash tree close to the location of the proposed access and that the effects of proposed works on the root spread of that tree need to be taken into account. However, I have been provided with no evidence to challenge the conclusion reached in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment provided by the appellant that this tree would be retained.
41. I have also taken into account the views expressed by local residents that the traffic survey on which the appellant's Transport Assessment was based is limited to times during the school holidays and are therefore not representative of traffic conditions in the area generally. Although the Agreed Statement provides some additional information on traffic generation, I share the concerns raised by local residents that the traffic survey on which the Transport Assessment is limited in its scope. I also note the concerns expressed by local residents that the Transport Assessment does not take in account local highway conditions including, as I observed, the delays caused to the traffic flow on Old Odiham Road by on-street car parking associated with Alton College. In addition, I note the views expressed by local residents that the proposed development is in any event premature pending the outcome of transport study for Alton being undertaken by the County Highways Authority.
42. However, I must balance these concerns against the fact that the Transport Assessment was produced by specialist highway consultants and, on the basis of the additional information provided in the Agreed Statement, agreed by the County Highways Authority. The technical evidence is therefore consistent in finding that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of traffic generation and wider highway impacts. Moreover, by signing the Agreed Statement, I must assume that the County Highways Authority is content that consideration of the proposed development in advance of the transport study for Alton being completed is not premature. Consequently, despite my own reservations, on the evidence before me I am persuaded that the proposed development would be acceptable in highway terms.
43. At the Hearing, I was invited by the occupiers of No 24 Grebe Close to view the appeal site from their property. I accept that the outlook from this dwelling would change significantly as a result of the proposed development. However, being mindful also that the submitted layout is indicative and given the separation distance, I am not convinced that the proposed new houses shown on the submitted layout would be intrusive or overbearing when viewed from No 24 Grebe Close. Similarly, given that the disposition of windows in the proposed houses is not shown at this time, I am not convinced that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupiers of this property, notwithstanding the windows facing onto the appeal site and the low height of the fence enclosing the garden space. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 24 Grebe Close.

Conclusion

44. Paragraph 7 of the Framework indicates that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: an economic role, a social role and an environmental role. I am satisfied that the proposed development would fulfil a social role in that it would provide 120 new houses, including a significant number of affordable units. In the context of the need for affordable housing in the District and the comment in the Inspector's report on the examination onto the Joint Core Strategy that the provision of 700 houses in Alton should be regarded as a minimum, these are significant benefits arising from the proposed development. I am also satisfied that the proposed development would fulfil an economic role insofar as the construction of the proposed houses would generate jobs and economic activity in the short term. This too would be a benefit arising from the proposed development, albeit a limited one.
45. In terms of fulfilling an environmental role, the appeal site is not in a sustainable location and the proposed development would therefore conflict with local and national policies designed to promote sustainable development. The proposed development would infringe the green skyline that surrounds the town and would fundamentally change the way in which Alton is appreciated in the wider landscape. This would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore conclude that the proposed development does not contribute to protecting or enhancing the environment and as such does not fulfil an environmental role in the context of Paragraph 7 of the Framework.
46. In balancing the benefits and harms resulting from the proposed development, I am mindful that the Council is able demonstrate a five year housing supply. This reduces the weight that should be given to the provision of 120 new houses, notwithstanding that the percentage of affordable units within the scheme would be in accordance with development plan requirements. I therefore conclude that the substantial harm to the environment outweighs the benefits in social and economic terms arising from the proposed development, such that the proposed development does not constitute a sustainable form of development.
47. Accordingly, having regard to all the above, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Freer

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Ian Donohue BA (Hons) MRTPI	Southern Planning Practice Ltd
Mr Chris Williams	WSP Group Ltd
Mrs Annette Wells	ACD landscape Architects
Mr Peter Stevens	Site owner

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mrs Julia Mansi ¹	Planning Manager
Mr Adam Harvey BA (Hons) MA MRTPI	Planning Officer
Ms Julie Boschi	

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor Andrew Joy	
Mr B.Alexander	The Alton Society
Mr Mike Heelis	Chair of Alton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Mr John Grace BSc (Hons) Agriculture	Alton Eastbrooke and Wooteys Residents Association
Mr Robert Armstrong	Local resident
Mrs Susan Bottomley	Local resident
Mr Steve Cook	Local resident
Mr Peter Field	Local resident
Mr Christopher Lockett	Local resident
Mr Hugh McInally	Local resident

¹ BSc (Hons), B.T.P. Post G, Dip Urb Design MRTPI

Mr Philip Page	Local resident
Mrs Elaine Walker	Local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- 1/ Department of Communities and Local Government Letter dated 26 February 2015.
- 2/ Agreed Statement of Highways and Transport Matters.
- 3/ Location plan and layout for housing development at Cadnam Farm.
- 4/ East Hampshire District Council Guide to Developers' Contributions (as amended September 2014) and Addendum (December 2014).
- 5/ Alton Town Design Statement.
- 6/ Alton Neighbourhood Plan – Dwelling Site Selection Methodology and Supporting Narrative (January 2015).
- 7/ Unilateral Undertaking, signed and dated 1 April 2015.
- 8/ Copy of layout plan, Drawing No 13.114.SK05.
- 9/ Access layout plan, Drawing No. Drawing No 5983/SK/010.
- 10/ Statement of Common Ground, signed and dated 22 March 2015.
- 11/ Suggested wording of conditions relating to arboriculture and ecology.
- 12/ East Hampshire District Council Transport Statement Live Scheme List, September 2013.
- 13/ East Hampshire District Council Developers Contributions for Open Space and Recreation: Alton Town Priorities/Requirements 2012 onwards.
- 14/ East Hampshire District Council: Consultation on Replacement Alton Sports Centre.
- 15/ Extracts from the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance submitted by the appellant in relation to the Replacement Alton Sports Centre.
- 16/ Unilateral Undertaking, signed and dated 2 April 2015.