



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 11-14 May 2010.

An accompanied site visit was made on 17 May 2010 and an unaccompanied visit to the town centre and locality on 18 May 2010, as well as visits to the street market on 11 and 18 May 2010.

by **D G Hollis BA DipTP MRTPI**

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
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
5 July 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/M1710/A/10/2122565 Unit 1-2, Mill Lane, Alton, Hampshire GU34 2QJ

- 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 Tesco Stores Limited against the decision of East Hampshire District Council.
- The application Ref 22467/004, dated 16 October 2009, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2010.
- The development proposed is "*A1 (retail) food store at first floor level with undercroft parking, including associated landscaping and access improvements following demolition of existing buildings*".

Decision

1. For the reasons given below, I dismiss the appeal.

Main issues

2. Having read the written representations, considered the evidence given at the Inquiry and carried out accompanied and unaccompanied visits to the appeal site, Alton town centre and other parts of the town, I consider there are three main issues in this appeal. The first issue is whether the proposed development would cause significant harm to the vitality and viability of the existing town centre. Secondly, whether the proposed scheme would be likely to provide an adequate choice of modes of transport or increase reliance upon the use of the private car. Lastly, whether the use of the local highway network in association with the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental effect upon highway safety and the free flow of traffic in the area.

Reasons

Background details

3. In the statement of common ground it was said that the site forms part of the Mill Lane industrial area and although the site has been unused for a number of years, it was previously occupied as a vehicle depot with manufacturing and storage uses. In 2007, planning permission was granted for a retail warehouse use with various restrictions; the land has an area of about 1.2 hectares. To the north-east the site is bordered by Montecchio Way, to the north-west by
-

the Waterloo-Alton mainline railway, to the south-west by existing retail warehousing and to the south-east by Mill Lane. Montecchio Way links directly to the A31 Alton By-Pass. Although the copy of the statement of common ground was submitted on behalf of the appellant and unsigned, I did not receive objections from any party to these details.

4. In evidence given on behalf of the appellant it was stated that the proposed development would have a gross floor area of 6,112m², including an atrium and a net retail area of 3,600m². The new store would be set above a ground level car park with pedestrian access via travellators and lifts; the car park would have a total of 296 spaces, including 20 reserved for disabled person use, as well as 48 cycle spaces. It was said that this kind of store is a relatively new concept and involves greater construction costs, but those are balanced by the need for less land for the development.
5. A signed copy of a statement of common ground has been submitted on behalf of the appellant with the Hampshire County Council in respect of highway matters. Within the issues raised in the document, it was said that the appeal site at present has poor accessibility by bus; the site is within 1,300 metres of Alton railway station, but it was agreed that rail would amount to an insignificant mode of travel for customers of the proposed store. Whilst there is a cycle route along part of Anstey Road, Mill Lane currently has no cycle provision. There are no footways leading to the north-east of the site towards Holybourne and whilst there are footways along Mill Lane that link to industrial, commercial and residential areas, as well as the town centre, they are not in good condition. Street lighting does exist along Mill Lane.
6. In terms of traffic flow, all road junctions near to the appeal site operate within capacity, with the exceptions of the PM peak period at the Montecchio/Mill Lane junction and the Spitalhatch junction. In both instances, traffic queues do occur. It is said that the any increase in traffic generation at these two junctions relating to the new store would not be such as to have a material effect upon the results of the submitted Transport Assessment. A Travel Plan has been agreed and which would be managed by Tesco. The car parking provision would satisfy the standards set by the County Council.
7. The Unilateral Undertaking submitted by the appellant seeks to resolve most of the highway objections raised by the Council. Among the items listed is a financial contribution of £480,000 for the purpose of improving the bus service; any such service would run through the town centre, some residential areas, the railway station, to the appeal site. A sum of £20,000 would be paid to the Council for environmental improvements to Mill Lane, £100,000 for improvements to the town centre and £16,500 for the County Council to monitor compliance with the Travel Plan.
8. The following highway works would be carried out by the appellant. Signalisation of the Mill Lane/Montecchio Way junction, widening of the latter highway and provision of a bus lay-by, bus stop and a right turning lane into Mill Lane. Modifications to the access into the site, widening of Mill Lane to provide a right turn into the site, provision of a continuous shared footway/cycle path to Anstey Road and a footway from London Road to Anstey Road would be provided. Also provision for a shared footway/cycle path to Newman Lane and safety measures at various junctions. In a further

addendum to the statement, the appellant has agreed to provide a double mini-roundabout at the Spitalhatch junction. Prior to the opening of the Inquiry, the Council confirmed that in the light of the latter agreement with the appellant, reason for refusal No.4 would not be pursued.

Planning policy

9. Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4) makes it clear that when considering retail schemes of the nature of the current proposal it is necessary to look to see whether there are any alternative sites closer to the town centre that may be available and preferable. There is also a need to assess any proposal upon the impact it may have in various terms, including the vitality and viability of the town centre, consumer choice and range and quality of comparison and convenience retail offers. Reference was also made to Planning Policy Guidance 13 (PPG13).
10. Among the various planning policies mentioned in evidence, reference was made to policies in the Regional Spatial Strategy – South East Plan 2009 (South East Plan), relating to schemes intended to strengthen town centres and recognise the social, economic and cultural importance of towns to the wider rural areas and region as a whole. In particular, reference was made to Policies T1, T2, CC7, TC1 and TC2. Within the East Hampshire Local Plan 2006 (Local Plan), reference was made to Policy TC2 in respect of large scale retail users, including superstores outside of town centres; the policy includes a sequential approach to development, the site to be within the settlement boundary, not to adversely affect the vitality and viability of the town centre and be easily accessible by public transport, car, bicycle or on foot.
11. Policy T1 relates to the integration and choice of transport and an effective public transport system. Policy T2 states that planning permission would not be granted unless development that generates significant levels of travel is well served by public transport. Policy T3 follows similar requirements for pedestrians and cyclists and Policy T9 seeks to ensure development does not cause danger or inconvenience on the public highway. Policy GS1 requires schemes that minimise the numbers and lengths of trips by car and be readily accessible by public transport; Policy GS2 seeks safety and convenience on the public highway.
12. It seems to me that local planning policies follow closely the national planning guidelines of promoting towns such as Alton as independent comparison and convenience centres and where local people should be able to expect to find a range of goods, adequate consumer choice and with retail stores providing proper competition for the benefit of local residents. There is also a need to provide proper and effective alternative modes of transport to that of the private car.

Effect upon the vitality and viability of Alton Town Centre

Demand

13. In terms of demand, the Council have accepted that there is evidence of a need for additional retail provision, although they do suggest the existing smaller stores and a new Aldi and Waitrose could satisfy that demand. Within the appellant's evidence it was said that there is only one superstore in Alton that

contributes significantly to main bulk food demand. Indeed, third party representation at the Inquiry included the suggestion that many local people felt they needed another superstore to compete with the J Sainsbury store and offer a better choice, as well as competition on price. One third party representing the local Chamber of Commerce concluded that he was not opposed to more business enterprises in the town and believed more competition to J Sainsbury was needed; he did add that the views of local business owners were divided on the proposed scheme, but an overwhelming number of residents were in favour.

14. The evidence of the Council did not suggest that the proposed scheme would force the closure of J Sainsbury, but that there would be a reduction in their trade that may lead to an effect upon investment or improvements to the store. From my own observations, as well as the evidence given by witnesses at the Inquiry, other existing food retail stores are small when compared to the J Sainsbury store. Marks and Spencer, Iceland and the Co-op all have only small representation in the town and are unlikely to compete seriously with the J Sainsbury store for bulk food sales in Alton. Whilst the Council's retail witness gave a rather pessimistic view of future trading for existing food stores in Alton if the Tesco scheme is built, it is possible that businesses such as the J Sainsbury store may well seek to up-grade their store and offer in order to compete, rather than close.
15. Representatives of J Sainsbury had the opportunity to attend the Inquiry and give evidence, but chose to submit written objections. Having considered their letter carefully, I am not convinced that significant harm would be caused to the trading levels of that store. Neither am I convinced that the appellant's survey of J Sainsbury stores at Alton and Godalming on one particular day is a reliable indication the store in Alton is over-trading. The reasons for a number of items being out of stock, persons queuing at check-outs or staff directing customers where to park their cars could have been due to a number of reasons and not just a sign of over-trading.
16. Nevertheless, I agree with the comment of the appellant's retail witness during cross-examination, that although statistics can indicate various scenarios, it is often a question of common sense or an experience of circumstances that can at least give an indication of the way in which a locality or individual store is trading. Whilst I am aware of the differences of opinion between the retail witnesses of the appellant and the Council as to whether J Sainsbury is overtrading to a significant level, it does seem to me that to provide a proper level of competition, there is a need for a store large enough to allow a proper range of goods and provide for consumer choice in the manner advocated by PPS4.
17. I disagree with the suggestion that a combination of smaller stores that exist or are proposed would create sufficient consumer choice together with a range of goods at competitive prices. The latter issue was precisely the point made in a number of third party representations. In all of these circumstances, it is my opinion that Alton does need another superstore in order to provide a proper level of competition and consumer choice for this sector of the market. The current situation is that J Sainsbury is likely to be overtrading and there are only minor levels of competition from Marks and Spencer, Iceland and the Co-op. Even with a future Aldi and Waitrose proposals, it is my view that the size

and choice necessary to compete with J Sainsbury would not exist in Alton. The current Tesco proposal would provide that level of offer.

Linked trips

18. However, the issue of demand is only one aspect of my consideration. The appellant's retail witness suggested that J Sainsbury does little to contribute to the aggregate of the shopping core in Alton. I disagree with that assessment. In my view, because the store is so close to the town centre, as well as being within easy walking distance, it has a good relationship with that area and contributes to the attractiveness and trading levels of the town centre.
19. The Council suggest that the turnover of businesses in the town centre would fall significantly due to the loss of linked trips and the direct impact of trade lost to the new store. In evidence, the appellant referred to a survey that found a majority of J Sainsbury shoppers from within the whole catchment area visited that store for a single purpose trip. Nevertheless, there are still likely to be a significant number of people able to carry out a linked trip to the town centre. But the difference between customers visiting the J Sainsbury store and a Tesco store on the appeal site is that the former do at least have the opportunity to walk into the town centre and browse comparison shops or other services. Tesco customers would be unlikely to take that opportunity to walk because of the distance involved and would need to get into their cars and make a specific trip into the town centre. I did note that one third party suggested she would cycle to the store from her home, but I doubt many customers would do that for bulk food shopping.
20. In terms of linked trips, the Nathaniel Lichfield Study found in an on-street survey that 33.6% of persons interviewed and living in nearby residential areas, walked to the town centre. That may not be the case if those persons were encouraged to drive to a new Tesco store in Mill Lane rather than walk into the town centre and the J Sainsbury store. The appellant's retail witness suggested that a Tesco store development would provide town centre initiatives and draw trade from the rural areas. That is a possibility, but it is also likely that some customers from rural areas already drive to the J Sainsbury store and then visit other larger centres for comparison shopping. A Tesco store would again be unlikely to encourage linked trips by foot from those customers to the town centre; if such trips took place they would do so by car. The Nathaniel Lichfield Study of 2007 recommended that Alton should function as one of the District's two main comparison shopping destinations. Accordingly, there is a need to support the vitality and viability of the town centre, as well as providing a properly balanced convenience retail offer.
21. It was suggested by the appellant that customers would have a choice of visiting Tesco or J Sainsbury and shop in the town centre as well. That is a possibility, but as I have already mentioned, given the distance involved between the town centre and the appeal site, I am not convinced that a significant number of customers would drive into the centre after having carried out their main food shopping at Tesco. Such a linked trip is even more questionable given that the Tesco store would not only have 70% of floorspace devoted to convenience goods, but some 30% occupied by comparison goods. Customers may decide to carry out their bulk food shopping at Tesco and then

return home, whereas at the present time they have the opportunity of a close pedestrian link to the town centre from J Sainsbury.

22. It is also possible that even with the comparison offer in the new store, customers visiting Tesco may opt for a visit to another larger town centre elsewhere for that part of their shopping. That would be precisely the opposite to the suggestion made by the appellant of clawing back trade into Alton from nearby areas for comparison and convenience shopping. The location of the appeal site to the north-east of Alton, the location of Holybourne residents, as well as the future residents of the some 170 dwellings on a nearby site would allow those residents a much closer and better access to a bulk food offer, and many of those residents could walk to the new store. But in my opinion, such a situation would do little to help maintain the level of vitality and viability of the town centre as they would still need to take a conscious decision to take a car journey into the centre.

Attractiveness of Alton town centre

23. During my time outside of Inquiry sessions and during my site visits, I was able to observe the range and attractiveness of existing businesses in Alton. In common with the Council's opinion, I did not find the town centre to be in poor health. Indeed, the Council's retail witness suggested the centre is satisfactory, although he added it is vulnerable to over-reliance upon food/convenience shopping, loss of shop units and individual shops and investment moving elsewhere. The representative of the Chamber of Commerce considered the town centre to be in reasonable health and an Inspector assessing a previous appeal considered the centre to be robust, albeit when assessed against a smaller scheme.
24. I also found the town centre to have a very pleasant shopping environment and note that the Nathaniel Lichfield Study found pedestrian movement through the town centre to be reasonably busy, especially on Tuesdays, which is market day. Pedestrian flows were said to be good with limited traffic intrusion. It also states that Alton has a very good overall environmental quality, with a reasonably good range of shops and services. Nevertheless, whilst I do not disagree with the basic finding of that Study and found businesses to be achieving a reasonable level of trade, I again concur with the Council that the need to maintain a proper level of vitality and viability in the town centre should not be dismissed lightly. Of course, I am aware of the current economic climate and that businesses may struggle for trade. But that is also a national phenomena and trade generally may well improve in the near future.

Sequential test

25. In terms of the sequential test advocated in PPS4, the Council stated that there is already planning permission for an Aldi store near to the existing J Sainsbury store and they are in the process of assessing an application for another store adjacent to the Railway Station; a letter from Waitrose states that Company wishes to occupy the new store. However, from the evidence given by witnesses it is clear that both the Waitrose and the Aldi developments would be likely to have a significantly lower floorspace than the Tesco scheme. I note that the Council do not claim that either of the proposed schemes could provide the necessary range and level of competition and consumer choice in the same

manner as the Tesco scheme. I was also shown the Coors site which is outside of the town centre and is not an edge of centre site. However, the Council have already resisted a retail development on that land, although I note from the written representation of the owner's agent that they intend to pursue development on that land. But in the light of the evidence given at the Inquiry, I am not convinced that there is at the present time a suitable alternative site that could offer a size and range of store to compete satisfactorily with the J Sainsbury store.

Available modes of transport and use of the car

26. The second issue I have identified is whether there would be an adequate choice of modes of transport or whether the proposed scheme would increase reliance upon the private car.

Accessibility

27. Both main parties accept that the appeal site is located in an out-of-centre location and on the edge of the urban area of Alton. Given the proposed size of the scheme and likely number of customers that would be attracted, the new development would be likely to generate a considerable amount of traffic. Furthermore, being located on the north-east periphery of Alton, many residents would be some distance from the site and be likely to have to travel further than they would to the town centre or J Sainsbury. That of course would not be the case for residents of much of Holybourne and other areas near to the appeal site; some of those residents, as well as people working in Mill Lane could consider walking to the new store. But given the fact that many customers would be undertaking main bulk food shopping, even local people are likely to use their car.
28. Of course, that is likely to be the case with customers to J Sainsbury already, but because that store is more centrally located, I estimate that a considerable number of residents in Alton as a whole would have to travel further to reach the appeal site. I have noted the appellant's catchment area estimates for walking distances, but concur with the Council that many of those distances would be too far for people to walk and even in the further parts of Holybourne, people would be likely to use their car rather than walk.
29. It is possible that some people would cycle to the new store but, as with pedestrians, for a bulk food shopping trip they are likely to use their cars. In respect of clawback of trade from other localities, as I have already mentioned, that is a possibility, but given the easy access from the appeal site onto the A31, there is also a possibility that people from further away would be attracted and thereby increase the length and number of car journeys.
30. As far as public transport is concerned, I have noted that there is a poor bus link at present to the appeal land. Mention was made at the Inquiry of the Cango service in addition to the existing public service routes, but those services are both limited and often inconvenient. It seems to me that given the relatively remote location of the appeal site from the town centre, it would be necessary to significantly improve the links between residential areas of the whole town and a new Tesco store via the town centre. In my opinion, only by providing a significant and substantial bus service would residents be encouraged to leave their cars at home and adopt an alternative mode of

transport. They may still wish to carry out their main bulk food shopping by car, but with a much improved and convenient bus link, they could visit the Tesco store on occasions when they are also shopping in the town centre.

31. The appellant has had discussions with the County Council and offered a payment of £480,000 to establish a new bus service. However, the County Council's calculations show that payment would only cover the cost of such a service for some 8-9 years; they suggest that only a payment of over two million pounds would secure the service on a long term basis and would prefer a service in perpetuity to be provided by the appellant.
32. It seems to me that given my conclusions regarding the likely reduction in linked trips to the town centre, the only practical alternative mode of transport to the car would be to establish an attractive, convenient and easily accessible bus service from the residential areas of Alton via the town centre to the new Tesco store. However, I am not persuaded from the evidence before me that adequate investigations have been made of the extent of routes or frequency of such a future service. I concur with the County Council that the proposed service would be inadequate in terms of the areas covered and the level of service during all opening periods of the store. There may even be the possibility to provide a dedicated service that provides the links I have mentioned. Based on these circumstances, I am not satisfied that a sufficiently detailed attempt has been made to provide an extensive and adequate bus service.
33. As far as the financial contribution is concerned, I note that the main parties are a considerable distance apart in determining a reasonable figure. It seems to me that in order to mitigate the locational objections to the appeal site, including the concerns over the loss of linked trips that I have mentioned, it would be necessary to offer a service that would last for longer than 8-9 years. It was suggested by the appellant that after that period of time the bus service should be self-financing. From the evidence that I have received, I am not convinced that length of time would be reasonable; neither do I consider such measures would overcome my concerns at the loss of links to the town centre, particularly over a long period of time.
34. There has been criticism by the Council in respect of the improvement of links for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly along Mill Lane that have been proposed by the appellant. In my opinion, the improvements offered should be sufficient to accommodate the limited use by pedestrians and cyclists. Furthermore, those improvements are in addition to the proposed Travel Plan for the new store.

Use of the local public highway network

35. I have given consideration to the agreements reached between the Council and the appellant relating to improvements to various road junctions, installation of traffic signals, improvement to footways and provision of cycle routes. I have also noted the terms of the Unilateral Undertaking. In all of these circumstances, I consider that the schemes would be adequate to ensure that traffic generated by the proposed development would be able to access the appeal site without causing significant detriment to the free flow of traffic or highway danger.

36. I am aware of the concerns of local people in respect of traffic congestion at various road junctions. However, I consider the agreements reached between the parties would overcome such problems.

Other matters

37. The Council did not raise the question of design as a reason for refusal and having considered the submitted plans, I have found that aspect of the scheme to be acceptable. I am also aware that the proposed scheme would allow the regeneration and reuse of previously developed land; the Council suggest that in time, the land could still be used for the sale of bulky goods. Having taken both opinions into account, I do not consider that evidence should outweigh the conclusions I have made on other aspects of the scheme.

38. It was said in evidence that there would be an additional opportunity for employment at the new store. The appellant suggests that there would be some 320 persons likely to be employed at the new store. However, doubt is cast upon that by the Council witness who suggested it would be nearer 60-70 jobs bearing in mind diversion from existing facilities and the level of trading. Whichever figure is found to be more relevant, in times of unemployment and financial difficulties, any net increase in jobs should be welcomed. However, I do not consider such a matter should outweigh the concerns I have identified to the proposed development.

Overall conclusions

39. Having listened carefully to evidence from both professional witnesses and members of the public, as well as written representations, I am aware that residents in Alton are divided as to whether a new Tesco store on the appeal site would be a good form of development for the town.

40. In terms of planning policy, both the South East Plan and the Local Plan seek to promote town centres such as Alton as independent comparison and convenience centres where local people should be able to expect to find a range of goods, adequate consumer choice and proper competition between stores for the benefit of local residents. But these Plans also seek to strengthen the vitality and viability of such town centres.

41. For the reasons I have given, I have found that it is likely that J Sainsbury is overtrading and that an additional large store in Alton is necessary to provide proper and balanced consumer choice and range of goods. This conclusion was supported by a number of third party oral and written representations. Given the limited size of stores and range of goods offered in the existing smaller food stores, as well as the proposed Aldi and Waitrose, I am not convinced the demand identified would be properly satisfied by a combination of those smaller stores.

42. Whilst I consider the Tesco proposal would provide the necessary consumer choice, the location of the appeal site is such that it would not allow linked trips to the town centre in the way in which the J Sainsbury store allows easy pedestrian access. Neither am I convinced that a significant number of customers visiting the new Tesco store would make a separate car trip into the town centre. Because of these circumstances, I am concerned at the possible loss of such linked trips and the consequent effect upon the vitality and viability

of the town centre. It is possible that residents from the Holybourne area and developments near to the appeal site would find it acceptable to walk to the new store, but that does not mean they would then use their cars to visit the town centre.

43. There is also the possibility of a clawback of trade from persons that travel a distance to other towns in order to carry out both convenience and comparison shopping. But there is also the possibility that due to the location of the appeal site to the A31, the new store would attract customers from much further away than the immediate rural areas; that would then be likely to result in an increase in the length and number of car journeys. But in my opinion, none of these scenarios are likely to significantly help to maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre or assist in replacing the loss of linked trips. In my estimation, Alton town centre has a reasonable level of trade and the shopping environment is generally attractive, but there is still a need to ensure that situation is not eroded.
44. In terms of the sequential test, I was not able to identify any other available or suitable site able to accommodate a development large enough to compete properly with J Sainsbury. As far as the first issue is concerned, although I found there was an identified demand, lack of alternative sites and the town centre was in reasonable health, I have significant concerns over the potential loss of linked trips and the effect that would have upon the vitality and viability of the town centre.
45. As far as the second issue is concerned, I agree with the suggestion that there should be a balanced approach when assessing the overall effects of the proposed scheme. But I have already expressed my concerns at the potential loss of linked trips to the town centre and the need to balance that with a proper attempt at an alternative mode of transport to that of the private car. I found it unlikely that many customers would walk or cycle to the new store due to the distance from the majority of local residents' homes. The exception would be those people living in parts of Holybourne and areas near to the appeal site; even those persons may be unlikely to be disposed to walk home and then use their car to drive into the town centre. It was accepted by both parties that the appeal site is poorly served by bus services. I concur with that assessment. I am also of the opinion that the financial and other suggestions made by the appellant to improve those services would be inadequate to establish a sufficiently comprehensive, convenient and reliable link to the new Tesco store via the town centre. In my opinion, a proper and adequate link would be essential to maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre and help to replace the loss of linked trips.
46. In terms of the use of the local highways by vehicles generated by the use of the new store, I am satisfied that the financial offers, Travel Plan and various improvements to the highway network to be carried out by the appellant would ensure that there would be no significant detriment to highway safety or the free flow of traffic.
47. Bearing all of these matters in mind, I am of the opinion that there is a need for a better and more detailed scheme for improving the bus services to provide a convenient, attractive and reliable link between significant parts of the residential areas and the appeal site via the town centre. Accordingly, I am

of the view that the current scheme would cause significant harm to the vitality and viability of the town centre in that there would be an inadequate alternative mode of transport linking residential areas, the town centre and the appeal site. In such circumstances, I do not consider the proposed development complies with either national or local planning policies. I have taken into account all other matters raised at the Inquiry and in written representations, but none was sufficient to outweigh the conclusions I have reached.

D G Hollis

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr M Bedford of Counsel

He called

Mr A Whitty, District Team Manager with East Hampshire District Council

Mr T Wall, Team Leader for the Highways Development Planning Team of Hampshire County Council

Mr P Wilks, Director with Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr P Clarkson QC

He called

Mr M Robeson of Martin Robeson Planning Practice

Mr P Rust, Technical Director of Waterman Boreham Limited

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mrs S McLeod
Mr Willis
Mr V Applegath
Mrs Hulbert
Mr Eckles
Mr Gay
Mrs Lerew
Councillor Jay
Mrs Archer

DOCUMENTS

1/1-1/12	Lists of persons attending the Inquiry.
2/1-2/5	Copies of letter of notification and persons notified of appeal.
3/1-3/11	Letters from third parties.
4/1-4/3	Statement of Common Ground between Tesco Stores Limited and East Hampshire District Council, Statement of Common Ground between Hampshire County Council and Waterman Boreham Limited on highway matters and an addendum to the latter document.
5	List of suggested conditions.
6/1-6/2	Signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking and briefing note

- 7/1-7/5 submitted on behalf of the appellant
Bundle of documents submitted by Mr Clarkson comprising copy of Alton Household Survey, extract from East Hampshire District Council Core Strategy, copy of planning permission for 10 industrial units at Station Approach, Alton, extracts from South East Plan and Local Plan.
- 8/1-8/2 Bundle of documents submitted by Mr Bedford comprising extract of Appendix 6 from Mr Wall's evidence and Alton Telephone Survey of NEMS Market Research.
- 9/1-9/4 Copy of Appendices A-D from Mr Whitty's supplementary proof of evidence.
- 10/1-10/6 Copy of Appendices 1-4 from Mr Wilks proof of evidence, town centres, retail and leisure studies of Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners and response documents to Mr Robeson's evidence submitted by Mr Wilks.
- 11/1 Copy of Appendices 1-19 of Mr Wall's proof of evidence.
- 12/1-12/3 Copies of Appendices 1-8 of Mr Robeson's proof of evidence, additional note relating to Mr Wilks Appendix 2 and Appendix 1 of Mr Robeson's supplementary proof of evidence.
- 13/1-13/2 Copies of Appendices 1-21 of Mr Rust's proof of evidence and the Workplace Travel Plan, including Appendices 1-5.
- 14/1-14/2 Copies of submissions made by Mr Gay and Mr Eckles.
- 15/1-15/16 Development Impact Assessments submitted by the appellant

PLANS

- A/1-A/7 Set of application plans
- B/1-B/4 Set of perspective plans submitted by the appellant.
- C Plan submitted by Mr Bedford showing extent of Alton and Holybourne.