



**PLANNING REF: 3335/21/FUL**

**DESCRIPTION: Construction of 125 homes, commercial business units, landscaped parkland, community boat storage/parking, allotments, improvements to existing permissive pathway and public footway, enhancement of vehicular access and associated infrastructure and landscaping.**

**ADDRESS: Proposed Development Site at SX 566 494, Land West of Collaton Park, Newton Ferrers.**

11<sup>th</sup> May 2022

## **LETTER OF OBJECTION FROM THE SOUTH HAMS SOCIETY**

### **The South Hams Society interest**

For the last 60 years, the South Hams Society has been stimulating public interest and care for the beauty, history and character of the South Hams. We encourage high standards of planning and architecture that respect the character of the area. We aim to secure the protection and improvement of the landscape, features of historic interest and public amenity and to promote the conservation of the South Hams as a living, working environment. We take the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty very seriously and work hard to increase people's knowledge and appreciation of our precious environment. We support the right development - in the right places - and oppose inappropriate development.

The South Hams Society regrets finding it necessary to be writing yet again regarding this planning application. Lichfield's has produced another briefing note (Ref: 63167/01/AC/SC) which the Society does not agree with.

The most troubling part of this briefing note is the referencing of a planning appeal in Oxfordshire, (**Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/20/3265861 Little Sparrows, Sonning Common, Oxfordshire RG4 9NY**) submitted as a justification in support of this major planning application in the AONB.

The Society will point out why this reference should NOT be considered as supporting the Collaton Park application.

### **The size of the communities in context and their surroundings.**

In the 2001 census, Yealmpton village had a recorded population of 1,923, falling to 1,677 at the 2011 census.

According to the 2011 census, the population of the village of Newton Ferrers was 1,268 and that of the electoral ward of Newton and Noss was 1,814.

Collaton Park is an isolated group of former RAF houses not linked with any village, but in between the two small villages of Yealmpton and Newton Ferrers.

W: <https://southhamsociety.org/> FB: <https://www.facebook.com/South.Hams.Society/>

Charity number: 263985

Registered address: Higher Norris Farm, North Huish, South Brent, TQ10 9NL



In contrast, Sonning Common is a village with a population 3,784 and the appeal proposal was for an elderly care development of 133 units on the edge of a much larger village and where a 100% need was demonstrated.

The village of Sonning Common has a larger population than the population of the parish of Newton and Noss and the village of Yealmpton put together.

### **Review of the applicants supporting Appeal, Ref: APP/Q3115/W/20/3265861**

#### **The Sonning Appeal Planning Inspector:**

*'Reasons*

*Planning Policy context 10.*

***Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the appeal must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of this appeal, the development plan comprises the following documents'***

The inspector correctly pointed out legislation requirements. In the Collaton Park application, this would be the Joint Local Plan and the Newton Ferrers and Noss Mayo NP.

(We have previously pointed out that following the JLP post examination statement, the Newton and Noss NP must be considered to be out of date because all of the development within the South Devon AONB villages was deleted by the Planning Inspectorate).

#### **The Sonning Appeal Planning Inspector:**

*'The appeal site is located within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Chilterns AONB is a 'valued landscape' in respect of paragraph 170 of the NPPF. AONBs, along with National Parks and the Broads, benefit from the highest status of protection in relation to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CROW) places a duty on relevant authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of an AONB. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF requires "great weight" to be given to those matters in decision making. **It is common ground that the appeal proposal involves major development within the AONB and as such should be refused other than in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.'***

The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) at 324 square miles is much larger than the South Devon AONB which is 130 square miles.

The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) stretches from the River Thames in southern Oxfordshire up through Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire to Hitchin in Hertfordshire.

Sonning Common village isn't in the AONB but the appeal site is.

**The housing stock in the Chilterns AONB at the 2011 census stood at 33,845. That equates to an average of 104.5 dwellings per square mile.**



The South Devon AONB housing stock was 19,034 at the 2011 census which equates to 146 dwellings per square mile. At the 2011 census, the SDAONB was the most built upon AONB alongside Chichester Harbour AONB (where 43% of the AONB is fully submerged at high tide).

**There is no doubt now that the SDAONB will be singularly the most built upon AONB in England.**

This is an appalling verdict on the District Councils record of conserving its designated landscape for future generations, the main responsible public body since 1973/4.

**The appeal site of 133 units is part of Sonning Common Village, whereas Collaton Park is in the open countryside, and not alongside a large community. Collaton Park was not presented as a suitable site with the JLP evidence and the 20 dwellings in the parish that were, were deleted.**

The Sonning Common appeal site on the edge of the village:



### **The Sonning Appeal Planning Inspector:**

*'I consider that the Council's supply figure should be reduced to reflect the Appellant's position set out in Table 2 of SoCG 5. The Council's supply figure of 5,785 dwellings in Table 2 should be reduced to give a more robust total supply figure of 4,789 dwellings for the five year period. Although the Council maintains there is a 5.08 year supply, the evidence that is before me indicates a housing land supply equivalent to 4.21 years. The implications of not having a five-year housing land supply are significant. Not only is there a shortfall, but it also means*

W: <https://southhamssociety.org/> FB: <https://www.facebook.com/South.Hams.Society/>

Charity number: 263985

Registered address: Higher Norris Farm, North Huish, South Brent, TQ10 9NL



***most important policies for determining the application are automatically out-of-date. The Council accepts that means all the policies in the SOLP and the SCNP are out-of-date. It also means if the paragraph 172 tests in the NPPF are satisfied then the tilted balance applies.'***

The Sonning Common District Council could not provide evidence of a 5 year housing supply and the Planning Inspector gave that fact great weight.

**Plymouth, South Hams and West Devon have an up to date Local Plan with agreed housing stock numbers recently approved by the Planning Inspectorate.**

**This plan contains more housing provision for the South Hams District than was required by the evidence base** as stated by the examining Planning Inspector who also said it may well lead to higher unemployment levels.

**The Sonning Appeal Planning Inspector:**

*'First Issue - whether the proposed development would be in accordance with the Council's strategy for the delivery of older persons accommodation throughout the district as set out in the development plan;*

***The Need for Extra Care'***

The Sonning Common appeal was to consider the need and provision for the need of elderly care facilities and whether the proposal complied with both the local plan and the neighbourhood plan.

**The Sonning Appeal Planning Inspector:**

*'Second issue - the impact of the proposed development on the landscape character of the AONB and the landscape setting of Sonning Common.'*

These two considerations are irrelevant to the Collaton Park application and the Chiltern AONB is also irrelevant.

As stated, the two AONBs are dissimilar in size and the development locations are also dissimilar within the AONB's.

**Here, the District Council should take note of its AONB's local specialist expert knowledge, the South Devon AONB unit.**

In simple terms, the Sonning Common Village appeal has very little in common with **and does not support the Collaton Park proposal.**



In addition, the Society would like to remind the LPA of its recent planning appeals for its own AONB.

### The supporting planning appeals for refusal

#### 1: WEMBURY:

**Planning Application Ref:** 3769/17/OPA Outline application for the erection of **15 no. dwelling houses** all matters reserved save for access and layout

**Appeal Ref:** APP/K1128/W/18/3215689 **Appeal Result:** Dismissed (Refusal)

**Appeal Determination Date:** 16 October 2019

*'31. Having regard to the Framework I find that the development of agricultural land on the scale proposed at the edge of a settlement the size of Wembury, that would cause harm to the natural beauty of the AONB should be regarded as a major development. Given the weight that I attribute to the other considerations, **in particular that there is no compelling need for the development in respect of housing delivery, and the detrimental effect on the landscape, the exceptional circumstances test at Framework paragraph 172 would not be passed.**'*

#### 2: EAST CHARLETON:

**Planning Application Ref:** 1193/17/OPA READVERTISEMENT (Revised description and plans) Outline application with some matters reserved for **construction of up to 24 dwellings** (including affordable housing), village green, children's play area, parking area, and associated works including landscaping

**Appeal Ref:** APP/K1128/W/18/3208541 **Appeal Result:** Dismissed (Refusal)

**Appeal Determination Date:** 26 March 2019

*'20. For the reasons outlined above I conclude that the proposed development would constitute major development in the AONB. **Consequently paragraph 172 of the Framework states that planning permission should be refused except in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.***

*31. I have taken into account the fact that modifications to the JLP place greater weight upon protection of the AONB than the provision of housing in West Charleton. Indeed, **the examining Inspectors have advised that West Charleton should be deleted from the list of 'sustainable villages' considered capable of accommodating 10 dwellings, reflecting the weight given to conservation and enhancement of AONBs within paragraph 172 of the Framework. As such the trajectory of emerging policy appears to be set against the development.**'*



### 3: KINGSBRIDGE:

**Planning Application Ref:** 4257/17/OPA Description: Outline application wish some matters reserved for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of **18 dwelling units (8 affordable)** with associated highway access, parking and landscaping.

**Appeal Ref:** APP/K1128/W/18/3218669 **Appeal Result:** Dismissed (Refusal)

**Appeal Determination Date:** 13 June 2019

*'9. On an unallocated site, the development would extend built form into the site's open, undeveloped surroundings. This would have an urbanising effect on the site, the AONB and Undeveloped Coast, and would extend the apparent extent of Kingsbridge into the area's rural surroundings. Consequently, the development would have a suburbanising effect on the countryside and would appear as an incongruous feature that would detract from the surrounding area's openness and be out of character with the scattered, less dense built environment in the surrounding undeveloped rural landscape.*

*10. Part of the site, containing the access track, existing buildings and area of hardstanding, is developed land. However, I observed on my site visit that the land immediately to the south of the existing buildings, although used for parking, consists of an open grass field containing no previous or existing structures. It is also beyond Selworthy House's clear garden boundary of hedging on a raised bank. **This area and the large field to the east are therefore undeveloped land, and they cover the majority of the site. Consequently, although the development on the developed part of the site would not result in a significant change from the existing situation, the development on the remainder of the site would. This would result in a noticeable encroachment into the rural landscape, and it would be this that would cause the harm.***

*18. The JLP and the Framework seek to protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment and valued landscapes, recognise their distinctive characteristics and special qualities, and attach great weight and the highest degree of protection to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of AONBs. I attach significant weight to this. I am also mindful of the duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for regard to be had to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB.*

*19. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to the South Devon AONB. I therefore find that the proposal fails to accord with Policies SPT1, SPT12, DEV23, DEV25 and TTV26 of the JLP. Amongst other aspects, these require development to: respect scenic quality and the area's distinctive sense of place and characteristics; and protect, conserve and enhance the site's setting and natural beauty of the protected landscape, with particular reference to the special qualities and distinctive characteristics of the AONB and the unique landscape of the Undeveloped Coast. These policies are broadly consistent with the Framework in so far as they relate to achieving well-designed places and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.*

*32. As set out above, the evidence before me indicates that the Council can demonstrate sufficient housing land supply following the recent adoption of the JLP. However, even if sufficient housing land supply could not be demonstrated, the harm to the AONB means that the application of Framework's policies that protect areas or assets of particular importance, including AONBs, provides a clear reason for dismissing the appeal.*

*33. I recognise that the appellants carried out community consultation, that Kingsbridge Town Council and the Council's Housing Team support the development, and that some other*

W: <https://southhamsociety.org/> FB: <https://www.facebook.com/South.Hams.Society/>

Charity number: 263985

Registered address: Higher Norris Farm, North Huish, South Brent, TQ10 9NL



***consultees have not objected. I acknowledge that the relocation of the vets on the site would allow that business to grow, reduce commercial traffic and mean that development on the site may be deliverable relatively quickly. Adjoining the settlement of Kingsbridge, the site would have also good access to services and facilities. This would reduce the need to travel and support the move to a low carbon economy. However, these aspects do not indicate that harmful development should be permitted.***

#### **4: FROGMORE:**

**Planning Application Ref:** 1768/16/OPA READVERTISEMENT (Revised Documents submitted) Outline Planning application (with all matters reserved) for **the erection of 28 dwellings (including affordable/starter homes), creation of community allotments, accesses, highway improvements and associated landscaping.**

**Appeal Ref:** APP/K1128/W/17/3185418 **Appeal Result:** Dismissed (Refusal)

**Appeal Determination Date:** 17 August 2018

***'10. I also note the provisions of the South Devon AONB Management Plan 2014- 2019 (MP). Amongst other things, this identifies the special qualities of the AONB and sets out numerous policies. These include: conserving and enhancing the special qualities, distinctive character and key features of the AONB (policy Lan/P1) and; protecting the character of open views into, within and out of the AONB (policy Lan/P5). Whilst not forming part of the development plan, the MP has been subject to a process of stakeholder consultation. It can be given moderate weight.***

***14. As set out within the Framework, great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB. The scale and extent of development should be limited and planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Footnote 55 of the Framework (which applies to the AONB) states whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined.***

***21. These other appeal decisions are materially different to the situation before me. The Council has also drawn my attention to another appeal decision in respect of 15 dwellings elsewhere in the district which was found to comprise major development. Each case must be determined on its own merits and none of these other decisions set a precedent that I must follow.***

***24. As also set out within the development plan and JLP, great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB. Planning permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest.***

***25. The proposed development would help to address the very substantial shortfall in housing land supply within the district. It would also provide some additional affordable dwellings for those who are currently unable to access the local housing market. In this regard, and notwithstanding the nine dwellings at Creek Close and other affordable housing in Frogmore, there remains a pressing need for such accommodation within the South***

W: <https://southhamssociety.org/> FB: <https://www.facebook.com/South.Hams.Society/>

Charity number: 263985

Registered address: Higher Norris Farm, North Huish, South Brent, TQ10 9NL



**Hams.** The appellant, as a local landowner, should be commended for the continuing effort to help meet the housing needs of the local community. It is perhaps unfortunate that a scheme could not be worked up with the support of the Parish Council.

**26. In addition, the proposal would include new allotments and public open space provision. The new dwellings would be conveniently located for access to services and facilities, including the local bus service. Incoming residents would help sustain these services and facilities. The development would also provide support to the local construction industry. It would bring social and economic benefits. The totality of these benefits, including the contribution to HLS, weighs heavily in support of the argument for granting permission.**

28. I note the appellant's argument that within the Council's 2017 Strategic Housing and Economic Land Assessment the only available sites for housing at Frogmore are within the AONB and that development in much of the district is constrained by landscape and environmental protection policies. **However, the Council has informed me that sites are being brought forward through the JLP and these have been carefully selected to ensure that the AONB is conserved and enhanced. On the basis of the evidence before me, it is by no means certain that no other more suitable sites for housing exist, including land outside the AONB. The environmental constraints within the South Hams do not amount to exceptional circumstances necessary to justify this major development within this part of the AONB and outweigh the above noted harm.'**

The Society points out that Collaton Park was **not** one of those sites carefully selected for the JLP.

**Returning to the Lichfield briefing note:**

*'The housing need that exists for villages within the AONB can only be addressed within that defined area. The new community at Sherford lies outside of the local area and will do nothing to address the acute housing need that has been identified. It will not tackle the problem of local people being forced to move elsewhere to find suitable accommodation at a price that they can afford.'*

*In the context of the (undisputed) evidence of need, it is suggestions such as this – that the local need could be addressed on the edge of Plymouth and that a much smaller scheme would suffice – that would perpetuate and exacerbate the significant challenges that are faced by very many members of the local community.'*

As the Planning Inspector points out in the Frogmore Appeal (para 28), the District Council is directed to look outside of its AONB if possible for the provision of housing to meet its needs. That possibility exists at Sherford, a much more sustainable location and only a few miles away.

***'Previously developed and contaminated land***

3.2 *The suggestion that the "planning application package is misleading because it generally exaggerates the amount of brownfield land at the application site" is itself misleading. The applicant recognises that only part of the site can be defined as previously developed and has consistently referred to this fact. However, it is included on SHDC's brownfield register and, as such, its development would be preferable to the release of greenfield land.'*





The site was only registered as Brownfield land in 2017. Despite being land in its current state (a hardstanding) for the previous 35 years, the location had never been recorded as brownfield.

*'As to JLP Policy TTV26, it has been demonstrated that there are numerous exceptional circumstances to support the proposed development which is not "isolated" but is well related to nearby settlements, immediately adjoining dwellings, and the B3186.*

*"It is recognised that centralising housing allocation at Collaton could have a wider AONB benefit by easing pressure on housing land supply which is being proposed on more sensitive sites within the South Devon AONB."*

The Society's opinion is that the site is remote from the stated communities and not well related. There are no policies to support the view that it is acceptable practice to sacrifice part of the AONB to save the remaining AONB.

*'3.15 It is not accepted that the proposed development site is in "an isolated location" nor that it would be dependent on travel by private car. It is located between two clusters of existing housing (Collaton Park and Richardson Close/Livingstone Avenue) and is just 2.3km from the centre of Newton Ferrers and 2km from Newton Ferrers Primary School. The development will include employment and community facilities – which are expected to include a local convenience store, café and community office hub within which people can socialise, work and network. This would serve residents of the new development as well as those already living in the immediate vicinity and thereby provide easy access to a range of facilities that may be required on a daily basis.'*

**The Society highlights the fact that the proposal contains parking for 531 vehicles where none currently exist at present.**

This is not a good indicator for the tranquillity of the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the survival of the public transport beyond the 5 years subsidised funding. Clearly the proposed site is not a sustainable location nor one that addresses the Climate Emergency but adds to it.

It is disappointing that the Parish Council is failing to understand its statutory duty, a duty highlighted in para 18 of the Kingsbridge appeal:

***'I am also mindful of the duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 for regard to be had to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB.'***



It is impossible to state that Construction of 125 homes, commercial business units, landscaped parkland, community boat storage and parking for 531 vehicles is '**conserving**' the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

We urge the council to take note of Planning Inspectorate's comments from appeals contained in this letter, the policies of its JLP and perform its statutory duty.

This development proposal is '*exceptional*' for the wrong reason. The largest development proposal in the open countryside in the South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is not supported by the LPA's designation expert opinion, the AONB unit, nor the adopted South Devon Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty's Management Plan.

As the Planning Inspectorate's recent decisions highlights, the District Council can demonstrate that it has an over provision of housing in its local plan.

We therefore strongly continue to **object** to this proposal in defence of the South Devon AONB

For and on behalf of the South Hams Society

Richard Howell

Chairman.



### **Addition notes.**

Extracts from the South Devon AONB unit submission for the Glover review:

#### ***'The South Devon AONB Partnership evidence to the Review of England's National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty***

***Eight AONBs in the South East and South West of England accounted for all housing applications within English AONBs over the period 2012-17 equating to 74% of all housing applications in AONBs and 79% (30,890) of all approved housing units within AONBs. South Devon topped the list as the most impacted of all AONBs with 96% of schemes above 10 units approved, resulting in the highest density of units per km2 of designation.'***

***'From a South Devon AONB perspective, the rate of change within and outside the AONB that negatively impacts on the natural beauty of the South Devon AONB risks the designation not being fit for purpose or meaningful in the future.'***

***'Current AONB protections through legislation and planning policy do not result in the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty.'***

In 2011 DEFRA prepared a report for the:

***'Land Use Change in Protected Landscapes (AONBs and National Parks): A Guide to the Tabulations (LAND USE CHANGE INDICATORS FOR PROTECTED AREAS).'***

From this report we can glean the evidence of how the South Devon AONB landscape is disappearing under housing stock.

When we relate those housing stock numbers to the size (area) of the AONB's, then we discover that the SDAONB then had the equal highest density of housing units per square mile. It is almost certain that the SDAONB now takes top place alone in that table.

DEFRA Table S3b

Table S3b AONB	Stock			Households			Population			Households Per Dwelling	
	2001	2011	Change %pa	2001	2011	Change %pa	2001	2011	Change %pa	2001	2011
Arnside & Silverdale	3642	3873	0.63	2555	2558	0.01	7610	7680	0.09	0.70	0.66
Blackdown Hills	4899	6018	2.28	4408	5047	1.45	12906	13374	0.36	0.90	0.84
Cannock Chase	2401	2515	0.47	1686	1711	0.15	5994	6110	0.19	0.70	0.68
Chichester Harbour	4126	4198	0.17	2437	2498	0.25	8120	8128	0.01	0.59	0.60
Chilterns	32445	33845	0.43	22958	24688	0.75	81756	82606	0.10	0.71	0.73
Cornwall	26108	29075	1.14	16724	16500	-0.13	51006	49861	-0.22	0.64	0.57
Cotswolds	61211	65588	0.72	40335	43362	0.75	139714	142590	0.21	0.66	0.66
Cranborne Chase & West Wiltshire	13430	14848	1.06	9780	10726	0.97	32778	33679	0.27	0.73	0.72
Dedham Vale	2826	3004	0.63	2173	2327	0.71	6550	6686	0.21	0.77	0.77
Dorset	33593	37661	1.21	18954	20347	0.73	69744	71973	0.32	0.56	0.54
East Devon	9234	10246	1.10	5947	6464	0.87	19318	20479	0.60	0.64	0.63
Forest of Bowland	5689	6920	2.16	4477	5458	2.19	15599	16244	0.41	0.79	0.79
High Weald	47043	51634	0.98	33850	38595	1.40	118074	125780	0.65	0.72	0.75
Howardian Hills	2013	2217	1.01	1631	1687	0.34	5465	5474	0.02	0.81	0.76
Isle Of Wight	5003	5393	0.78	3575	3622	0.13	10715	10444	-0.25	0.71	0.67
Kent Downs	27733	30702	1.07	19660	22133	1.26	66534	73308	1.02	0.71	0.72
Lincolnshire Wolds	3994	4569	1.44	3392	3679	0.85	9871	10089	0.22	0.85	0.81
Malvern Hills	4647	4882	0.51	3275	3723	1.37	11011	10942	-0.06	0.70	0.76
Mendip Hills	3009	3358	1.16	2501	2752	1.00	8114	8095	-0.02	0.83	0.82
Nidderdale	4261	5380	2.63	3204	3948	2.32	11525	12274	0.65	0.75	0.73
Norfolk Coast	10658	11652	0.93	6652	6877	0.34	18779	18419	-0.19	0.62	0.59
North Devon	4593	5609	2.21	2766	2884	0.43	9561	9986	0.44	0.60	0.51
North Pennines	5176	6048	1.68	3926	4268	0.87	11973	12099	0.11	0.76	0.71
North Wessex Downs	38017	41609	0.94	26483	29004	0.95	93657	98889	0.56	0.70	0.70
Northumberland Coast	3346	3992	1.93	1457	1597	0.96	5263	5496	0.44	0.44	0.40
Quantock Hills	1161	1352	1.65	1103	1173	0.63	2927	2874	-0.18	0.95	0.87
Shropshire Hills	8036	9169	1.41	5883	7264	2.35	18381	19968	0.86	0.73	0.79
Solway Coast	1404	1558	1.10	908	907	-0.01	3199	3040	-0.50	0.65	0.58
South Devon	17185	19034	1.08	8404	8779	0.45	30877	31274	0.13	0.49	0.46
Suffolk Coast & Heaths	10871	11678	0.74	6107	6228	0.20	20353	20154	-0.10	0.56	0.53
Surrey Hills	15297	16135	0.55	11715	12908	1.02	39760	40764	0.25	0.77	0.80
Tamar Valley	5415	5901	0.90	3559	3624	0.18	12750	12744	0.00	0.66	0.61
Wye Valley	10859	11993	1.04	7172	8420	1.74	24998	26678	0.67	0.66	0.70
<b>All AONB's England</b>	<b>429325</b>	<b>471656</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>289,657</b>	<b>315758</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>984,882</b>	<b>1,018,201</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.67</b>
<b>England</b>	<b>20,967,000</b>	<b>22,814,000</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>20,451,427</b>	<b>22,063,368</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>48,248,15</b>	<b>52,059,931</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>0.97</b>

2011 League Table - The 34 AONB's Property Stock per Square Mile

	AONB	Area (square miles)	Stock (2011)	Number of dwellings per square mile
1	Chichester Harbour	28.6	4198	146
1	South Devon	130	19,034	146
3	Arnside & Silverdale	29	3,873	133
4	Malvern Hills	40.5	4,882	121
5	Chilterns	324	33,845	104.5
6	East Devon	100	10,246	102
7	Surrey Hills	163	16,135	99
8	Cannock Chase	26	2,515	97
9	Wye Valley	126	11,993	95
10	High Weald	564	51,634	91.5
11	Kent Downs	338	30,702	91
12	Dedham Vale	34.7	3,004	87
12	Dorset	435	37,661	87
14	North Devon	66	5,609	85
15	Cotswold	790	65,588	83
16	Cornwall	370	29,075	79
16	Tamar Valley	75	5,901	79
18	Northumberland Coast	53.3	3,992	75
18	Suffolk Coast & Heaths	155	11,678	75
20	Isle of Wight	73.7	5,393	73
21	Norfolk Coast	174	11,652	67
22	North Wessex Downs	668	41,609	62
23	Mendip Hills	77	3,358	44
25	Blackdown Hills	143	6,018	42
26	Cranbourne Chase & West Wiltshire	379	14,848	39
27	Quantock Hills	38	1,352	36
28	Solway Coast	44.4	1,558	35
29	Shropshire Hills	310	9,169	30
30	Howardian Hills	79	2,217	28
31	Nidderdale	233	5,380	23
32	Forrest of Bowland	310	6,920	22
33	Lincolnshire Wolds	216	4,569	21
34	North Pennines	770	6,048	8