



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 4 June 2013

Site visit made on 4 June 2013

by David Morgan BA MA (IoAAS) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 31 July 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/A/13/2192636

(Former) Bureau West, Horton Road, Devizes, Wilts SN10 2JJ

- 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 Redrow Homes South West against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref E/2012/0268/FUL, dated 22 February 2012, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2012.
 - The development proposed is change of use from light industrial to residential relating to the outline planning permission APP/E3905/A/08/2090652 now to provide 24 residential dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use from light industrial to residential, erection of 25 dwellings at land to the south of Horton Road (former Bureau West site), Devizes SN10 2JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref E/2012/0268/FUL, dated 22 February 2012, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule at the end of this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. As the number of dwellings proposed during the course of the determination of the application changed from 24 to 25 the description of development in the formal decision has been amended to reflect this. The address has also been altered to that on the decision notice and appeal application form as this more accurately describes the site.
3. The appellant has submitted a unilateral undertaking making provision for affordable housing as a component of the development and to facilitate a financial contribution towards local infrastructure. The former is considered against the criteria of the paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework (henceforth referred to as The Framework) and the latter against the regulatory tests of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Main Issues

4. These are a) whether or not the Council can demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, b) in light of the current employment land supply position, whether or not it is necessary for the site to be retained for this purpose and c) whether or not there is a market demand for the site on the basis of an evidentially derived market value for the land in its current use.

Reasons

Five year housing land supply

5. Housing land supply was not a matter addressed either in the officer report or in the Council's reasons for refusal, the matter being raised by the appellant on the submission of their appeal. Although apparently tangential to the primary issues relating to the loss of employment land, the matter is relevant in that if a five year supply of housing land cannot be demonstrated policies relevant to the supply of housing cannot be considered up to date.¹ It is also reasonable to argue in such a context that policies for the long-term protection of employment sites are indeed relevant to the supply of housing, in that if not recently reviewed they may be surplus to requirements and therefore a potential constraint on land otherwise appropriate for housing.
6. Debate on housing land supply is well established in Wiltshire and has been considered in numerous appeal decisions. It is an evolving topic, with emphasis being laid upon the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (dRSS) allocations and latterly its evidence base, and the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy (eWCS), now at Examination in Public (EiP) stage², though yet to be judged sound. In the past, significant weight has been apportioned to the dRSS and its evidence base, it being to date the only assessment having been considered in such objective detail. However, Orders in Parliament have now revoked (in greater part) the Regional Strategies, and in any event the evidence base is increasingly viewed as out of date. On the other hand, the eWCS, for all its consultation and part EiP, remains the subject of objection, at least in relation to housing land supply, and has yet either to be judged as sound or formally adopted. In the light of paragraph 216 of The Framework, this must temper the weight afforded to it and the housing numbers it projects.
7. The Council assess supply based on their dWCS East Wiltshire Housing Market Assessment (EWHMA) as being 6.2 years (based on a figure of 37,00 homes during the plan period and 5,500 in the EWHMA). The appellant argues the 37,000 number is too low (and has raised objection to the dWCS on this basis), asserting the figure should be the 44,000 identified in the dRSS. When the numbers are disaggregated by County sub-area this raises the EWHMA from 5,500 to 6,538 dwellings. Such an increase would reduce the 5 year supply to 4.6 years. However, even when the Council's own assessed deliverable supply is set against the dRSS figures, the appellant accepts a 5.3 year supply can be demonstrated.
8. The plan and evidence-based allocations are of course but one side of the debate; expectations of delivery are also critical to any conclusions on the matter. Indeed, the nub of the debate in relation to this case, it seems to me, is in relation to the expectations of housing deliverability within the plan period. The appellant makes clear that both the dRSS and eWCS 5 year plus supply, based on the Council's expectations, are contingent on the delivery of a small number of strategic sites they expect to come forward with anticipated annual delivery rates.
9. The appellant focuses on six larger sites within the EWHMA, the former Jam Factory, Easterton, Land at Zouch Manor, North East Quadrant, Tidworth, Drummond Park, Granby Gardens and Salisbury Road, Marlborough, arguing

¹ Paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

² At the time of the Hearing the Examination Hearings were running conterminously.

either that they should be discounted completely or the annual delivery rates should be reduced. What is apparent however, when set against the eWCS figure, is that with just the Drummond Park and Tidworth delivery reduced, the five year supply drops to 4.5 years. Whilst there is a resolution to grant outline permission for the Drummond Park scheme, subject to a section 106 agreement, the site has no planning permission. However, as the Secretary of State makes clear in the Oaklands, Ersham Road, Hailsham case³, the absence of planning permission is, of itself, no basis for excluding the site, under the terms of footnote 11 of the Framework, in principle. Moreover, the Council maintain that the 106 agreement will be imminently engrossed, the reserved matters will come forward and building will commence this year⁴ with the expectation of sustained delivery in subsequent years ranging from 35 in year 1/2 to 81 in year 4.

10. The appellant is significantly less optimistic, suggesting on-going difficulties with the section 106 negotiations, no submission of reserved matters, no discharge of pre-commencement conditions and infrastructure delivery problems with the site, all suggesting little prospect of delivery before 2016. Similar arguments are applied to the Tidworth site, where the site has planning permission but has no reserved matters approved, again pointing to a slower and lesser delivery of homes. Central to the debate in each case is the anticipated annual delivery rate on the sites, the Council maintaining 50 and 81 units per annum (UPA) being a reasonable expectation, whilst the appellant suggests, on the basis of national housing industry delivery figures (28.6 UPA and their local delivery expectations of between 30 and 35 UPA), this is consistently over-optimistic and so unrealistic.
11. The market is improving, and it may be reasonable to expect that in Wiltshire it performs better than other areas when consider against national averages. However, the market is by no means buoyant, and the obstacles to brisk delivery identified by the appellant are certainly a serious consideration. In these circumstances, the rapid delivery of these two large sites cannot be assumed to be as optimal as the Council have forecast. Moreover, even if the Drummond Park site were to come forward in part, there are sufficient doubts in my mind in relation to the other sites identified by the appellant that could still, on the balance of probability, result in an under-delivery across the EWHMA. Accordingly, I conclude that the Council, on the basis of the evidence presented to me at the Hearing, cannot convincingly demonstrate a five year supply of housing land.
12. It follows therefore that their policies for the supply of housing cannot be considered up to date, and that the prescriptions set out in bullet point four of paragraph 14 of The Framework apply.⁵ However, as paragraph 14 presumes in favour of sustainable development, it is first necessary to consider whether the appeal proposal is indeed sustainable, under the terms of The Framework.
13. In locational terms, though on the eastern edge of Devizes, the site is close to public transport routes and it is close to existing and proposed employment sites. As the planning obligation commitments affirm, the site is in reasonable

³ Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/A/12/2186147

⁴ Inspector's note of Council statement at the hearing.

⁵ That is that where the development plan is out of date, decision makers should grant planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits the development would bring.

proximity to community and educational facilities. Moreover, in addition to the accepted shorter-term economic benefits the development would bring, it would also provide housing, both market and affordable, for which there is a demand, and this could be achieved without harm to the local environment, assuming provision is made for the safeguarding of the trees immediately outwith the site. In all these terms therefore, the proposals have a sound claim to sustainability under the terms of the Framework.

14. The housing land supply and national policy context having been considered, it is now necessary to consider the substantive issues of harm or otherwise, concluding with a balanced assessment of benefits and drawbacks in the case.

The necessity for retaining the land in employment use

15. The Council assert that although the site is not allocated for employment use in the eWCS, this should not be taken as a reflection of its lack of importance, instead affirming the site's significance in relation to the mixed use scheme granted on appeal in 2009⁶. There can be no reasonable expectation that all lesser employment sites should be identified in the eWCS. However, given the Council's assertion in the decision notice that 'the site makes a valuable contribution to the range and diversity of available employment sites in Devizes' it would be reasonable to expect its significance to be recorded in any evaluation of employment land in the area or County as a whole. It comes as something of a surprise therefore to learn that there is no mention of the site in the Wiltshire Workspace and Employment Land Review undertaken in 2011 by Roger Tym & Partners (RT&P). Moreover, it is relevant to consider that it was the Council, (according to the appellant), who supplied the list of sites to RT&P prior to the commencement of the review. If the site was considered significant by the Council, it seems logical to anticipate it should have been identified as such.
16. Furthermore the Council, in formulating its employment land allocations for the eWCS, has chosen to increase the hectareage above that advised in complementary RT&P work for the Council in this area. For Devizes, this results in an increase from 6.2ha to 9.9ha, meaning the Council can meet its local employment land needs without the appeal site apparently being in any assessment. Moreover, whilst acknowledging the accepted principle of the mix of employment land, residential and commercial residential use allowed in the 2009 appeal, the close juxtaposition of such uses must inevitably restrict the range of employment opportunities that might be appropriate to the site. Notwithstanding the actual compatibility of these uses, such proximity, in these specific circumstances, can lead to a perceptual concern that such proximity may risk conflict, ultimately deterring a commitment to the site. Such concerns could only be compounded by the knowledge that the Council depot to the east of the site, currently in employment use, has been identified as a potential future site for residential development.
17. Although market demand is considered below, it is noted that the greater site (pre-2009 appeal) had been marketed for a number of years, and that post-appeal the residual site had also been promoted, though with very little interest. Although I have taken account of the previous Inspector's acknowledgement of the contribution the site could make to creating employment opportunities in Devizes, this has not been reflected in market

⁶ Appeal\I ref: APP/E3905/A/08/2090652.

interest or more tellingly by the apportionment of any significance to its value in the Council's assessment of employment land. Moreover, this site is more an existing 'allocated employment site' rather than an 'existing employment site' as defined in policy ED7 of the Kennet District Local Plan (KDLP), it not having been used for employment purposes for many years. Therefore its change of use and development for other purposes would not result in the actual loss of an occupied employment site. I remain unconvinced, in this broader context, that the site makes a significant contribution to the range and diversity of such sites in the area. As a consequence, I see no conflict with policy ED7 of the KDLP in allowing its use for another purpose. Whilst the policies of the eWCS are also cited by the Council, because of their emerging status, they may only be afforded limited weight.

Market value and demand for the site in employment use

18. There can be little doubt that the commercial property sector has been operating in difficult economic circumstances in the last five years. With an over-supply of employment land in the County, a sustained drop in rental values and, with increasing build costs, new-build activity has been focused on the larger settlements of Chippenham and Trowbridge. This is reflected in the historic lack of interest in the site, which has been marketed in greater and lesser part for around thirteen years. This marketing has been extensive and covered a range of media, from a physical presence at the site to a range of publications and web sites. This is also in the context of the availability of other office and workshop space within Devizes, identified by the appellant.
19. The parties have divergent views on the market value of the site, though both acknowledge the above circumstances. The appellant maintains a value of £500,000 or £352,000 per acre for the site based on an agreed offer from *Metabolics* in March 2010, this offer was at an advanced stage when the buyer pulled out, apparently citing concerns over terms and the proximity of the residential development adjacent to the site. After initially agreeing with this view, the Council now maintain a lower price is appropriate, in the region £250,000/£300,000, based on comparable sites, notably in Calne, and on the basis of informal offers made by three local businesses. It is suggested by the Council that the non-disclosure of these 'offers' by the appellant suggests a desire to downplay interest in the site, whilst the appellant suggests these are opportunistic attempts, in the light of the planning application and its determination, to leverage a lower than market price for the land.
20. These may be relevant factors. On the one hand, although I detect no low tactical intent in the offers made, consideration of the planning permission may have been a motivating factor. On the other hand, a measured lack of enthusiasm to respond by the appellant could be understood, given the loss of the initial sale and the decision to submit the residential scheme and the reasonably positive nature of negotiations with the Council in their initial stages. More substantively though, the *Metabolics* deal is the most robust and convincing one on offer, and little has changed in the market subsequently to suggest the then agreed price is unreasonable. Moreover, I am satisfied that there are other locations in Devizes that can offer accommodation for the two or three smaller-end enterprises that have shown an interest in the site. Their expressions of interest, such as they are, do not in my view amount to convincing evidence that there is a strong and sustained demand for this site in the town. Once again therefore, I see no conflict with policy ED7 of the KDLP.

Unilateral undertaking

Affordable housing

21. There is an established need for affordable housing in the area, as assessed by the Council. The proposed development would provide 10 affordable shared ownership dwellings that would go towards addressing that need and would accord with the Council's policy objectives. Moreover, when this provision is considered in conjunction with the rented affordable accommodation provided on the adjacent component of the site a reasonable mix of tenure types would be delivered. On this basis the obligation accords with the three criteria set out in paragraph 204 of The Framework and so may be fully taken into account.

Education

22. By the Council's agreed formula the proposed development would give rise to demand for 7 primary school places and 5 secondary school places. Whilst capacity exists for the secondary pupils and no contribution sought, capacity at Bishops Canning, the local Primary School, has or is nearly reached. Applying the Council's cost multiplier, a per capita figure is calculated and the monies targeted at increasing capacity at the school in response to this demand. On this basis the contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is proportionate and would be directly related to the development; it therefore complies with the criteria of the regulatory tests and may duly be taken into account.

Open space and community facilities

23. The proposed development will result in an increased demand for and use of recreational space and facilities as future occupants seek such active leisure and community activities beyond their own homes. The Council, whilst accepting that formal play pitch provision in the area is adequate, have identified deficiencies in that provision that limit accesses for future residents. The financial contribution facilitated by the obligation will provide for the upgrading of such proximate facilities, in this case the Bishops Canning cricket pitches. Similarly, increasing capacity at Bishops Canning village hall is identified by the Council as the recipient of contributions to accommodate increased demand for such facilities. Both contributions are anticipated by policy HC34 of the Kennet Local Plan and the proportionate calculations set out in adopted Supplementary Planning Documents; both recipient facilities are within the parish in which the development is to be located. On this basis the contributions meet the tripartite criteria of the regulatory tests and may be taken into account.

Planning balance and conclusions

24. The land is currently designated for employment use, and it certainly had a value as part of a mixed use scheme considered necessary to deliver a viable development package in 2009. The Council is therefore right to expect that any change of use is appropriately justified. However, it is equally important that if such an existing use is to be safeguarded, there needs to be clear evidence of its importance in delivering employment opportunities in the town, and that there is genuine interest in the site being taken forward for that purpose.

25. Moreover, this has to be seen in the context of paragraph 49 of The Framework, whereby if the Council cannot demonstrate, as I have found to be the case here, a five year supply of housing land, their policies relevant to the supply of housing cannot be considered up to date. Policy ED7, which seeks to safeguard strategic employment sites and other employment sites in specified settlements, can be seen as relevant to the supply of housing, insofar as it safeguards sites (some, like this one, un-reviewed) that may otherwise be appropriately considered for housing.
26. Specifically in this regard, The Framework also makes clear in paragraph 22 that planning policies should avoid long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. It goes on to state that land allocations should be regularly reviewed, and where no reasonable prospect of that use coming forward is found, alternative uses should be considered on their merits.
27. The Council has undertaken a review of its employment land through the RT&P report. This site was not identified by the Council in informing the scope of this study, which has to be considered anomalous in the light of their subsequent conclusions that it plays an important role in helping employment opportunities come forward in the town. Moreover, in the full course of its marketing over a 13 year period, only one firm but later withdrawn offer has been made for the site. By any measure, and notwithstanding the late and limited interest shown prior to the appeal, there can be no real prospect of this site being used for its currently designated purpose.
28. The appeal proposal brings with it clear benefits. It is sustainable under the terms of The Framework, it would bring forward market housing in an area where there is a shortfall in housing land supply. It would also bring forward affordable housing, again for which there is a pressing need in the area. Both these factors weigh very significantly in favour of the scheme. Furthermore, the financial contributions facilitated by the unilateral undertaking render the scheme neutral in terms of its impact on local infrastructure and all its provisions may be duly taken into account.
29. Paragraph 14 of The Framework makes clear that that where relevant policies are out of date decision-makers should grant planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. In the context of this appeal, policy ED7 cannot be considered up-to-date, nor can it be concluded that the site makes a significant contribution to the range and diversity of employment sites in the town. Moreover, there is no realistic prospect of this site coming forward for its current designated use. There are significant benefits the appeal proposals would bring, and no substantive adverse impacts to outweigh them. In this context, and in accordance with the clear presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in The Framework, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

30. The appeal being allowed, conditions are attached requiring the submission of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping and its mid-term management, and the submission of samples of materials, all to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. A condition is also attached requiring the submission of all tree protection measures, to safeguard all trees identified in relation to the site

during and after construction. Conditions are also attached requiring the submission of a scheme for water efficiency on the site and compliance with the requirements set out in submitted planning documents setting out drainage arrangements for the site, to safeguard local water resources and to ensure the satisfactory drainage of the site. A further condition is added requiring that the access, turning and parking areas serving the dwellings are laid out prior to their first occupation, to ensure such provision is appropriately secured.

31. Conditions are also attached requiring the submission of a Construction Environmental Management Plan, the provision of high performance acoustic fenestration in certain of the dwellings, the provision of obscure glazing in unit 15 and the provision of an acoustically treated fence along the boundary with the adjacent depot, all in the interests of safeguarding the living conditions of future and adjacent occupiers. Lastly a condition is attached requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of sound planning.
32. For the reasons given above and having considered all matters raised in evidence and at the Hearing, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Morgan

Inspector

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Notwithstanding the submitted landscaping details (which have been superseded by an amended layout drawing) no development shall commence on site until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include any hard surfacing materials and planting details including planting heights, species, locations and densities. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner; All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 4) No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to the site for the purpose of the development, until a scheme showing the exact position and type of protective fencing to enclose all retained trees

beyond the outer edge of the overhang of their branches in accordance with British Standard 5837 (2012): Trees in Relation to Construction, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and; the protective fencing has been erected in accordance with the approved details. This fencing shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

- 5) No development shall commence on site until details and samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) No development shall take place until a scheme for water efficiency has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 7) The drainage arrangements for the development hereby permitted shall be as specified in the PFA Consulting Flood Risk Assessment, dated April 2007 in respect of application K/58682/O and the submitted Drainage Layout Drawing S82198-D-230 Rev E received on the 28th February 2012 as updated by email received on the 1st June 2012 and attached drainage statement S82609-002.
- 8) No building hereby permitted shall be occupied until the access, turning area and parking spaces serving that building have been provided in accordance with the approved access, turning and parking areas shown on drawing 05217.02.AP001 Rev B. The access, turning and parking areas shall be retained for these purposes thereafter.
- 9) No development shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan, incorporating pollution prevention measures, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and agreed timetable.
- 10) Before first occupation of unit nos. 11 to 19 all windows and glazed doors in the rear facing elevations of unit nos. 11 to 19 and in the side (east) elevation of unit no 14. shall be glazed to the minimum glazing specification or better as set out in the appendix to the "Environmental Noise Survey: PPG24" by Noise.co.uk accompanying the planning application E/10/0303/REM, and glazing to this specification shall be maintained permanently thereafter. Additionally, all windows shall be provided with acoustic trickle vents.
- 11) Before unit no. 15 hereby permitted is first occupied the first floor side elevation window in the north facing elevation shall be glazed with obscured glass only and permanently fixed shut and shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.

- 12) The boundary of the site between the adjoining Council Depot and unit nos. 11 to 19 shall be defined by a 2.0 metre high acoustically treated fence along its entire length and shall be completed in its entirety before any of unit nos. 11 to 19 are first occupied. The acoustically treated fence shall be maintained as such thereafter.
- 13) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents; plan and document numbers/titles: -
- Landscape Specification by ACD Landscape Architects received on 28th February 2012
 - Tree Survey and Arboricultural Assessment by RPS received on the 25th April 2012.
 - Street Scene RHSL.05217.02.SS002 received on the 25th May 2012
 - House Type booklet (except superseded house types The Broadway-Evesham, The Letchworth and The Warwick) received on the 28th February 2012.
 - House Type Drawings (Amended) for The Warwick, The Broadway Evesham and
 - The Letchworth all received on the 25th May 2012.
 - Design and Access Statement received on 28th February 2012 except insofar as superseded by the amended layout.
 - Storey Height Plan 05217.02.SHP001 rev B received on the 12th July 2012
 - Boundary Material Plan 05217.02.BMP001 Rev B received on the 12th July 2012
 - Adoption Plan 05217.02.AP001 Rev B received on the 12th July 2012
 - Slab levels Plan 05217.02.SLP001 Rev B received on the 12th July 2012.
 - Topographical Survey S2074/01 received on the 28th February 2012.
 - Site Layout Plan (for adjoining site) SL01 received on the 28th February 2012
 - Drainage Layout Plan S82198-D-230 received on the 28th February 2012.
 - Dwelling Material Plan (final materials reserved for approval via condition number 2) 05217.02.DMP001 Revision B received on the 12th July 2012.
 - Site Layout 05217.02.PL001 Rev C received on the 12th July 2012.
 - Updated Strakers Marketing received on the 25th May 2012
 - Loss of Employment Land Supporting Statement provided by NLP dated 16th October 2012.
 - Drainage Layout Drawing S82198-D-230 Rev E received on the 28th February 2012 as updated by email received on the 1st June 2012 and attached drainage statement S82609-002
 - PFA Consulting Flood Risk Assessment, dated April 2007 in respect of application K/58682/O

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Andrew Cockett	Nathanial Lichfield and Partners
Mr Henry King FRICS	Kavanaghs
Ms Jenny Mitter	Nathanial Lichfield and Partners
Mr Lee Hawker, Land Director	Redrow Homes South West
Ms Charlotte Cooper	Redrow Homes South West

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms Rachel Yeomans BSc (Est Man) MA (T&CP)	Wiltshire Council
Ms Caroline Lightfoot, Senior Development Officer	Wiltshire Council
Mr Matthew Croston, Senior Development Officer	Wiltshire Council
Mr Jonathan Shortt, Chartered Surveyor	Martin Walker Estate Agents
Mr Neil Tiley	Wiltshire Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Ms Jill Crooks	Wiltshire Gazette and Herald
----------------	------------------------------

Documents presented at the hearing

1. Hearing date and venue notification
2. East Wilts HMA update April 2013
3. Addendum to Statement (appellant)
4. Wilts infrastructure delivery plan (Tideworth)
5. Wilts infrastructure delivery plan (Marlborough)
6. Statement of Common Ground (Wilts CS EiP)
7. Statement of Common Ground (Wilts CS EiP Horton Road)
8. Office availability in Devizes Table)
9. Workshop/warehouse availability in Devizes
10. E mail – land price evaluation
11. Extract from RICS evaluation standards document
12. Emails to Mr Harker (appellant)
13. Signed copy of Statement of Common Ground