



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 21-24 and 27 November, 11 and 13 December 2023.

Site visit made on 27 November 2023.

by J Woolcock BNatRes (Hons) MURP DipLaw MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R3650/W/23/3326412

Land East of Knowle Lane Cranleigh

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the 1990 Act) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gleeson Land Limited against the decision of Waverley Borough Council (WBC).
 - The application Ref:WA/2023/00294, dated 19 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of up to 162 dwellings (including 30% affordable dwellings) built in up to 3 phases including access road, pedestrian and cycle accesses, parking, public open space, biodiversity enhancement and landscaping and other associated infrastructure and works.
 - The application is in outline with all matters reserved except access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site address in the bullet point above appears on the application form. The appeal form states that the site address is Land Centred Coordinates 505938 138328, Knowle Lane, Cranleigh Surrey.
3. The application is for outline planning permission with access to be determined. Access details are shown on Proposed Access Arrangement and Visibility Drawing No.2010010-04, Proposed Arrangement of Pedestrian/Cycle Drawing No.2010010-07 and Access Junction: Landscape Proposals Plan Drawing No.0350-L10. A suggested planning condition would require development to be carried out in accordance with a Parameter Plan Drawing No.1321.03 and Phasing Plan Drawing No.1321.04. I have had regard to other details shown on the plans and drawings submitted as illustrative material that does not form part of the application.
4. WBC refused the application for 8 reasons. Following progress made regarding a legal agreement and additional information received from the appellant WBC formally withdrew Reasons for Refusal 3-8 inclusive prior to the Inquiry. Reason for Refusal 1 provides that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of an area of valued landscape. It adds that the provision of housing on an unallocated greenfield site outside of the settlement boundary would be poorly related to Cranleigh and would be an irregular and disjointed intrusion into the open countryside that would harm the visual amenity of users of the Downs Link path (DLp) and

- footpath FP379.¹ Reason for Refusal 2 refers to the proximity of the proposed development to the listed buildings at West Barn and The Brew, adding that the scheme would not preserve or enhance their character or appearance causing less than substantial harm to their significance, and states that the public benefits from the scheme do not sufficiently outweigh this harm.
5. Coldharbour Farmhouse (17th Century timber framed dwelling), West Barn and The Brew (both 18th Century timber framed barns) are grade II listed buildings.² I am required by Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building. The Inquiry was referred to assarted fields of medieval origin.³ I requested that WBC and the appellant submit a statement about how some of the field boundaries in the locality had evolved over time, and asked the heritage experts whether the assarted fields were a non-designated heritage asset.⁴ Trees on the appeal site are not currently the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. An order has been made but not yet confirmed. An objection by the appellant to the inclusion of one tree in the order is currently under consideration by WBC.⁵
 6. On application, Knowle Lane Residents' Group (KLRG) were granted Rule 6(6) status pursuant to The Town and Country Planning (Inquiries Procedure) (England) Rules 2000. KLRG participated fully in the Inquiry opposing the proposed development.
 7. The site notice about the Inquiry was posted one day late. However, given that the Inquiry did not close until 13 December 2023 there was time for anyone who wished to do so to participate in the proceedings. I consider it unlikely that anyone would have been prejudiced by the late posting.
 8. The appellant advised that the ownership of a strip of land within the red line site boundary was unknown. A 'Certificate C' was issued and advertised with any representations to be submitted by 24 November 2023. There was time for any submissions about this to be raised before the Inquiry closed, but none were received.
 9. KLRG requested that the highways model TEMPro be run live at the Inquiry. I considered that running the model during the hearing would not be appropriate on procedural and fairness grounds because of the risk of introducing new evidence at a late stage. My ruling required KLRG and the appellant to make their respective cases at the Inquiry on the basis of the evidence about TEMPro submitted in their Proofs of Evidence and Rebuttals.
 10. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) were submitted on Planning (CD1/3a), Landscape (CD1/3b), Built Heritage (CD1/3c) and 5-Year Housing Land Supply (CD1/3f) between WBC and the appellant, on Flood Risk and Drainage between

¹ The Downs Link path (DLp), a section of which abuts the eastern boundary of the appeal site, is a shared-use route following disused railway lines linking the North Downs Way with Shoreham-by-Sea. Footpath FP379 extends east/west across the appeal site between the DLp and Knowle Lane via a group of dwellings known as the Redhurst group. Footpath FP378 runs parallel and near to the eastern side of the DLp for most of the eastern boundary of the appeal site.

² CD7/3a,b,c. West Barn and The Brew are referred to in this decision as 'the listed barns' notwithstanding that they are now converted for residential occupation.

³ An 'assart' is a piece of land converted from forest to arable use.

⁴ ID17 and ID18.

⁵ The appellant's Arboricultural Impact Assessment is at CD2/1i and WBC's consultation response at CD2/3h. Tree Preservation Order No.09/23 is at CD7/8a and the objection at CD7/8b. Planning SoCG paragraphs 2.6.3-4.

the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and the appellant (CD1/3d) and on Transport between Surrey County Council (SCC) and the appellant (CD1/3e).

Local and national policy

11. The development plan for the area includes Waverley Borough Local Plan Part 1: Strategic Policies and Sites, dated 2018 (LPP1) and Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, dated 2023 (LPP2). A High Court judgment dated 28 November 2023 dismissed a legal challenge to LPP2.⁶ The Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan Submission Stage (Regulation 16) version is dated April 2023 (CNP). A Regulation 16 consultation took place from 4 August to 15 September 2023. There are outstanding objections to various policies of the CNP and so little weight can be given to it at this stage. I have had regard to the revised National Planning Policy Framework, December 2023 (NPPF), about which the parties were invited to comment⁷, and taken into account the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

Site location and proposed development

12. The appeal site, which at its closest is about 500 m to the south of Cranleigh High Street, comprises open land located between Knowle Lane and the DLp. The northern part of the appeal site adjoins the Snoxhall Playing Fields that extend to, but lie outside of, the Settlement Boundary for Cranleigh as defined in LPP2. The playing fields and the tip of the northern part of the appeal site lie within a designated Area of Strategic Visual Importance (ASVI). LPP2 states that the ASVI in Cranleigh is being reviewed as part of the CNP and so the boundary will remain unchanged until the CNP has been made. The remainder of the appeal site is designated in LPP1 as Countryside beyond the Green Belt, where Policy RE1 applies. Countryside beyond the Green Belt is defined in LPP2 as a rural area, where Policy DM15 applies.
13. To aid the presentation of evidence to the Inquiry the parties referred to the 11.7 ha appeal site as comprising four parts. It is useful to continue to do so in this decision. The part of the appeal site described at the Inquiry as Area 1 is in part adjacent to and in part south of the Snoxhall Playing Fields. Area 2 lies to the south of the listed barns and to the north of footpath FP379. There is a connecting strip between Areas 1 and 2 that is adjacent to the DLp but lies within the appeal site. Area 3 is the land to the west of Area 2 and bounded by the access to Coldharbour Farmhouse, Knowle Lane, and the access and fields associated with the Redhurst group of dwellings.⁸ Area 4 lies to the south of footpath FP379, to the west of the DLp, to the north of a belt of trees that extends from the DLp to the rear of a group of dwellings located off Knowle Lane, and to the east of a belt of trees extending from these dwellings to the east of the Redhurst group and abutting footpath FP379. At the time of my site visit Area 4 contained a crop of Christmas trees. To the south of the appeal site there are open fields demarcated by hedgerows and trees.

⁶ ID16.

⁷ Emails from the appellant and KLRG dated 11 January; and from WBC 17 dated January 2024.

⁸ The Redhurst group of dwellings includes Hernshaw, Littlefold, Stable Cottage, Coach House Cottage, Craneswood and Redhurst.

14. The appellant's proposed Parameter Plan identifies an area of 5 ha as a Development Area⁹ and 6.7 ha for Green Infrastructure and Open Space¹⁰. The Parameter Plan also depicts the proposed vehicular access into the site from Knowle Lane and a proposed cycle/pedestrian access between the Development Area and the DLp. Area 1 is shown on the Parameter Plan as Green Infrastructure and Open Space.
15. A planning agreement between the appellant, WBC and SCC pursuant to section 106 of the 1990 Act is dated 20 December 2023 (s106 agreement).¹¹ This provides for the delivery of Affordable Housing and First Homes (30% of the dwellings) and managed land (including a LEAP and LAPs) on a phased basis.¹² It also provides for a number of plots to be made available for Self-Build or Custom-Build Housing (5% of the dwellings). The obligations to SCC include financial contributions towards a pedestrian and cycle link to, and along part of, the DLp (£116,000), improvements to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on and in the vicinity of Cranleigh High Street (£40,404.71), public transport infrastructure improvement (£24,452.83) and a Travel Plan Monitoring Fee of £6,150.

Main Issues

16. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - (1) The character and appearance of the area.
 - (2) Heritage assets.
 - (3) Highway safety and the need to travel by car.
 - (4) Flood risk and drainage.
 - (5) The supply of housing.

Reasons

The character and appearance of the area

17. There is a dispute about whether the appeal site is a valued landscape for the purposes of NPPF paragraph 180.¹³ National policy provides that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, (a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and (b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
18. The NPPF does not define valued landscapes. The Landscape Institute's Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 02/21 *Assessing landscape value outside national designations* sets out how the assessment of landscape value has evolved over time. The guidance in TGN 02/21 reflects both the Institute's *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition* (GLVIA3), including the list of factors set out in Box 5.1, and Natural England's *Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2013*. GLVIA3 recommends that when undertaking an assessment in an undesignated area, landscape value should be determined through a review of existing assessments, policies, strategies and guidelines and, where appropriate, by

⁹ Residential development to include C3 residential uses, roads, parking, open space, SUDS, landscaping and associated infrastructure. Maximum 2.5 story development (up to 11.5m).

¹⁰ Green infrastructure including landscape buffers, public open space such as areas of natural play, landscape planting and SUDS.

¹¹ ID22.

¹² LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play). LAP (Local Area for Play).

¹³ Table 1.0 of the Landscape SoCG. KLRG considers that the development would lead to significant and unacceptable urbanisation of what is currently a valued, and undeveloped rural area.

new survey and analysis.¹⁴ TGN 02/21 provides a structured and transparent assessment process that can include community-based evidence. It is useful guidance relevant to the circumstances that apply to this appeal. Before considering Table 1 of TGN 02/21 in more detail, I deal first with previous assessments relevant to the consideration of landscape value.

19. In the Surrey Historic Landscape Characterisation (2001) Areas 2, 3 and 4 of the appeal site are located within Historic Landscape Character (HLC) Type 102 *Medium irregular assarts and copses with wavy boundaries*. The northernmost part of the site (Area 1) is within HLC Type 1007 *Major sports fields and complexes*. The connecting strip between Areas 1 and 2 lies within HLC Type 905 *Smaller designed gardens*, which also encompasses Oaklands, Coldharbour Farmhouse, West Barn, The Brew and their associated gardens and adjoining fields. The description and historical rationale for HLC Type 905 includes paddocks being landscaped as part of wider gardens, but the field to the north of the listed barns, which is outside the appeal site, does not appear to have been landscaped and remains open.
20. HLC Type 102 is described as a field system created by the piecemeal clearance of the original woodland cover that probably took place in the early medieval period. This landscape sub-type occurs throughout the Low Weald. It was apparent from my site visit, and particularly so in aerial photographs, that the appeal site lies within a wider area between the DLp and Knowle Lane that is characterised by irregular shaped fields with wavy boundaries comprising mature trees and woodland, including oak trees. However, the appeal site does not contain fields bounded by narrow strips of coppiced woodland and there is no conclusive evidence of shaws (remnant strips of cleared woodland) that are identifying characteristics of HLC Type 102. There have also been changes to field boundaries over time.¹⁵ Some of the wavy field boundaries identified on older maps now comprise a few residual trees or have been moved or lost altogether. Nevertheless, the treed/wooded margins of the appeal site, especially along the access to Coldharbour Farmhouse, adjacent to Knowle Lane, and along the western and southern boundaries of Area 4, tie it into a distinctive wider landscape of assarted fields.
21. I asked the heritage experts at the Inquiry whether the assarted fields on and near to the appeal site are non-designated heritage assets. The evidence before me does not indicate that these fields warrant this status.¹⁶ Although assarted fields are a feature of the Low Weald, the landscape to the west of Knowle Lane is characterised by large, regular shaped fields, in HLC Type 144 *'Prairie' fields (large enclosures with extensive boundary loss)*. The contrast with the HLC Type 102 designation for the land between Knowle Lane and the DLp enhances the distinctiveness of the appeal site in its surrounds. In assessing landscape value, I have had regard to the field pattern and boundaries as a significant historic landscape feature.
22. The appeal site is located within National Character Area No.121: Low Weald. Key characteristics of this area include a generally pastoral landscape, with field boundaries of hedgerows and shaws enclosing small, irregular fields. The Low Weald has a strong sense of being an anciently settled and farmed

¹⁴ GLVIA3 paragraphs 5.27 and 5.28.

¹⁵ ID17. Some comparisons can be drawn with the 1806 Thomas Budgen Map, but its scale and level of detail/accuracy make this problematic.

¹⁶ ID18.

- landscape, with farmsteads (often of medieval origin) set in landscapes also enclosed in the medieval period and successively reorganised.
23. WBC's Landscape Study – Part 1: Farnham & Cranleigh prepared by AMEC, dated August 2014, aimed to assess the ability of the landscape to accommodate future residential development. A key objective of the study was to evaluate the capacity of the landscapes around the identified towns and villages to accept change, basing this on the value of these landscapes and their sensitivity. Area 1 of the appeal site and the connecting link between Areas 1 and 2 make up a small part of the study's Area CL-C, where the study found that infill development would not be out of character. However, it is not clear to what extent this applies to that part of Area CL-C that lies outside Area 1. Areas 2, 3 and 4 of the appeal site lie within Area CL-D of the study, which extends to farmland to the south of Area 4. The evaluation for Area CL-D concluded that it has moderate landscape sensitivity and medium landscape value. Only two of the bullet points for Area CL-D concern the appeal site. These refer to open fields in the northern part where the field slopes up to the west, with a boundary of hedges and trees, with low visibility into the field. If this is a reference to Area 2/Area 3 of the appeal site, it is not clear how the evaluation regarding visibility has taken into account views from footpath FP379. Furthermore, the evaluation makes no reference to the setting of the listed buildings. For these reasons, I have not found this study to be very helpful in assessing the landscape value of the appeal site.
 24. In the Surrey Landscape Character Assessment: Waverley Borough, dated April 2015, the appeal site is located within Landscape Type WW: Wooded Low Weald, where the historic landscape pattern associated with woodland management, grazing, farming and industrial activity is a key characteristic. Reference is also made to many scattered dwellings and farmsteads located along a network of rural, often sunken, lanes. Key positive landscape attributes include a generally intimate, mostly small scale, peaceful, pastoral and secluded landscape, with undulating landform, thick intact hedgerows with hedge trees, a pattern of historic rural settlement and scattered farmsteads accessed by a network of narrow winding rural lanes.
 25. The landscape strategy for the Wooded Low Weald is to conserve its areas of intimate, peaceful landscape, primarily through protection of its woodland, hedgerows and trees, along with limiting the spread of settlements. Land management guidelines include conserving historic elements of the landscape and the low key, rural character of footpaths. Conserving the rural, largely unsettled landscape, resisting further spread of low density dwellings and road infrastructure, conserving and enhancing the landscape setting to the edge of settlements, and conserving areas of undisturbed wooded skyline, are included in the guidelines for built development in Landscape Type WW. These guidelines add that new development should maintain the enclosure of the wooded setting and character of the surrounding landscape, and that built form should be contained within a wooded or treed setting.
 26. Within Landscape Type WW the appeal site, with the exception of the corridor linking Areas 1 and 2, lies within Landscape Character Area (LCA) WW6: Dunsfold to Pollingfold Wooded Low Weald. This is a large character area located to the south of Cranleigh. Its key characteristics include a patchwork of arable and pastoral fields, woodland blocks and hedges/tree belts. It is described as a rural tranquil landscape, due to limited influence from

settlement and road, with woodland blocks. An area extending from the eastern side of the corridor linking Areas 1 and 2 to Knowle Lodge on the western side of Knowle Lane, which includes Oaklands, Coldharbour Farmhouse and the listed barns, is excluded from LCA WW6 and included within the area shown as Cranleigh. However, it was apparent from my site visit that this area has a very different character to the urban area. It contains an open field adjacent to the listed barns, with the other dwellings set in large, wooded plots, all separated from buildings in Cranleigh by the DLp. Knowle Lodge is even further detached from the built area of Cranleigh and seen in the context of Knowle Park, which is within LCA WW6. I consider that this area excluded from LCA WW6 relates more to the surrounding countryside than it does to Cranleigh.

27. TGN 02/21 advises that landscape offers multiple values, benefits and services and the way in which landscapes are valued by people is a dynamic process that can change over time. In applying the factors in TGN 02/21 Table 1, I have considered not only the site itself and its features, elements, characteristics and qualities, but also their relationship with, and the role they play within, the site's context.¹⁷ The context here includes the edge of Cranleigh, Knowle Lane, the open land to the immediate south of the appeal site and the DLp.
28. There is a local ridge extending eastward from Knowle Park and over Knowle Lane into the appeal site. The east/west section of FP379 runs along this ridge line as it descends towards the DLp. Area 3 is part of the folded edge to the ridge as the land falls down towards Coldharbour Farmhouse. This adds some interesting relief into the local terrain. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment assessed 194 trees, 23 tree groups and 10 sections of hedgerow.¹⁸ This landscape has natural heritage interest by reason of the local topography, trees and hedgerows, which together contribute positively to its quality.
29. The listed former farm buildings and setting, along with the field pattern, and important hedgerows contribute in a positive way to appreciating the historical significance of this landscape. These features give the area an important dimension of time-depth. Historic England's Guiding principles for Historic Landscape Characterisation states that landscape in an intensively occupied, used and experienced place like Britain is more about history than geography: its most important characteristic is its time-depth; the appreciation that change and earlier landscapes exist in the present landscape.¹⁹ Cultural heritage in the locality here adds significantly to its landscape value.
30. The land to the south and west of Cranleigh between Knowle Lane and the DLp that encompasses the appeal site is characterised by a strong framework of wooded areas, tree belts and hedgerows. Much of this vegetation is in a good state.²⁰ The Christmas tree plantation in Area 4, which is not under active management, currently appears as an incongruous element within this landscape resource. However, as a commercial crop, the impact of the Christmas trees would be likely to vary over time. It is not a consideration that

¹⁷ The factors cited are Natural heritage, Cultural heritage, Landscape condition, Associations, Distinctiveness, Recreational, Perceptual (Scenic), Perceptual (Wildness and tranquillity) and Functional. TGN 02/21 also states that value is best appreciated at the scale at which a landscape is perceived – rarely is this on a field-by-field basis.

¹⁸ CD2/1i.

¹⁹ CD1/5b Appendix B.

²⁰ The appeal site contains 45 Category A oak trees, 2 Category A ash trees and 3 Category A tree groups.

detracts much from the overall landscape condition of the area. In any event TGN 02/21 notes that poor landscape management should not be a reason to deny a landscape valued status. The semi-improved grassland may have limited ecological value, but it adds to openness and so makes a contribution to landscape structure. Overall, this is a landscape that is in a good physical state.

31. The Inquiry was not informed about any associations of this landscape with people or events that would add to its value. However, its physical characteristics give it a strong sense of place. This derives largely from the contrast between the countryside to the west of the DLp and urban development to the east of the link, which contributes to the character and identity of Cranleigh. Knowle Lane is an example of a feature referred to in Landscape Type WW: Wooded Low Weald.²¹ Assarted fields are identified as a landscape sub-type that occurs throughout the Low Weald.²² These are not, therefore, rare features. Nevertheless, they are landscape elements characteristic of this place that help to confer a strong sense of identity. The majority of the key positive landscape attributes for LCA WW6 apply to the appeal site. The distinctiveness of this landscape contributes positively to its value.
32. Footpath FP378 provides a pedestrian route to FP379 and the DLp. FP379 across the appeal site and the DLp along its boundary provide recreational opportunities to experience this landscape and add to its value. The DLp is a well-used long-distance route where experience of the countryside is likely to be an important consideration for those traversing the link. FP379 provides views of parts of the appeal site from elevated vantage points. These views of a rural scene are likely to enhance recreational activity and add value to the landscape.
33. In terms of how the local landscape is perceived, it is significant that part of the appeal site is designated as an ASVI. The emerging CNP proposes to extend the southern boundary of the existing ASVI to include all of Area 1 of the appeal site.²³ Little weight can be attributed to the CNP at this stage. Nevertheless, this proposed CNP designation is indicative of how much this part of the appeal site is appreciated by the local community for its visual amenity. Written representations at the application and appeal stages also referred to the attractive landscape, which provides distant views to the Surrey Hills National Landscape.²⁴ It was apparent from my site visit that the topography, trees, open land and historic buildings create visual diversity that contributes to an appreciation of this landscape. The scenic quality of this landscape adds significantly to its value.
34. The Perceptual (Wilderness and tranquillity) value of this landscape is affected by the proximity of urban development to the east of the DLp and traffic using Knowle Lane. Aircraft noise was apparent at times on my site visit. Notwithstanding these influences, parts of the appeal site feel quite secluded. What relative tranquillity the site offers would be of value to those wanting to enjoy the countryside outside Cranleigh.

²¹ Landscape Type WW: Wooded Low Weald refers to scattered dwellings and farmsteads located along a network of rural, often sunken, lanes.

²² CD7/2g.

²³ The proposed extension does not include the connecting strip between Area 1 and Area 2. CNP CRAN11 at CD6/1c.

²⁴ Formerly Surrey Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

35. This overall rural landscape does not perform a clearly identifiable and valuable function beyond that attributable to its agricultural land value and contribution to wildlife corridors. These are largely typical for the wider local area, but there is some enhanced advantage derived from the proximity of the wooded DLp corridor.
36. Taking into account all the factors in TGN 02/21, the evidence before the Inquiry and what I experienced on site, I consider that the landscape qualities of the area elevate it above other more everyday landscapes. It has more than 'ordinary' value in the context of the wider character and landscape area. My overall judgement is that the appeal site is part of a valued landscape for the purposes of applying NPPF paragraph 180. I turn next to the effect of the proposal on landscape character.²⁵
37. I have no reason to doubt, subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions, that the proposed development could provide a reasonable relationship with retained trees.²⁶ Furthermore, the development would accord with the guideline for Landscape Type WW that built form should be contained within a wooded or treed setting. However, there would be a loss of mature vegetation within the existing embankment on Knowle Lane to create the access. This, along with widening of the lane to provide the required visibility splay, would detract from the rural character of this sunken part of the lane.²⁷ Replacement planting would not fully compensate for this loss. Retained trees within the proposed development would also be seen in the context of urban residential development rather than in a countryside setting. Area 1 would not be developed, but an existing open field would be divided for land ownership reasons, with implications for its boundary treatment.
38. The proposed development in accordance with the Parameter Plan would be likely to have a significant adverse impact on the natural landform. The construction of access roads and housing platforms would alter the bowl-shaped valley in Area 3 and the slope in Area 2, reducing the significance of these features as contributors to the character of the area. Appreciation of the folded edge to the ridge would be lost by these changes to the local topography.
39. More significantly, the change from a predominantly rural character to an urban environment, albeit surrounded by trees, would fundamentally change the character of the area. Any remaining appreciation of the assarted field pattern would be subsumed within a suburban housing development in Areas 2, 3 and 4. Rooftops and parts of dwellings located to the east of the DLp can be seen from the appeal site in some places through or above the wooded link. However, these glimpses would not mean that the proposed 162 dwellings would be perceived in the context of built development at Cranleigh. The DLp forms an effective visual and perceptual barrier between the appeal site and Cranleigh. The proposed development would not be perceived as a logical extension to the built-up area. Overall, I consider that the changes to the area from the proposed development would result in an adverse effect on landscape

²⁵ Having regard to the evidence adduced at the inquiry and Tables 2.0 and 3.0 of the Landscape SoCG.

²⁶ Planning SoCG paragraphs 2.3.6-10.

²⁷ David Williams (DW) Viewpoint A, Michelle Bolger (MB) Photos U, V, W, X.

character of substantial significance.²⁸ I deal next with the visual effects of the proposal.²⁹

40. The Parameter Plan provides for residential development of “Maximum 2.5 storey development (up to 11.5m)”. From some parts of the Snoxhall Playing Fields it would be possible to see development of this scale that was sited close to the ridge line that divides Areas 2 and 4.³⁰ This development would be seen above the roof of the listed barns, where it would detract from what would otherwise be interpreted as the wider countryside setting of Cranleigh. The playing fields are used both for active sport and more leisurely recreation and so users should be considered to be of ‘medium/high sensitivity’. Given the separation distance from this vantage point, the development would have an adverse visual impact of moderate/minor significance.
41. Views into the proposed development from Knowle Lane beyond the widened access would be screened by a replacement bank and planting.³¹ Nevertheless, the introduction of an urban access road into an attractive sunken rural lane would harm the visual amenity of the area. Those using the lane are ‘medium sensitivity’ visual receptors. I consider that changes to the lane would result in an adverse visual impact of moderate significance that would not lessen over time.
42. There would be some views from the DLp in glimpses between trees and vegetation, especially where the link is elevated and in winter when trees have lost leaves.³² For those moving along the link a series of glimpses of houses and urban infrastructure within the proposed development would be read, cumulatively, as a large-scale residential development. It is unlikely that additional planting would be able to screen out this effect. Those using the link would sense that it was enclosed by urban development along the length of the eastern boundary of the appeal site. Users of the DLp are ‘high sensitivity’ users and the proposal would have an adverse visual effect of moderate/substantial significance.
43. The most significant views into the proposed development would be from FP379, a part of which runs along the top of the ridge. The appellant’s landscape expert considers that in Year 1 of the development the adverse visual effect on FP379 would be of “Major Substantial to Moderate” significance, and in Year 15 would be “Moderate/Substantial to Moderate/Slight adverse”. WBC’s landscape expert considers that the “Major Substantial to Moderate adverse” level of harm would still apply in Year 15.³³
44. Residential development on the higher parts of Area 2 would obstruct views from FP379 towards the listed buildings and their setting.³⁴ Any views over Area 4 would be towards a large area of residential development.³⁵ The access road between Areas 2 and 4 would cross FP379 opening up views of residential development both sides of the path. This would significantly detract from the

²⁸ In my judgements about significance for landscape and visual effects I have applied a verbal scale of major, substantial, moderate, minor and negligible – with intermediate judgements between two levels where the order in which they are expressed makes no difference.

²⁹ Having regard to the evidence adduced at the inquiry and Table 4.0 of the Landscape SoCG.

³⁰ DW Photos 1, 14 and 15, MB Photo O, MB Figure 12.

³¹ Access Junction: Landscape Proposals Plan.

³² DW Photo 4, MB Photo Y.

³³ Table 4.0 Landscape SoCG.

³⁴ DW Photos 6 and 7, MB Photos P, Qa and R, MB Figure 18.

³⁵ MB Photo Qb, MB Figure 20.

visual experience of those walking the footpath to access the countryside outside Cranleigh. For Area 3 the current views over attractive countryside from FP379 would be replaced by views into a residential development, some at close range, with longer views of houses and the access road over an intervening sheep paddock.³⁶ Tree planting and landscaping within the proposed development might be able to soften the impact on some of these views, but any such masking would be likely to be seen as townscape landscaping associated with urban infrastructure and activities. This would not mitigate the harm to the visual amenity of the area. I consider that the proposed development would have an adverse visual effect on the users of FP379 of substantial/major significance in Year 1, Year 15 and thereafter.

45. Taking all these considerations into account, I consider that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area of substantial significance.
46. The proposed development would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with the land management guidelines for Landscape Type WW because it would not conserve historic elements of the landscape and the low key, rural character of footpaths, or the rural landscape. Furthermore, the dwellings and road infrastructure would not conserve or enhance the landscape setting to the edge of settlements.
47. The scheme would not protect and enhance a valued landscape and so would not contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment in accordance with NPPF paragraph 180. This would bring the proposal into conflict with LPP1 Policy RE1, which states that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and safeguarded in accordance with the NPPF. The appeal scheme would not respect the distinctive character of the landscape in which it is located and so would be at odds with LPP1 Policy RE3. The site is defined as a rural area in LPP2 where Policy DM15 applies. The proposal would not accord with this policy because it fails to appropriately recognise the natural beauty and undeveloped character that is intrinsic to the open countryside.

Heritage assets

48. WBC and the appellant agree that the proposed development would not cause direct harm to the fabric of the three listed buildings, but that harm would result from the introduction of built form into a part of the identified assets' setting. This level of harm is agreed to be in the spectrum of less than substantial harm.³⁷
49. The appellant's heritage expert acknowledges that harm would arise from the introduction of built form into a part of the historic rural agricultural landscape to the south of the former farm.³⁸ The listed buildings have some group value as a former farmstead, but now have separate curtilages. The listed barns have been altered with additional fenestration. Nonetheless, their form and countryside location, with adjoining open fields, make apparent their agricultural origin. This is not diminished by the current absence of a

³⁶ DW Photo 8, MB Photo S, MB Figure 16.

³⁷ Built Heritage SoCG. KLRG supports WBC's position on heritage matters.

³⁸ CD1/5d paragraph 4.1.6.

functional or ownership association between the fields and the listed buildings. It was apparent from my site visit that the listed buildings can be experienced from parts of Area 1, Area 2 and Area 3 of the appeal site, and these areas form part of the setting to these heritage assets. Footpath FP379 falls within this setting, but the extent to which the former historic farmstead can be experienced reduces significantly further south into Area 4.

50. The South East Farmsteads Character Assessment notes that historic farmsteads are an integral part of the landscape.³⁹ Advice in Historic England's Agricultural Buildings Listing Selection Guide states that some buildings may possess extra interest because they relate to an especially intact field system that is strongly representative of the character and development of a regional farming pattern.⁴⁰ The field pattern here is not especially intact but what remains of the open fields and field boundaries assists in interpreting the listed buildings in their historic context and adds to their local significance.
51. Taking into account the evidence before the Inquiry and from what I experienced at my site visit, I consider that the setting of the listed buildings makes an important contribution to their significance by reason of historic interest. This is less so for Coldharbour Farmhouse, which is set within a large domestic curtilage containing mature trees and vegetation that diminishes the relationship between the farmhouse and the open fields.
52. Residential development of the appeal site would alter the rural setting of the listed buildings to one more characteristic of urban fringe. Housing on the higher ground in Areas 2 and 3 would significantly reduce the setting of the listed buildings. Furthermore, the intervening space would, as shown on the illustrative masterplan, most likely comprise a drainage basin, children's play area, landscaped natural greenspace, amenity space and access roads. This, along with other infrastructure necessarily associated with suburban housing development, including the proposed footpath/cycle link to the DLp through the corridor between Areas 1 and 2, would harm the setting of the listed buildings. The proposed reinstatement of an east/west hedgerow to the south of the listed barns would not mitigate this harm.
53. The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed buildings, at the lower end of the scale for Coldharbour Farmhouse and a medium/high level of harm for the listed barns. NPPF paragraph 205 requires great weight to be given to the conservation of these assets. In accordance with LPP1 Policy HA1, LPP2 Policy DM20 and NPPF paragraph 208, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Highway safety and the need to travel by car

54. Highway safety and sustainable location considerations were not an issue for WBC. SCC as Highway Authority agreed technical matters with the appellant's highway expert about site access, traffic assessment and impact, traffic calming and sustainable accessibility.⁴¹ However, KLRG submitted evidence to the Inquiry about these matters and considers that the development would cause severe residual (cumulative) impact on the road network.

³⁹ CD7/3f.

⁴⁰ CD7/3h.

⁴¹ Transport SoCG.

55. KLRG questioned the accuracy of the appellant's traffic modelling and produced its own run of the TEMPro model. Any modelling relies on assumptions. The appellant's highway witness was asked about the planning data tab in the model, but said that he does not do the TEMPro growth factor himself and that this work was undertaken by other people. In KLRG's modelling it is not clear to what extent the inclusion of past and future housing development might result in any double counting or conflict with other assumptions in the model. The Inquiry was not able to come to a definitive view about traffic modelling on the evidence adduced. In the circumstances, I consider that it is reasonable to assume that the Highway Authority is familiar with TEMPro and to give significant weight to the fact that the responsible authority took no issue with the way the model was used in the traffic assessment.⁴²
56. It was apparent from my site visit that KLRG's concerns about forward visibility near the bend in Knowle Lane to the south of the proposed new access are not unfounded. The alignment, topography and roadside vegetation in this part of the lane are significant constraints. However, I am satisfied, with the provision of appropriate traffic calming, that the proposed visibility splays would comply with relevant guidance. Maintaining the splays unobstructed would be a matter for WBC. I am not convinced that queuing vehicles would have an unacceptable adverse effect on visibility. I concur with the Highway Authority that safe and suitable access to the site could be achieved for all users.
57. Additional traffic on Knowle Lane from the proposed development would, at times, add to congestion at the junction of the lane and Cranleigh High Street. Vehicles loading or waiting on-street near to this junction can result in queuing, but this is an enforcement matter. KLRG's dispute about the modelling also concerns the predictions for the operation of this junction. Again, in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, I prefer the advice from the Highway Authority that the proposed development could be accommodated within the existing operating capacity of the local highway network and would not result in any significant adverse disruption to the free flow of traffic on the local highway network.
58. KLRG considers that the appellant's claims in respect of 'sustainable transport' are greatly overstated. Cranleigh acts as a service centre and provides a range of commercial and community facilities. The appeal scheme provides for improvements to pedestrian and cycle access to Cranleigh High Street. There are bus stops on Horsham Road some 800 m to the east of the appeal site. Bus service 63 provides an hourly service between Horsham and Guildford Monday to Saturday. I am satisfied that the proposal would, subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions and obligations, limit the need to travel by car and would offer a genuine choice of transport modes.
59. On the evidence before me, I find that vehicles associated with the proposed development would be unlikely to have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or to result in the severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network, that would in accordance with the NPPF justify preventing or refusing the proposed development on highways grounds. The Highway Authority does not object to the scheme. Subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions and obligations, I find no conflict with LPP1 Policy ST1 concerning

⁴² Transport SoCG paragraph 3.1 states; "The junction modelling takes account of future development in the local area through application of a suitable growth factor (extracted from TEMPro – Trip End Model Presentation Program, the industry standard tool for estimating traffic growth)."

sustainable transport modes. The development would not be isolated from everyday services and facilities and would maximise opportunities for walking and cycling, and so would not conflict with LPP2 Policy DM15.

Flood risk and drainage

60. KLRG considers that there are insufficient safeguards in place to provide reasonable guarantees to fully protect neighbouring sites against the risk of flooding. Flooding and drainage was not a matter taken up by WBC. SCC as LLFA is satisfied that the level of detail in the submitted flood risk assessment and drainage strategy is sufficient for this outline planning application and that a detailed drainage design could be secured through planning conditions.⁴³
61. Concerns raised by KLRG include the focussing of discharge from the appeal site to particular points and the capacity of off-site ditches to take these flows, along with potential for disruption to groundwater flows. Flooding at Snoxhall Playing Fields and the adjacent car park already occurs. To the south of the appeal site KLRG queries the ability of the appellant to improve the off-site ditch to Holdhurst Brook. The LLFA advised that if the appellant's drainage strategy was implemented as proposed, there would be no increase in surface water flood risk to areas beyond the site boundaries. The LLFA notes that the construction of final outfall headwalls to any Ordinary Watercourse would require Land Drainage consent under section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991.
62. Taking all the above into account, I am satisfied that flood risk and drainage considerations would not be an insurmountable obstacle to granting outline planning permission. It was apparent from my site visit that there is reasonable scope here for a drainage scheme to be devised and implemented to ensure that surface and any groundwater from the proposed development could be adequately managed without adding to the risk of flooding elsewhere. This is a matter that could be adequately addressed by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions. I find no conflict with LPP1 Policy CC4 and LPP2 Policy DM1 a) regarding flood risk and SuDS.

The supply of housing

63. The appellant and WBC agree that application of the standard method requires a minimum of 755 dwellings per year and that this should be used to calculate supply for the purpose of this appeal.⁴⁴ There is a dispute about the deliverability of 7 sites, which gives rise to a disagreement about the 5-year housing land supply. WBC considers that this equates to a supply of 3.89 years (a shortfall of 836 homes), whereas the appellant's position is that the 5-year deliverable housing land supply is 2,265 homes and equivalent to a 3.0-year supply (a shortfall of 1,510 homes).
64. Dunsfold Aerodrome is a strategic allocation in LPP1 for around 2,600 homes and benefits from an outline planning permission for 1,800 dwellings and full permission for commercial uses. Based on evidence from the promoters of the site setting out the timescales for delivery trajectory, WBC included 374 dwellings within the 5-year supply.⁴⁵ However, there is no convincing evidence about progress towards submission of a required masterplan or a reserved

⁴³ Flood Risk and Drainage SoCG.

⁴⁴ SoCG on Housing Delivery and 5-Year Housing Land Supply at CD1/3f.

⁴⁵ 50 dwellings in 2025/6, 120 in 2026/7 and 204 in 2027/8.

- matters application. There is progress on highway construction to open up the site for development, but no housebuilder has been secured. The site lacks the clear evidence necessary to be considered deliverable.
65. WBC includes Land at Coxbridge Farm for 60 dwellings. The site has outline planning permission for 320 dwellings and pre-application discussions with a national housebuilder about a reserved matters application are ongoing.⁴⁶ Provision for 60 dwellings reflects a requirement for additional infrastructure before more homes could be constructed. Notwithstanding that no reserved matters application has been submitted or outline permission conditions discharged, I prefer WBC's submission for this site. There is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within 5 years.
66. Residential development of the Wey Hill Youth Campus site at Haslemere requires the relocation of existing premises.⁴⁷ New buildings are required for two community groups and pre-application discussions for identified WBC-owned sites in Haslemere are proposed for 2024. The necessary clear evidence to include 34 dwellings in the deliverable supply is lacking for this site, especially as funding arrangements for its redevelopment are yet to be explored by WBC.
67. There is an outstanding objection from Natural England to the development of The Old Grove, High Pitfold, Hindhead. The outline planning application for up to 18 dwellings was submitted in August 2021, but Special Protection Area mitigation remains unresolved. The site is allocated in LPP2 for 40 dwellings, but in the absence of any convincing evidence about proposals to remove Natural England's objection its deliverability remains questionable. There is no clear evidence to include the site in the 5-year supply.
68. Land at Secretts Hurst Farm, Milford is an LPP2 allocation for 177 dwellings. WBC resolved in August 2023 to grant hybrid planning permission for a mixed commercial and residential scheme (full planning permission for 216 dwellings) subject to a section 106 planning obligation and consultation with the Secretary of State. Given that it is currently unknown whether the application will be called in for determination by the Secretary of State, along with uncertainty about the time to finalise the necessary legal obligations, I am not convinced that the site would be likely to contribute the 168 dwellings anticipated by WBC within 5 years. In the absence of evidence about infrastructure provision and the time anticipated to deal with likely pre-commencement conditions, I do not consider that there is currently clear evidence to demonstrate that the site would deliver in the 5-year period.
69. The only evidence adduced for Land at Highcroft, Milford (7 dwellings) and The National Trust Car Park, Hindhead (13 dwellings) is an allocation in LPP2. Notwithstanding that these are small sites, their allocation by itself is not the clear evidence necessary to demonstrate deliverability.
70. Taking all the above into account, WBC cannot currently demonstrate a sufficient housing land supply in accordance with NPPF paragraph 77, and I find the shortfall to be about 1,450 dwellings. This is a serious and significant shortfall. WBC is taking a proactive approach to deal with the shortfall, with a

⁴⁶ WBC advised that pre-application discussions are confidential and so it is not possible to provide details, only that discussions have taken place.

⁴⁷ ID11 and ID12.

call for sites to be considered in the preparation of a new local plan. However, this is at an early stage.

71. The appeal scheme would include 30% Affordable Housing Units and First Homes. The s106 agreement provides that of these, unless otherwise agreed by WBC, 25% are to be First Homes, 16% Affordable Rent, 8% Shared Ownership and 51% Social Rented Units. The proposed development would also include 5% of the dwellings made available as self-build or custom-build. The proposal would appropriately address LPP1 Policy AHN1 and AHN3 concerning affordable housing and housing types. It would also accord with LPP2 Policy DM36 (self-build and custom housebuilding) and be in line with the guidance set out in WBC's 2023 Affordable Housing SPD.
72. The proposed development would make an important contribution to the supply of housing given the identified shortfall in WBC's 5-year housing land supply. The provision of affordable housing would be particularly beneficial given the circumstances outlined in the Affordable Housing Technical Note at CD1/5n. The current clear and pressing local need for affordable housing delivery was not disputed by WBC at the Inquiry.

Other Matters

73. The Parameter Plan specifies that some 57% of the appeal site would be greenspace and multi-functional open space. The illustrative layout would deliver a 79.48% net gain in habitat units and a 15.06% net gain in hedgerow units against a policy requirement in LPP2 Policy DM1 g)i. of at least 10%. The proposed development would not result in harm to protected species and accords with LPP1 Policies NE1 and NE2 concerning the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and provision of green infrastructure.⁴⁸
74. The appeal site is classified as grade 3b agricultural land and so contains no land designated as the best and most versatile agricultural land for the purposes of applying part c) of LPP2 Policy DM15. Any loss of agricultural productivity in this case would not weigh against the proposal.
75. KLRG considers that the village's infrastructure is already under intense pressure and that existing approved schemes present the real risk of placing the village in a state of overload. Written representations from local residents include submissions that local services and facilities would not be able to provide for the needs of the future residents of the proposed development. However, no convincing evidence was adduced to support dismissing the appeal on the grounds of an unacceptable adverse effect of the proposal on local infrastructure and services.

Planning balance

76. In applying NPPF paragraph 208 I have given considerable importance and weight to the harm I have identified to the listed buildings. In my judgement the public benefit arising from the significant contribution of the scheme to market and affordable housing would, by itself, be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the designated heritage assets. I find, therefore, no conflict with LPP1 Policy HA1 or LPP2 Policy DM20, which both refer to the NPPF.

⁴⁸ Planning SoCG paragraphs 2.3.11-2.3.14.

77. For the reasons set out in the next section of this decision I have found that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and so should not be approved by virtue of NPPF paragraph 11.c). NPPF paragraph 11.d) is engaged here by Footnote 8. Given my finding regarding NPPF paragraph 208 in this case, there is no clear reason for refusal on heritage grounds for the purposes of applying NPPF paragraph 11.d)i. and so the planning balance is as set out in paragraph 11.d)ii. The Planning SoCG sets out the respective positions of WBC and the appellant on benefits and harm.
78. The proposal would boost the supply of homes in WBC and make an important contribution to addressing the shortfall. This is a consideration that attracts significant/substantial weight, particularly so as 30% of the dwellings would be affordable housing. The contribution of the 5% self-build and custom-build plots would be beneficial and would help to address past under-delivery in WBC. However, a desire to build one's own house is not comparable to the needs of those eligible for affordable housing. The provision of self-build and custom-build plots attracts limited weight.
79. Not much weight can be afforded to the early delivery of the 162 dwellings as the suggested planning condition specifies the standard 3-year period for the submission of reserved matters applications with commencement within 2 years of the final approval of the last of such matters to be approved.⁴⁹
80. Ecological enhancement and Biodiversity Net Gain above that required would be a benefit that should be given slight weight. The development would add to the local economy. However, Cranleigh is a large settlement and any socio-economic benefits from the development of 162 dwellings would be modest in this context and should only attract limited weight. The other benefits claimed; open space provision, supporting local services, off-site contributions to infrastructure, along with sustainability benefits, would be advantageous to the community. However, these should only be given limited weight in this balancing exercise because they would primarily address the impact of the proposal in this countryside location outside the settlement boundary of Cranleigh.
81. WBC argues that the proposal would result in substantial harm to its Spatial Strategy. But it seems to me that if that was so it would be a consideration that added to the conflict with the development plan rather than amounting to a separate element of harm in the planning balance. I address this in the next section of this decision.
82. Unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, which includes a valued landscape, weighs heavily against the proposal. This attracts substantial weight in the planning balance. I have also given considerable weight to the overall harm to the listed buildings.
83. Taking all these considerations into account, my overall judgement is that the adverse impacts of granting outline permission for the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against NPPF policies taken as a whole.

⁴⁹ ID21.

Development plan

84. If NPPF paragraph 11.d and Footnote 8 mean that a lack of a 5-year housing land supply renders the most important policies for determining this appeal out of date, then that does not prescribe the weight that should be attached to those policies. LPP1 Policies SP1, RE1, RE3 and HA1 are consistent with the NPPF. So too, are LPP2 Policies DM15 and DM20. The appellant and WBC agree that LPP1 Policy SP2 is out of date.⁵⁰
85. LPP1 Policy SP1 reflects provisions of the NPPF and seeks to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Given the planning balance in this case and the conflict I have identified with the NPPF the proposal does not accord with Policy SP1.
86. The spatial strategy set out in LPP1 Policy SP2 to maintain Waverley's character whilst ensuring that development needs are met in a sustainable manner is to, amongst other things, 1. avoid major development on land of the highest amenity and landscape value, such as the Surrey Hills AONB and to safeguard the Green Belt, and 2. focus development at the four main settlements, one of which is Cranleigh. I do not consider that this policy only applies to landscapes that have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, as set out in the NPPF. The reference to 'amenity' gives it a wider meaning. It also refers to safeguarding the Green Belt, which is primarily a spatial rather than a landscape designation. LPP1 does not define what constitutes 'land of the highest amenity and landscape value' and whether a particular parcel of land can so be described, or not, is a matter of planning judgement. In this case I consider that the valued landscape I have identified falls within land of the highest amenity and landscape value for the purposes of applying Policy SP2. As major development, the proposal would conflict with part 1. of this policy. However, the weight this policy conflict attracts is limited by the spatial strategy being based on a housing requirement derived from 2015 data.
87. Part 2. of Policy SP2 seeks to focus development at the main settlements. I am satisfied that the appeal site would reasonably comply with this element of the spatial strategy. Focussing development infers a concentration or convergence of development at a settlement, which the appeal scheme would achieve. There is some support for this interpretation in the supporting text at paragraph 5.16 of LPP1. This recognises "that there is a limit to which sites within existing settlements can meet the Borough's needs for development, particularly new homes. Therefore, it will be necessary to allow some expansion of settlements through the development of suitable sites on the edges of settlements". However, given the harm I have identified, I do not consider the appeal site to be a suitable site on the edge of Cranleigh for the proposed development.
88. The proposal conflicts with LPP1 Policy RE1, LPP1 Policy RE3 and LPP2 Policy DM15 for the reasons set out in paragraph 47 of this decision. With the additional policy conflict from LPP1 Policies SP1 and SP2, I find that the proposed development does not accord with the development plan taken as a whole.

⁵⁰ Planning SoCG.

Conclusions

89. The proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and would result in unacceptable harm to designated heritage assets. The proposal conflicts with the development plan. The planning balance falls against the proposal and the scheme gains no support from the NPPF when taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations in this case to indicate that the development plan should not be followed. I have considered all other matters raised in evidence, but I have found nothing of sufficient weight to alter my conclusions. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Woolcock

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

David Lintott of counsel

He called

Katherine Dove MPlan MRTPI
Michelle Bolger FLI DipLA BA
PGCE BA
Sophie Piper BA (Hons) MSc IHBC
Spencer Copping BA (Hons) DipTP
MRTPI

Principal Planning Officer WBC
Director Michelle Bolger Expert Landscape
Consultancy
Principal Conservation Officer WBC
Planning Director WS Planning & Architecture

FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Litton KC

He called

Jeff Richards BA (Hons) MTP
MRTPI
Philip Bell BEng (Hons) MCIT MILT
MCIHT
Paul Jenkin BEng (Hons) MSc
CEng CWEM FCIWEM
David Williams BA (Hons) Dip
(Hons) LA CMLI
Jonathan Smith BA (Hons) MA
PGCE PGDip MCIFA IHBC
Anna Gillings BSc (Hons) DipTP
MRTPI AIEMA

Senior Director Turley
Managing Director Motion Consultants Limited
Director of Flood Risk Management Abley
Letchford Partnership Limited
Director David Williams Landscape
Consultancy Ltd
Senior Director RPS Group
Managing Director Gillings Planning Limited

In respect of Planning Condition matters

Hannah Pearce BA (Hons) MA
MRTPI

Director Gillings Planning Limited

Emma Philpott CEng CWEM
MCIWEM

Associate Director Abley Letchford Partnership
Limited

In respect of Planning Obligation matters

James Smith

Solicitor James Smith (Planning Law Services)
Limited

FOR KNOWLE LANE RESIDENTS' GROUP (Rule 6 Party):

Edmund Forrester

He called

Edmund Forrester BSc (Hons)

Local resident

Michael Piotrowski BSc (Hons)

Principal Hydrologist Geosmart Information Limited

Andrew Bandosz BA (Hons)

Director D&M Planning Ltd

DipUPI RTPI

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY (ID)

ID	1	Appellant's Opening Statement
ID	2	Opening Submissions on behalf of Waverley Borough Council
ID	3	Report on the Examination of the Waverley Local Plan Part 2 13 March 2023
ID	4	Appeal Ref:APP/R3650/W/19/3234716 Land at Alfold Garden Centre
ID	5	Appeal Information regarding Old Compton Lane, Land South of Alfold Garden Centre, Land West of Loxwood Road and Land East of Loxwood Road
ID	6	Appeal Ref:APP/R3650/W/22/3301692 Land at Windacres Farm
ID	7	Highway Boundary Plan
ID	8	Supplementary Modelling prepared by Calum McGoff [Motion]
ID	9	Title Boundary with Proposed Access Overlay
ID	10	Summary PoE Proposal's Impact on the Heritage Assets on behalf of Knowle Lane Residents Group
ID	11	Update note by WBC regarding land at Wey Hill Haslemere
ID	12	Appellant's note on Wey Hill Youth Campus
ID	13	Revised Landscape Statement of Common Ground Appellant and WBC November 2023
ID	14	Appellant's Technical Note Surface Water Off Site Drainage Connectivity including Drawing No.A423-SK-001 P1
ID	15	Knowle Lane Residents' Group updated suggested Flood Risk and Drainage Conditions
ID	16	High Court judgment Case No:CO/1578/2023 dated 28 November 2023
ID	17	Built heritage SoCG Addendum Note 1 including Appendices i and ii
ID	18	Built heritage SoCG Addendum Note 2
ID	19	Local Heritage Listing: Identifying and Conserving Local Heritage Advice Note 7 (Second Edition) Historic England
ID	20	Field Systems Introductions to Heritage Assets Historic England
ID	21	Suggested conditions by appellant and WBC
ID	22	Section 106 planning agreement dated 20 December 2023
ID	23	CIL Compliance Statement
ID	24	Closing Submissions of Knowle Lane Residents' Group
ID	25	Closing Submissions on behalf of Waverley Borough Council
ID	26	Appellant's Closing Submissions

CORE DOCUMENTS (CD)

CD1/1 Appeal Submissions	
CD1/1a	Appeal submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, dated July 2023
CD1/1b	Waverley Borough Council's Appeal Questionnaire, including list of supporting documents
CD1/2 Statements of Case (SoC)	
CD1/2a	Appellant's Statement of Case, dated July 2023, prepared by Gillings Planning
CD1/2b	Council's Statement of Case, dated September 2023, prepared by WS Planning & Architecture
CD1/2c	Rule 6 Party Statement of Case, dated September 2023, prepared by Knowle Lane Residents Group
CD1/3 Statements of Common Ground (SoCG)	
CD1/3a	Planning Statement of Common Ground – prepared between Council and Appellant
CD1/3b	Landscape Statement of Common Ground – prepared between Council and Appellant
CD1/3c	Built Heritage Statement of Common Ground – prepared between the Council and the Appellant (dated 19 October)
CD1/3d	Flood Risk and Drainage Statement of Common Ground – prepared between LLFA and the Appellant (dated 21 September)
CD1/3e	Transport Statement of Common Ground – prepared between Surrey County Council and the Appellant (dated 6 October)
CD1/3f	5YHLS Statement of Common Ground – prepared between the Council and the Appellant (dated 18 October)
CD1/3g	Planning Statement of Common Ground – Appendix SOCG1 – DRAFT List of Suggested Conditions (v2 dated 24 October 2023)
CD1/4 Council's Proofs of Evidence (PoE)	
CD1/4a	Council's Landscape Proof of Evidence, prepared by Michelle Bolger (<i>Figure 5 superseded – updated version provided as CD1/4b/iii</i>)
CD1/4b/i	Council's Landscape Proof of Evidence – Appendices – Part 1
CD1/4b/ii	Council's Landscape Proof of Evidence – Appendices – Part 2
CD1/4b/iii	Council's Landscape Proof of Evidence – Figure 5: Historic Landscape Character
CD1/4c	Council's Heritage Proof of Evidence, prepared by Sophie Piper
CD1/4d	Council's Heritage Proof of Evidence – Appendices
CD1/4e/i	Superseded – Council's Planning Proof of Evidence including Appendices, prepared by Spencer Copping, dated October 2023
CD1/4e/ii	Council's Planning Proof of Evidence, prepared by Spencer Copping, lodged 3 November 2023
CD1/4e/iii	Erratum to Planning Proof of Evidence, prepared by Spencer Copping
CD1/4f	Council's Planning Proof of Evidence – Appendices
CD1/4g	Council's Housing Land Supply Proof of Evidence, prepared by Katherine Dove
CD1/4h	Council's Housing Land Supply Proof of Evidence – Appendix 1
CD1/5 Appellant's Proofs of Evidence (PoE)	
CD1/5a	Appellant's Landscape Proof of Evidence, prepared by David Williams
CD1/5b	Appellant's Landscape Proof of Evidence – Appendices
CD1/5c	Appellant's Landscape Proof of Evidence – Summary

CD1/5d	Appellant's Built Heritage Proof of Evidence, prepared by Jonathan Smith (with Figures included)
CD1/5e	Appellant's Built Heritage Proof of Evidence – Summary
CD1/5f	Appellant's Planning Matters Proof of Evidence, prepared by Anna Gillings (including Appendix 1)
CD1/5g	Appellant's Planning Matters Proof of Evidence – Summary
CD1/5h	Appellant's Housing Delivery and Five Year Housing Land Supply Proof of Evidence, prepared by Jeff Richards (including Summary at Section
CD1/5i	Appellant's Housing Delivery and Housing Land Supply Proof of Evidence – Appendices
CD1/5j	Appellant's Highways & Transport Proof of Evidence, prepared by Phil Bell
CD1/5k	Appellant's Highways & Transport Proof of Evidence – Summary
CD1/5l	Appellant's Flooding & Drainage Proof of Evidence, prepared by Paul Jenkin (with Appendices included)
CD1/5m	Appellant's Flooding & Drainage Proof of Evidence – Summary
CD1/5n	Appellant's Planning Matters Proof of Evidence – Appendix 2 – Affordable Housing Technical Note, prepared by Gemma Saffhill (with Appendices included)
CD1/6 Rule 6 Party's Proofs of Evidence (PoE)	
CD1/6a	Rule 6 Party's Landscape, Character & Heritage Proof of Evidence, prepared by Andrew Bandosz <i>(Appendix 1, 2 and 3 provided as CD5/1c, CD5/1w and CD2/4b)</i>
CD1/6b	Rule 6 Party's Flood Risk & Drainage Proof of Evidence, prepared by Michael Piotrowski
CD1/6c/i	Rule 6 Party's Flood Risk & Drainage Proof of Evidence – Appendix A
CD1/6c/ii	Rule 6 Party's Flood Risk & Drainage Proof of Evidence – Appendix B Part 1
CD1/6c/iii	Rule 6 Party's Flood Risk & Drainage Proof of Evidence – Appendix B Part 2
CD1/6c/iv	Rule 6 Party's Flood Risk & Drainage Proof of Evidence – Appendix C
CD1/6d	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence, prepared by Edmund Forrester <i>(Appendix APP T5 provided as CD5/1x and CD5/3a)</i>
CD1/6e/i	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence – Appendix APP-F1 – LFFA Email
CD1/6e/ii	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence – Appendix APP-S1 – Summary by Parish
CD1/6e/iii	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence – Appendix APP-T1 – Crash Map
CD1/6e/iv	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence – Appendix APP T2 – Oncoming Traffic, Summary
CD1/6e/v	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence – Appendix APP-T3 – High St Congestion, dated 23 September 2023
CD1/6e/vi	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence – Appendix APP T4 – Bus Routes
CD1/6e/vii	Rule 6 Party's Proof of Evidence – Appendix APP T6 – Projected Traffic Growth
CD1/7 Additional Submissions to Inquiry	
CD1/7a	List of Suggested Conditions agreed by Appellant and Council, dated 16 November
CD1/7b	<i>Intentionally left blank</i>
CD1/7c	DRAFT Section 106 Agreement, dated 14 November 2023
CD1/7d	<i>Intentionally left blank</i>

CD1/8 Council's Rebuttals	
CD1/8a	<i>Intentionally left blank</i>
CD1/9 Appellant's Rebuttals	
CD1/9a	Appellant's Landscape Rebuttal Proof of Evidence, prepared by David Williams
CD1/9b	Appellant's Flood Risk & Drainage Rebuttal Proof of Evidence, prepared by Paul Jenkin
CD1/9c	Appellant's Highways & Transport Rebuttal Proof of Evidence, prepared by Phil Bell
CD1/10 Rule 6 Party's Rebuttals	
CD1/10a	Rule 6 Party's Rebuttal to Highways & Transport Matters
CD1/10b	<i>Intentionally left blank</i>
CD2 – Application Documents	
CD2/1 Application Submission Documents (excluding Plans & Drawings, listed in the SOCG)	
CD2/1a	Application Form (and Certificate B Form)
CD2/1b	CIL Form
CD2/1c	Design and Access Statement, prepared by Richards Urban Design
CD2/1d	Transport Assessment, prepared by Motion
CD2/1e	Travel Plan, prepared by Motion
CD2/1f	Heritage Statement (Archaeology and Built Heritage), prepared by RPS Group
CD2/1g	Ecological Appraisal, prepared by Aspect Ecology
CD2/1h	Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, prepared by Aspect Ecology
CD2/1i	Arboricultural Impact Assessment, prepared by Aspect Arboriculture
CD2/1j/a	Report on Landscape and Visual Matters Part 1, prepared by David Williams Landscape Consultancy
CD2/1j/b	Report on Landscape and Visual Matters Part 2, prepared by David Williams Landscape Consultancy
CD2/1j/c	Report on Landscape and Visual Matters Part 3, prepared by David Williams Landscape Consultancy
CD2/1j/d	Report on Landscape and Visual Matters Part 4, prepared by David Williams Landscape Consultancy
CD2/1j/e	Report on Landscape and Visual Matters Part 5, prepared by David Williams Landscape Consultancy
CD2/1k	Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by Mayer Brown
CD2/1l	Air Quality Assessment, prepared by Mayer Brown
CD2/1m	Flood Risk Assessment, prepared by Abley Letchford
CD2/1n	Energy and Sustainability Statement, prepared by Daedalus
CD2/1o	Economic and Social Benefits Statement, prepared by Turley
CD2/1p	Planning Statement, prepared by Gillings Planning
CD2/2 Documents submitted for Validation	
CD2/2a	SCC SuDS Summary Pro-forma
CD2/2b	Utility Strategy Report
CD2/2c	Waverley Biodiversity Checklist
CD2/3 Key Statutory Consultation Responses to Planning Application	
CD2/3a	Landscape Briefing Note 1: Land East of Knowle Lane, Cranleigh, prepared by Michelle Bolger, dated 26 May 2023

CD2/3b	Heritage Assets consultation response, Waverley Borough Council, dated 30 May 2023
CD2/3c	Flood Risk and Drainage consultation response, Surrey County Council, dated 9 February 2023
CD2/3d	Flood Risk and Drainage consultation response, Surrey County Council, dated 28 March 2023
CD2/3e	Waste and Water consultation response, Thames Water, dated 27 February 2023
CD2/3f	Highways consultation response, Surrey County Council, dated 4 April 2023
CD2/3g	Highways consultation response, Surrey County Council, dated 24 April 2023
CD2/3h	Tree and Landscape consultation response, Waverley Borough Council, dated 10 May 2023
CD2/3i	Ecology consultation response, Surrey Wildlife Trust, dated 24 March 2023
CD2/3j	Ecology consultation response, Surrey Wildlife Trust, dated 27 April 2023
CD2/3k	Affordable Housing consultation response, Waverley Borough Council, dated April 2023
CD2/3l	Cranleigh Parish Council consultation response, dated 20 February 2023
CD2/4 Representations received from Third Parties	
CD2/4a	Highway and Transport Considerations, prepared by Bellamy Roberts, dated March 2023
CD2/4b	Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by Manorwood, dated April 2023
CD2/5 Rebuttals made to Consultation Responses	
CD2/5a	LLFA Response (dated 1 March 2023) prepared by Abley Letchford – email to LLFA dated 23 March 2023
CD2/5b	Applicant response to SWT comments – email from Gillings Planning to Rachel Lawrence dated 24 April 2023
CD2/5c	Applicant response to Consultation Comments (summary table) – email from Gillings Planning to Rachel Lawrence 30 March 2023
CD2/5d	TN08: Response to Bellamy Roberts Highway & Transportation Considerations Report, dated 9 May 2023, prepared by Motion – provided to Council by email 17 May 2023
CD2/5e	Rebuttal to Heritage Impact Assessment provided by Manorwood, dated 11 May 2023, prepared by RPS – provided to Council by email
CD2/5f	Applicant response to Affordable Housing, Heritage and Highways matters, provided by email from Gillings Planning to Michael Eastham, dated 17 May 2023
CD2/5g	Flooding & Drainage Technical Note, dated 9 May 2023, prepared by Abley Letchford – provided to Michael Eastham by email, dated 5 June 2023
CD2/5h	Applicant response to Parish Council comments, prepared by Gillings Planning – provided to Michael Eastham by email, dated 5 June 2023
CD2/6 Request for Screening Opinion	

CD2/6a	Cranleigh – Land East of Knowle Lane – Request for Screening Opinion – 7 November 2022 (<i>accompanied by Plans CD8/1a, CD8/1b, and CD8/2a</i>)
CD2/6b	Acknowledgement of Registration – 11 November 2022
CD2/6c	Email confirmation the proposal is not EIA Development – 3 July 2023
CD3 – Post-Decision Submissions	
CD3/1 Ecology	
CD3/1a	Ecology Update, prepared by Aspect Ecology, dated July 2023
CD3/1b	Further Ecological Surveys, prepared by Aspect Ecology, dated September 2023
CD3/1c	Technical Note: Great Crested Newt Mitigation, prepared by Aspect Ecology, dated October 2023
CD3/1d	Letter from Surrey Wildlife Trust to the Council, dated 9 th October 2023
CD3/2 Agricultural Land	
CD3/2a	Cranleigh Agricultural Land Classification Report prepared by Roberts Environmental Ltd, dated June 2023
CD3/3 Trees	
CD3/3a	Correspondence between Ian Brewster (WBC Tree Officer) and Richard Curtis (Aspect Arboriculture) – regarding Trees
CD3/3b	Correspondence between Ian Brewster (WBC Tree Officer) and Richard Curtis (Aspect Arboriculture) – Meeting Minutes
CD3/3c	Correspondence between Ian Brewster (WBC Tree Officer) and Richard Curtis (Aspect Arboriculture) – regarding TPOs
CD4 – Waverley Borough Council Report Documents and Decision Notice	
CD4/1 Application Decision Documents	
CD4/1a	Decision Notice, dated 8 June 2023
CD4/1b	Officer Report, dated 8 June 2023
CD4/1c	Additional Report on Impact on Heritage Assets & Trees, undated (submitted to PINs 23 September 2023)
CD4/2a Screening Opinion Decision Documents	
CD4/2a	Screening Opinion Decision Notice – dated 22 August 2023 (ref: SC/2022/02807)
CD4/2b	Officer Screening Opinion Report
CD5 – Relevant Decisions and Judgements	
CD5/1 Appeal Decisions (including purpose)	
CD5/1a	APP/C1435/W/22/3307820 – Land at Bird in the Eye Farm, Framfield, Uckfield
CD5/1b	APP/R3650/23/3316848 – Land off Green Lane, Badshot Lea, Farnham <i>referenced by Council and Appellant for 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1c	APP/R3650/W/19/3225951 – Land at Binscombe <i>referenced by Council and Rule 6 Party (Appendix 1 of CD1/6a)</i>
CD5/1d	APP/R3650/W/19/3227970 – Land to the South of Cox Green Road, Rudgwick
CD5/1e	APP/Z3825/A/14/2219076 – Land East of Littleworth Lane, Partridge Green
CD5/1f	APP/W3520/W/18/31947926 – Land on East Side of Green Road, Woolpit
CD5/1g	APP/P1560/W/17/3185776 – Land to the South of Bromley Road, Ardleigh

CD5/1h	APP/Q3115/W/20/3265861 – Little Sparrows, Sonning Common <i>referenced by Appellant for 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1i	APP/C1950/W/17/3190821 – Entech House, London Road, Woolmer Green
CD5/1j	APP/Z1510/W/18/3207509 – Land off Colchester Road, Bures Hamlet <i>referenced by Appellant for 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1k	APP/U2805/W/18/3218880 – Southfield Road, Gretton <i>referenced by Appellant for 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1l	APP/D0121/W/21/3285624 – Land at Farleigh Farm and 54 and 56 Farleigh Road, Backwell
CD5/1m	APP/R3650/W/21/3278196 – Land West of Loxwood Road, Alford <i>referenced by Appellant for spatial strategy, weighting and 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1n	APP/R3650/W/21/3280136 – Land off Scotland Lane, Haslemere <i>referenced by Council and Appellant for 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1o	APP/R3650/W/22/3302544 – Tree Tops, Mapledrakes Road, Ewhurst <i>referenced by Appellant for 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1p	APP/R3650/W/22/3310793 – Lower Weybourne Lane, Badshot Lea, Farnham
CD5/1q	APP/R3650/W/19/3237359 – Land East of Loxwood Road, Alford <i>referenced by Appellant for spatial strategy and 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1r	APP/R3650/W/19/3230164 – Land at Windacres Farm, Rudgwick <i>referenced by Appellant and Council for 5YHLS</i>
CD5/1s	APP/Q3305/W/21/3285335 – Land at Beauchamps Drive, Stratton on Fosse
CD5/1t	APP/R3650/W/22/3300262 – Land at Dunsfold Common, Godalming <i>referenced by Appellant for self-build</i>
CD5/1u	APP/R3650/W/22/3311941 – Land West of and Opposite Old Compton Lane, Farnham
CD5/1v	APP/R3650/W/22/3295573 – Hedgehog Lane, Haslemere <i>referenced by Appellant for self-build</i>
CD5/1w	APP/R3650/W/18/3215310 – Land Rear of Penlan, Cranleigh Road, Ewhurst
CD5/1x	APP/R3650/A/06/2016865/WF – Oak Cottage, Knowle Lane, Cranleigh <i>referenced by Rule 6 Party (Appendix APP T5 of CD1/6k)</i>
CD5/1y	APP/R3650/W/22/3312128 – Land at Green Lane, Weybourne, Farnham
CD5/1z	APP/Q3115/W/23/3323268 – Land West Of Thame Road, Chinnor <i>Added to CD Schedule by Council 15 Nov</i>
CD5/1aa	APP/M3645/W/23/3319149 - The Old Cottage, Station Road, Lingfield <i>Added to CD Schedule by Council 20 Nov</i>
CD5/1bb	APP/R3650/W/20/3265361 - Land South of Alford Garden Centre, Horsham Road, Alford Crossways <i>referenced by Appellant for Spatial Strategy</i>
CD5/2 Judgements	
CD5/2a	Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire District Council [2014] EWCA Civ 137
CD5/2b	Gladman Developments Limited v Daventry [2016] EWCA Civ 1146
CD5/2c	Suffolk Coastal District Council (Appellant) v Hopkins Homes Ltd and another (Respondents) Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and another (Respondents) v Cheshire East Borough Council (Appellant)

CD5/2d	CD5.1z – APP/Q3115/W/23/3323268 - Land West Of Thame Road, Chinnor
CD5/2e	Gladman Development Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government & Sedgemoor District Council [2019] EWHC 128
CD5/2f	R (On the Application of Corbett) v Cornwall Council [2020] EWHC 1022 Civ 508
CD5/3 Council Decisions	
CD5/3a	Decision Notice Ref: WA/2005/2402 – Oak Cottage, Knowle Lane, Cranleigh – 24 April 2006 (<i>referenced by Rule 6 Party - Appendix APP T5 of CD1/6k</i>)

CD6 – Planning Policies and Guidance

CD6/1 Development Plan	
CD6/1a	Waverley Borough Council Local Plan (Part 1), dated 2018
CD6/1b	Waverley Borough Council Local Plan (Part 2), dated 2023
CD6/1c	Cranleigh Neighbourhood Plan – Submission Stage Regulation 16 version, dated 2023
CD6/1d	Waverley Borough Council Local Plan (Part 1) Appendix C, Housing Trajectory
CD6/2 National Policy Context	
CD6/2a	National Planning Policy Framework, dated 2023
CD6/2b	National Planning Practice Guidance (referenced by paragraphs)
CD6/3 Supplementary Planning Documents	
CD6/3a	Climate Change and Sustainability SPD, dated 2022
CD6/3b	Open Space, Sport and Recreation (PPG17) Study, dated 2012
CD6/3c	Viability Assessment, dated 2016
CD6/3d	Cycling Plan SPD, dated 2005
CD6/3e	Vehicular, electric vehicle and cycle parking guidance for new developments (Surrey County Council) dated 2023
CD6/3f	Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (Surrey County Council), dated 2018
CD6/3g	Residential Extensions SPD, dated 2010
CD6/3h	National Design Guide, dated 2019
CD6/3i	Cranleigh Design Statement, dated 2008
CD6/3j	Review of Cranleigh’s Area of Strategic Visual Importance, dated 2018
CD6/4 Other Council Documents	
CD6/4a	Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement 2021, dated 2021
CD6/4b	Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement base date 20 February 2023, dated 2023
CD6/4c	Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement base date 1 April 2023, dated 2023
CD6/4d	West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment, dated 2015
CD6/4e	Waverley Borough Council Landscape Study – Part 1: Farnham & Cranleigh, dated 2014
CD6/4f	Waverley Borough Council Local Landscape Designation Review, dated 2014
CD6/4g	Surrey Landscape Character Assessment: Waverley Borough, dated
CD6/4h	Surrey Hills Management Plan (2014-2019), dated 2014
CD6/4i	Waverley Borough Council Buildings of Local Merit
CD6/4j	Waverley Borough Council Land Availability Assessment, dated 2020

CD6/4k	Waverley Borough Council Brownfield Register, dated 2022
CD6/4l	Waverley Borough Council Housing Delivery Test Action Plan, dated
CD7 – Other Relevant Documents	
CD7/1 Five Year Housing Land Supply	
CD7/1a	Completions data 2013-2023, dated 2023
CD7/2 Landscape	
CD7/2a	The Landscape Institute – Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd edition
CD7/2b	The Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 06/19 – Visual Representation of Development Proposals
CD7/2c	The Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 02/21 – Assessing Landscape Value Outside National Designations
CD7/2d	Institution of Lighting Professionals PLG04 – Guidance on Undertaking Environmental Lighting Impact Assessments (<i>hard-copy available at</i>
CD7/2e	Institution of Lighting Professionals GN01/21 – Guidance notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light
CD7/2f	Natural England: National Character Area Profile: 121 Low Weald, dated 2013
CD7/2g	Surrey Historic Landscape Characterisation, dated 2001
CD7/2h	The Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 01/20 – Reviewing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments and Landscape Visual
CD7/3 Heritage	
CD7/3a	List Entry No. 1189752 – Coldharbour Farmhouse
CD7/3b	List Entry No. 1352786 – The Brew
CD7/3c	List Entry No. 1294129 – West Barn
CD7/3d	Good Practice Advice Note 2: <i>Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment</i> by Historic England, dated 2015
CD7/3e	Good Practice Advice Note 3 <i>The Setting of Heritage Assets</i> Historic England, dated 2017
CD7/3f	South East Farmsteads Character Assessment, English Heritage 2014
CD7/3g	HEAG102 Historic England Domestic 1: Vernacular Houses Listing Selection Guide, dated 2017
CD7/3h	HEAG122 Historic England Agricultural Buildings Listing Selection Guide, dated 2017
CD7/3i	Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
CD7/4 Housing Matters	
CD7/4a	Custom-Build and Self-Build Housing Register, dated October 2023
CD7/4b	Start to Finish <i>What factors affect the build-out rates of large scale housing sites?</i> Lichfield, dated February 2020
CD7/5 Highways	
CD7/5a	Manual for Streets, dated March 2007
CD7/5b	Manual for Streets 2: Wider Application of the Principles, dated September 2010
CD7/5c	TRL Junctions 9 User Guide, Application Guide 72, written by Graham Burtenshaw, 2019
CD7/5d	Census Data 2011
CD7/5e	NTEM Planning Data Guidance Note
CD7/5f	TEMProv8 NTEMv8 Release Notes

CD7/5g	Road Traffic Forecasts 2018 Scenario 1 Reference
CD7/6 Flooding & Drainage	
CD7/6a	Desktop Study, prepared by BRD Environmental
CD7/7 Ecology	
CD7/7a	<i>Intentionally left blank</i>
CD7/8 Trees	
CD7/8a	Tree Preservation Order No.09/23 (including Plan 1 and 2)
CD7/8b	Appellant's Response to TPO 09-23 dated 7 th July 2023
CD7/9 Planning	
CD7/9a	Budget Meeting Agenda and Minutes, dated 21 st February 2023

CD8 – Plans and Drawings

CD8/1 Plans and Drawings for Approval – Submitted with Planning Application January		
CD8/1a	Site Location Plan	1321.01
CD8/1b	Parameter Plan	1321.03
CD8/1c	Phasing Plan	1321.04
CD8/1d	Proposed Access Arrangement and Visibility Splay	2010010-04 rev D
CD8/1e	Proposed Arrangement of Pedestrian / Cycle Route	2010010-07
CD8/1f	Access Junction Landscape Proposals	0350-L10
CD8/2 Illustrative Plans and Drawings		
CD8/2a	Illustrative Masterplan	1321.02
CD8/2b	Illustrative Masterplan	1321.02-A
CD8/2c	Illustrative Landscape Strategy Plan	0350-L4
CD8/2d	Illustrative Landscape Strategy Plan	0350-L4-C
CD8/2e	Green Links Plan	0350-L5-A
CD8/3 Landscape Plans for Evidence		
CD8/3a	Landscape Context Plan	0350-L1-C
CD8/3b	Site Appraisal Plan	0350-L2-B
CD8/3c	Visual Appraisal Plan	0350-L3-B
CD8/3d	Illustrative Masterplan – Zone of Theoretical Visibility Plan (Bare Earth)	0350-L6A
CD8/3e	Illustrative Masterplan – Zone of Theoretical Visibility Plan (Visual)	0350-L7A
CD8/3f	Parameter Plan – Zone of Theoretical Visibility Plan (Bare Earth)	0350-L8
CD8/3g	Parameter Plan – Zone of Theoretical Visibility Plan (Visual Barriers)	0350-L9
CD8/4 Highways Plans for Evidence		
CD8/4a	Traffic Calming Measures on Knowle Lane	2010010-08
CD8/4b	Amenities Plan	Figure A1
CD8/4c	Key Pedestrian Routes	Figure A2
CD8/4d	Key Cycling Routes	Figure A3

CD9 – Correspondence between the Main Parties

CD9/1 Post Submission (of Appeal)	
CD9/1a	Appellant's Position Statement, prepared by John Litton KC, dated 21 September 2023
CD9/1b	Appellant's Updated Position Statement, prepared by John Litton KC, dated 10 October 2023

CD9/1c	Council's Updated Case Statement, undated
CD9/1d	Rule 6 Party's Updated Case Statement, dated October 2023, prepared by Eddie Forrester
CD9/2 Joint Correspondence	
CD9/2a	Case Management Conference Notes DRAFT, prepared by Mr J Woolcock, dated 26 September 2023
CD9/2b	Pre-Inquiry Note, prepared by Mr J Woolcock, dated 16 October
CD9/2c	Pre-Inquiry Note, prepared by Mr J Woolcock, dated 23 October
CD9/2d/i	Draft Programme, prepared by Mr J Woolcock, dated 13 November
CD9/2d/ii	Draft Programme, prepared by Council, R6 and Appellant, dated 13 November
CD9/2e	Inquiry Notification Letter and list of those notified, dated 25 October
CD9/2f	Site Notice and Locations
CD9/2g/i	Site Visit Suggested Route Map, with key agreed viewpoints, dated 15 November
CD9/2g/ii	Site Visit Suggested Itinerary, dated 15 November
CD9/2h	Pre-Inquiry Note, prepared by Mr J Woolcock, dated 14 November