

**TEWKESBURY BOROUGH PLAN 2011-2031 – EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC
STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF L&Q ESTATES LIMITED – REFERENCE ID 381
LAND AT HARVEY’S LANE, WINCHCOMBE**

Matter 2: Overall housing provision in the TBP

This Matter Statement has been prepared on behalf of our client, L&Q Estates Limited, in response to the Inspector’s List of Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) as part of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan Examination in Public.

L&Q Estates Ltd control land located to the north and south of Harvey’s Lane, which directly adjoins the settlement boundary of Winchcombe (the ‘Site’). The Site has capacity to deliver up to 130 dwellings with associated open space and landscape infrastructure – split between 50 dwellings to the south of Harvey’s Lane and 80 dwellings to the north.

The Site was partially allocated within the Preferred Options version of the Tewkesbury Borough Plan (TBP) as a suitable and sustainable location to deliver approximately 45 dwellings. However, following the Preferred Options consultation, the allocation was deleted from the emerging TBP.

This Matter Statement should therefore be read in conjunction with our representations to the Pre-Submission consultation which demonstrates that the emerging TBP is unsound as currently drafted.

In accordance with the Inspector’s MIQs, this Matter Statement relates to Matter 2: Overall housing provision in the TBP. For the avoidance of doubt, where a written response to a question is not provided, we reserve the right to provide further comment as part of the hearing session.

Questions

2.1 What distinguishes non-strategic housing sites within the remit of the TBP from strategic sites within the remit of the JCS? What is the current anticipated timescale for preparation of the JCS Review?

1. It is noted that TBC has published a revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) which now forms part of the Examination Library (Ref: CD013). At paragraph 2.4, this includes a revised timescale for the preparation of the emerging Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Review:
 - Issues and Options consultation – Winter 2018/19

- Preferred Options consultation – Summer 2021
 - Pre-Submission consultation – Winter 2022
 - Submission to Secretary of State – Spring 2023
 - Examination – Summer 2023
 - Adoption Winter 2023
2. In the first instance, it is unclear as to whether this timescale has been agreed between the Joint Authorities. The timescale does not appear on the Joint Core Strategy website and is not available as part of the Local Development Schemes for Gloucester City Council (GCC) or Cheltenham Borough Council (CBC). We would therefore be grateful if the Council could confirm that the timescale is agreed by all authorities and that TBC, GCC and CBC are committed to delivering the JCS Review.
 3. Notwithstanding this, we raise no objection to the principle of preparing a joint spatial strategy. However, it is important to note that they are hugely complex documents that can take a number of years to progress to adoption. Indeed, the JCS took almost 8 years to reach adoption, following an Issues and Key Questions consultation in November 2009 to February 2010. Moreover, as confirmed within the Inspector's MIQs, this included a shortfall of 2,450 dwellings against Tewkesbury Borough's housing requirement – to be addressed through an immediate review of the JCS.
 4. This immediate review has clearly not occurred. Whilst an Issues and Options consultation took place in winter 2018/19, no further material has been published. Whilst the Joint Authorities reference a Preferred Options consultation taking place in Summer 2021, it remains unclear as to the scope and content of the emerging JCS Review – or even if this timescale has been agreed by the Joint Authorities.
 5. Moreover, we have significant concerns with the assertion that the JCS Review will reach adoption in Winter 2023. Notwithstanding the precedent set by the JCS, there has already been a significant delay between publication of the Issues and Options consultation in Winter 2018/19 and the Preferred Options consultation that is expected to take place in Summer 2021 (two and a half years). For context, in the subsequent two and a half year period, the Joint Authorities are expecting the JCS Review to progress from the Preferred Options consultation to Adoption.
 6. Moreover, Section 3 of the LDS (Ref: CD013) notes that the emerging TBP is anticipated for Adoption in Winter 2021, following hearing sessions in Spring 2021. TBC therefore

anticipate the Borough Plan (a Part 2 Local Plan) will take longer to reach adoption than the JCS Review (a joint spatial strategy between three authorities). This is considered to be a clear inconsistency between the timescales proposed by TBC and the Joint Authorities.

7. With this in mind, we advised in our response to the Pre-Submission consultation that 2026 (at the earliest) would be a more reasonable timescale for the JCS Review to reach adoption. We do not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided by the Joint Authorities to robustly demonstrate this to be an unreasonable position.

2.2 Given the provisions of the JCS, the current JCS review, and the subsidiary role of the TBP to allocate non-strategic sites, does the TBP make the required contribution towards meeting the housing needs of Tewkesbury borough over the plan period 2011-2031? Will the remaining shortfall be provided through the JCS review, or in other ways, in the necessary timescale, and if not, is this a matter for the TBP?

8. Paragraph 3.2.18 of the JCS (Ref: DP001) clearly identifies a significant housing shortfall in Tewkesbury Borough. An immediate review of the JCS is therefore required to allow for the remaining shortfall to be addressed by exploring additional sites both within and outside the JCS area.
9. As set out within our response to Question 2.1, this has clearly not taken place. It has now been over three years since the JCS was adopted (December 2017), with no details available as to how this housing shortfall will be addressed.
10. Indeed, since adoption of the JCS in December 2017, Tewkesbury Borough's housing land supply position has plummeted. In an appeal decision at Highnam dated 20th December 2018, the Inspector found that TBC could only demonstrate a housing land supply position of 3.99 years (Appeal Reference APP/G1630/W/17/3184272) – i.e. 1 year following adoption of the JCS. In coming to this decision, the Inspector found that the surplus of dwellings accrued from the first years of the Plan period should not be carried forward into the five year housing land supply position. The appeal was 'called-in' by the Secretary of State, who agreed with the findings of the Inspector in respect of the Council's five year housing land supply position.

11. Subsequently, TBC published a Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement in August 2019, advising a position of 4.33 years of deliverable housing sites. Importantly, against the recommendations of the Highnam Inspector and Secretary of State, the Council continued to include previous 'oversupply' within their five year housing land supply calculation.
12. This shortfall has continued with the Council's Housing Land Supply Statements in October 2020 (4.37 years) and January 2021 (4.35 years) demonstrating shortfalls in their housing land supply.
13. Whilst this represents the Council's published positions, the housing land supply position within Tewkesbury Borough was recently tested as part of an appeal for up to 50 dwellings at Ashmead Drive, Gotherington (Appeal Reference: APP/G1630/W/20/3256319), dated 12th January 2021 – **Appendix 1**.
14. The Inspector considered the Council's use of previous 'oversupply' as part of the housing land supply calculation at paragraphs 58 to 63. The Inspector noted at paragraph 59 that the Framework makes no allowance for subtracting additional supply from the annual requirement. Moreover, whilst the PPG enables LPAs to take additional supply into account, there is no specific requirement to do so. It is not a symmetrical approach to dealing with undersupply as advocated by the Council. As such, the Inspector agreed with her colleague and Secretary of State in the Higham decision in removing 'oversupply' from the Council's housing land supply calculation. On this matter alone, the Council's housing land supply position reduced to 2.4 years.
15. Notwithstanding this, the Inspector agreed that the Council's suggested supply from 'Land at Stoke Road, Bishop's Cleeve' and 'Land at Fiddington, Ashchurch' was unrealistic and should be reduced. Taking into account these deductions, the Inspector agreed with the Appellant that the Council could only demonstrate a five year housing land supply position of 1.82 years.
16. Taking this into account, the Inspector concluded that **"the future supply in the borough at the current time is deeply concerning"** (paragraph 72).
17. We would agree. TBC has consistently been unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing since the JCS was adopted. This has largely been a result of the Plan-led system failing to provide sufficient sites to address housing need within the Borough. The JCS Inspector recognised this shortfall and recommended an immediate review of the Plan.

This has not been forthcoming and limited weight can be attributed to the Council's assertion that the JCS Review will be adopted by 'Winter 2023'.

18. The NPPF (February 2019) is clear in its approach that Local Plans must be positively prepared. It is therefore considered critical for the emerging TBP to fully address the housing shortfall identified by the JCS. Failure to do so and it is likely to lead to a continued period in which the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing.

2.3 What progress has been made in delivering the anticipated 500 dwellings to meet Tewkesbury's needs at Mitton. Is this provision agreed with Wychavon?

19. We do not have any specific comments to make in relation to this question but do nevertheless reserve the right to comment further on this in so far as it may affect our client's land interests at Winchcombe.

2.4 The JCS states (on page 26) that the 2015 Settlement Audit will be refreshed prior to submission of the TBP. Has this been done, and if so what are the results of the refresh and would any changes to the settlement hierarchy be justified?

20. It is noted that a Joint Core Strategy Rural Area Settlement Audit (July 2017) has been prepared in support of the emerging Borough Plan (Ref: EB011). This lists the 75 named settlements in Tewkesbury Borough which have been included as part of the audit and ranks them in accordance with their service provision, accessibility and size.

21. As set out at paragraph 4.4, the Settlement Audit includes the overall score and ranking of the named settlements within Tewkesbury Borough. Winchcombe is ranked third, behind only Tewkesbury and Bishop's Cleeve. However, despite a similar score to Bishop's Cleeve, it is noted that Winchcombe is apportioned significantly fewer dwellings.

2.5 Is the methodology used for identifying housing sites in the TBP, as described in the Housing Background Paper (HBP) appropriate? (This is not an opportunity to discuss the merits of individual allocations which will be considered under Matter 3).

22. No. It is considered that the methodology for identifying housing sites as described in the Housing Background Paper (HBP) (Ref: EB010) is unsound as it has led to a disproportionate skew of dwellings towards Bishop's Cleeve, rather than Winchcombe.

23. The allocation of residential sites has been informed by a disaggregation process to determine the level of development appropriate to each Rural Service Centre and a site specific selection process. The methodology and results of these assessments are outlined in the HBP.
24. As set out at paragraph 4.2 of the HBP, the same approach has been taken for the disaggregation between Winchcombe and Bishop's Cleeve as the approach to Rural Service Centres. The disaggregation has therefore been guided by Policy SP2 of the JCS, which sets out that the levels of development for each settlement should be proportionate to the following quantifiable factors:
- Size
 - Function
 - Proximity and accessibility to Cheltenham and Gloucester
25. Furthermore, the HBP notes that allocations will take into account the environmental, economic and social impacts – albeit these are referred to as subjective matters which will be factored in by the decision-taker. Deliverability of a site will also be considered a critical factor that will be considered as part of the site selection process.
26. This approach is generally supported in assessing a suitable disaggregation between settlements. However, we do not support the weighting that has been applied to each of the factors, with 80% attributed to the size of the settlement and only 10% respectively to function and proximity/accessibility. Indeed, paragraph 4.25 of the HBP in fact states **“The JCS Submission Policy SP2 does not ‘weight’ each of the elements that need to be taken into account”**.
27. Whilst the Council's justification at paragraphs 4.25 and 4.26 is noted, the function of a Rural Service Centre is key to ensuring new homes have access to appropriate services which ultimately underpin the sustainability of a housing allocation. Sustainable development being the fundamental purpose of the planning system.
28. The disaggregation process is then set out within Appendix D of the HBP, which includes a breakdown of the scoring between Size, Function and Accessibility. The table demonstrates that Winchcombe scores '36' compared against Bishop's Cleeve's '42' in respect of Function – i.e. the availability of services (such as for example a shop, doctor's surgery, primary school, post office etc (paragraph 4.15 - HBP). However, despite this

similar availability of services (54%/46%), Winchcombe is attributed a substantially lower proportion of housing to Bishop's Cleeve.

29. Indeed, the disaggregation process confirms that Winchcombe is only required to deliver a minimum of 597 dwellings over the Plan period. This equates to approximately 32% of dwellings between the two Rural Service Centres.
30. As such, it is considered that the disaggregated housing requirement for Winchcombe is unsound and should be regarded as higher than the 597 dwellings proposed within the HBP (October 2019). The HBP (October 2019) clearly identifies Winchcombe as a sustainable location with a level of services and facilities comparable to Bishop's Cleeve. Accordingly, it is considered that there should be a more equal split between the two Rural Service Centres.
31. Notwithstanding this, it is important to note that the emerging Borough Plan will not even deliver 597 dwellings at Winchcombe. Table 6 of the Tewkesbury Borough Housing Land Supply Position Statement (December 2020) (Ref: EXAM001B) confirms that only 354 dwellings will be delivered at Winchcombe over the Plan period. This further exemplifies the issue of soundness with the disaggregation process between Rural Service Centres.

2.6 JCS Table SP2a appears to require the TBP to identify further potential for 315 dwellings. Is this correct, and if so has this requirement been met?

32. It is noted that Table SP2a of the JCS identifies the provision of 315 dwellings as 'Tewkesbury Borough Plan (Further Potential)'. No further reference is made to this aspect of supply with paragraph 3.12 of the emerging Borough Plan simply stating that the global figure of 7,445 dwellings (as of April 2017) has been achieved.
33. We would therefore be grateful if the Council could confirm whether this aspect of the supply has been met. If not, these dwellings should be allocated within the emerging Borough Plan.

2.7 The JCS provides for housing development at Tewkesbury town 'in line with its role as a market town' but sets no specific housing requirement for the town area. The HBP notes in paragraph 3.7 that smaller scale (non-strategic) sites within the TBP would contribute towards the shortfall in provision identified in the JCS but also states it is not appropriate for the plan to define a housing requirement for the town. Rather, the HBP states that the plan includes all the (non-strategic) sites within or adjacent to the town that are suitable for allocation given the site selection criteria. In this light, is the overall housing

provision in the TBP for Tewkesbury town justified, consistent with the JCS and has the plan been positively prepared in this respect?

34. We do not have any specific comments to make in relation to this question but do nevertheless reserve the right to comment further on this in so far as it may affect our client's land interests at Winchcombe.

2.8 The JCS provides for about 1,860 dwellings at the Rural Service Centres, Bishop's Cleeve and Winchcombe. Under Policy RES1, three sites are allocated at Bishop's Cleeve and one at Winchcombe. As at April 2020, taking these allocations, existing commitments and completions into account, the TBP would provide for 2,044 and 354 dwellings respectively in the two settlements, a total of 2,398 dwellings and some 538 in excess of the JCS figure. In this light, is the overall housing provision in the TBP for the two Rural Service Centres justified, consistent with the JCS and has the plan been positively prepared in this respect?

35. As set out within our response to Question 2.5, the evidence base to the emerging Borough Plan identifies a disaggregated requirement of 597 dwellings towards Winchcombe – equating to a 68/32% split in favour of Bishop's Cleeve.

36. However, as confirmed by Table 6 of the Council's Housing Land Supply Position Statement (December 2020) (Ref: EXAM001B), Bishop's Cleeve has delivered a total of 2,044 dwellings whilst Winchcombe has delivered 354 – equating to an 85/15% split in favour of Bishop's Cleeve. As such, in accordance with the Council's own evidence base, Winchcombe should be required to deliver an additional 243 dwellings over the Plan period. This is the minimum number of dwellings required by the HBP (October 2019) to address local housing needs and sustain Winchcombe as a Rural Service Centre.

37. In justifying the approach taken by the emerging Borough Plan, it is noted that the HBP (October 2019) provides the following comments at paragraph 11.6:

"Winchcombe has an indicative housing of requirement of 597 dwellings and there have been 271 dwellings committed within the plan period so far leaving a remaining requirement of 326 dwellings. Although this would not be fulfilled by the proposed allocations there are no other suitable sites at the settlement... Moreover, the JCS Policy SP2 requirement for the Rural Service Centres will be exceeded by the existing commitments and proposed allocations in the pre-submission TBP. It is not therefore essential to allocate any more sites at Winchcombe in order to meet identified needs."

38. The HBP (October 2019) therefore raises two distinct issues for the allocation of housing within Winchcombe. Firstly, the Council considers at paragraph 11.6 that there are no further appropriate sites for development within Winchcombe – an issue which we address as part of our response to Matter 3A. However, in addition to this, the Council justifies the shortage of housing at Winchcombe through supply coming forward at Bishop’s Cleeve.
39. We strongly object to this assertion which suggests housing need at Winchcombe can be appropriately addressed through housing coming forward within a different settlement. Indeed, paragraph 13.9 of the HBP explains that data from the Tewkesbury Borough Housing Register (August 2019) demonstrates a need for 85 dwellings from people/families with a local connection to Winchcombe. This specific requirement for affordable housing at Winchcombe will not be addressed through the emerging Borough Plan.
40. Furthermore, it is important to note how there has been such a significant skew of housing towards Bishop’s Cleeve – particularly given that it significantly exceeds the quantum of development envisaged by the HBP (October 2019). By way of background, the provision of 2,044 dwellings at Bishop’s Cleeve includes the following sites:
- Homeland’s Farm, Bishop’s Cleeve (450 dwellings) – approved by the Secretary of state in an appeal decision dated 16th July 2012 (Appeal Reference: App/G1630/A/11/2146206).
 - Clevelands, Bishop’s Cleeve (550 dwellings) – approved by the Secretary of state in an appeal decision dated 16th July 2012 (Appeal Reference: App/G1630/A/11/2146206).
 - Land at Stoke Road, Bishop’s Cleeve (215 dwellings) – approved at appeal in a decision dated 11th November 2019 (Appeal Reference: APP/G1630/W/19/3229581)
41. As such, it is clearly apparent that housing growth towards the Rural Service Centres has not been intentionally planned by TBC. Indeed, 59% of housing growth towards Bishop’s Cleeve has been actively resisted by the Council.
42. Policy SP2 of the JCS advises that the Rural Service Centres will accommodate ‘in the order’ of 1,860 dwellings. It should therefore be regarded as a minimum figure which can be exceeded whilst still retaining the overarching aspirations for housing growth

within the Borough. We therefore have no objection to the emerging Borough Plan delivering housing in excess of what was proposed by Policy SP2 of the JCS.

43. However, the emerging Plan cannot be considered positively prepared in respect of the provision of housing at Winchcombe. The Council's own evidence base clearly demonstrates that additional housing needs to come forward in Winchcombe to sustain the settlement over the Plan period. It is therefore considered that additional housing allocations are required at Winchcombe for the Plan to be found sound.

2.9 The JCS provides for about 880 dwellings at the Service Villages. Under Policy RES1, ten sites are allocated at six of these villages. As at April 2020, taking these allocations, existing commitments and completions into account, the TBP would provide for 1,088 dwellings, some 208 above the JCS figure. In this light, is the overall housing provision in the TBP for the Service Villages justified, consistent with the JCS and has the plan been positively prepared in this respect?

44. We do not have any specific comments to make in relation to this question but do nevertheless reserve the right to comment further on this in so far as it may affect our client's land interests at Winchcombe.

2.10 The TBP identifies six Urban Fringe Settlements (Brockworth, Churchdown, Hucclecote, Innsworth, Longford and Uckington) which are recognised as sustainable settlements closely associated with Gloucester or Cheltenham but no specific housing requirements are set for them in the JCS. Under Policy RES1, two sites are allocated at Brockworth. In this light, is the overall housing provision in the TBP for the Urban Fringe Settlements justified, consistent with the JCS and has the plan been positively prepared in this respect?

45. We do not have any specific comments to make in relation to this question but do nevertheless reserve the right to comment further on this in so far as it may affect our client's land interests at Winchcombe.

2.11 On adoption of the TBP and in advance of the JCS review, would there be a satisfactory five-year housing land supply position and if so, for how long? What are the implications of any shortfall and how far, if at all, is this a matter for the TBP?

46. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that in plan making, strategic policies should identify a 5 year housing land supply from the intended date of adoption of the plan (Paragraph: 004, Reference ID: 68-004-20190722). As such, it is noted that the Tewkesbury Borough Housing Land Supply Statement (December 2020) advises that the Council will be able to demonstrate a 7.27 year supply of housing on adoption of the Borough Plan (Ref: EXAM001B).

47. With this in mind, we consider the following aspects of the Council's five year housing land supply position:

Including previous 'oversupply' as part of the housing land supply calculation

48. In establishing the housing requirement for the first five years of the Plan period, the Council correctly identifies the JCS target of 495 dwellings per annum. Once a 5% buffer is added to the requirement, this equates to a five year requirement of 2,599 dwellings over the period 2020/21 to 2024/25.

49. However, the Council continues to maintain that previous 'oversupply' from earlier years of the Plan period should be discounted from the five year requirement – in effect a Sedgefield in reverse methodology. As set in our response to Matter 2.2, this is despite the approach being rejected by the Planning Inspector and Secretary of State as part of the Highnam Appeal Decision (Appeal Reference APP/G1630/W/17/3184272), as well as the Planning Inspector for the Ashmead Drive, Gotherington Appeal Decision (Appeal Reference: APP/G1630/W/20/3256319). Indeed, the Council provides no further evidence in response to these decisions to support its approach.

50. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF (February 2019) states that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement. In defining a 'deliverable' site, Annex 2 of the NPPF (February 2019) states that a site **"should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years"**.

51. By this definition, it is not possible for previous 'oversupply' to be considered a deliverable site in the context of the NPPF (February 2019). It has already come forward and therefore cannot be expect to be delivered within the next five years. In determining the Ashmead Drive, Gotherington appeal the Inspector agreed with this approach and that 'oversupply' should be discounted from the Council's five year housing land supply. This appeal decision was dated 12th January 2021 and is of direct relevance to the Council's currently housing land supply position.

52. Assuming all other aspects of the Council's housing land supply were correct, removing 'oversupply' would reduce the position to **3.97 years**. A shortfall of 536 dwellings.

53. On this basis alone, it is considered that the emerging Borough plan is unsound as the Council would not be able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing on adoption.

Deliverable Supply – Major Sites with outline planning permission

54. As set out at Table 4, the Council anticipates that a total of 375 dwellings are anticipated to come forward over the five year period from major sites with outline planning permission (referenced 'C'). The accompanying schedule confirms that these dwellings are made up from 125 dwellings at Stoke Road, Bishop's Cleeve (Ref: 18/00249/OUT) and 250 dwellings at Land at Fiddington (Ref: 17/00520/OUT).

55. However, the delivery of dwellings from these two sites was a matter for consideration as part of the Ashmead Drive, Gotherington appeal (Appeal Reference: APP/G1630/W/20/3256319). For the avoidance of doubt, the same housing trajectory was before the Inspector as set out within the Council's housing land supply position (Ref: EXAM001B).

56. In considering these two sites, the Inspector agreed with the Appellant that the Council had failed to provide clear evidence to demonstrate that Land at Fiddington would come forward within the next five years. Furthermore, the Inspector agreed that it was reasonable to assume that Stoke Road, Bishop's Cleeve would not deliver any dwellings in the 2022/23 monitoring year. It is understood that no further evidence has been provided in support of the emerging Borough Plan to demonstrate that an alternative view should be taken to the Inspector at Ashmead Drive, Gotherington.

57. As such, in accordance with the findings of the appeal decision, a total of 300 dwellings should be discounted from the Council's five year housing land supply. Taking into account the removal of 'oversupply' this would reduce the Council's five year housing land supply position to **3.39 years**. A shortfall of 836 dwellings.

Deliverable Supply – Emerging Tewkesbury Borough plan

58. As set out at Row 'F', the Council anticipates that an additional 857 dwellings can be expected to come forward over the next five years from emerging allocations contained within the TBP. However, in defining a 'deliverable' housing site, Annex 2 of the NPPF (February 2019) states that "**where a site has outline planning permission for major development, *has been allocated in a development plan, has a grant of permission in principle, or is identified on a brownfield register, it should only***

be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years” (our emphasis).

59. The NPPF (February 2019) is therefore clear in its approach for defining a ‘deliverable’ site. It is not sufficient for a site to be allocated within a development plan for it to be considered deliverable, it must be supported by site specific evidence. Failure to provide such evidence means that a site cannot be considered deliverable.

60. With this in mind, the Council sets out how the draft allocations are expected to come forward within ‘Appendix A – Tewkesbury Borough Plan – housing allocation deliverability schedule’. However, no evidence is provided in support of their assertions for the delivery of draft allocations where an application has yet to come forward.

61. In particular, this includes the following draft allocations:

- TEW1 Land at Odessa Farm – 100 dwellings
- BIS3 Land at allotments off A435 – 85 dwellings
- WIN1 Land off Delavale Road/Orchard Road – 80 dwellings
- COO1 Land at junction of A38/A4019, Coombe Hill – 50 dwellings
- SHU1 Land at corner of Badgeworth Lane and A46 – 50 dwellings
- SHU2 Land north of Leckhampton Lane – 20 dwellings
- SHU3 Garage site at Harrison Road – 15 dwellings
- TOD1 Land adjacent to Pheasant Public House – 25 dwellings
- WOO1 Land adjacent Oxbutts Caravan Park – 60 dwellings
- BRO1 Land Adjacent to Hucclecote Road and Golf Club Lane – 166 dwellings
- BRO2 Nerva Meadows, Gloucester Business Park – 106 dwellings
- FOR1 Land at corner of Bishops Walk and School Lane – 10 dwellings

62. As such, there are considered to be a total of 767 dwellings included within the Council’s trajectory that fail to meet the definition of ‘deliverable’ as defined by the NPPF (February 2019).

63. Notwithstanding this, given that the Council is anticipating a significant number of sites to come forward within the next five years, it would be considered reasonable to at least include a non-implementation rate – on the basis that allocations may get delayed. If a non-implementation rate of 10% was to be assumed, this would reduce delivery by an

additional 77 dwellings – a position of **3.24 years**. This equates to a shortfall of 913 dwellings.

Summary

64. In light of the above, it is considered that the Council would be unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply position on adoption of the emerging TBP. For ease of reference, it is considered that the following adjustments should be made to the Council's Five Year Housing land Supply Position Statement (December 2020) (Ref: EXAM001B):

- If 'oversupply' was to be removed from the Council's housing land supply calculation, the position would reduce to **3.97 years**.
- The removal of 'Land at Fiddington' (250 dwellings) and a reduction in the delivery rate of 'Land at Stoke Road, Bishop's Cleeve' (50 dwellings) would reduce the total supply of 300 dwellings – **3.39 years**.
- Introduction of a 'Non-Implementation' rate to draft allocations would reduce deliverable supply by a further 77 dwellings – **3.24 dwellings**.

65. The Council has not been able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing since the Highnam appeal decision was published in December 2018. The failure to deliver sufficient housing is therefore a longstanding issue which needs to be addressed through the emerging TBP, rather than waiting for a review of the JCS. However, as set out above, insufficient sites are to be allocated in the emerging Borough Plan to ensure a five year supply of housing can be demonstrated on adoption.

66. It is therefore considered necessary for the emerging TBP to allocate additional sites to accommodate its housing need in full. Furthermore, these sites should be deliverable within the first five years of the Plan period for the emerging TBP to be found sound. With this in mind, it is noted that our Client's Site could contribute towards this shortfall, given that it can be built out in full within the first five years of the Plan period – delivering an additional 130 dwellings.

APPENDIX 1

**APPEAL DECISION: APP/G1630/W/20/3256319
LAND OFF ASHMEAD ROAD, GOTHERINGTON**



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 30 November – 4 December 2020

Site visit made on 9 December 2020

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G1630/W/20/3256319 Land off Ashmead Drive, Gotherington

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by J J Gallagher Limited and Mr Richard Cook against the decision of Tewkesbury Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01071/OUT, dated 25 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is an outline planning application with means of access from Ashmead Drive (all other matters reserved for subsequent approval), for the erection of up to 50 dwellings (Class C3); earthworks; drainage works; structural landscaping; formal and informal open space; car parking; site remediation; and all other ancillary and enabling works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an outline planning application with means of access from Ashmead Drive (all other matters reserved for subsequent approval), for the erection of up to 50 dwellings (Class C3); earthworks; drainage works; structural landscaping; formal and informal open space; car parking; site remediation; and all other ancillary and enabling works at Land off Ashmead Drive, Gotherington in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01071/OUT, dated 25 October 2019, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. This appeal is an outline planning application for up to 50 dwellings with all matters except for access reserved. Indicative plans have been provided detailing the layout and landscaping. I have had regard to these so far as relevant to the appeal.
3. The Tewkesbury Borough Local Plan 2011-2031 - Pre-Submission version 2019 (eLP) is due to be examined in early 2021. However, the Hearing dates have not yet been confirmed and no examination has taken place. There are also unresolved objections. Therefore, I attach little weight to the emerging policies.
4. The joint authorities in the area are in the early stages of preparing a Joint Core Strategy Review. Given its stage in the examination process, I give it very little weight.
5. The Cotswolds Conservation Board received Rule 6 Party status and presented evidence on the second main issue at the Inquiry.

6. Several planning obligations were submitted in draft form, discussed at the Inquiry and subsequently finalised. I have taken them all into account.
7. Reasons for refusal 4 and 5 were not pursued at the Inquiry owing to the drafting of the planning obligations. I have proceeded to determine the appeal accordingly.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are:
 - (a) Whether the proposal would accord with the Council's plan led strategy for housing and growth;
 - (b) The effect of the proposal on the landscape character and appearance of the area; including the setting of, and the effect in, the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and,
 - (c) The effect of the proposal on the social well-being and vitality of Gotherington.

Reasons

9. Located to the south of Gotherington's settlement boundary, the site is an open and relatively flat field. Existing residential development influences the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. To the western boundary, houses on Shutter Lane are evident to the north western part, but to the south of the public right of way (PRoW) that transects the site, the park home caravan site is not overly prominent from the site itself. Agricultural fields extend to the south, separating Gotherington from Bishops Cleeve, a larger village over 500m away.
10. To the north and east of Gotherington is the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB) and the site falls within a locally designated Special Landscape Area (SLA). Policy justification sets out that the SLAs play a role in providing the foreground setting for the adjacent AONB.
11. The proposal is for outline planning permission, developing the site for up to 50 dwellings. Based on the land use plan, these dwellings would be located to the south side of the site with large areas of formal and informal open space proposed on the northern and western parts of the site.

Strategy for housing and growth

12. Gotherington is identified as a Service Village in the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (December 2017) (JCS). Policy SP2 of the JCS details that Service Villages will accommodate in the order of 880 dwellings, yet this number is not a maximum.
13. Policies SP2 and SD10 of the JCS broadly encourage residential development to be located in Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury, along with rural service centres and service villages. The site is not allocated for development in the JCS and does not meet any of the exception criteria in Policy SD10, sitting outside the settlement boundary of Gotherington.
14. Policy GNDP02 of the Gotherington Neighbourhood Development Plan 2011-2031 (September 2017) (NDP) identifies 3 sites for residential development. The site is not identified. The latter part of the policy refers to the future

development plan identifying the possibility of additional strategic housing need in Gotherington, with criteria if this occurs.

15. Similarly, policies GNDP03 and GNDP11 of the NDP set out criteria for development outside of the defined settlement boundary and not on allocated sites. One of the criteria in both policies is where evidenced need for additional housing in Gotherington has been established through the development plan and cannot be met within the defined settlement boundary.
16. The NDP identifies that Gotherington should provide around 86 homes between 2011-2031. This is based upon evidence in the Council's "Approach to Rural Sites" (February 2015) document, which has also formed the evidence base for the eLP. The allocated sites proposed a minimum of 66 new dwellings, with the 3 ensuing planning permissions granting 69 dwellings. Paragraph 5.11 of the NDP sets out that with the 3 allocated sites, and including 26 dwellings completed prior to the NDP being made, there would be a minimum of 92 dwellings delivered.
17. The appellant argued that the 3 allocated sites would not deliver the 92 dwellings and there was a shortfall of 23 units. I disagree. When 5.11 is read as a whole, 26 units were delivered after 2011 while the NDP was being prepared/examined. These form part of the housing supply in the plan period. Therefore, based upon the NDP, there is no identified shortfall of housing in Gotherington itself. That said, the Council acknowledge there is a shortage of housing in the Borough, with there being less than a 5 year housing land supply. I shall return to this matter later.
18. To conclude on this main issue, the location of development would not accord with the Council's plan-led strategy for housing and growth. This would be contrary to policies SP2 and SD10 of the JCS and policies GNDP02, GNDP03 and GNDP11 of the NDP. There would be conflict with Policy RES3 of the eLP, as the location of development would also not meet the strategy for the distribution of new development in the area, given the settlement boundary of Gotherington is not proposed to change in the eLP.

Landscape character and appearance

19. There are several topic areas in relation to this main issue referred to in the reason for refusal and the evidence before me. Therefore, I have split this section into subheadings dealing with each issue before concluding overall.
20. Although the site is within the SLA, its contribution to the setting of the AONB is limited. It has few special qualities aside from being a pleasant undeveloped field and given its proximity to the village and sense of enclosure on most sides, even its landscape and visual quality is low.
21. The importance of the AONB is enshrined by statute, and paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) gives great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs. Additionally, Policy SD7 of the JCS requires proposals within the setting of the Cotswolds AONB to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance its landscape, scenic beauty, wildlife, cultural heritage and other special qualities. Proposals will be required to be consistent with the policies set out in the Cotswolds AONB Management Plan 2018-2023 (MP). Various policies in the NDP also seek to

protect the AONB and views into and out of it, particularly those from Nottingham Hill and Cleeve Hill.

22. Policy CE1 of the MP sets out that proposals that are likely to impact on, or create change in, the landscape of the Cotswolds AONB, should have regard to the scenic quality of the location and its setting and ensure that views – including those into and out of the AONB – and visual amenity are conserved and enhanced.

Views towards the AONB

23. From the PRow that runs east west and the PRow that runs south to Bishops Cleeve, views of the AONB can be appreciated, especially towards Nottingham Hill and Cleeve Hill.
24. The proposal would introduce built development onto the southern parcel of the site. By its very existence, views from the PRowS towards the AONB, in particular Nottingham Hill, would be changed by the introduction of housing. Whilst these views are of a high quality, given they take place from the PRowS, the views are transient, appreciated by people travelling along the routes for a relatively short amount of time.
25. A large area of open space on the northern part of the site, along with footpath linkages is proposed. Unlike the existing transient views, the open space would provide people with the opportunity to spend time viewing the AONB, which would still be visible above or between the new houses depending upon where one was situated on the open space. Furthermore, the appellant has submitted a unilateral undertaking (UU) that makes provision for a multi-purpose community area (MPCA). The purposes of this space would be for meeting, play or holding events and the UU describes its form would be either a seating area (such as a mini amphitheatre) or covered space (such as a band stand).
26. Providing the MPCA is sensitively sited, the space, particularly that of a mini amphitheatre, would provide a formal area in which the public could view the AONB, including Nottingham Hill for as long as they desired. Owing to the formal and informal space becoming publicly available space, existing views from this currently private part of the site towards the escarpment and AONB would become publicly available. Whilst these views would include the new housing development in the foreground, I do not consider that this would significantly reduce the quality of the view. This is because existing housing development is visible from the existing PRowS and the 'new' views could be appreciated for a longer and more leisurely period. Additionally, views from the PRowS would also remain above or between the dwellings, such that at different points along the PRowS, some views could still be gained.

Views from the AONB

27. The effect of the proposal on views from Nottingham Hill and Cleeve Hill was the subject of much discussion during the Inquiry, and I viewed the site from both viewpoints on my visit.
28. Evidence at the Inquiry focussed on whether paragraph 172 of the Framework was relevant to this appeal. Having regard to case law¹ presented, along with the Planning Practice Guidance, in my view, although the proposal is outside

¹ Stroud District Council v SSCLG v Gladman Developments Limited [2015] EWHC 488 (Admin)

the AONB, the effect on views out of the AONB, gained from within the AONB would result in paragraph 172 being relevant.

29. *Nottingham Hill* – the appellants conclude the effect from this viewpoint would be moderate adverse. The Council state major/moderate adverse. The Rule 6 Party state significant adverse.
30. The viewpoint takes in a panoramic view from the Cotswold escarpment towards the Vale of Gloucester/Severn Vale with the Malvern Hills beyond. Gotherington is prominent in the foreground and the proposal would be visible. That said, the view is extensive and long ranging, and the development would be located between 2 ‘fingers’ of development that run along Cleeve Road and the park home caravan site. Whilst it would introduce permanent built development onto an undeveloped site, it would be an edge of settlement site, enclosed from this view point on 3 sides by other built development, such that in the context of the wide ranging view, the proposal would not lead to a major or significant adverse effect. Indeed, I agree with the previous Inspector, who assessed a similar appeal² at this site, that it would recede into the existing settlement pattern.
31. However, I acknowledge that views from the escarpment are one of the special qualities of the AONB, and the effect would be moderately adverse owing purely to the introduction of built development and the change to the view. This would lead to a moderate harm to the AONB from this viewpoint.
32. *Cleeve Hill* – the view from Cleeve Hill is more extensive than that from Nottingham Hill and takes in Cheltenham, Bishops Cleeve, Gotherington, other villages and open countryside. Views of the site are available and it is seen as part of the gap between Gotherington and Bishops Cleeve, yet, the site is clearly enclosed on 3 sides by development from this viewpoint. Additionally, in the context of the wide panoramic views taken from this point, the development of the site would have a neutral effect.

Coalescence of Gotherington and Bishops Cleeve

33. Spatially, the gap between Gotherington and Bishops Cleeve would not be reduced by the proposal given the existing development to 3 sides of the site. Indeed, the narrower gap that exists between dwellings on Cleeve Road and the Homelands site would remain the same, and there would be a substantial gap of over 500m remaining between the site and Bishops Cleeve.
34. When viewed from Nottingham Hill, even with the new residential development that has taken place in Bishops Cleeve, because much of Bishops Cleeve is not readily visible, and the site is enclosed on 3 sides, it would also not result in encroachment or perceived coalescence of the villages.
35. From Cleeve Hill, similarly, the site is visibly enclosed by existing development and the proposal would not contribute towards further coalescence of Gotherington and Bishops Cleeve. From other viewpoints around the site, there would not be a noticeable reduction in the gap.
36. Nonetheless, perceptually, residents and the Council take the PRoW running east west across the site to be the natural line of where development stops in the village. Development to the south of this, where the housing is proposed,

² APP/G1630/W/17/3175559

would, in their view, perceptually bring Gotherington closer to Bishops Cleeve. When travelling on the PRow than runs north south between the villages, I agree there would be a sense of development advancing towards Bishops Cleeve.

37. However, the indicative plans show a landscaping buffer to the southern edge of the site. This would continue the existing well-established landscaping strip to the south east corner of the site along the southern boundary, to the extent that any perceptual effect of encroachment from this PRow would be satisfactorily ameliorated over time. Therefore, a strong sense of separation would be maintained.
38. The site's allocation in the eLP strategic gap policy was also the subject of much discussion. However, this is a matter for the Local Plan Inspector in examining the eLP.
39. Nevertheless, it is my view that the site does not function as an essential part of the gap between villages and development of the site would appear as an infill. Additionally, a clear gap would remain which is likely to be subject to protection in the eLP, and development of the site would not result in coalescence of Gotherington and Bishops Cleeve.

Linear form of Gotherington

40. The proposal would not project into the open countryside beyond existing development southwards. When viewed from Nottingham Hill, although the depth of Gotherington would become greater and the proposal would not follow the linear shape of the settlement; to my mind, it would be read as infill development. Even so, Malleson Road and Gretton Road would remain as the most prominently developed roads in the village, and the linear form would not be adversely affected.

Conclusion on landscape character and appearance

41. Given its location adjacent to the settlement boundary, the relatively enclosed nature of the site and its limited contribution to the SLA; development of the site would not appear as a significant encroachment into the surrounding rural landscape that could be considered as harmful or disproportionate. The gap between villages would be maintained and the linear nature of Gotherington would not be adversely affected. Views towards the AONB from the site would change, but with the views that would become available from the open space, the effect would be acceptable.
42. It is, however, inevitable that there would be a permanent change to the landscape character of the area by the development of a greenfield site with housing. Whilst the site is not a valued landscape for the purposes of paragraph 170 (a) of the Framework, the site is locally valued, and the proposal would not enhance the landscape character of the area. For this reason, there would be some limited harm. There would also be a moderately adverse effect from the viewpoint at Nottingham Hill. Furthermore, whilst the effect on the view from Cleeve Hill would be neutral, it would not enhance landscape and scenic beauty.
43. Therefore, when looking at the overall effect and drawing this together, it is my view that the proposal would lead to some limited harm to landscape character and appearance of the area and the setting of the AONB. There would be

overall moderate harm to views from the AONB. Thus, the proposal would conflict with Policy LND2 of the LP, Policies SD6 and SD7 of the JCS, Policies GNDP02 and GNDP09 of the NDP, and Framework paragraphs 170 and 172. However, given my finding on the views towards the AONB, there would be no conflict with GNDP10 of the NDP, which seeks to give special attention to locally significant views.

44. Like the previous Inspector, I agree that LND2 of the LP is not entirely consistent with the Framework, and this reduces the weight which I afford it.
45. Whilst I do not find the site to be of high quality in landscape terms, based on the current eLP, there would be conflict with Policy LAN1, which seeks to maintain the quality of the natural environment and its visual attractiveness. However, given my findings on the gap, there would be no conflict with Policy LAN3 of the eLP, which seeks to protect the strategic gaps.
46. My conclusion on this main issue is different to that of the previous Appeal Decision on this site. However, I do not know what evidence was presented to this Inspector; and the evidence presented to me, particularly the effects from the AONB, have led me to a different opinion.

Social well-being of Gotherington

47. Gotherington village is identified as a Service Village in the JCS and would be expected to take a reasonable amount of new housing development. That said, the village has seen housing developments built out over the last few years on sites at Malleson Road and Shutter Lane.
48. The previous Appeal Decision at the site, for a very similar development, found there would be harm to the social well-being of the village at the time of the decision. This was owing to the scale and extent of development that had taken place in the village at the time, and the Inspector was not provided with persuasive evidence that the facilities were capable of expansion.
49. However, since this decision was made in April 2018, these housing developments have been substantially completed such that it would be reasonable to conclude that their effect upon the village has been largely absorbed or would be by the end of this year. Indeed, the appellant's evidence indicates that the last property within the Shutter Lane development was purchased in September 2017, and development of Malleson Road is projected to be completed by the end of March 2021. Development of this site would not commence until around 2023/24, and at that point, would result in around a 9% increase in the village, which is not exceptionally large, nor disproportionate to the size of the village at that time. I also note there is no anticipated delivery of homes in Gotherington between 2021/22 to 2022/23, nor anytime beyond this except for this site. Thus, when dwellings would start to be delivered, no new homes would have been delivered in the village for 2 years, so any new development could be assimilated differently to when the previous Inspector was considering the proposal.
50. Moreover, as part of the proposal, a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA), Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP) and MPCA would be provided on-site within the area of Public Open Space. This MUGA and MPCA are new to the proposal before me. Together with the LEAP, these facilities are likely to act as a focal point for the development which would benefit both new residents and the

existing community. The public open space and MUGA would also accord with aspirations from the NDP by providing more activities for young people. The MUGA could be used for football of which residents assert a shortage, and any potential noise issues would be addressed at a later stage. The MPCA would deliver a social benefit for people of all ages being able to meet in a formalised area, and the LEAP would provide an area of play for children and parents or carers to meet. These on site facilities would be of a social benefit and contribute towards supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities. The current space is valued by the community and formalised use of it would be of benefit to the existing residents.

51. Furthermore, the monetary contributions towards the provision of school places, which is agreed by the County Council, indicates that the increase in demand can be accommodated, even if this is in Bishops Cleeve. However, as the catchment area for the primary school includes this site, I see no reason why occupiers of the new dwellings would not be able to access school places over time. Other planning obligations will provide monies toward libraries to ensure any effect upon their capacity is suitably mitigated. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) would also provide monies in the village.
52. The range of services in the village is satisfactory and although the Council considered them to be generally low quality, I disagree. The evidence I have been presented with demonstrates that the facilities are well used, and new residents could access them if they wished to do so. This would have a positive effect upon local services and facilities. Furthermore, whilst there may be waiting lists for some groups, this is not uncommon for popular children's activities. The residents assert that the village hall has a restricted layout and size. Whilst this may be the case, there are other facilities in the village, such as the Old Chapel, and it is also not uncommon for older community buildings to have some form of size restriction.
53. Whilst the proposal is not anticipated by the NDP, the cumulative development of the village would not be overly disproportionate, and there is no tangible evidence before me that the village has reached capacity. Furthermore, I gauged a strong sense of community from the interested parties such that I see no reason why new residents would find it difficult to assimilate into the village.
54. Therefore, the proposal would not be harmful to the social well-being and vitality of the village. Moreover, given the onsite facilities and the many benefits new housing can bring by enabling local people to stay local, providing family homes and contributing to the local economy, it could lead to an enhancement of the vitality and well-being in the village.
55. This would be compliant with Policy SP2 of the JCS, which seeks to accommodate lower levels of development proportional to their size and function. There would also be compliance with the Framework, which seeks to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities.

Other Matters

Housing Land Supply

56. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. At this appeal, the Council claim that it has 4.37 years supply, based on the October 2020 Five

Year Housing Land Supply Statement (HLSS). The appellants assert 1.82 years. The significant difference in numbers is largely attributed to the Council's reduction in its 5 year annual requirement owing to a significant oversupply in previous years.

57. On the first day of the Inquiry, the appellants brought to my attention the Council's response to the eLP Examining Inspector's preliminary questions. Within this document, the JCS Monitoring Report (Autumn 2020) is appended and sets out that Tewkesbury Borough has 2.9 years of housing supply. To explain this clear anomaly in evidence, the Council referred me to paragraph 3.2 of the response, which sets out that "*the Council's Housing Monitoring Report 2019/20 and Five Year Supply Position Statement will provide the most up to date information specific to Tewkesbury Borough*". However, whilst this may be the Council's position, the JCS Monitoring Report is dated a few months prior to the publication of the HLSS and the very different figures in each document weakens the Council's position on this matter.

Additional supply

58. The Council indicate that their approach to incorporating additional supply is consistent with Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) paragraph 32³. This states that "*where areas deliver more completions than required, the additional supply can be used to offset any shortfalls against requirements from previous years*". However, paragraph 73 of the Framework states "*LPAs should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies*".
59. The policy in the Framework makes no allowance for subtracting additional supply from the annual requirement. Moreover, whilst the guidance in the PPG enables LPAs to take additional supply into account, there is no requirement to do so. It is not a symmetrical approach to dealing with undersupply as advocated by the Council.
60. PPG paragraph 32 details that the additional supply can be used to offset shortfalls against requirements from previous years. Therefore, shortfalls against requirements from previous years would be necessary, in order to take account of any additional supply. The requirement from previous years, being those since the development plan was adopted, is 495 dwellings per annum (dpa). In the 3 years since adoption, there has been an overall surplus of 797 dwellings, and since the base date there has been an overall surplus of 1,115 dwellings. Therefore, there is no shortfall against requirements from previous years which could conceivably be offset.
61. Furthermore, for a site to be considered deliverable, it should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years. Housing already delivered cannot possibly meet this definition.
62. The Council's argument that the loss of additional housing delivery would have significant implications for plan making, potentially resulting in Council's holding back sites and restricting sites, is unfounded. This is because it would be unreasonable to refuse planning permission for housing if there had been

³ Reference ID: 68-032-20190722

additional supply, bearing in mind the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Additionally, Policy SP1 of the JCS requires at least 9,899 new homes. There is no maximum number.

63. Whilst it is clear that housing above the annual requirements has been delivered in the area and housing supply has been boosted in line with the Framework; it is my view that additional supply is not a tool that can be used to discount the Council's housing requirement set out in its adopted strategic policies. Consequently, the annual requirement should be 495 dpa as set out in the adopted strategic policies, and the future supply should reflect this. Therefore, the past additional supply should be removed from the 5 year housing requirement. As detailed by the appellant, this would reduce the housing land supply to 2.4 years.

Disputed sites

64. *Land at Fiddington, Ashchurch* – the site has outline planning permission and is subject to several planning conditions. One of these is the submission of a site wide master plan prior to reserved matters, which is currently being considered by the Council. As it stands, there are outstanding concerns from Sport England and a re-consultation was taking place.
65. There have been no pre-application discussions or the submission of reserved matters application, nor does it appear any site assessment work has taken place. There is also no known developer. Notably however, the email I have from the site promoter, which agrees with the Council's trajectory in the HLSS, postdates the publication of the HLSS. This raises significant concerns over the validity of the trajectory used. I appreciate the site promoter may have a good track record for delivering sites and the Council believe there is no reason to prevent development within a 5 year period, yet, the site promoter is not the developer. The test in the Framework is that there should be clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years. In this case, I do not believe I have clear evidence.
66. *Land at Stoke Road, Bishop's Cleeve* – similar to the above site, the site has outline planning permission. The Council is in pre-application discussions with a major housebuilder, but these details are confidential. However, no reserved matters, site assessment work or conditions have been submitted for discharge. The site remains in the ownership of the promoter, and again, the email from the site promoter, which considers the Council's trajectory to "*remain broadly accurate*" also postdates the publication of the HLSS.
67. Therefore, it would be unrealistic to expect housing to be delivered on site in 2022/23, and I have no clear evidence to suggest this. Yet, the pre-application discussions indicate that there is developer interest and it would be reasonable to assume some delivery in 2023 and beyond.

Future supply

68. Aside from the 2 disputed sites and windfall developments, there is only one other site beyond years 1 and 2 in the trajectory which is predicted to deliver 5 dwellings. Notwithstanding my findings on the above sites, this is a grave situation.
69. The Council asserts that the eLP contains numerous housing allocations, which will feed into the supply following adoption. However, at the current time, the

plan is of limited weight and these allocations should not be included in the trajectory. Furthermore, the eLP details that it is not the role of the Plan to meet the shortfall identified by the JCS, but it could contribute towards meeting some of this housing need.

70. The JCS was adopted with a shortfall, which was to be remedied by an immediate review on the plan. It is now 3 years later and there is little progress towards this.
71. The trajectory does not include sites which have a resolution to permit awaiting planning obligations. I also have very little evidence to indicate if any of these would come forward in the next 5 years. There are also, it is asserted, numerous major applications for housing being considered. Nonetheless, as these sites are not been included in the trajectory, I have little evidence whether these would be deliverable.
72. Therefore, despite the Council's arguments, the future supply in the borough, at the current time is deeply concerning.

Conclusion on housing land supply

73. Considering my conclusions on the additional supply and the disputed sites, the housing land supply would reduce to 1.82 years. This reflects the appellant's conclusions. Additionally, the lack of supply beyond year 3 is deeply concerning; and, even if I had taken account of the additional supply, the Council would still not have a 5 year housing land supply and the past trend of additional supply is not projected to continue.

Provision of market and affordable housing

74. The state of housing land supply is such that very significant weight should be given to the delivery of housing generally. Additionally, the Council could provide me with no 'better' sites for development. The site has good accessibility to facilities and services using a genuine choice of transport modes.
75. Furthermore, the proposal would deliver 40% affordable housing. This would be policy compliant (with JCS SD12) and there is an accepted need for 126 affordable houses per annum in Tewkesbury. The appellant asserts there will be a shortfall of 333 affordable dwellings in the next 5 years. The Council does not dispute this, and the delivery of this site would double the affordable housing stock in the village.
76. Although I heard comments from interested parties that there is little need for affordable housing in the village itself, on the substantive evidence before me, there is little affordable housing stock in the village and there is a clear need in the Borough. This proposal would deliver a considerable amount of affordable housing, which is a benefit of significant weight.

Ecology and biodiversity

77. The proposal would produce net gains in biodiversity from the creation of attenuation features, with permanent water elements, tree planting and wildflower grassland within areas of open space. It would create around 17% net gain for habitat areas and about 83% net gain for linear features. This is a significant benefit in favour, providing more net gains than would be necessary.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

78. The proposal is near to Cleeve Common Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Dixton Wood Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Bredon Hill SAC, such that development of the site could have a significant effect upon the important interest features of the sites. These effects would be the increase in people who may visit the SSSI and SACs for recreational purposes, and this could adversely affect the integrity of the sites.
79. The Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment (SHRA) carried out by the appellant details that fewer than 1 additional visitor (0.79) would be likely to visit either the Dixton Wood SAC or Bredon Hill SAC annually. Therefore, recreational pressure would not be likely and there would be no adverse effects either alone or in-combination on the integrity of the SACs.
80. However, future residents may use Cleeve Common more frequently and the SHRA advises that new homeowners should be made aware that, in order to maintain the conservation value of the SSSI, livestock may be grazing on the common. As such, dogs should be kept under control and walkers should be vigilant. Homeowner information packs (HIPs) should be provided to all new residents, outlining informal recreational assets in the area and key 'Countryside Code' messages.
81. With the HIPs, the potential adverse effect would be avoided, and the integrity of the site would not be adversely affected. The aim of this would be to direct new residents to other sites, avoiding the SSSI. Natural England have no objections to the proposal on this basis.
82. I am satisfied that the HIP could be effectively secured by condition, and having undertaken the appropriate assessment, I am satisfied that the scheme would not adversely affect the integrity of the nearby habitats sites.

Public Open Space

83. The amount of public open space on site would exceed the standards set out in Policy RCN1 of the LP, and this would be of a moderate benefit to the scheme.

Economy

84. The development would have an economic benefit through the provision of jobs over the construction period as well as the contribution the local economy throughout the lifetime of the development. The appellant purports £3.4M gross value added per annum and £1.1M per annum on retail expenditure. However, all residential development of this scale is likely to deliver similar benefits, and this weighs moderately in favour.

Highways

85. Despite assertions from local residents, the substantive evidence presented on highway matters indicates that the surrounding highway network has sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional traffic resulting from the proposed development. Therefore, there would be no harm caused to the safety of users of the highway, nor any adverse effect upon capacity.

Planning obligations

86. There are several planning obligations. An agreement with Gloucester County Council obliges the payment of education contributions, a libraries contribution and a travel plan monitoring fee. It also obliges the developer to provide for bus stop upgrade works. The CIL Compliance Statement adequately sets out sufficient justification for the education and libraries contribution and monitoring fees, along with the requirement for bus stop upgrades. All these obligations would be necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
87. The travel plan monitoring fee would pay for monitoring associated with the submitted Travel Plan. During the Inquiry, I raised questions over whether the Travel Plan was necessary, given the consultation response from the Council's Highways team. Based on the evidence I heard, the Travel Plan would encourage a modal shift towards sustainable travel, which would be in accordance with the Framework, and thus the obligation would be necessary. Furthermore, access to Bishops Cleeve on the PRoW would be difficult in inclement weather and the Travel Plan could encourage means of transportation other than a private car. Therefore, the monitoring fee would be necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
88. A second obligation is with the Council. This would deliver at least 40% affordable housing, the onsite MUGA and LEAP (and their transfer to a management company), along with a refuse and recycling contribution and a monitoring fee. The CIL Compliance Statement submitted with the appeal sets out how each obligation would meet the tests in the CIL Regulations and the Framework. Based on this evidence, I am satisfied that each obligation contained in the second agreement would meet the tests, in that they are all necessary to make the development acceptable, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind.
89. The last obligation is in a unilateral undertaking, which provides for the MPCA. The Council contests that this would not be compliant with the tests in the Framework. I disagree. Following on from my conclusions on the main issues, the MPCA would deliver a social benefit for the community, providing a meeting place and social focal point for residents of all ages. It would also enable an area where views of the AONB could be appreciated over a longer period than on the existing PRoWs. I consider it would be necessary to make the development acceptable. It is directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Planning Balance

90. The proposal would conflict with the spatial strategy of the area and the NDP. It is clearly not plan-led development. However, given my conclusions on the housing land supply, the policies which govern the spatial strategy and housing development in the area are deemed out of date by Framework paragraph 11 d). Because of the very poor housing land supply position, this indicates that the spatial strategy is not effective and therefore these policies are of limited weight.
91. There would be limited harm to landscape character and appearance of the area and the setting of the AONB, and moderate harm to views from the AONB.

This would conflict with the JCS, NDP, LP, Framework 172 and the MP in this regard. However, the harm is limited for the purposes of the character and appearance of the area and this attracts limited weight against the proposal. Nevertheless, I give great weight to the moderate harm to the AONB as required by the Framework.

92. In favour of the development is the provision of housing in general, affordable housing, net gains in biodiversity and the delivery of on site facilities that would contribute towards the village's social wellbeing. The delivery of affordable and market housing would be a very significant benefit, of overriding importance when considering the chronic housing land supply position. The net gains in biodiversity are of considerable weight and the on site public open space would be of moderate weight. Additionally, there would be economic benefits during construction and from the additional residents that would contribute towards spending in the area. This is of moderate weight.
93. Framework paragraph 11 d) requires permission to be granted unless [i.] the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. Even giving great weight to the moderate harm to the AONB, it is my view that this does not provide a clear reason for refusing the development.
94. Taking account of all the above, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As such, the material considerations indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

95. In addition to the conditions I have already detailed above, the plans are listed for certainty. Furthermore, a condition requiring general compliance with the illustrative details ensures the reserved matters presented are those envisaged by the Council. Despite the Council's suggestion, reserved matters would include layout, and this would comprise internal access roads such that a separate reserved matter for access would be unnecessary.
96. A Construction Ecological Management Plan and a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan are necessary to ensure proper provision is made to safeguard protected species and their habitats. A Construction Method Statement is necessary to reduce the potential impact on the public highway, accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies and ensure the effect upon residential living conditions during construction is not adverse. Archaeological investigations are necessary to ensure any archaeological remains are recorded and investigated.
97. To ensure safe access to the site for construction works, a condition requiring the access to be provided is necessary. Foul and surface water details are required to ensure the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage. A footpath from the site to nearby roads would need to be installed prior to occupation to ensure safe and suitable access on foot. A lighting scheme is required to safeguard protected species and their habitats, along with ensuring the village remains a low light pollution area.

98. To ensure that an appropriate housing mix is delivered to contribute to the creation of mixed and balanced communities compliant with the NDP, a housing mix statement would be necessary. A Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement to ensures protection of trees. A condition restricting the reserved matters to 50 dwellings is necessary for certainty.
99. I have not included conditions relating to proposed ground levels, landscaping and electric vehicle charging, as these details would be proposed at reserved matters, thus they are not necessary. The condition for site waste management has been included in the Construction Method Statement.

Conclusion

100. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

For the Local Planning Authority:	
Jeremy Patterson	Solicitor and Principal Planning Lawyer, Tewkesbury Borough Council
He called	
Phil Williams BA Hons MSC MBA MRTPI	Council's planning witness
Stuart Ryder BA (Hons) CMLI	Director, Ryder Landscape Consultants Ltd
Gary Spencer LLB (Hons)	Planning solicitor, One Legal
Keith Warren BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Associate Director, Astbury Planning Consultants
Stephen Hawley IENG FIHE MCIHT MTPS	Highways Development Management Team Leader, Gloucestershire County Council
Adam White MRTPI	Senior Planner, Tewkesbury Borough Council
Bryn Howells	Housing Strategy and Affordable Housing Officer, Tewkesbury Borough Council
Bridgette Boucher	Solicitor, Gloucestershire County Council
For the appellant:	
Killian Garvey of Counsel	Instructed by J J Gallagher Limited and Mr Richard Cook
He called	
Mark Sitch BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Senior Partner, Barton Willmore LLP
Ben Connolley BSc (Hons) PG DipLA CMLI	Associate Landscape Architect, The Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd
Matthew Grist BSc Dip UD MCIHT MCILT	Director, Jubb
For the Cotswolds Conservation Board Rule 6 Party:	
John Mills BEng (Hons) MSc MRTPI	Planning and Landscape Lead, Cotswolds Conservation Board
Interested parties:	
Eddie McLarnon	CPRE
Simon Tarling	Gotherington Parish Council
Caroline Ryman	Local resident
Philip Cule	Local resident
Michael Stevens	Local resident

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

ID1	Appellant Opening Submissions
ID2	Local Planning Authority Opening Submissions
ID3	Rule 6 Opening Submissions
ID4	Inspector's Report and Secretary of State Decision Letter for APP/G1630/W/17/3184272
ID5	Mr Tarling's submissions
ID6	Local Plan Examining Inspector's Preliminary Questions
ID7	Tewkesbury Borough Council's response to Examining Inspector's Preliminary Questions
ID8	Sport England objection to the details relating to condition 8 (Site Wide Masterplan Document) of planning application re 17/00520/OUT
ID9	Suggested site visit points – Mr Tarling
ID10	Written comments from Mr Stevens
ID11	Gotherington Neighbourhood Plan – Report of Examination extract
ID12	Appellant's note on 5 year housing land supply in the Pre-Submission Tewkesbury Borough Plan 2011-2031.
ID13	Mrs Ryman's closing statement
ID14	Gotherington Primary School Admissions Policy 2021
ID15	Site visit route
ID16	Cotswolds AONB Landscape Strategy and Guidelines Introduction
ID17	CPRE statement
ID18	Rule 6 Closing Submissions
ID19	Local Planning Authority Closing Submissions
ID20	Appellant Closing Submissions

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for the approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan (Drawing No. BM-M-04 Revision B), Land Use Plan (Drawing No. BM-M-02) and Site Access (Drawing No. SK_002 Revision P1) September 2019.
- 5) No development shall take place until a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include, but not limited to the following:
 - i) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities including provisions for protected species,
 - ii) Identification of 'biodiversity protection zones' including (but not exclusively) hedgerows and mature trees,
 - iii) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements),
 - iv) The locations and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features (e.g. daylight working hours only starting one hour after sunrise and ceasing one hour after sunset),
 - v) The times during construction when ecological or environmental specialists need to be present on site to oversee works,
 - vi) Responsible persons and lines of communication,
 - vii) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similar person,
 - viii) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs; and
 - ix) Ongoing monitoring, including compliance checks by a competent person(s) during construction and immediately post-completion of construction works.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period in accordance with the approved details.

- 6) No development shall take place until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The LEMP shall cover the first ten years of management following the commencement of construction and enabling works. Enhancement measures should be included for existing natural habitats and created habitats, as well as those for protected species. All Ecological enhancements outlined in the LEMP will be implemented as

recommended in the LEMP and the number and location of ecological features to be installed should be specified.

- 7) No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 8) No development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement (CMS) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CMS shall:
 - i) provide for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - ii) provide for the loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - iii) provide for the storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - iv) provide for wheel washing facilities
 - v) specify the intended hours of delivery and construction operations
 - vi) include measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction works; setting out measures for dealing with such materials to minimise overall waste and to maximise re-use, recycling and recovery in line with the waste hierarchy
 - viii) construction lighting scheme

The approved CMS shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

- 9) No development above ground level shall commence until the site access has been provided in accordance with the submitted plan SK_0002 Revision P1. The first 20m of the access road from Ashmead Drive shall be surfaced in a bound material and the access shall be retained and maintained in that form until and unless adopted as highway maintainable at public expense.
- 10) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until surface water and foul water drainage works shall have been implemented in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The information submitted shall be in accordance with the principles set out in the approved drainage strategy. The submitted details shall:
 - i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters
 - ii) include a timetable for its implementation; and,
 - iii) provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

- 11) Prior to first occupation of any individual dwelling, a footpath to that dwelling including connections to Aggs Close and Ashmead Drive, shall be completed to a minimum of 2m wide with bound surfacing.
- 12) Prior to first occupation, details of external lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall clearly demonstrate that lighting will not cause excessive light pollution or disturb or prevent bat species using key corridors, forage habitat features or accessing roost sites. The details shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - i) A drawing showing sensitive areas and/or dark corridor safeguarding areas.
 - ii) Description, design or specification of external lighting to be installed including shields, cowls or blinds where appropriate,
 - iii) A description of the luminosity of lights and their light colour including a lux contour map.
 - iv) A drawing(s) showing the location and where appropriate the elevation of the light fixings.
 - v) Methods to control lighting control (e.g. timer operation, passive infrared sensor (PIR)).

All external lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the approved details. These shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with these details.

- 13) Prior to first occupation, a Homeowner Information Pack (HIP) setting out the location and sensitivities of the Cleeve Common Site of Special Scientific Interest shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The HIP shall include reference to the sensitivities of the sites, messages to help the new occupiers and their families enjoy informal recreation at the site and how to avoid negatively affecting it, alternative locations for recreational activities and off road cycling and recommendations to dog owners for times of year dogs should be kept on lead when using the site (i.e. to avoid disturbance to livestock). Two copies of the HIP shall be provided to all future residents prior to occupation of each dwelling.
- 14) The approved Travel Plan (Reference: 15163-TA-V2) shall be implemented in accordance with the details and timetable therein, and shall be continued thereafter with the exception that the Travel Plan monitoring period shall be a minimum of 5 years.
- 15) Applications for the approval of the reserved matters shall be generally in accordance with the principles and parameters described in the Design and Access Statement (October 2019) and the Illustrative Site Layout BM-M-01 Revision A.
- 16) The reserved matters shall include a Housing Mix Statement to setting out an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes, types and tenures to be provided on site that will contribute to a mixed and balanced housing market. It will address the needs of the local area and of older people, as set out in the local housing evidence base, including the most up-to-date Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the area at the time of the submission of the relevant reserved matters. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Housing Mix Statement.

- 17) The reserved matters shall include a scheme for the protection of retained trees and hedgerows, in accordance with the most up-to-date BS 5837, including a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) and an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS). All construction works shall be implemented in strict accordance with the approved details.
- 18) The reserved matters shall propose no more than 50 dwellings.

*****END OF CONDITIONS*****