



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 30, 31 January and 1 February 2007

Site visit made on 1 February 2007

by **Paul K Jackson** B. Arch (Hons) RIBA

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 4 April 2007

Appeal A: APP/W0530/A/06/2030589

Land to rear of The Lanes, High Street and Long Furlong, Over, Cambridgeshire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Camstead Homes Ltd against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- The application Ref S/1114/06/F, dated 30 May 2006, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2006.
- The development proposed is erection of 28 dwellings and provision of playing field for Over Primary School.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted subject to conditions set out below in the Formal Decision.

Appeal B: APP/W0530/E/06/2030614

Land to rear of The Lanes, High Street and Long Furlong, Over, Cambridgeshire

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Camstead Homes Ltd against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
- The application Ref S/1113/06/LB, dated 30 May 2006, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2006.
- The works proposed is rebuilding of front/side garden wall to No. 17 at back of footpath.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is allowed, and listed building consent is granted in the terms set out below in the Formal Decision.

Preliminary matter

1. At the Inquiry, a Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was submitted by the appellants. I have dealt with this in paragraph 31.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - Whether the proposed development would be acceptable, having regard to the designation of Over as a Group Village in the adopted Core Strategy for the area;
 - Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Over Conservation Area, and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the architectural character, historic interest and setting of No. 17 High Street, which is a Grade II listed building.
-

Planning Policy

3. The development plan for the area includes the Regional Planning Guidance for East Anglia to 2016 (RPG6) published in 2000. Revisions to RPG6 have been the subject of examination in public; the East of England Plan (EEP) is expected to be published in mid 2007 following return of consultation responses in March. The draft document, which I give significant weight, recommends a substantial increase in housing provision in the Cambridge sub-region to support economic growth. The Council acknowledges that if possible, targets for housing should be exceeded.
4. The Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Structure Plan 2003 (SP) and the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan 2004 (LP) are also relevant. Parts of the LP have been superseded by the Local Development Framework Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CS) which was adopted in January 2007.
5. The thrust of the draft EEP and SP policies with regard to housing provision is to identify locations in a sequential order of preference, starting with sites within built-up areas and cascading down to sites within and adjacent to market towns, larger villages and previously established new settlements. One of the latter is Northstowe, based around Longstanton and Oakington, about 4 kilometres south east of Over towards Cambridge. This is expected to ultimately accommodate a large number of new homes (4800 by 2016) including a town centre and employment uses. Having regard to the ability of Northstowe to serve surrounding villages, and the level of facilities available in Over, the newly adopted CS includes policy ST/6 which identifies Over as a 'Group Village' within which residential development up to an indicative maximum scheme size of 8 dwellings will be permitted, although up to about 15 dwellings may be acceptable where this would make the best use of a single brownfield site. This supersedes the previous designation of Over in policy SE3 of the LP as a Limited Rural Growth Settlement (LRGS) within which a residential development up to maximum of 30 dwellings had been indicated as acceptable.
6. Policies P7/6 of the SP and EN30 of the LP require proposals to preserve or enhance the special character of conservation areas. According to LP policies EN18, EN20, and EN28, so far as relevant to the appeal proposal, applications for development which would harm a listed building, its well-being, attractiveness or setting will be resisted. I have also had regard to policy Over 3 included in Part 2 of the LP, which remains adopted policy. It allocates approximately 0.7 hectare as an extension to the primary school playing field. This forms part of the appeal site and is currently in private ownership. The policy draws attention to the cramped nature of the existing school site.
7. The Council adopted the Over Conservation Area Appraisal in 1999 following local consultation. It provides a useful guide to the features which contribute to and form the special character of Over and I give it significant weight.
8. National guidance includes Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 *Housing* and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 15 *Planning and the Historic Environment*, which provides advice on listed buildings and conservation areas.

Reasons

Background

9. Over is a village in countryside north east of Cambridge. The appeal site consists of about 1.62 hectares of land in the centre of the village, once used as orchards but now for the most part unmaintained scrub. It is enclosed by the rear gardens of houses and other premises facing the High Street, residential development to the east and south, 'The Cramp' footpath and the grounds of Over Primary School. There is no dispute that it is previously developed land in terms of the definition given in Annex B to PPS3 and it was allocated for residential development in 1993. Although later proposed as a Protected Village Amenity Area (PVAA), the 2004 Local Plan Inspector at that time saw no reason to prevent residential development of that part of the site not allocated to the school under policy Over 3.
10. Previous proposals for development sought a mix of housing including affordable dwellings on most of the site area, in order to provide the school with a playing field on the remainder. Currently, the school site is restricted in size. Enlarged grounds would avoid children having to cross Long Furlong to use the village recreation ground. The appeal proposal followed lengthy consultation with Council officers and was recommended for approval on 6 September 2006. There is no dispute between the main parties that the whole site is suitable for residential development in principle; or that the density, mix, design and layout of the proposed development would be appropriate.

Rural settlement policy

11. According to policy ST/6 of the CS, as Over is a settlement with Group Village status, the proposed development exceeds the limits placed on the number of dwellings permitted in a scheme by at least 13 dwellings. It could only be permitted if there are significant material considerations that indicate that an exception to this recently adopted policy should be made (and is acceptable with respect to the other issues raised). In my view, there is one central advantage and several other contributory factors, which cumulatively persuade me that the proposal has substantial merit in respect of this issue.
12. Firstly, the provision of the extended school playing field would be a significant community benefit and is a longstanding development plan policy objective. It would avoid the current necessity for children to cross Long Furlong to the village recreation area for school playing field purposes, with the attendant safety hazards. It seems to me common sense that the school would prefer to be able to control the likelihood of hazards such as broken glass and litter that might occur on the open public land currently used. The existing school field does not comply with the Government's minimum standard of playing field area and is one of only 6 out of 250 schools in the County with a similar lack of provision.
13. I attach little weight to the argument that the school may not want the play and recreation area because it would be expensive to maintain. The Governing Body and the Head Teacher recognise the need for this element of the scheme which has been sought for many years. The County Council as education authority strongly supports the scheme for this reason and I consider it extremely unlikely that in the circumstances, having been represented at the Inquiry and having cooperated with the appellants in its design and planning, that adequate funding would not be forthcoming for its ongoing maintenance.

14. It is possible that the playing field could be provided by other means, but that has not previously been possible, despite various efforts over 20 years. I do not discount the possibility of Compulsory Purchase Order proceedings but nothing was put forward at the Inquiry to suggest that this is any more likely now or in the future than it has been in the past, because of the complexity and costs involved. This proposal not only provides the land but also a storage shed and the planting, landscaping and boundary treatment that would secure a playing surface as well as an area of woodland and a pond for nature study.
15. Some residents have expressed concern that the new road junction at the High Street would significantly increase safety hazards for children, not only those going to and from the school but others simply passing through the village, perhaps visiting the shops or other facilities. I do not disagree, but all roads involve an element of risk. I am not persuaded that the new junction would be any more dangerous than many other similar 'T' junctions in the village that children have to negotiate. It would have adequate sight lines. Moreover, the scheme includes the provision of a speed table that would contribute to road safety in the High Street generally. At the site visit, I saw that on approaching the centre of the village, vehicles accelerate after passing the junction with Long Furlong. The proposed table would discourage this.
16. Moreover, the scheme would do much to help resolve a localised flooding problem that has affected the centre of Over, by providing a new land drain and pumping station. I consider that the provision of porous paving and a large underground sub-base storage zone is likely to be effective in managing the release of surface water to the Internal Drainage Board and South Cambridgeshire Awarded drains to the north east without undue additional loading on those systems. No objection has been raised by the Environment Agency.
17. The provision of 8 affordable units is another significant benefit. I understand that there is substantial demand within Over for affordable housing. The level of provision would be 28.5%, That is not very close to the 50% suggested in policy HG7 of the LP for settlements with a population under 3000 but very near to the suggested proportion of 30% for those with a population over 3000. Figures presented to the Inquiry suggest that the population of Over was about 2790 at the last count. I note that Council officers were satisfied in 2006 that the provision of drained and landscaped land for the extension to the school playing field and the high cost of site drainage were sufficient justification for the number of affordable units. In this connection, I note that during discussions, the number of market houses was reduced, yet the number of affordable dwellings remained the same.
18. The provision of the playing field, the affordable housing and the new drainage scheme involves a significant cost to the developer which would be borne by the profit arising from the scheme. The details of the land purchase costs with all the existing land owners are not available; the purchase price of the new houses is also unknown and depends on the market at the time of sale. It is therefore difficult to directly assess the balance between developers profit and the public benefits of the project. However, all schemes involve an element of risk and it is unlikely the developers can be entirely certain of the viability of the scheme; in any event, lack of precise information of that sort is no reason to refuse planning permission.
19. I have also taken account of the evidence on the sustainability merits of the village itself. There is little to choose between the facilities provided in Over, compared to Willingham to the east, which is designated a minor rural centre where a maximum scheme size of 30

dwellings would be permitted. I also note that Willingham is significantly further away from the Cambridge Guided Bus (CGB) route which will provide rapid frequent services to Northstowe and Cambridge as well as towns to the west. From Over, the CGB stop is a reasonable walk or an easy cycle journey.

20. Overall, I am satisfied that the significant benefits to the community outweigh the additional impact that this scheme might have over a smaller scheme which would be permitted under CS policy ST/6, but which would be extremely unlikely to have the same advantages. In assessing this I have given little weight to the construction of the policy wording put forward by the appellants that they suggest implies that 2 schemes (or more) of 15 houses each very close to each other might comply; but that would not be the intended effect of ST/6 and is a matter to be resolved when such a situation arises and in any event, separately from this appeal. It seems to me that elsewhere within the identified village framework of Over, there are very few if any opportunities for individual schemes of more than 15 units, let alone 2 in close proximity.
21. The appeal site is surrounded by other development on all sides and has a single access. A lower number of houses that would fall within the constraints set by CS policy would be at a very low density (the density of the appeal proposal is 30 dwellings per hectare, the minimum considered acceptable in national guidance). A smaller scheme would require the same width and design of access and a similar drainage scheme. Given the complexities of land ownership, it is extremely improbable that 2 separate proposals could come forward that would provide the playing field.
22. There would be an additional 13 dwellings provided over and above the suggested maximum of 15 in one scheme contained in CS policy ST/6. I conclude on this issue that on this site, the proposed total of 28 units would facilitate unique and substantial benefits to the community of Over that in my opinion would be extremely unlikely to occur otherwise. Exceptionally, they outweigh the sustainability objectives of the preferred sequential rural settlement hierarchy outlined in the Core Strategy.

The Conservation Area

23. The character of the conservation area in the area around the appeal site derives mainly from the quality of the individual buildings that line the High Street and the spaces between them. It seems to me that Nos. 13 and 17 and houses opposite, together with the mature trees in this area, make an important contribution to the meandering street, which reveals different views as one travels along it in either direction. No. 15 is of more recent date than its neighbours and is uncharacteristically set back from the footway. It has less impact on the character of the area.
24. The existing highway markings and kerbs form strong lines reinforcing the curve of the road which in my opinion detract from the rather more informal arrangement of the buildings on each side and tend to encourage a brief and speedy passage through the village. The appeal proposal would introduce a change in surface, a speed table and a number of bollards which in my view would provide visual interest and in some respects would be more reminiscent of the less regimented High Street that would have existed prior to the kerbs being laid. In this context, I do not consider the minimal alterations and signage necessary would add any significant harm. There are already speed tables in other parts of the village and residents must be accustomed to them.

25. With regard to the potential loss of the wall adjacent to No. 17, this is partly of rather different and more recent construction, severely eroded by water splash and is in very poor condition generally. The Council suggests that it is part of the curtilage of No. 17, but the western part that appears to be oldest, immediately adjacent to the dwelling but separated by an open joint, has few characteristics that might link it to that house. Its construction and materials are more similar to No.13 and I consider it almost certainly formed part of the original curtilage of that property. As such, it is now separated from it by No 15 which was built later, and contributes little now to the conservation area beyond appearing very old. I find little merit in retaining the wall as it is, even if it could be preserved without complete rebuilding. The appeal proposal includes the building of a new wall to the same dimensions and design and including bricks salvaged from the present structure. In my view, although on a different alignment, it would not harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
26. The 3rd reason for refusal refers to the impact on the conservation area of the walled compound to the proposed pumping station. I do not consider the wall would be noticeable or out of place in the context of the remaining ancillary buildings at the rear and the new wall that would extend back from the High Street.
27. I conclude in respect of this issue that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the Over Conservation Area and would not conflict with the relevant aims of SP policies, LP policy EN30 or national guidance.

The Listed Building

28. The fabric of the listed building itself would not be affected. There is a distinct gap between the wall that would be demolished and the building, which is of different appearance and construction. The evidence strongly suggests that the wall is unlikely to have been associated with No.17 in the first place. The proposed new wall would weather in time and would appear little different, in terms of the contribution it would make to the setting of No. 17. There is already a gap between No. 15 and No. 17 and a view through; the proposed wall would draw more attention to this but would not appear significantly different to other similar junctions elsewhere in Over High Street. Moreover, the position of the access would be on the concave side of a bend in the road and would not be particularly visible in the setting of No. 13 or No. 17 seen from the High Street.
29. I am satisfied that providing conditions are imposed that require the Council to approve detail drawings and samples of the construction of the new wall including the location of recovered materials and the mortar mix, the architectural character, historic interest or setting of No. 17 would not be noticeably affected.
30. I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not conflict with SP and LP policies that aim to protect listed buildings and their settings.

The Unilateral Undertaking

31. Having concluded favourably on the main issues, I turn to the UU submitted at the Inquiry, which is in the form of a single deed in multiple parts. It aims to facilitate the provision of the school playing field and ancillary works and its transfer to the County Council; the provision of 8 affordable dwellings; and the formation of a management company to maintain the communal open space of the development. The Council has commented on

the undertaking and alterations have been made accordingly. Having regard to the tests in Circular 05/2005 *Planning Obligations*, it seems to me that it would provide the intended benefits. I accord it very significant weight.

Other Matters

32. Many residents have expressed concern that wildlife in the village would be affected by the development. In particular, my attention was drawn to the possibility that the white spotted pinion moth could be resident in the woodland. This moth relies upon elm trees and is a priority species in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. It has suffered as a result of the spread of Dutch elm disease. However, whilst it has been seen in other parts of the village there is no evidence that it breeds on the appeal site. In any case, the development would retain many of the existing young elm trees as part of the nature area in the enlarged school grounds. These trees are not protected currently. I do not consider that the appeal scheme would be likely to lead to a significant deterioration in its prospects. With regard to other species, I am not persuaded that there would be any significant effect; all those mentioned are common in rural villages where there are large areas of gardens, such as Over.
33. I have taken account of all the other matters raised, including the impact of the development on flood risk in the area. The area is relatively flat and susceptible to flooding, which is managed through a system of dykes. I heard that from time to time water flows onto the High Street off the appeal site. The proposed drainage system would include measures to absorb and store water during heavy rainfall and subsequently pump it into a new drain which would discharge outside Over into the dyke system. As there would be no additional water falling on the site, the improved ability of the site to absorb water and management of the outflow should reduce the risk of flooding.

Conclusions

34. Whilst the proposed development would conflict with the housing settlement aims of the most recently adopted policies, there are significant material considerations that persuade me that an exception should be made in this case. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

35. In addition to the usual time limitation and details of landscaping the suggested conditions also cover a wide range of other matters including disposal of floodwater, a programme of archaeological work, hours of working on the site, protection of trees during construction, provision of public art, provision of public open space, traffic calming measures, children's play equipment and a scheme of ecological enhancement. The appellant company generally accepts the conditions but questions the need for public art.
36. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice in Circular 11/95 *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions* in particular the tests set out in paragraph 14 which include that the conditions should be reasonable, necessary and relevant to the development to be permitted. Having regard to the character of the site and its surroundings, I do not consider it necessary that the provision of public art should be required to make the development acceptable. More precise details of the external materials should be provided in the interests of the visual appearance of the development. I consider that the traffic calming scheme would not need all of the bollards included on the application drawings and

should be submitted for detailed approval. In view of the history of flooding, a condition requiring the slab levels of the dwellings to be approved is necessary. The other conditions I consider are reasonable and necessary to comply with other policies of the development plan and to protect the character of the locality and the amenity of existing and future residents.

37. With regard to the listed building consent, conditions are necessary to ensure that the wall is recorded for posterity and that the reclaimed bricks, new bricks, bond and mortar are blended in a way that is sympathetic to the listed building and the character of the conservation area.

Formal Decisions

Appeal A: APP/W0530/A/06/2030589

38. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for erection of 28 dwellings and provision of playing field for Over Primary School on land to rear of The Lanes, High Street and Long Furlong, Over, Cambridgeshire in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S/1114/06/F, dated 30 May 2006, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development, specification of all proposed trees, hedges and shrub planting, which shall include details of species, density and size of stock, details of boundary treatment and of the materials to be used for surfacing roads and pavements including the measures for traffic calming.
- 3) All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of any development, the scheme for surface and foul water drainage shall be constructed and completed in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 5) Prior to the commencement of any development, a plan showing the finished floor levels of the proposed dwellings in relation to the existing and proposed ground levels of the surrounding land shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No dwellings shall be occupied until the traffic calming measures in the High Street have been constructed in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

- 7) No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 8) No development shall take place until a scheme of ecological enhancement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of the features to be enhanced, recreated and managed for species of local importance including invertebrates, nesting birds, bats and moths both in the course of development and in the future and a destructive search for great crested newts and badgers while the site is being cleared. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
- 9) Any removal of trees, scrub or hedgerow shall not take place in the bird breeding season between 1 March and 31 August, unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- 10) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of children's play equipment on the central open space has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
- 11) During the period of demolition and construction, no power operated machinery shall be operated on the site during construction, before 0800 hours and after 1800 hours on weekdays and 1300 hours on Saturdays, nor at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise previously agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

Appeal B: APP/W0530/E/06/2030614

39. I allow the appeal, and grant listed building consent for rebuilding of front/side garden wall to No. 17 at back of footpath on land to rear of The Lanes, High Street and Long Furlong, Over, Cambridgeshire in accordance with the terms of the application Ref S/1113/06/LB, dated 30 May 2006 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
- 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
 - 2) As part of the works hereby granted consent, the historic section of the boundary wall shall be carefully dismantled in accordance with a method statement to be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA prior to these works commencing. As many bricks as possible shall be salvaged and securely stored for re-use in the rebuilt wall. The location/mix of the salvaged bricks in relation to the new bricks as part of the rebuilding of the wall shall be agreed in writing with the LPA prior to the rebuilding commencing and once the number of salvaged bricks has been established.
 - 3) Prior to the rebuilding of the wall commencing, a sample panel of brickwork shall be constructed on the site to enable the LPA to agree in writing the following: the specification of the new bricks, the brick bonding, the mortar mix and colour, the

joint detailing and the coping format including any special/cut bricks. The wall shall be constructed in accordance with these agreed details.

- 4) Prior to the existing wall being dismantled a visual record shall be made of the wall to meet the requirements of Level 1 of the RCHME 'Recording Historic Buildings' specification (1996). This record shall consist of photographs annotated to a scaled site plan and a written description of the structure including a brief contextual history of the wall. Two copies of the record documents shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the LPA prior to the dismantling works commencing.

Paul Jackson

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Tim Comyn	Of Counsel
He called	
Nick Grimshaw MA BA BPL RICS Dip Bldg Cons MRTPI IHBC	South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne, Cambridgeshire CB3 6EA
John Koch Dip TP MRTPI	South Cambridgeshire District Council, South Cambridgeshire Hall, Cambourne, Cambridgeshire CB3 6EA

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Andrew Kelly	Queens Counsel
He called	
Philip Barnes	Design Manager, Camstead Limited, 1 St Marys Court, Main Street, Hardwick, Cambridge CB3 7QS
Dr David Brown BSc DipLD MA PhD MIHort FArborA	10 College Road, Impington, Cambridge CB4 9PD
Charmain Hawkins BA MTPI Dip Bldg Cons(RICS), Dip Surv, IHBC	QuBE Planning Ltd, Building 14, Michael Young Centre, Purbeck Road, Cambridge CB2 8PG
Michael Palmer BSc CEng MICE MIHT DipTE	Unex House, 132-134 Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 8PA
Simon Somerville-Large	Land Director, Camstead Limited, 1 St Marys Court, Main Street, Hardwick, Cambridge CB3 7QS
Don Proctor Dip TP MRTPI	RPS Planning, Cromwell House, 3 The Meadow, St Ives, Cambridgeshire PE27 4LG

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Dr Peter Connolly	30 Station Road, Over, Cambridgeshire CB24 5NJ
Brian Burling	Chain Farm, Overcote Lane, Over, Cambridgeshire CB4 5NS
Anthony Hyde	18 High Street, Over, Cambridgeshire CB24 5ND
Colin Rickard	Cambridgeshire County Council, Shire Hall, Castle Hill, Cambridge CB3 0AP
Kate Parker	18 Long Furlong, Over, Cambridgeshire CB24 5PG
Peter Jackson	8 Fen End, Over, Cambridgeshire CB24 5NE

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Letter of notification.
- 2 Local Development Framework Core Strategy adopted in January 2007.
- 3 Index of adopted policies in 2007, supplied by the appellants.
- 4 Schedule of events leading to the adoption of the LP in 2004, supplied by the appellants.

- 5 Plan of Conservation Area boundary, supplied by the appellants.
- 6 Extract from South Cambridgeshire District Council 2002 Housing Needs Survey, supplied by the Council.
- 7 Modified text of RSS incorporating proposed changes, submitted by the appellants.
- 8 Outline note on enabling development as a material consideration, submitted by the appellants.
- 9 4 photographs of the access and High Street, submitted by the appellants.
- 10 4 photographs of 13 High Street, before and after re-facing, submitted by the appellants.
- 11 Summary of historic evidence relating to No 13/15/17, submitted by the appellants.
- 12 Letter from QuBE Planning to Prior Associates, dated 26 January 2007, submitted by the appellants.
- 13 Extracts from 'Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Monuments' by Charles Mynors, 4th edition 2006, submitted by the appellants and the Council.
- 14 Briefing paper on Shimizu judgement and how it affects the Over site, submitted by the appellants.
- 15 Joint DETR/DCMS consultation paper on the impact of the Shimizu judgement (June 2000), submitted by the appellants.
- 16 Bundle of documents relating to Over School, submitted by Mr Burling.
- 17 4 photographs of flooding in the area and map of locations, submitted by Mr Burling.
- 18 Definitive plan of Conservation Area boundary, provided by the Council.
- 19 Indicative views of proposed development including dimensional check, Definitive plan of Conservation Area boundary, submitted by the appellants.
- 20 Summary of Statement by P Barnes, Camstead Design Manager.
- 21 Statement by Colin Rickard CPFA, Chief Financial Planning Officer, Cambridgeshire County Council.
- 22 Report to Planning Committee of 10 January 2007 in the light of changes to planning policies, and summaries of decisions taken, submitted by the Council.
- 23 'Manual for Streets' Consultation Draft July 2006, submitted by the appellants.
- 24 Representations of C W Wayman of 19 High Street Over including speed survey.
- 25 Note and plan of 28 January 2007 from Savills regarding representations of Mr Wayman, submitted by the appellants.
- 26 Response to letter from Wildlife Trust by Green Environmental Consultants, submitted by the appellants.
- 27 Copy of email of 29 January 2007 from Highways Authority.
- 28 Copy of letter from Hurst Surveys Ltd 30 January 2007 regarding surface water drainage design, submitted by the appellants.
- 29 Case law report *R. v. West Dorset District Council, ex parte Searle*, 1998, submitted by the appellants.
- 30 Extract from Horsham District LDF Core Strategy DPD Examination Inspectors' Report 2006, submitted by the appellants.

- 31 Extract from 2000 Inquiry Procedure Rules 2000, submitted by the appellants.
- 32 Extract from General Permitted Development Order 1995, submitted by the appellants.
- 33 JPL 470: *R v. Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, ex parte Milne* submitted by the appellants.
- 34 List of suggested listed building consent conditions.
- 35 Comments of the local planning authority on the UU.

PLANS

201/PA/01 Rev B
201/PA/02 Rev B
201/PA/03 Rev B
201/PA/04 Rev B
201/PA/05 Rev B
201/PA/06 Rev B
201/PA/07 Rev B
201/PA/08 Rev B
201/PA/09 Rev A
201/PA/10 Rev A
201/PA/11 Rev B
201/PA/12 Rev B
201/PA/13 Rev B
201/PA/14 Rev A
201/PA/15 Rev A
201/PA/16 Rev A
201/PA/17 Rev A
201/PA/18 Rev A
SK050920