



---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 11-14 May and 14 June–18 June 2021

Site visit made on 18 May 2021

**by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 6<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R3325/W/20/3265558**

**Manor Farm, Combe Hill, Templecombe BA8 0LJ**

- 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 Gleeson Strategic Land Ltd against the decision of South Somerset District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/03416/OUT, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2020.
  - The development is described on the application form as “proposed is demolition of existing buildings and residential development of up to 80 dwellings including the creation of a new vehicular access and pedestrian accesses, open space, landscape planting and surface water attenuation (all matters reserved except access).”
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The original planning application proposed a development of up to 80 dwellings. However, during the course of the determination of the application this was reduced to up to 60 dwellings. A revised description was agreed between the Council and the appellant to reflect this and is the basis on which the application was determined. I have therefore determined the appeal on the same basis.
3. The application was submitted in outline with only access to be determined at this stage. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are to be determined at reserved matters stage. Amongst other things an Illustrative Masterplan<sup>1</sup> and Indicative Landscape Strategy Plan<sup>2</sup> have been submitted and I have considered these plans on this basis.

### Main Issues

4. Having regard to the Council’s decision notice, and statement of case which includes a further putative reason for refusal relating to the Council’s settlement strategy, the main issues are:
  - The effect of the development on the setting of Manor House a Grade II\* listed building;

---

<sup>1</sup> Drg: SK01 rev H

<sup>2</sup> Drawing No: L4 Revision J

- The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- Whether the appeal site is a suitable location for housing having regard to local planning policy, and;
- Whether the Council can demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land.

## **Reasons**

### *Listed building*

5. The appeal site comprises open pasture fields, several large farm buildings, and associated farm infrastructure belonging to Manor Farm, Templecombe. Residential development abuts the north and west boundaries of the appeal site and to the east and south is predominantly open countryside.
6. To the west of the appeal site is Manor House which is Grade II\* listed. It is a 17<sup>th</sup> century building, but is located on a much earlier medieval site which was a preceptory of the Knights Templars until 1300, and the Knights Hospitallers until 1540. After this it fell into private ownership, at which time it was modified resulting in the building as we see it today.
7. There are two main elements to Manor House. A domestic wing which addresses High Street/Combe Hill, and attached to this, sitting at a right angle and extending along the north boundary of the site to meet Manor Farm, is a non-domestic wing. The two are identifiable by their contrasting architectural detailing. The domestic wing is articulated with irregular fenestration whereas the non-domestic wing is more noticeably devoid of openings.
8. It is suggested that the non-domestic wing formerly contained the refectory and kitchen of the Knights Hospitallers Preceptory and there is what appears to be a large medieval fireplace here<sup>3</sup>. In more recent years it was likely to have been a byre or barn associated with the historic use of the site as a post-medieval farmstead. Historic maps showing fishponds, orchards and surrounding fields further points to its farming history, along with the presence of 19<sup>th</sup> Century barns<sup>4</sup>, now converted to residential use, which are located just to the south-east of Manor House.
9. As the site of a medieval religious house and later a post-medieval farmstead, the Manor House and its associated buildings were historically sited in a rural farming landscape beyond the boundaries of nearby Templecombe. This would therefore have, for many centuries, been the setting of Manor House. Whilst much of the land surrounding this listed building has been built upon over the years as Templecombe has expanded up to and around it, the land to the east, which includes the appeal site, has remained in farming use. The appeal site and the wider rural farming landscape to which it belongs are now the last link between the Manor House and its historic rural farming setting.
10. The history of the Manor House is extensive dating back to medieval times and its earliest uses were closely associated with its rural environs. This history greatly contributes to the significance of the Manor House. What remains of the rural setting of the Manor House therefore contributes to this significance as it

---

<sup>3</sup> Somerset Vernacular Building Research Group Report, Appendix B, Built Heritage Proof of Evidence by RPS

<sup>4</sup> Figures 7-14 of Appendix 1 to Heritage Proof of Evidence of Kit Wedd

informs our understanding and appreciation of the heritage asset on the ground.

11. In addition to this, the appeal site is an area from which the gable end of the non-domestic wing of the Manor House can be seen. Wider views from a nearby public right of way (PROW) and from East Street and a former railway bridge to the north-east are also possible across the appeal site given its open and undeveloped nature. This is of further value as it allows the significance of the listed building to be appreciated in a farming context, albeit a modern one. Once you know about the history of the building you can readily appreciate this from these views.
12. The Illustrative Masterplan shows that the proposed housing could be accommodated in the southern half of the site, tucked behind the residential property belonging to Manor Farm, such that, in terms of Manor House, it would not encroach to an unacceptable degree into its setting. The northern part of the site, it is suggested, could then become an area of managed public open space (MPOS) with tree and shrub planting, and wildflower and grassed areas. In addition to this, a new footpath link to East Street, to be determined at this stage, is proposed to cut across the MPOS. This would consist of a 2m wide footpath which would require earthworks along a substantial part of its length to ensure a suitable gradient for all users.
13. Currently the area it is suggested could be MPOS is farmland. At the time of my site visit I was able to stand near to the gable end of the non-domestic wing of Manor House, in a small paddock, towards the western corner of the appeal site, where there were sheep grazing. The history of the building and its connection to this farmland was palpable from here both visually and from the quiet and tranquillity afforded by a small paddock of grazing sheep. I accept that this area is not open to the public. However, as set out in Historic England (HE) guidance<sup>5</sup> the contribution that setting makes to the significance of a heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights or an ability to access or experience that setting. This does not, therefore, diminish the contribution this farmland setting makes to the significance of the Manor House.
14. Turning this area into MPOS would completely alter the setting to the Manor House. It would, for the most part, have a main purpose of serving the proposed development, and this would lead to it being more heavily used by the public, which of itself would change the current tranquil character of this area of pastureland. It would also likely be landscaped, which again, would be very different to the relatively open and rough terrain of the current fields here, and indeed, different to that of a productive orchard such as was historically located here. The modern grade footpath proposed with low level lighting would appear as an alien feature. Consequently, if I were to stand in the same spot as I was on my site visit in the suggested area of MPOS, the connection between the Manor House and its historic farmland setting would be irretrievably lost.
15. Views across this suggested MPOS from the PROW, East Street and the old railway bridge would also be affected. Whilst I accept views of the heritage asset could be retained through landscape management and maintenance, rather than seeing it in a farmland context it would be more akin to a parkland

---

<sup>5</sup> The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)

- setting. This would detrimentally affect an appreciation of the significance of the Manor House from these views.
16. Whilst the application is made in outline with, amongst other things, layout and landscaping reserved for later consideration, the indicative and illustrative plans before me fail to provide evidence that an acceptable scheme is capable of being devised at reserved matters stage without harming the setting of the Manor House.
  17. I have read in detail the responses from Historic England (HE) dated 11 February 2020, 22 April 2020 and 16 July 2020. In particular, I have noted HE's comments on the significance of Manor House and the contribution made by its setting, which align with my findings above, namely that the appeal site is the last vestige of the rural setting of the Manor House and a key component in understanding the former position and relationship of this historic complex with its surrounding landscape.
  18. Although HE did not specifically express concern about the loss of an agricultural use of the land or how the MPOS might be used, their advice was clear that development should be avoided in the north-west section of the appeal site. The Council's conservation officer also did not raise specific concerns on this point. Nevertheless, it was raised by the Council's heritage witness and discussed at the inquiry. No one would therefore be put at a disadvantage by my taking the view that I have.
  19. It is clear that the appellant has been able to reduce harm from the proposed development to the heritage asset through their consultation with HE. Nevertheless, the advice in HE's final letter still identifies residual harm. Where on the scale of 'less than substantial harm' the development sits, they do not, elucidate. Nevertheless, that remains a judgement for me in the determination of this appeal.
  20. Much of the legibility of the medieval farmstead has been lost, as touched upon above, in respect of the growth of Templecombe and conversion of former barns to the south-east to residential use. Added to this is the domestication of what remains of the land around Manor House. However, this does not justify further harm to the setting of Manor House. HE guidance<sup>6</sup> states that where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from the significance of the asset. Negative change, the guidance states, could include severing the last link between an asset and its original setting. In this case, this is precisely the type of negative change that would occur as a result of the proposal.
  21. Taking all of the above points together I find that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the setting of Manor House, diminishing its significance as a medieval religious house and later post-medieval farmstead. It follows, therefore that the proposal conflicts with Policy EQ3 of the South Somerset Local Plan (LP) which seeks to safeguard the significance and setting of heritage assets. In terms of para 196 of the Framework the harm I have found

---

<sup>6</sup> Historic England, The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)

would be 'less than substantial'. Within the spectrum of 'less than substantial harm' my assessment is towards a high level of less than substantial harm given the II\* grade of the heritage asset affected and that the appeal site is the last link between Manor House and its rural setting. As per para 196 of the Framework this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I return to this heritage balance later in my decision.

#### *Character and appearance*

22. When viewed from the PROW to the east of the appeal site, and East Street up to the disused railway bridge, the appeal site sits at a high point in the landscape. This makes it visually prominent in these views. From here the edge of Templecombe is visible as evidenced by houses which appear to sit along a ridgeline, and then farm buildings and pastureland as your eye moves down the slope. The existing farm buildings at Manor Farm, although large, and utilitarian in appearance, provide a visual transition between the village of Templecombe and the open countryside to the east.
23. Housing on the appeal site is proposed to replace existing farm buildings. At the number proposed this would alter the transitional nature of this locally prominent site. As a result, a far harder, denser, edge to Templecombe would be created. Even with landscaping it would be impossible to completely disguise the development, the majority of trees and hedgerows being shown on the Indicative Landscape Strategy Plan to be planted at a lower point in the landscape to the proposed housing. Furthermore, views of Manor House need to be retained which would also impact on the ability of landscaping to screen and soften the development.
24. I am therefore not satisfied that the size of development proposed could be accommodated on the appeal site without resulting in localised harm to the character and appearance of the area. The illustrative and indicative plans before me do not allay my concerns in this respect. I therefore find the proposal would conflict with Policies SD1 and EQ2 of the LP which seek to preserve the character and appearance of the district.

#### *Suitable location for housing*

25. Policy SS1 of the LP sets out the settlement strategy for South Somerset District Council. This identifies where development will be focused starting with Yeovil, which is a Strategically Significant Town, followed by Primary Market Towns, Local Market Towns and Rural Centres. Templecombe does not fall into any of these categories of settlements but is, instead, classified as a Rural Settlement.
26. Development in Rural Settlements is to be strictly controlled subject to the exceptions identified in Policy SS2. These exceptions are that it provides employment opportunities appropriate to the scale of the settlement; and/or creates or enhances community facilities and services to serve the settlement; and/or meets identified housing need, particularly for affordable housing.
27. The appellant submits that indirectly there would be employment generated by the development and I do not dispute this. However, the supporting text to Policy SS2 gives examples of employment opportunities likely to be considered acceptable under this policy and these include starter units to support individuals or small companies, workshops, and businesses that require a rural



location. Therefore, it is clear this policy is seeking the creation of tangible and permanent employment opportunities through economic development. Being solely a residential development, the proposal therefore fails to meet the first criteria.

28. Whilst the provision of housing on the appeal site would no doubt support, and even potentially secure existing facilities and services in Templecombe, the proposal would not, of itself, create any new community facilities or services, nor would it enhance any. Contributions to education and recreation along with highway works are to be secured through the submitted S106 agreement but this is to mitigate the effects of the development. To find otherwise would mean such obligations would not meet the relevant tests<sup>7</sup>.
29. The proposal does include an area of MPOS to be provided but this has primarily been created to reduce the impact of the development on the setting of the Grade II\* listed Manor House. There is no evidence that such a space would meaningfully serve Templecombe which already benefits from PROWS and other recreational facilities. Furthermore, I am not satisfied it would be used by residents outside of the development. It would be accessed from Combe Hill through a housing development and have a separate entrance to the PROW from East Street. It would therefore clearly be perceived as primarily serving the development proposed rather than the wider population of Templecombe.
30. The new footpath across the MPOS was also put forward as a new community facility. However, it would primarily be used as a pedestrian access for future residents of the development. For residents outside of the development it would provide a rather protracted and counterintuitive route to take, particularly to access services in Templecombe; the High Street being the more obvious and direct route. It might provide an alternative access to East Street (a predominantly residential street) or the PROW for the few properties immediately adjacent to the main entrance to the site but there is an alternative route largely served by pavements to these destinations. I am therefore not satisfied this would serve as a useful community facility.
31. I turn now to the final exception in Policy SS2 which requires development in rural settlements to meet identified housing need, particularly for affordable housing. The supporting text at para 5.44 again indicates that it is local housing need which is to be considered. The only evidence before me at the inquiry of any specific local housing need was for 5 affordable homes in the parish of Abbas and Templecombe<sup>8</sup>. The development would provide 21 affordable homes and 39 market houses. Whilst there is a larger district wide, and indeed national, need for affordable housing, in the terms of Policy SS2 the proposal would overprovide in terms of meeting identified housing need in this area.
32. Taking all of the above points together I find that the proposal does not meet the exceptions set out in Policy SS2. The appeal site is therefore not a suitable location for the development proposed having regard to local planning policy.
33. During the inquiry the Council's focus appeared to move away from non-compliance with the exceptions in Policy SS2, even though their third putative

---

<sup>7</sup> Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 56 of the Framework

<sup>8</sup> Latest Expressed Demand for South Somerset Parishes 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021

reason for refusal and evidence raised concerns in this respect. Nevertheless, the proposals compliance with the exceptions in Policy SS2 was explored thoroughly in the inquiry such that I am able to come to my own view on the matter without prejudicing either of the main parties. In the inquiry itself the Council appeared to focus more on the scale of the development. However, in Policy SS2, it is only once you have satisfied yourself that the proposal is one of the exceptions set out in that policy that you are then required to consider whether it would be commensurate with the scale and character of the settlement. In this case I have found that the proposal would not meet the exceptions in Policy SS2. A determination on scale would not change that outcome. It is therefore not necessary for me to pursue this matter further.

34. It has been put to me that Policies SS1 and SS2 are not consistent with the Framework paragraph 77. Both are broadly supportive of development in rural areas which is responsive to local circumstances, and of housing developments that reflect local needs. Policy SS2 is, perhaps, more detailed as to what might constitute local circumstances and requires additional considerations such as scale and character and increasing sustainability generally. However, consideration of built environment and local character are addressed elsewhere in the Framework, as is sustainability. I therefore afford this policy full weight in the determination of this appeal.

#### *5-year housing land supply*

35. The adopted strategic policies for South Somerset District Council are more than five years old and have not been reviewed and found not to require updating. In such circumstances, as per para 73 and footnote 37 in the Framework, local housing need should be the basis for assessing whether a five year supply of specific deliverable sites exists, and it should be calculated using the standard method set out in national planning guidance.
36. The requirement using the standard methodology is 690 dwellings per annum (dpa) or 3450 in total over the five-year period. The supply of deliverable sites should, in addition, include a buffer. In this case it should be 5% as per para 73a) of the Framework. If I apply this buffer to the 5-year requirement calculated using the standard method the total requirement goes up to 725dpa or 3623 in total over the five-year period<sup>9</sup>.
37. I must now compare this 5-year requirement to the supply of deliverable sites. The Council calculate this to be 4323<sup>10</sup>. Using these figures the Council can demonstrate 5.96<sup>11</sup> years of housing land supply. However, to be considered deliverable, as set out in Annexe 2 of the Framework, sites for housing 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.
38. During the inquiry a number of large sites set out in a Scott Schedule were discussed in detail<sup>12</sup>. During round table discussions two sites were discounted from the schedule: Viney Bridge Mills, 43 dwellings; and a duplication of housing delivery figures at Land north of Wheathill Lane, 65 dwellings. In

---

<sup>9</sup> Appellant's Updated 5 Year Land Supply Position Table 2

<sup>10</sup> FINAL Housing Lane Supply Statement of Common Ground point 6.5

<sup>11</sup> FINAL Housing Lane Supply Statement of Common Ground point 6.6

<sup>12</sup> Appendix 1 to Housing Land Supply Statement of Common Ground

addition an over count of 8 dwellings at Land off Cuckoo Hill Bruton was removed.

39. Victoria Road was also discussed which is a site for 24 dwellings. Detailed planning permission was granted in late 2009, a number of conditions have been discharged and works have commenced on site. However, no further progress has been made in the circa 10 years following this and a photo provided by the Council shows no work is currently underway. I therefore find this to be compelling evidence that homes will not be delivered in the next five years on this site.
40. I move on now to sites in the Scott Schedule which have outline permission only. These are: Kit Hill, 100 dwellings; Torbay Road, 165; Land off Lyndhurst, 35; Land adjacent to Triways, 24 and Land at Stalbridge, 130. To be deliverable, as set out in Annexe 2 of the Framework, where a site has outline planning permission for major development, it should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years. In all of these cases the evidence before me is very limited and largely based on anticipated trajectories assuming reserved matters will be approved in the very near future. There is no certainty before me that this will occur. I must therefore conclude that these sites are not deliverable in the terms of the Framework.
41. There is also a further complication to four of the above sites, and indeed many others across the district. Recent advice from Natural England (NE) regarding the unfavourable condition of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site means that before determining a planning application that may give rise to additional phosphates within the catchment, competent authorities should undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment proceeding to an appropriate assessment where a likely significant effect cannot be ruled out, even where the development contains pollution mitigation provisions. A large proportion of the District is affected by this issue and it will adversely impact housing delivery as acknowledged in a letter from affected Councils, including South Somerset District Council, to the Secretary of State for Housing dated 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2020.
42. Whilst the Council is developing a Phosphates Management Strategy due to be delivered by autumn 2021, this is dependent on a great deal of work being undertaken over the summer, which is when people tend to take leave, and this work includes getting agreement with Natural England on key elements. Notwithstanding my concerns in this respect an initial draft is scheduled to be completed by August 2021. However, the resulting Supplementary Planning Document will then need to be progressed through the democratic decision-making process to approve it for the purpose of consultation and subsequent adoption. This will all take time and co-ordination across various bodies. It would be optimistic, in my view, to assume this could all be concluded before the end of this year.
43. The Council have said that, in light of NE's advice, they are applying a cautious approach to housing supply. However, this is not borne out in the evidence before me. There is very limited discussion of how the issue of phosphates has been taken into account by the Council on the sites in the Scott Schedule, the majority of which fall within the affected catchment. Indeed, the schedule did not even identify which sites fall within the affected catchment until requested



at the inquiry. Consequently, this matter could significantly delay not only the outline permissions I refer to above but many other outline permissions, and permissions with detailed planning permission but which still have undischarged foul drainage conditions. I have been provided with very limited evidence to indicate otherwise. There may also be indirect effects on viability for all development affected moving forward.

44. This all gives me sufficient concern so as to question the overall deliverability of the Council's supply of housing, most notably, I consider the phosphates issue will lead to delays which have not been factored into the Council's supply figure. Therefore, of the figures before me, I lean in favour of the appellant's housing supply figures which using the standard method with a 5% buffer indicate a five-year housing land supply of between 3.97 and 3.66 years supply.
45. The appellant also put forward arguments that the standard method should not be applied in this case, contrary to the advice in the Framework, because under the standard method housing requirement is lower than that of the adopted plan. Whilst I take the appellant's points about significantly boosting housing supply<sup>13</sup>, past performance in terms of delivery of housing in South Somerset<sup>14</sup>, and the Middleton Cheney appeal<sup>15</sup>, the Framework is nevertheless clear on the approach to take in the specific circumstances of this appeal. Furthermore, the standard method was introduced in order to be a simpler, quicker and more transparent way of calculating housing land supply. To adopt a contrary approach would undermine this.
46. The appellant similarly also makes a case that a 10% buffer should be applied. However, the Framework is again clear on this point. A 10% buffer should only be applied where the local planning authority wishes to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable sites through an annual position statement or recently adopted plan. An annual position statement, which is scrutinised by the Secretary of State through a formal process, and which would conclusively demonstrate the housing land supply position, has plainly not occurred. Nor is there a recently adopted plan for the District.

#### *Heritage balance*

47. I return now to the heritage balance<sup>16</sup> where I must balance the high level of less than substantial harm that I found to the Manor House against the public benefits of the proposal. Given my finding on housing land supply the addition of 60 houses to include affordable housing would boost local housing supply and would be a benefit of significant weight particularly given that this site is not affected by the aforementioned phosphate issue and is in a particularly sustainable location in terms of accessibility to local services and public transport. Linked to this would be in-direct economic benefits which I give modest weight.
48. I note the appellant's point that the development could allow a greater appreciation of the Manor House insofar as the MPOS would allow closer public access to the heritage asset, not presently possible. However, this would be at the expense of the loss of the last vestiges of its rural setting. I therefore

---

<sup>13</sup> NPPF para 59

<sup>14</sup> Accelerating Delivery of Housing in South Somerset Report - Draft Ver 3 June 2020, Three Dragons

<sup>15</sup> APP/Z2830/W/20/3261483

<sup>16</sup> NPPF para 196

afford this benefit very limited weight. Removal of modern steel barns would be a benefit of itself. However, this would be replaced with a greater scale of built form. Again, this therefore attracts only limited weight.

49. The proposals could provide a significant area MPOS to be used for informal recreation. As explored previously in my decision this would predominantly be used for future residents of the development who, based on the indicative plans, would all have private garden space. I therefore also give this benefit limited weight. Similarly, the new pedestrian route through the site, for the reasons already discussed, I give limited weight. The proposal would also provide a moderate biodiversity net gain which I accordingly give moderate weight.
50. Notwithstanding the individual weight I have attributed to the above benefits, their collective weight would be significant. However, they are not collectively sufficient to outbalance the identified high level of 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the Manor House, given that considerable importance and weight should be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings when carrying out a balancing exercise in planning decisions. I am also conscious of the advice in the Framework that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, and the more important the asset the greater the weight should be.

#### *Planning balance*

51. As shown in the heritage balance above the harm I have identified to the setting of Manor House is not outweighed by public benefits. I have also found harm to the character and appearance of the area and harm in terms of a policy conflict with Policies SS1 and SS2 of the LP which restrict development in the countryside.
52. Given that I have found that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged and the policies most important for determining the application are to be considered as out-of-date. However, in accordance with para 11d i) and footnote 6 of the Framework it is then clear that permission should not be granted as the application of policies in the Framework that protect, of particular note for this appeal, designated heritage assets, provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.
53. Consequently, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all material considerations advanced in this case, the appeal is dismissed.

*Hayley Butcher*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Philip Robson BVC LLB(Hons) MSc<br>of Counsel | Instructed by South Somerset District Council |
|---|---|

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| He called:<br>Charles Potterton BA DipLA<br>CMLI | Chartered Landscape Architect |
|--|-------------------------------|

|          |                     |
|----------|---------------------|
| Kit Wedd | Heritage Consultant |
|----------|---------------------|

|                                       |               |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| Liz Alexander BA(Hons)<br>MPhil MRTPI | Bell Cornwall |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|

|                                    |                                 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| David Kenyon BA(Hons)<br>BPO MRTPI | South Somerset District Council |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| Mary Cook Partner at Town Legal<br>LLB | Instructed by David Barnes |
|--|----------------------------|

|  |                  |
|--|------------------|
| She called:<br>David Williams BA(Hons) LA<br>Dip Hons LA, CMLI | Director of DWLC |
|--|------------------|

|                      |           |
|----------------------|-----------|
| Jonathan Smith MRTPI | RPS Group |
|----------------------|-----------|

|                                  |                      |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Jonathon Orton BA(Hons)<br>MRTPI | Director at Origin 3 |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

|                           |                                      |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Tony Garratt              | South Somerset District Council      |
| Sarah Hickey              | South Somerset District Council      |
| Matthew Loughrey-Robinson | South Somerset District Council      |
| Daniel Gordon             | South Somerset District Council      |
| Olivia Hughes             | Origin 3                             |
| Rob Phillips              | Gleesons                             |
| Mrs T J Chapman           | Abbas and Templecombe Parish Council |
| John Smith                | Gleesons                             |
| Graham Cridland           | Observer                             |
| Mark Stead                | Observer                             |
| John Grierson             | Observer                             |
| Ian Bissett               | Observer                             |
| Frances Gully             | Observer                             |
| Linda Pincombe            | Observer                             |
| Jo Calvert                | Observer                             |
| Jo Wilkins                | Observer                             |

**DOCUMENTS submitted at the Inquiry**

- 1 CIL Compliance Statement
- 2 Planning conditions
- 3 Email correspondence between David Kenyon and Charles Potterton
- 4 Planning Statement of Common Ground
- 5 Draft S106 Agreement
- 6 Statement from Mr Bissett
- 7 Statement from Mr Grierson and photos
- 8 Addendum proof of evidence and appendix on housing land supply (Council)
- 9 South Somerset Authority Monitoring Report
- 10 Letters/legal advice on phosphates
- 11 Housing Land Supply Statement of Common Ground
- 12 Updated Scott Schedule
- 13 Consolidated evidence South Somerset District Council 5 Year Housing Land Supply (plus update)
- 14 Appellant's updated 5 Year Housing Land Supply Position
- 15 Additional photographs from Mr Grierson
- 16 Phosphates Management Strategy
- 17 Scanned copy of signed S106 Agreement