

---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 9 – 17 February 2016

Site visit made on 18 March 2016

**by Phillip J G Ware BSc DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 18 May 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W0530/W/15/3084325**

**Land off Shepreth Road, Foxton**

- 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 Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of South Cambridgeshire District Council.
  - The application Ref S/2822/14/OL, dated 27 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2015.
  - The development proposed is a development of up to 95 houses (Class C3) with access, open space and associated infrastructure and with all other matters reserved.
- 

### Procedural matters

1. The proposal is in outline, with only the principle of the development and the means of access to be determined at the stage.
  2. As described above, the planning application was for up to 95 houses, and was accompanied by a range of illustrative plans and supporting material showing that scale of development.
  3. A subsequent planning application for up to 76 dwellings on the land was submitted to the Council in October 2015. The appellant has requested that this scale of development and the associated illustrative plans be considered as an alternative scheme to the original illustrative layout.
  4. Although the revised scheme would involve a reduced level of housing, it would be covered by the description of the appeal development as being up to 95 dwellings, and it has been the subject of consultation as part of the separate planning application. Given that the revised scheme involves a lesser scale of development, and that consultation has taken place, I am satisfied that no prejudice would be caused to the interests of any party by consideration of the revised scheme, and I have taken it into account in addition to the original illustrative layout.
  5. The proposal as considered at the Inquiry included an amended access layout, with amended radii. I consider that no prejudice would be caused to any party by the consideration of this revised detail, as agreed by the highway authority, and I have taken it into account.
-

## **Decision**

6. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Main issues**

7. There are three main issues in this case:
  - The effect of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area, in particular on the form of Foxton village.
  - The effect of the proposed development on the setting of Foxton House, a Grade II Listed Building.
  - Whether there are any material considerations, particularly in relation to the provisions of the Planning Obligation and the housing land supply position, sufficient to outweigh any harm or conflict with policy in relation to the above matters.

## **Reasons**

### *Background – the site and the surrounding area*

8. The appeal site is around 6 hectares in extent and is an agricultural field, including three farm buildings. To the northwest there is a belt of trees adjacent to the A10, to the north and northeast are commercial uses (partly screened from the appeal site by vegetation), to the southeast is the boundary of Foxton House and four other houses, and to the southwest is an agricultural field. The site is generally flat.
9. During most of the Inquiry the boundary between the site and Foxton House was marked by a dense screen of Cypress Leylandii trees, which effectively prevented inter-visibility. These trees, within the curtilage of Foxton House, were protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) which covered all the trees within the garden of Foxton House. Consent to fell all the leylandii within the garden was given in September 2015. On the final sitting day the Inquiry was informed that a few of these trees had been felled, and by the date of my site visit (which had been agreed with all parties) all the leylandii on the boundary with the appeal site had been felled.
10. The appeal site is adjacent to the village of Foxton, outside the settlement boundary as identified in the adopted Core Strategy (2007) (CS). Foxton is a Group Village in the CS and has a range of shops, facilities, a primary school and other services. These local services are within an acceptable distance of the site, as agreed by the parties in the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG). The SOCG also identifies the employment opportunities in the wider area.
11. The Foxton Conservation Area is close by the appeal site. However the parties agreed that the site does not make a contribution to the Conservation Area and there is no objection on that basis. I have no reason to disagree with that position.

12. There are bus services running along Shepreth Road and the railway station some 670 metres from the centre of the site. Amongst other destinations, this line runs to Cambridge, around 12 minutes away.
13. The site has no relevant planning history and has not been considered through the Strategic Land Housing Availability Assessment process.

*Background - the appeal scheme*

14. The application sought outline planning permission for up to 95 dwellings and the site access. An illustrative Framework Plan showed how the development could be accommodated on a residential area of 3.33 hectares at a density of 28.5 dwellings per hectare, and included around 2.6 hectares of incidental and open space including a community orchard.
15. The second set of illustrative material showed up to 76 dwellings with the same site access. It was supported by a similar range of illustrative material and showed development on a residential area of 2.7 hectares, at a density of 28 dwellings per hectare. One significant difference was that the illustrative material for the reduced scheme showed no built development in the area closest to Foxton House.
16. Both schemes included a new pedestrian link and cycleway from the appeal site along the south side of the A10, giving access to the railway station.

*Background - policy context*

17. The parties agree that the only parts of the development plan with direct relevance to the appeal are the CS and the Development Control Policies (2007) (DCP). The SOCG notes the relevant policies in both documents, and refers to the fact that both predate the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
18. The emerging Local Plan (DLP) was submitted for examination in March 2014. The Examination has been the subject of preliminary conclusions from the Inspectors examining the Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire Local Plans, and there has been subsequent correspondence. The Examination is currently suspended and the parties agree that there are outstanding and unresolved objections. As a result the weight to be accorded to relevant policies will be assessed in line with national policy in the Framework and the parties agree that they can be accorded only limited weight.

*Background - further matters agreed between the main parties*

19. A number of additional matters were agreed in the SOCG, most importantly:
  - Paragraphs 11 – 14 of the Framework and the presumption in favour of sustainable development apply to the appeal proposal.
  - There is no objection to the proposal in relation to the emerging DLP.
  - The Council's position is that it can demonstrate a 3.9 year housing land supply, using the 'Sedgefield' method and applying a 20% buffer.

- The traffic generated by the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network or on highway safety. The proposed (revised) access achieves the required visibility splays.
- The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents could be addressed at the detailed stage and no objection was raised in this respect.
- Following trial trenching and a report, it is agreed that archaeological matters could be secured by an appropriate condition.
- The appeal site comprises Grade 2 and Grade 3a agricultural land. Although it is therefore classified as best and most versatile agricultural land, it is not of a significant scale and consultation with Natural England was not necessary. No objection was raised to the loss of the agricultural land.

*The effect on the surrounding area*

20. The appeal site lies within the East Anglian Chalk National Character Area 87 and the Chalklands character area in the District Design Guide (2010). It is part of a broad area of low lying relatively flat land. The area is not covered by any designations designed to protect the landscape.
21. The site is relatively well shielded from the surrounding area by vegetation, aided by the topography of the area. As a result the development would only be seen from a limited area, with views largely confined to the immediate perimeter of the site. Doubtless for this reason, there is no alleged conflict with landscape policies and no objection to the effect of the proposal on the landscape. Although obviously a housing development of the scale proposed would have a significant effect on the immediate landscape, I share the view that this is not a matter on which this appeal should turn.
22. The Council's concern in relation to this issue relates to the alleged shortcomings of the proposal in relation the form of development in Foxton. The policy support for this concern is to be found in DCP policies DP/2 and DP/3 which seek high quality design and resist development which would have an unacceptable adverse impact on village character. These policies generally accord with the approach in the Framework, wherein it is stated that great importance is attached to the design of the built environment and that this is indivisible from good planning.
23. The density of the scheme, as illustrated by the two sets of illustrative proposals, was a matter of particular concern to the authority and was discussed in some detail at the Inquiry. Foxton is a settlement which appears to have grown organically from its original historic core, and includes developments of varying ages. As one might expect, the main parties differed as to which parts of the settlement were representative of the prevailing density in Foxton, and consequently how the appeal scheme compared to existing densities. The appellant identified a wide range of areas in the settlement, with densities ranging from 12 to 32 dwellings per hectare. The Council's analysis covered areas ranging from 5.3 to 16.7 dwellings per hectare.

24. It is certainly true that the appeal proposal, as shown by the two sets of illustrative plans, would represent a denser urban grain than is exhibited in some parts of the existing settlement. However, in numerical density terms, it would be comparable to other parts of Foxton. The Council suggested that the form and density of the appeal scheme appeared to have been driven with reference to the high density of the Rowland Close development. However this area, which both parties agreed was not a good example of urban design and planning, is fundamentally different from the proposed scheme, and there is nothing to suggest that the approach of the appeal proposal was based on that development.
25. The illustrative plans serve to show that the site is capable of accommodating development at densities broadly in line with some parts of Foxton. However, density comparisons can only go so far, and it is more informative to consider the way in which the development might fit in with the surrounding area.
26. From the evidence presented it is clear that Foxton is a village which has been enlarged by the addition of a range of developments over the years. Not all of these have been in a linear form aligned along the roads, with the result that the village is not exclusively linear in nature. The proposed development has been described as a backland scheme which, in the sense that the houses would not front onto established roads, is correct. However this does not take the analysis much further as the proposed development is of a size and location such that it would inevitably have a character in its own right. Additionally the visual envelope from which the development would be visible is very limited as the site is enclosed by mature vegetation and the site is well related to the established settlement edge. Even if the details of the proposal were to be different to the predominant form of parts of the settlement, I am not persuaded that this would be necessarily harmful or that it would conflict with DCP policies DP/2 or DP/3. In any event, this is largely a matter for a subsequent stage.
27. Whichever scale of development were adopted the proposal would be a very significant increase in the size of Foxton. This is in the light of the fact that the site is outside the DCP settlement boundary and is therefore affected by DCP Policy DP/7 which restricts development outside the settlement boundary. Foxton itself is identified as a Group Village in CS Policy ST/6 and in such locations development is restricted to an indicative maximum of 8.
28. However these are clearly relevant policies for the supply of housing and are out of date in the light of the housing land supply position - as I will discuss below. This does not mean that they carry no weight, but from the evidence before me I consider they have limited weight at best. The evidence does not demonstrate that the proposed increased in the size of Foxton would be inherently harmful.
29. The majority of the Council's criticism of the proposal in design terms focussed on a range of details as shown on the two sets of illustrative material. These concerns related, amongst other matters, to the layout, inactive frontages, the quality of the public realm, and poor overlooking of public spaces. However the proposal is in outline and the illustrative layouts are not part of the scheme before me. Given the location of the access and the shape of the site, it is reasonable to assume the broad location of the road

leading into the main part of the site – but that is as far as it is reasonable to make assumptions regarding the eventual layout.

30. It was suggested that the Council's design witness did not appreciate that the proposal was in outline, but although much of her evidence focussed on the illustrative material, I am not persuaded that this was the case. However she did accept that the site could be developed in a manner which would be in keeping with the character of Foxton. Even if one were to criticise some of the illustrative details, that is all that the current proposal is required to do. In closing submission it was accepted for the Council that these answers by the design witness were unhelpful to the position of the authority.
31. Overall, bearing in mind the outline nature of the scheme, I consider that the proposal would not harm the character of the surrounding area, in particular the form of Foxton village. It would not conflict with the policies I summarised above.

*The effect on the setting of Foxton House*

32. Foxton House was constructed in 1825 for a prominent local landowner, William Hurrell. It is a two storey building and has a double piled plan. The main rooms face in the direction of the appeal site and include bay windows and a glazed veranda, as I saw during my site visit. The entrance to the building has shifted over time, as has the access to the site – which used to be more directly from the village and is now by way of a curving drive from a location closer to the appeal site entrance. The gardens of the house are comparatively limited, and are of an elongated shape running along the entrance drive. This has had the result that the house itself is relatively close to the boundary with the appeal site. The parties agree that the significance of this Listed Building lies in its aesthetic and historic interest.
33. The development plan policy context is provided by DCP policy CH/4, which provides that planning permission will not be granted for development which would adversely affect the curtilage or the wider setting of a listed building. However this policy does not reflect the approach of the Framework in that it does not balance the harm to heritage assets with public benefits. The same applies to the Council's Listed Buildings Supplementary Planning Document (2009). I therefore accord these policies limited weight, and have assessed the proposal largely against the more recent policy in the Framework.
34. During most of the Inquiry the main focus of the evidence was whether the appeal site formed part of the setting of Foxton House. Using the definition in the Framework this is the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Although there is no need to attempt a definitive finding on the overall extent of the setting, it is therefore clearly necessary to decide whether the proposed development would be within the setting.
35. At the time of the submission of evidence, and for the majority of the Inquiry, there was a dense line of leylandii within the garden of Foxton House along the boundary with the appeal site. These trees, which were planted by a previous owner (along with other leylandii elsewhere in the garden) formed a total visual barrier between the house and the appeal site. Much of the

discussion at the Inquiry therefore focussed on whether the appeal site which, it was argued by the Council, had a historical association with Foxtton House, could form part of the current setting of the heritage asset due to the lack of intervisibility.

36. However, although it was known during the Inquiry that the leylandii had consent to be felled, no work had been undertaken and all parties considered the position both if the trees remained or alternatively if they were felled. As stated above, felling started on the last day of the Inquiry and had been completed (as far as it involved the boundary trees) by the time of my site visit. The question of whether the site could be considered part of the setting of the asset even though one could not be seen from the other was therefore rendered academic.
37. This recent history serves to illustrate the fact that the setting of a heritage asset can change over time. There is now no doubt that the removal of the tree screen has meant that the appeal site is now part of the setting of Foxtton House – whatever the position before the tree felling.
38. The setting of a heritage asset often includes land which has a visual relationship with the building, and this is certainly the case in this instance. The house, which is sited at a slightly elevated level, looks across the appeal site, from which it is clearly visible. In particular the principal rooms and a main façade are clearly visible from the appeal site, and the setting makes a positive visual contribution to the significance of the house and enhances the ability to appreciate that significance. Despite some post war commercial development on the far side of the appeal site (off the A10) the house can now be appreciated and understood in its rural setting at the edge of the settlement.
39. In this context it is also useful to revisit the question of the historical association of the appeal site with Foxtton House. Although this was discussed largely in relation to whether the site was within the setting of the house, now an academic concern, the possibility of an historic relationship between the asset and the appeal site is of relevance to the contribution which the setting makes to the asset. The appellant's position was that the history of the setting can help to determine the level of contribution that the setting makes to the asset.
40. When Foxtton House was built, it sat in its own gardens enclosed by pastureland around the village, including the appeal site. There did not appear (from various historic maps) to have been any attempt to lay out the appeal site as parkland associated with the house when it was built, especially as the surrounding land was apparently not in Hurrell's ownership at the time. That much is common ground between the parties. However, over a period of time, historic maps appear to show additional planting of what could well be specimen trees across the appeal site. This led to the position in 1914, when the estate was sold in separate lots, that the appeal site was described as parkland. On my site visit I noted some remaining specimen trees and parkland-style railings around part of the appeal site identical to those at Foxtton House.

41. The interpretation of historic maps can be difficult, as was evidenced by the amount of debate on the matter at the Inquiry. But on the balance of the evidence, I consider that the appeal site has had an historic relationship with Foxtan House, and retains some elements which can still be understood as parkland today.
42. It is clear that the appeal site is now within the setting of the heritage asset and makes a significant contribution to the significance of the asset and the ability to appreciate it. That contribution relates to the proximity of the open land to the asset and their historical relationship. The proposal, whichever illustrative plan was pursued, would affect an important view of the asset and would visually compete with and distract from it. That position was accepted by the appellant as a risk caused by the appeal proposal. However the appellant further considered that the indicative landscaping scheme would reduce the impact and the resulting effect on the setting and significance of the Listed Building would be towards the “..bottom end of the less than substantial spectrum”. However the harm caused by the introduction of a substantial housing development within the setting of this heritage asset would not be significantly reduced by landscaping.
43. In Framework terms, the harm to the asset would be less than substantial. However given the importance of the setting to the appreciation of the asset, I give this harm considerable importance and weight. The proposal would conflict with the duty to give special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building. It would seriously harm the setting of Foxtan House, and conflict with the policies summarised above. I have weighed this harm against the public benefits of the proposal, most particularly the provision of housing, but consider these benefits (to which I will return below) do not outweigh the harm to the setting of the heritage asset.

#### *The Planning Obligation*

44. A Unilateral Planning Obligation (UPO), dated 1 March 2016, has been submitted by the appellants. This was discussed at the Inquiry and covers a range of matters. In particular, in relation to the District Council, the UPO provides for the works to provide the open space and its transfer to a management company (and subsequent arrangements), the phased provision of affordable housing, the payment of the Council’s monitoring fee, a contribution towards household waste receptacles, and a phased contribution towards medical facilities. In relation to the County Council the UPO provides for a contribution related to Real Time Passenger Information, a phased library contribution, a Traffic Regulation Order contribution and a bus shelter maintenance contribution.
45. The Council submitted evidence on the proposed UPO, and the matter was discussed at the Inquiry. A range of issues were raised by the two Councils at the Inquiry (and subsequently), and time was allowed after the close of the Inquiry for consideration of these matters. The result was the final UPO and a statement explaining the appellant’s position.



46. The County Council, as the education authority, had originally requested a contribution towards primary education. However this request was withdrawn at the start of the Inquiry.
47. The appellant has questioned whether a number of these matters are fairly and reasonably related to the development, in the light of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations. However, the majority of the provisions are designed to mitigate the effects of the proposal, and add little to the arguments in favour of the development. The provision of open space and arrangements for its maintenance is a matter weighing in favour of the proposal and is soundly based on policy. Similarly the provision of housing, including affordable housing, weighs in favour of the proposal. I consider these elements meet the policy in paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the tests in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010.

#### *Housing Land Supply*

48. The housing land supply position, as it relates to this appeal, is relatively straightforward. As mentioned above, the DLP Examination is currently suspended, in part due to concerns about housing delivery.
49. As matters currently stand, it is agreed that the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply against the adopted CS or the housing requirement in the emerging DLP. The position as agreed at this appeal is that the Council can only demonstrate a 3.9 year housing land supply, using the 'Sedgefield' method and applying a 20% buffer. It is also common ground that the authority has persistently failed to deliver the appropriate quantum of housing, hence the use of a 20% buffer.
50. Both parties provided some limited evidence as to the way in which the authority is seeking to address the shortfall in housing land, including the Cambridge City Deal and joint working arrangements between the authority and Cambridge City Council. The progress of modifications to the emerging DLP were also referred to. However none of these matters was fully explored or tested at the Inquiry, nor should they have been as they are matters for the ongoing DLP examination.
51. The first consequence of this agreed position is that, in line with Framework paragraph 49, relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date. In particular, whilst the appellant accepts that the proposal conflicts with elements of the development plan due to non-compliance with existing housing policies and the countryside location of the site, policies CS ST/6 (Group Village) and DP/7 (settlement boundary) are out of date and can be accorded only limited weight.
52. The second consequence of the housing land supply shortfall is that paragraph 14 of the Framework is engaged – the presumption in favour of sustainable development. I return to this matter below.
53. National policy is to boost significantly the supply of housing. In this context and given the evidence of a substantial shortfall in the provision of general needs and affordable housing (to be provided by the scheme at a policy

compliant level), the housing proposed in the appeal scheme is a matter which attracts significant weight.

*Planning balance and conclusion*

54. The consequence of the acknowledged shortfall in housing land supply is that paragraph 14 of the Framework is engaged such that, if the proposal constitutes sustainable development, then planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or specific policies in the Framework indicate that development should be restricted. The footnote to this latter part of the policy gives a range of examples, including policies relating to designated heritage assets.
55. In assessing whether the proposal constitutes sustainable development, I am guided by the policy in the Framework regarding the three roles of sustainability. It is noted that these roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent.
56. In terms of the economic role of sustainability, the parties agreed that the estimated 85 construction jobs, along with additional employment in associated industries, would contribute to the vitality of the area. However the wider benefit of the increased value of local household expenditure is hard to quantify and, in any event, would arise from any housing development undertaken to meet the housing shortfall largely regardless of its precise location.
57. The proposal is clearly in line with the social role of sustainability, which seeks to provide the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations. There should be accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being. The provision of up to 95 houses, including 40% affordable housing, clearly accords with this aspect of sustainability.
58. Based on the evidence, it can reasonably be concluded that the site is in an accessible location, as noted in the SOCG. But, contrary to the SOCG, the Council expressed concern at the Inquiry that the facilities within the village would not be easily accessible from the proposed development. However the distances are not great and I consider the services in the village are realistically accessible by methods other than the private car. In addition there are proposed enhancements to public transport, which would facilitate access to a network of rural and urban facilities.
59. There are two aspects of the proposal which would, to a limited extent, enhance the environmental role of biodiversity. The provision of open space at a level above what is required by policy (including the potential provision of a community orchard) is undoubtedly a factor in favour of the proposal – but this support has to be tempered by the fact that the site is already open fields – albeit without public access. The proposed biodiversity enhancements are of limited benefit as habitats already exist on the site and the biodiversity approach can reasonably be seen in large part as mitigation for the loss of the open countryside.

60. The key issue in relation to the environmental role is the need to protect and enhance the built and historic environment. As set out above, the proposal would seriously harm the setting of Foxtan House, and conflict with the relevant policies in the development plan and the Framework summarised above.
61. On balance, the key benefit of the development is the provision of much needed general and affordable housing. But although this is to be welcomed in a District with significant housing need, it is a general benefit which could be located on any sustainable site in the area. This particular site, due to its location within the setting of a Listed Building, gives rise to very considerable objections on heritage and therefore sustainability grounds. On balance I conclude that the proposal does not comprise sustainable development.
62. Both parties submitted appeal decisions illustrating the general approach to be adopted. However, each appeal must be decided on its merits and, in this particular case, the precise location of the appeal site within the setting of a heritage asset is a factor which distinguishes this proposal from most of those considered at other appeals.
63. Overall, I do not consider that there are any material considerations sufficient to outweigh the harm and conflict with policy in relation to the heritage issue.
64. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*P. J. G. Ware*

Inspector

**APPEARANCES**

**FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Mr G Mackenzie of Counsel	Instructed by Head of Legal Services
He called	
Ms J Shepherd BA(Hons) Dip Arch TRP RIBA RTPI IHBC	Consultant Conservation Officer
Ms B Kwok BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA	Lead urban design project coordinator
Ms S Ballantyne-Way BSc(Hons) MSc MTRPI	Sole practitioner, acting for the Council
<i>For s106 session:</i>	
Mr S Reid	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Mr J Fisher	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Ms J Carballo	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mr C Fitzgerald	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mr M Salter	Cambridgeshire County Council
Mr J Finney	Cambridgeshire County Council

**FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Mr J Barrett of Counsel	Instructed by Gladman Developments Ltd
He called	
Mr L Lane BSc(Hons) MRTPI	Planning Manager, Gladman Developments Ltd
Mr J Clemons BA(Hons) MA MSc MRTPI IHBC	Director and Head of Historic Buildings, RPS CgMs
Mr P Rech BA(Hons) BHPIL CMLI	Director, FPCR Environment and Design Ltd
Mr D Hartley BSc(Hons) MA DipTRP MRTPI	Director, Rural Solutions
Mr O Nicholson BSC(Hons)	Strategy Director, EPDS (Not called in evidence)

**FOR FOXTON PARISH COUNCIL:**

Mr P Kratz	Birketts LLP
He called	
Ms J Burton IHBC	Beacon Planning

**INTERESTED PERSONS:**

Councillor Roberts	District Councillor
--------------------	---------------------

## **INQUIRY DOCUMENTS<sup>1</sup>**

1	Lists of persons present at the inquiry
2	Submission by the appellant regarding Wheatcroft position
3	Edward Ware Homes v SSCLG and Bath and North Somerset Council [2016] EWHC 103 (Admin)
4	Position statement by Cambridgeshire County Council (2 February 2016)
5	Email (8 February 2016) from Cambridgeshire County Council to the appellants
6	Appeal decision (16 December 2015) related to land north of Pelham Road, Clavering
7	Minutes of Planning Committee of Foxton Parish Council (27 January 2016)
8	Statement of Mr N Rapley (Foxton House) (February 2016)
9	Community Orchards (CLG) (2011)
10	Extract from A Guide to Foxton
11	Email from Mr N Rapley (Foxton House) to Mr Kratz
12	Advice to the Council on monitoring fees
13	S106 Obligation (1 March 2016)
14	Correspondence regarding S106 obligation
15	Closing submissions on behalf of Foxton Parish Council
16	Closing submissions on behalf of South Cambridgeshire District Council
17	Closing submissions on behalf of the Appellant

---

<sup>1</sup> Core Documents on file