



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 16 July 2024

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by Graham Chamberlain BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J0540/W/21/3287538

Field To the east of Old Pump House, Old Leicester Road, Wansford, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire PE8 6JH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kelland Developments against Peterborough City Council.
 - The application Ref is 17/00550/OUT.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Construction of up to 14 prestige self-build dwellings and associated infrastructure with access secured and all other matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) reserved'.
 - This decision supersedes that issued on 24 March 2023. That decision on the appeal was quashed by order of the High Court.
-

Decision

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

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was submitted in outline with all matters of detail reserved for future consideration save for the access. I have assessed the proposal on this basis and treated the drawings in all other respects as simply being an illustration of how the proposal could ultimately be configured.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') was updated after the quashed decision was issued. The parties were afforded an opportunity to address this change and I have taken their comments into account. At the hearing, I accepted the documents listed at the end of this decision. I did so because they were relevant and capable of being addressed by those present. As such, no prejudice was caused.
4. The Council and appellant share the view that the provision of ecological offset land (also referred to as Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space – SANG) within the blue line on the site location plan would not result in a material change of use and thus require planning permission. I am not entirely convinced by this because the area is intended to be transferred to the Council to be used, at least in part, as a recreational asset¹ by the public. I have

¹ The 'Recreational Greenspace Strategy' refers to the provision of 3.34 hectares of public open space with the addition of a circular walking route and mowing to facilitate access to the grassland area.

nevertheless adopted the position of the Council and appellant for the purposes of my assessment.

Main Issues

5. The Council failed to determine the planning application within the prescribed period and therefore the appellant exercised their right to submit this appeal. The Council has confirmed through putative reasons for refusal that had it been able to do so, it would have refused the proposal. The main issues listed below are derived from the Council's concerns.
6. That said, the Council has confirmed through the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) that it does not wish to pursue its fourth putative reason for refusal, which relates to the absence of affordable housing. This is an understandable and prudent position for the Council to take because the threshold for the provision of affordable housing in Policy LP8 of the Peterborough Local Plan 2019 (LP) is 15 or more homes. When considering the Inspector's findings in the previously quashed decision, the Council also withdrew its concerns raised in the third putative reason for refusal.
7. The appellant has submitted a planning obligation pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in the form of a unilateral undertaking. The submission of this document addressed the concerns raised in the Council's fifth and sixth putative reasons for refusal, these relating to an absence of any mechanism to secure the proposed plots for custom or self-builders and the provision of ecological offset land. Accordingly, I have not assessed these as a main issue.
8. Consequently, the main issues in this appeal are:
 - Whether the appeal site is an appropriate location for residential development with reference to the spatial strategy in the development plan;
 - Whether the support for custom and self-build housing in the development plan would justify the location of the proposal in the countryside;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - Whether any adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits.

Reasons

The appropriateness of the location with reference to the spatial strategy

9. The LP sets out a spatial strategy underpinned by several aims. These include guiding the distribution and location of growth to focus it on Peterborough, support sustainable communities, reduce the need to travel, make best use of existing infrastructure and recycle previously developed land. The spatial strategy also seeks to prevent the spread of development beyond village boundaries and to protect the character of the countryside and settlements.
10. To achieve these aims Policy LP2 of the LP sets out a settlement hierarchy that is used to inform decisions on the location and scale of new development. It also explains that development within settlement boundaries will be supported,

whereas development in the countryside² will be restricted to stated circumstances, including rural exception sites for affordable housing, replacement dwellings, or the conversion of rural buildings. Policy LP3 of the LP sets out the broad distribution of development, including that for villages. It explains that housing allocations have been made for some villages but otherwise new development at these settlements will be limited to infilling.

11. It is common ground between the Council and appellant that the appeal site is in the countryside and the appeal scheme is not allocated for development, amount to infilling or be any of the types of development permitted in the countryside when applying Policies LP2, LP8 and LP11 of the LP.
12. Accordingly, the appeal site would not be an appropriate location for the proposal when applying the spatial strategy in the development plan, which is a carefully drafted and considered statement of policy. Instead, the proposal would undermine the objectives of the strategy. This would be harmful given the public interest in having a planning system that provides consistency and direction by being genuinely plan led.

Whether the demand for custom and self-build housing would justify the location of the proposal in the countryside

13. Policy LP8 of the LP seeks to secure development that meets housing needs, including affordable housing, homes for older people and self-build plots. Policy LP9 of the LP seeks to protect existing prestige homes and deliver new ones as part of allocated sites. It says nothing about permitting such development in the countryside. The second half of Policy LP9 states that proposals for residential development will be considered more favourably if they provide appropriate opportunities for custom and self-build (CSB). Accordingly, the LP establishes clear policy support for certain types of housing on account of a recognised need.
14. During the hearing, the Council and appellant agreed that in respect of Policy LP9, an 'appropriate opportunity' for CSB is one where the provision of CSB would be practical and feasible as part of a residential development scheme. For example, the layout would allow for CSB plots/homes to be individually designed and accessed. In such circumstances, the residential development should be considered 'more favourably'. This means the residential development would be given more positive weight in the planning balance than if the scheme did not provide CSB plots.
15. The appeal scheme would provide residential plots that could practically function as CSB. In this respect the proposal would provide appropriate opportunities for CSB and should therefore be considered more favourably than if it did not. However, this does not mean that CSB plots are, as a matter of principle, acceptable in the countryside as an extension to the exceptions listed in Policy LP2. If the Council had meant this, then it would have explicitly said so in Policies LP2, LP8 or LP11, perhaps setting down assessment criteria in the same way it has for rural exception sites. Instead, Policy LP2 states that all other residential development outside of village envelopes, which would include CSB, will, by definition, be contrary to the vision, objective, development strategy and policies of the local plan, and should be refused.

² Defined as land outside of settlement boundaries.

16. Therefore, it seems to me that a conflict with Policy LP2 would ordinarily outweigh the more favourable consideration given by Policy LP9 to a residential scheme that provides appropriate opportunities for CSB. In this respect, the policies do not pull in different directions as Policy LP2 is concerned with the location of development and LP9 with the housing mix. However, there may be some circumstances where the 'more favourable' support given to the provision of CSB plots by Policy LP9 is capable of outweighing the conflict with Policy LP2. Perhaps if there were a minor conflict with Policy LP2 and a large unmet demand for CSB plots. This would be a matter of planning judgment and is an approach alluded to by an Inspector in another appeal decision³.
17. In this respect, the appeal scheme would not undermine some of the aims of Policy LP2 because residents of the development would be able to travel by active means to a reasonable array of services and facilities within Wansford on either side of the river. Nevertheless, the scheme would be a sizeable breach of the settlement boundary, and this would have a significant adverse effect on the setting of the village. This would meaningfully undermine a core aim of the spatial strategy in Policy LP2.
18. At the hearing it was agreed that there were 4 entries on the self-build register in the base period to 30 October 2022 and 6 in 2023. This is lower than other nearby local authorities, but I have seen nothing to suggest the register is not properly operated and it is advertised on the Council's website. There was no dispute between the parties that the number of permissions granted for CSB is comfortably exceeding the number of entries on the self-build register when measured by Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) returns.
19. The use of CIL returns is not a perfect measure because it relies on self-certification and does not count the actual number of plots delivered/homes built. Nonetheless, it is a reasonable methodology outlined in the Planning Practice Guide (PPG)⁴ because it relies on a signed declaration. This declaration can be taken as evidence that the development would be for the carrying out of CSB. Moreover, there is no detailed analysis before me that demonstrates CIL returns have erroneously been included in the Council's figures of CSB approvals. Thus, the indicators are that the Council is meeting its legal duty to give development permissions for the carrying out of CSB on enough plots⁵. This does not suggest there is a pressing need to provide additional CSB plots in the countryside contrary to Policy LP2.
20. That said, the PPG⁶ explains that secondary sources can also be referred to in addition to the self-build register when gauging the demand for CSB. To this end the appellant has referred to the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment from 2017 (SHMA). Although somewhat dated it is still useful evidence. It suggests that the self-build register does not reflect the significant local demand for CSB plots, although I have not been referred to any figures in the SHMA that quantifies this. As the number of entries on the register is low, a significant demand above this may not actually be a high number of plots. This number may fall when considering those wishing to self-build a 'prestige home', which the appeal scheme is proposing.

³ Paragraph 19 - APP/J0540/W/20/3253778

⁴ Paragraph: 038 - Reference ID: 57-038-20210508

⁵ Self-Building and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended)

⁶ Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 57-011-20210208

21. Nevertheless, the Council accepts that the demand for CSB is probably higher than recorded on the register and has sought to address this in the LP. Thus, in addition to permitting homes within settlement boundaries pursuant to Policy LP2, which can include CSB plots, Policy LP9 requires, through Policy LP5, 1-5% provision of CSB in urban extensions of 500 or more homes depending on the evidence of need at the time. This could yield hundreds of CSB plots over the plan period⁷. The drawback to this approach is that the SHMA suggest the highest need is in villages as opposed to urban extensions. The PPG also states that CSB plots should be provided where self-builders are actually keen to develop⁸. However, the Council advised at the hearing that in 2022, around 19 CSB plots were approved⁹, and this occurred again in 2023. As a result, CSB plots are currently being delivered at a rate which significantly exceeds the number of entries on the self-build register.
22. The appellant suggests that demand should be based on the previous Government's aspiration to deliver 10% of all homes as CSB¹⁰. This would result in an annual requirement for Peterborough of around 95 CSB plots a year¹¹. However, the evidence before me does not demonstrate a local demand for this level of CSB plots. It would also exceed the strategy in Policy LP5 of the LP, which is underpinned by the SHMA.
23. Reference has also been made to local marketing by Woodford and Co aimed at establishing the demand for the appeal scheme, the precise details of which are not before me. The update report states that about 763 enquiries were received and by the 14 November 2022 there were on average 298 live enquiries from Category 1 buyers – serious buyers looking for a house 'now' or imminently. Categorising interest in this way would exclude those that simply sought details out of curiosity, but there may still be some speculative interest captured in the list of Category 1 buyers, especially given the pleasant situation of the appeal site. Furthermore, it is not clear whether plots were being marketed or if the prestige concept was overtly stated. The information initially provided seems to suggest the site was marketed to those wishing to buy a 'village home' with a budget from £500,000. At the hearing this was described by villagers as a middling price in the area. Substantive evidence is not before me to justify departing from this local view. This all suggests that the demand for the appeal scheme may not be as high as the marketing indicates.
24. As an alternative means of measuring overall demand, the appellant suggests the average number of CSB plots approved in recent years could be used as a proxy of demand. There is some rationale to this given the lack of correlation between entries on the register and the number of CSB plots approved (as measured by CIL returns) and because both the Council and appellant agree the register probably does not accurately reflect the demand for plots. On this measure, the appeal scheme would deliver around a year's supply of CSB plots, which would be a significant contribution that would address some of the latent demand indicated by secondary sources.
25. In conclusion, the supply of CSB plots is comfortably meeting the demand recorded by the register. Indeed, the supply is exceeding this by some way.

⁷ Policy LP35 allocates 13,132 homes in urban extensions.

⁸ Paragraph: 028 Reference ID: 57-028-20210508

⁹ Based on CIL returns

¹⁰ This target is set out in the 'Help to Build' scheme.

¹¹ Based on an annual housing need of 950 homes

Moreover, the evidence from secondary sources is not sufficiently precise to indicate the current demand for CSB is significantly above the supply. Based on past trends, the proposal would probably meet a year's supply of CSB, but in doing so it would notably breach Policy LP2. On balance, the conflict with Policy LP2 outweighs the support given to CSB by Policy LP9.

The effect on the character and appearance of the area

26. Map B in the supporting text to Policy LP26 of the LP places the appeal site in the Nassaburgh Limestone Plateau Landscape Character Area (LCA). The Peterborough Landscape Character Assessment from 2007 (PLCA) lists the key characteristics of this area as a gently undulating limestone landscape, large blocks of woodland, large arable fields, areas of intact parkland, unspoilt nucleated villages comprising vernacular materials, remnant pre-enclosure fields, areas of calcareous grassland, wide grass verges to minor lanes, areas of high conservation interest, quarries and a generally quiet rural ambience.
27. It is unrealistic to expect a site or tract of countryside within the LCA to exhibit all the key characteristics listed above. Nevertheless, many are present in and around the appeal site. Indeed, the appeal site is the northern extent of a gently undulating series of small meadows between the River Nene and the A47. These meadows mark the western edge of Wansford, a nucleated village which has expanded beyond its core of vernacular stone buildings.
28. Old Leicester Road incorporates wide grass verges and is a rustic, intimate lane with a rural character. This lane does not mark a meaningful break between the appeal site and the rolling landscape to the south, which includes the Wansford Pasture Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Standen's Pasture Nature Reserve and Old Sulehay Forest Nature Reserve. The appeal site is also of conservation value as demonstrated by the wildlife surveys that accompanied the application, as it includes some calcareous grassland, a small pocket of trees and boundary hedges.
29. Although the A47 is an audible detractor, the area has a rural ambience due to the abrupt transition from village to countryside along Old Leicester Road and Yarwell Road. Accordingly, the area of landscape to the west of Wansford between the A47 and the River Nene is highly representative of the LCA. The PLCA places this landscape in sub area 2b, which has a 'strong' character and is in 'good' condition. These descriptions can be applied to the appeal site and its contextual setting from what I observed.
30. When approaching Wansford along Old Leicester Road, built form is not overly apparent until the village edge is reached. This is on account of the high levels of planting. This results in an abrupt transition from village to countryside which creates a memorable gateway feature that positively defines the identity of this part of the village, creating a strong sense of arrival and departure.
31. Upon leaving Wansford there are scenic views both south across the SSSI and north across the appeal site. In terms of recreational value, a public footpath passes to the west of the appeal site. This provides a functional connection with the landscape to the south of Old Leicester Road and affords views back towards the village. The houses in Robins Field are prominent in this view but the properties appear in the distance and softened by landscaping. As a result, the settlement fringe is a modest detractor. Spatially, the appeal site and the

fields to the west of Wansford provide a rural buffer to the extensive quarry works beyond and a pleasant rural setting to the village.

32. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would result in the urbanisation of a parcel of currently undeveloped countryside with some notable attributes. The impact of this would be consequential because the area lost would be a small scenic meadow that is locally distinctive component of the LCA. This would harmfully affect the local character of the area and erode the pleasant rural setting of the village. Improving the grassland to the west of the site would enhance biodiversity, as would extra planting. This would adhere to Policy Wans 13, 15 and 18 of the Design SPD¹². However, the net effect on landscape character would remain negative given the stark impact of the proposal.
33. Furthermore, the scheme would be an especially strident incursion because it would breach the well-defined village boundary at an important gateway into Wansford. In doing so the form of development along Old Leicester Road would also be unbalanced. This adverse spatial impact would be very apparent from the public footpath, the proposed SANG, and in views from Old Leicester Road. By way of mitigation, it would be possible to provide additional planting to strengthen existing boundaries. This would ensure the impacts of the scheme were visually softened and consequently more localised. However, this planting would take time to mature and would not address the effects on landscape character from building on an attractive meadow.
34. Significantly, the provision of an enclave of large prestige homes means the scheme would have a considerable presence. The provision of large plots alongside the shape of the site would also limit what form the scheme could take. All the indicators are that it would be an inward-looking, typically suburban cul-de-sac that would jar with the rural setting and character of the area in which it would be located. Moreover, the indicative layout shows the homes would back onto Old Leicester Road and the public footpath/SANG to the west. Although the scheme is submitted in outline with layout reserved for future consideration, it is difficult to envisage any other way of laying out the development given the large prestige scale of the homes and the awkward shape of the site. Accordingly, a very poor interface with the public realm would likely occur and this would compound the harmful impact.
35. In conclusion, the proposal would result in a high level of harm to the character and appearance of the local area even when accounting for the mitigation suggested. It would therefore be at odds with Policies LP16 and LP27 of the LP, which collectively seek to secure development that respects the context of the site and surrounding area, responds to local patterns and spacing and recognises, enhances and restores the special qualities of the landscape character area in which it would be situated.

Whether any adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits

36. The Council are currently unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and therefore the most important policies in the LP for determining the application, which are those I have already referred to, should be deemed out of date. However, they should not be disregarded or set aside. Instead, in this

¹² Peterborough Design and Development in Selected Villages Supplementary Planning Document 2011

instance¹³ Paragraph 11 of the Framework states that permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

37. The provision of 14 homes would contribute to the housing supply shortfall and there is nothing to suggest CSB plots would be inherently slower to deliver than conventional housing, especially as this is a small site. To this end, the appellant is content to accept a condition requiring a shorter implementation period than is usual. However, the contribution to the housing supply would be modest. The benefit also needs to be considered in the context of the Council's very good performance in recent years against the Housing Delivery Test measure, which has not dropped below 100% and is currently 145%. The Council also confirmed at the hearing that there are around 9,000 permissions in the pipeline. The Local Development Scheme also sets a target of adopting a new local plan by the spring of 2026. This document would identify new housing sites. I therefore edge more towards the Council's view that moderate weight be afforded to the benefit of housing delivery.
38. The appeal scheme would deliver 'prestige' homes outside an urban extension secured by condition¹⁴. This would help to assist the Council's strategy of providing high value homes closer to Peterborough so that managers and senior professionals would not need to commute as far. I have some reservations about all of the plots being 'prestige' homes as this would not provide a range of dwellings as sought by Policy LP8 of the LP and Paragraph 63 of the Framework. Indeed, Wansford already seems to have several prestige homes¹⁵. That said, the Council and appellant agreed at the hearing that the delivery of 14 plots for prestige CSB homes would be a benefit of significant weight and I have adopted this position.
39. The short-term economic benefits that would flow from the construction of 14 homes would not be extensive in the context of the wider economy and therefore carries middling weight. The proposal would increase the population of the village and these additional residents could get involved in local life, add vibrancy and help sustain the available facilities through their spending. However, there is little evidence before me to suggest existing facilities, clubs or organisations are suffering for lack of patronage or that the appeal scheme would make any material difference to their viability. This matter carries limited weight.
40. Limited weight is also attached to the provision of a pavement across the site frontage because the pavement would be on the periphery of the village in the position of an existing gravelled route. Limited weight is also given to the provision of a SANG (with dog walking route) on adjoining land as a means of alleviating recreational pressure on the nearby SSSI from dog walkers. This is because the bulk of the SSSI is already fenced with signs stating that dogs are not permitted. The level of additional planting, and the biodiversity net gain flowing from this, carries moderate weight given the wider nature crisis.

¹³ In this instance policies in the Framework that protected areas or assets of particular importance are not engaged

¹⁴ It was agreed at the hearing that a design code could be secured by condition that requires minimum floor areas, bedroom numbers and plots sizes to ensure the homes would be prestige.

¹⁵ For example, properties in Robins Wood appear to be large and set in very generous plots.

41. The adverse impacts in this instance would be a conflict with the spatial strategy and harm to the character and appearance of the area. The spatial strategy in the development plan is broadly consistent with national policy because it seeks to direct new rural housing to settlements in a way that balances several aims in the Framework, including support for rural communities, promotion of sustainable transport and recognition of the character and beauty of the countryside. To this end, identifying the extent of settlements and the growth they should accommodate through a hierarchy is a locally defined approach in a carefully considered development plan. It is also important to note that the Framework encourages a genuinely plan led approach to development.
42. However, Paragraph 60 of the Framework sets out the objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing and Paragraph 77 sets a requirement for local planning authorities to provide a minimum five-year housing land supply. The housing land supply in the Council's area currently stands at between 3.57 and 4.45 years, which amounts to a significant shortfall of around 518 homes. Accordingly, the spatial strategy is currently failing to deliver the required number of homes. As things stand a rigorous application of the spatial strategy would frustrate attempts to remedy the housing supply deficit. Indeed, it may be necessary to release land beyond settlement boundaries. On balance, the conflict with the spatial strategy carries moderate weight in this instance.
43. Given the landscape attributes outlined earlier, a strong case could be made that the appeal site is part of an above ordinary landscape and thus 'valued' for the purposes of Paragraph 180 of the Framework. However, neither the Council nor the appellant have made this case. Thus, the relevant test in the Framework is whether the proposal would contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Moreover, Paragraph 135 of the Framework seeks to secure development that would be sympathetic to local character. The proposal would not achieve these aims for the reasons already given.
44. During the hearing the Council conceded that it is likely to need more greenfield sites to meet its housing requirement. It therefore follows that some urbanisation of the countryside may need to occur. Nevertheless, the harm identified goes beyond simply urbanising a greenfield site. Instead, the scheme would appear strident and out of place with a negative impact on several landscape attributes. The harm would be to the site and the contextual character of its surroundings, including the setting of the village and the gateway function of Old Leicester Road. As such, it would not be well designed when applying guidance on 'context' in the National Design Guide as the scheme would fail to integrate with, or enhance, its surroundings. Paragraph 139 of the Framework states that development which is not well designed should be refused. Accordingly, the harm to the character and appearance of the area is an important point against the appeal scheme.
45. Paragraph 11d) of the Framework starts with the premise that a proposal should be granted in circumstances where a five-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. This presumption can only be displaced if the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This approach has been designed to authorise some harm. In this instance, the appeal scheme would have notable benefits that would deliver

positively against some of the policies in the Framework¹⁶. Nevertheless, it would also have important adverse impacts of a high order. Overall, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework.

Other Matters

46. Policy LP16 of the LP requires an efficient use of land. This is a site-specific planning judgment based on several factors, including those listed in Paragraph 128 of the Framework. The density of the scheme would be about 9 dwellings per hectare, which is low. However, there is nothing to suggest local market conditions would make it difficult to sell more plots or that local infrastructure lacks capacity. Moreover, the facilities in the village can be accessed by walking and cycling. These factors suggest the scheme should probably have aimed to increase the density beyond what was proposed. However, mindful of the nearest built context, the settlement hierarchy, and the prestige nature of the scheme (which requires larger plots) only a modest uplift would be appropriate. For example, if Plots 1-7 were substituted with homes of the indicative size of Plots 13-14, then a couple of additional dwellings could have been proposed. This calls into question whether the scheme would be an efficient use of land. However, given my findings above, I have not considered this point further as the outcome of the appeal would remain unaltered. For similar reasons, it has not been necessary to consider the various other concerns of interested parties, including highway safety.

Conclusion

47. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, the appeal has been dismissed.

Graham Chamberlain
INSPECTOR

¹⁶ Including Paragraphs 60, 70, 77, 83, 85, 88(d), 102, 108(c) and 180(d)

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

David Hutchinson MRTPI	Pegasus Group
Neil Tiley Assoc RTPI	Pegasus Group (Housing Land Supply)
John Hunter	Barrister, Kings Chambers
Paul Harris CMLI	MHP Design Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

James Croucher MTD MRTPI	Peterborough City Council
Gemma Wildman MRTPI	Peterborough City Council

INTERESTED PARTIES

Richard Clarke	Wansford Parish Council
Tracey Gould	Local Resident
Patricia Stuart-Mogg	Local Resident
Graham Stevens	Local Resident
Trevor Rogers	Local Resident
Molly Hood	Local Resident
Vivian Rogers	Local Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT OR AFTER THE HEARING

- Update biodiversity site walkover by Bioscan (UK) Ltd
- Peterborough Landscape Character Assessment 2007
- Revised list of suggested planning conditions, agreed by the Council and appellant
- Marketing update report dated 14 November 2022

This page is intentionally left blank