
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 8 December 2015

Site visit carried out on the same day

by C Sproule BSc MSc MSc MRTPI MEnvSc CEnv

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

Decision date: 26 May 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/W/15/3129788

Land to the north of Kings Lane and east of White Horse Hill, off White Horse Hill, Snitterfield, Warwickshire CV37 0LD

- 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 Mr Ray Morris, Snitterfield (Village Green) Ltd against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 14/03086/OUT, dated 5 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2015.
 - The development proposed is 25 no. market and affordable houses, 2 no. Class B1 business units, public open space including car parking for war memorial, management of protected tree belt.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter and Main Issues

2. The appeal concerns an application made in outline with all matters reserved for determination at a later date, except those in relation to the site access.
3. The main issues in this case, which reflect matters within the District Council's reasons for refusal, relate to : (a) whether the scheme would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; (b) the effect of the development proposed on the openness of the Green Belt; (c) the effect on the character and appearance of the locality; (d) the effect on the historic environment; and (e), if the appeal scheme is inappropriate development, whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development proposed.

Reasons

Planning Policy Context

4. Stratford-on-Avon District Local Plan Review 1996-2011 (LPR) Policy PR.2 states that a general presumption against inappropriate development applies within the Green Belt and lists forms of development that may be permitted in appropriate circumstances. These forms of development include: small-scale housing schemes within or adjacent to an existing settlement specifically to meet an identified local need in accordance with Policy COM.1 and Policy CTY.5; and for outdoor sport, recreation and leisure, including the construction
-

- of essential buildings which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
5. LPR Policy PR.2 also includes a criterion that allows for limited infilling or redevelopment of major existing development sites, as identified on the Proposals Map, for employment or other uses which would have no greater impact on the Green Belt or on the surrounding area than the existing use and which would not be contrary to the overall strategy of the Local Plan.
 6. Draft Core Strategy (CS) Policy CS.10 addresses the purposes of the Green Belt and would define inappropriate development. Types of development listed within CS Policy CS.10 as not inappropriate include: small scale development which meets housing, employment or other need identified by a local community, in accordance with CS Policy AS.10, subject to it not being harmful to the openness of the area; and, limited infilling in Local Service Villages identified in accordance with CS Policy CS.16.
 7. CS Policy AS.10 – *Countryside and Villages* requires all proposals to be thoroughly assessed to make sure that their scale, nature and location are appropriate. The policy considers acceptable in principle in the countryside, amongst other things, small-scale schemes for housing employment or community facilities to meet a need identified by a local community....on land within or adjacent to a village.
 8. The supporting text to CS Policy AS.10 includes Development Management Considerations that state it is not possible to define 'small scale' in terms of number of dwellings and that this would vary depending on the village and site involved.¹ Within the context provided by Snitterfield, the site and the countryside around it, the proposed dwellings and commercial units would not be a small scale development. Nor, the Council highlights, has a local need been identified apart from the provision of bungalows, and the evidence in this case would not cause me to come to a different view.²
 9. The CS Examination is at an advanced stage, but still ongoing. As a consequence, draft CS policies cannot attract full weight in this appeal since they may change.

Whether Inappropriate Development

10. The appeal scheme would not be one of the forms of development listed in Framework paragraph 90 as not being inappropriate in the Green Belt. With specific exceptions, Framework paragraph 89 states that a local planning authority should regard new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. The exceptions include the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, limited infilling in villages and limited affordable housing.³ The LPR pre-dates the Framework. The list of development in LPR Policy PR.2 that would not be inappropriate is not wholly consistent with these Framework paragraphs. Consequently and in accordance with Framework paragraph 215, the relevant Framework policies attract more weight in this case.
11. The appeal site lies immediately to the east of White Horse Hill and adjacent to the village. At present, much of the appeal site is an open field that is

¹ Hearing document 14

² Paragraph 4.6 of the Council's Hearing Statement

³ The full exemption descriptions are within Framework paragraph 89

separated from White Horse Hill by a belt of trees and other vegetation, which is also within the application site. Views southwards along White Horse Hill are to the War Memorial and the countryside beyond, on the opposite side of Kings Lane.

12. To the east of the appeal site are agricultural fields that provide a considerable area of gently rolling countryside with occasional trees between White Horse Hill and Park Lane. This substantial block of countryside includes the appeal site. It is bounded by highways on four sides and there is built development on three of those. Development within the village is concentrated to the north of this block, with ribbons of development extending along the western side of White Horse Hill to the west and along the eastern side of Park Lane to the east of the block.
13. This block of countryside is free from built development, its openness in this regard being emphasised by the tree belt between the grassland of the appeal site and White Horse Hill. The appeal proposal would develop land that is bounded by open countryside, a domestic garden and highways. I understand that much of the housing that has been permitted within the village may have been considered to be 'infilling', and another developer may have an interest in land that was described as such to the hearing. I also recognise that the term 'infilling' is not defined in the development plan. However, given the circumstances of the appeal site, and its particular context within a wider area of countryside, I am not persuaded that the proposed development could be considered to be an act of 'infilling'.
14. It is clear that the proposed built development would have a greater impact on the Green Belt than the existing use. The appeal scheme would provide open space and a new pedestrian link between the end of the existing footway on White Horse Hill and the War Memorial at the Kings Lane junction. Even so, it has not been shown that outdoor recreation would be anything other than a minor and ancillary part of the scheme to provide a mixed use development, and within the context of Framework 89, no buildings are noted to be proposed for the provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor use.
15. The construction of new dwellings, commercial units and associated works outside/adjacent to a village is not one of the exceptions listed in Framework paragraph 89. For the reasons above, the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Paragraph 87 of the Framework confirms that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and in this regard the appeal scheme conflicts with LPR Policy PR.2, (and draft CS Policy CS.10) and Section 9 of the Framework.
16. Framework paragraph 88 states that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt, and this is what the harm by inappropriateness attracts in this case.

Openness and Purposes of the Green Belt

17. Paragraph 79 of the Framework confirms that one of the essential characteristics of Green Belts is their openness. The courts have made clear that openness, in Green Belt terms, is the absence of buildings and development.⁴ I am in no doubt that the erection of 25 dwellings on this

⁴ Timmins & Anor v Gedling Borough Council [2014] EWHC 654 (Admin)

currently open and undeveloped land would mean that this part of the Green Belt would be less open than it is now. There would be harm to the Green Belt in this regard.

18. One of the stated purposes of Green Belts is assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The introduction of residential development onto the land would markedly change the character and appearance of the site from a field that is seen as part of the open countryside, to one that would be overtly residential in nature. Consequently, I consider that the spread of residential development would entail encroachment which Green Belt policy fundamentally aims to avoid.
19. In this respect the appeal scheme would be unacceptably harmful to the Green Belt and contrary to the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy as described by Framework paragraph 79. For the reasons above, this harm also attracts substantial weight against the appeal scheme.

Character and appearance

20. LPR Policy CTY.1 states that all forms of development in the countryside, other than those in accordance with the LPR, will generally be resisted to preserve the character of the countryside and to ensure that resources are protected. LPR Policy PR.1 seeks all development proposals to respect and where possible enhance the quality and character of the area, and not to destroy or damage features that contribute to local distinctiveness.
21. Draft CS Policy CS.5 is permissive of proposals that protect landscape character and avoid detrimental effects on features which make a significant contribution to the character, history and setting of a settlement or area.
22. Framework paragraph 56 is unambiguous that '*...Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people...*'. In this appeal, 'design' considerations include the placement of development within the landscape/townscape, rather than details that would be the subject of later decisions.
23. Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines confirm the appeal site to be within the *Arden* regional landscape character area. The *Arden* landscape character area is noted to include a well wooded farming landscape with a rolling topography, ancient and irregular field boundaries, winding lanes, dispersed hamlets, former deer parks and estates.⁵
24. Evidence in this case has also addressed the *wooded estate lands* sub-regional landscape character area context of the appeal site, which includes mature hedgerow and roadside oaks, a semi-regular pattern of medium to large fields, with a varied settlement pattern of small villages and scattered farmsteads.⁶
25. This countryside is typical of the rural openness that is present around Snitterfield and that contributes to the character and appearance of the area. A development of the scale, type and with the access proposed, would cause the loss of a field area and a number of trees that contribute to the landscape characteristics referred to above.

⁵ Page 5 of the appellant's *Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal*

⁶ Paragraph 4.14 of the Council's hearing statement

26. The belt of vegetation next to White Horse Hill is the subject of Tree Preservation Order No. 682 - *The Land to the east of White Horse Hill, Snitterfield, Warwickshire Order: 2013* ('the TPO'). The TPO identifies the protected area as Woodland 'W1' and the trees within it to be a mixture of coniferous and deciduous species. The appeal site includes the TPO trees. LPR Policy EF.10 seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, amenity and nature conservation value of trees, woodlands and hedgerows. Within this context the policy resists inappropriate arboricultural works to protected trees.
27. While at present the TPO trees may form an '*unmanaged woodland*', if the development were to be carried out as indicated the trees would be in close proximity to housing and a woodland trail is shown to provide public access through the TPO trees.⁷
28. The layout of the appeal scheme is not for determination at this stage, but the site access is. The application's *Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan* details trees that would be removed from the appeal site (or pruned) to accommodate the new access road, a swale, surface water balancing area, or buildings shown on the *master plan* drawing. This is shown to include trees around the existing pond.
29. Trees within the TPO provide a high degree of visual and functional separation of the pasture land from the activity on White Horse Hill and the dwellings on the opposite (western) side of the highway from the appeal site. The roadside tree belt continues northwards from the appeal site into the garden of Park House. Within the context of the TPO, the tree removal to create the access into the appeal scheme would be significant, due to the scale of the breach through the existing tree belt along the eastern side of White Horse Hill, and it conflicts with LPR Policy EF.10.
30. The application's *Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal* suggests views from Kings Lane to be of 'low importance',⁸ but that was not my experience when approaching the village prior to the hearing or when in the area for the accompanied site visit.
31. The Council refers to a Landscape Sensitivity Study (2012) which includes the appeal site, along with the rear garden of Park House and the neighbouring field immediately to the east, within an area identified as '*LCP/Zone Sn05*'. This it concludes to be of *high/medium* landscape sensitivity to housing development.
32. This is apparent in views from Kings Lane and confirmed by hearing document 8, which shows the view northwards from a point to the east of the White Horse Hill junction. This section of Kings Lane provides access to and from the A46. Anyone looking northwards at this point takes an aspect across the appeal site where the core of the village is framed by the block of open countryside between White Horse Hill and Park Lane. Even with the level of open space indicated for the appeal scheme, the scale and nature of the development would significantly erode the open rural character of the approach to the village from the A46.
33. This is especially so as the character of the countryside on the appeal site is reinforced by the TPO vegetation along the eastern side of White Horse Hill,

⁷ Paragraph 4.36 (for example) of the Council's hearing statement, and *master plan* drawing no. 14-140-02E

⁸ Pages 10 and 19 of the appellant's *Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal*

which in these views provides some screening of the development on the western side of White Horse Hill. Boundary planting indicated on the *master plan* would be expected to provide some screening of the proposed development, in addition there would be other tree, shrub and hedge planting, and there would be no loss of scattered 'parkland' trees to the east within this block of countryside.⁹ Nevertheless, the change to the character and appearance of the locality would still occur.

34. The Council's second reason for refusal refers to the proposal being a substantial extension to the settlement that would conflict with its current irregular outline. Mapping within the evidence (and the aerial photograph on the cover of hearing document 10) show the form of the village and the degree of irregularity. Site visits provided an opportunity to see this at street level. There are some discernable blocks of development within the village that have a higher degree of regularity in layout and design. However, these are not on the southern boundary where the appeal site is.
35. Development through the appeal scheme would be separated from White Horse Hill by the trees remaining in the TPO. Although the appeal site abuts the southern boundary of the garden to Park House, this is a very large garden that is proportionate to the scale of the original dwelling. Consequently, the appeal scheme would appear isolated within the context of existing development in Snitterfield and the appellant was unable to refer to a similar layout elsewhere in the village. In this respect, the appeal proposal would conspicuously depart from the established development pattern within the village.
36. Given the location and nature of the development proposed, the appeal scheme would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of Snitterfield. It would fail to preserve the character of the countryside to the south of the village, and the proposed development has not been shown to be in accordance with other provisions and the overall strategy of the LPR. Therefore, the appeal scheme conflicts with LPR Policies CTY.1, PR.1 and EF.10, (draft CS Policy CS.5) and the Framework. The harm in relation to this issue attracts significant weight against the proposal.

Historic environment

37. The Council's third reason for refusal refers to LPR Policies EF.13 and EF.14. LPR Policy EF.13 is not permissive of a development proposal that would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a Conservation Area or its setting. Policy EF.14 seeks to preserve listed buildings and their settings by, amongst other things, ensuring that development will not have an adverse impact on the special qualities of listed buildings or their settings.
38. Also referred to in the reason for refusal is paragraph 134 of the Framework, which states that '*...Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use....*'.
39. Snitterfield Conservation Area ('the Conservation Area') includes many historic buildings in street and plot layouts that provide core areas of the village with

⁹ Paragraphs 3.8 and 3.10 of the Grounds of Appeal

its distinctive character. The north western boundary of the appeal site abuts the grounds of Park House, which is a Grade II listed building that dates from the seventeenth century, with nineteenth century additions and twentieth century alterations. The boundary of the grounds at Park House is the boundary of the Conservation Area in this location, which places the appeal site within the setting of both heritage assets.

40. The Council Officer's report on the proposal notes that mapping from 1887 suggests that the appeal site may have been associated with Park House by providing informal woodland walks. The listing description addresses the architectural details within Park House, which is now subdivided into a number of homes.
41. Dr Firth's consultation response at the application stage highlighted the inter-visibility between the appeal site and Park View, a Grade II listed building on the north western side of Church Road.¹⁰ The Council Officer's report on the application noted that the outlook from Park View would be slightly compromised, and the physical relationship that would cause this was apparent during the hearing site visit.
42. Hearing document 13 provides the listing descriptions for three other Grade II listed buildings in the vicinity of Park View, which are Holly Cottage, Jasmine House and Tudor House. These descriptions note Holly Cottage and Jasmine House to be examples of houses built for the Philips estate in the period around 1840, while Tudor House is a timber framed building that dates from the sixteenth or seventeenth century.
43. The settings of these listed buildings and the Conservation Area includes existing development within Snitterfield and the countryside around it. The appeal site is part of the countryside that forms the settings to the south of the Conservation Area and at the western end of Church Road. This countryside emphasises both the locality's estate parkland history and Green Belt openness.
44. Given the length and extent of the rear garden at Park House, the level of inter-visibility between the listed building and the appeal site, along with the gently rolling topography that dips toward the centre of the appeal site, the scale and nature of the proposed development would fail to preserve the settings of Park House, Park View and the Conservation Area. The appeal scheme would also increase the perceived scale of development within the vicinity of the other listed buildings on Church Road.
45. The circumstances of these designated heritage assets would ensure that the harm caused by the appeal scheme to their significance would be less than substantial. However for the reasons above, the appeal scheme conflicts with LPR Policies EF.13 and EF.14 and relevant parts of the Framework, and this places significant weight against the appeal scheme.

Other matters

46. Concerns have been raised regarding a number of matters in relation to the possible effect of the development proposed on local living conditions. LPR Policy DEV.1 indicates that planning proposals are required to have regard to the character and quality of the local area, including the provision of

¹⁰ Appended to the Council's hearing statement

appropriate standards of amenity for existing properties and the development proposed.

47. Cars using the proposed junction would be a source of additional noise and disturbance, and light to existing windows near to the access. Such conditions are to be expected at residences next to highways. In addition, the level of light that is allowed to enter into a room through a window is a matter that is within the control of the occupier of the dwelling. Therefore, it has not been shown that the use of the proposed access would be likely to be harmful to local living conditions in regard to noise and disturbance, and light.
48. Matters reserved would address layout and detailed design that would be relevant to overlooking, visual impact and noise and disturbance. The appeal scheme would introduce development to a site where there is currently none. Accordingly, the potential for overlooking and noise and disturbance to occur would increase due to the residential and commercial nature of the development proposed. While the appeal site is immediately adjacent to the garden of Park House and there is some inter-visibility, it has not been shown that additional overlooking, visual impact or noise and disturbance would be likely to be sufficient to cause harm to local living conditions and conflict with planning policy, including LPR Policy DEV.1. The lack of harm in relation to local living conditions neither adds weight in favour nor against the appeal scheme.

Other considerations

Highway safety

49. Highway Authority comments have been provided that outline matters addressed during the application stage.¹¹ These matters included the design and safety of the proposed 'T' junction and vehicle movements associated with the development. Given the nature of the highway and the traffic movements along White Horse Hill, the proposed junction layout would provide a safe and suitable access to the development. Framework paragraph 32 is clear that *'...Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe...'*, and no such impacts have been identified in this case.
50. A footway extends only partially along the section of White Horse Hill between the junction with Church Road and the southern end of White Horse Hill. The footway finishes in the vicinity of (and opposite to) the proposed access into the appeal scheme. As a consequence, pedestrians currently have to use the carriageway on the southern section of White Horse Hill when walking to the Kings Lane junction. Footways through the appeal scheme would provide safer pedestrian routes to Kings Lane by separating people from vehicles on White Horse Hill and this attracts considerable weight in favour of the proposal.

Housing

51. Paragraph 47 of the Framework seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing, with paragraph 49 stating that *'...Housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-*

¹¹ Warwickshire County Council letter, dated 28 May 2015,

year supply of deliverable housing sites...'. The appeal site is within the Green Belt, which restricts the supply of housing in this location. When the hearing took place the Council did not have a 5 year supply of deliverable sites for housing and, at 3.85 years, the shortfall is significant.¹²

52. The appeal scheme would provide additional homes that would contribute to the Framework objective to boost significantly the supply of housing. In this regard, the appellant has referred to draft CS Policy CS.10 and modifications suggested during the CS Examination.¹³
53. The appeal scheme would include affordable housing. Hearing documentation includes the application stage consultation response from the Council's Development and Enabling Officer, who noted that local policy would be met by the proposed level of affordable housing. A housing provider has shown interest in operating the affordable housing within the development.¹⁴ Other schemes could come forward to deliver affordable homes in nearby locations. Nevertheless, the provision of housing and affordable units would yield social benefits that meet Framework objectives and attract significant weight in favour of the appeal scheme.

Open space

54. The appeal scheme would provide access to additional areas of open space. LPR Policy COM.4 provides standards of open space, with criterion (c) seeking children's play areas to a minimum of 0.8ha per 1000 population in settlements such as Snitterfield. LPR Policy COM.5 indicates that new residential development should address Policy COM.4 deficiencies in open space. The appeal scheme is indicated to contribute 0.5ha of open space to an identified shortfall of 0.52ha in Snitterfield.¹⁵ Therefore, the proposed development would comply with LPR Policy COM.5. The scheme is intended to provide public open space that would benefit local people, which attracts significant weight in favour of the appeal scheme.

Access to services

55. Snitterfield provides services and is 4 miles from the shops, services and employment opportunities in Stratford-upon-Avon. The appeal scheme would be in close proximity to local services and would provide access to Stratford-upon-Avon. As such, it would be in a relatively accessible location. This attracts significant weight in favour of the proposal.¹⁶

Economic

56. Developing new homes and commercial units would result in economic benefit through the economic activity associated with their construction and occupation. In accordance with Framework paragraph 19 (and 28), economic growth in a rural area through the provision of construction jobs and the sale of construction materials, and expenditure during occupation of the houses and commercial units, attracts significant weight in this case.

¹² Paragraph 5.2 of the Council's hearing statement and an Appendix with the Five Year Housing Land Supply Calculation for 31 March 2015

¹³ Pages 6 and 7 of the Grounds of Appeal and hearing document 11

¹⁴ Paragraph 6.2 of the Grounds of Appeal

¹⁵ Page 10 of the Grounds of Appeal and page 31 of the Council's hearing statement

¹⁶ Paragraph 5.11 of the Grounds of Appeal and paragraph 5.8 of the Council's hearing statement

Very special circumstances and conclusion

57. The Framework, and Section 9 in particular, confirms the importance that is placed on the designation of Green Belt. In relation to decision taking, associated Planning Practice Guidance states that “...*Unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt...*”.¹⁷
58. This is a proposal for housing and commercial development in a Green Belt location that is also within the setting of heritage assets. For the reasons above, the substantial weights attributed to the harms to the Green Belt and the significant weights to the other harms, are not clearly outweighed by other considerations that weigh in favour of the appeal scheme, which include the scope of suggested planning conditions. Following consideration of the various matters raised by the appellant, no very special circumstances have been found to exist in this case.
59. Framework paragraph 7 outlines the three dimensions to sustainable development, which are the economic, social and environmental roles, and the matters above address these. While the appeal scheme would be expected to comply with policies including LPR Policy COM.5 and LPR Policy DEV.1 in relation to local living conditions, it conflicts with LPR Policies PR.1, PR.2, CTY.1, EF.10, EF.13 and EF.14, draft CS Policies CS.5 and CS.10 and Framework policies in regard to Green Belt that indicate development should be restricted.
60. The proposed development would provide the economic, social and environmental benefits described above. However, the identified harm to the Green Belt and other harms,¹⁸ significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered within the context of local and national planning policy.
61. Consideration has been given to all matters raised in this case. Taken as a whole the proposal is plainly not compliant with the development plan and would not be a form of sustainable development. Neither are there very special circumstances nor any material considerations that warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

Clive Sproule

INSPECTOR

¹⁷ At Reference ID: 3-034-20140306 as referred to by page 30 of the Council’s hearing statement

¹⁸ That are relevant to the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Malcolm Hockaday
PhD FRTPI

Stephen Laws
DipLA BA CMLI

Andrew Mackley
BSc HNC

Ray Morris
David Stafford

Vista Architecture

Joint owner

Joint owner

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Stuart Castle

Senior Planner,
Stratford-on-Avon District Council
Consultant

Dr Allen Firth

Alison Frost
BSc(Hons) MLD CMLI
RFS Cert Arboriculture (Dist)

Forestry and Landscape,
Stratford-on-Avon District Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

P Blanchard

Chair of Snitterfield Parish Council

D Tweed

Local resident

Mrs M Tweed

Local resident

V Hughes-Jones

Local resident

J Kearney

Local resident

M Donald

Local resident

B Barter

Local resident

B Bennett

Local resident

P Lavin

Local resident

Dr Pitchford

Local resident

M Gay

CALA Homes (Midlands) Limited

DOCUMENTS

1. Stratford-on-Avon District Council – Core Strategy 2011-2031 – Proposed modifications in response to the Inspector’s Interim Conclusions – Inspector’s Matters, Issues and Questions for Examination hearings sessions commencing on 12 January 2016
2. Core Strategy - Proposed modifications in response to the Inspector’s Interim Conclusions – August 2015
3. Stratford-upon-Avon Interim Adopted CS (June 2015) with Modifications (August 2015) - Policy CS.8 Historic Environment, Policy CS.10 Green Belt, Policy AS.10 Countryside and Villages, Policy CS.12 Special Landscape Areas, Policy CS.13 Areas of Restraint, Policy CS.15 Distribution of Development, Policy CS.16 Housing Development, Policy CS.17 Affordable Housing, Policy CS.18 Housing Mix and Type
4. Appellant Statement of Common Ground – Signed by both main parties
5. Appendix 1 Statement of Common Ground: Agreed conditions (14/03086/OUT)
6. Policy PR.2 and Explanation
7. Policy CTY.1
8. An image showing the view of ‘The Park’ from Kings Lane
9. The Queen on the application of Mrs Jean Timmins and AW Lymn The Family Funeral Service Limited vs Gedling Borough Council and Westerleigh Group Limited [2015] EWCA Civ 10
10. Snitterfield 2000 Village Design Statement
11. Fig.1 Housing Trajectory - Table – CS Proposed Modifications – August 2015
12. The Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy Justification Statement
13. Listed Building Listing Descriptions for Holly Cottage, Jasmine Cottage and Tudor House
14. Policy COM.4, Policy COM.5, Policy COM.13, Policy COM.17, Policy CTY.1, Policy DEV.1, Policy DEV.3, Policy DEV.4, Policy DEV.7, Policy EF.6, Policy EF.7, Policy EF.9, Policy EF.10, Policy EF.11, Policy EF.12, Policy EF.13, Policy IMP.7, Policy PR.1, Policy PR.2, Policy PR.7, Policy PR.8, Policy AS.10
15. Core Strategy – As submitted September 2014 showing subsequent proposed modifications – June 2015