

Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 16 September 2014

Site visit made on 24 September 2014

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 13 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/A/14/2215276

Land south of Oxhill Road, Tysoe, Warwickshire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gladman Developments Ltd against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 13/02515/OUT, dated 27 September 2013, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2014.
 - The development proposed is residential development (up to 80 dwellings) access, parking, public open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Preliminary matters

2. The Inquiry sat on 16-19 and 23-26 September 2014, and 20 October 2014.
3. The application was submitted in outline with matters of scale, layout, appearance and landscaping reserved for future determination, though an indicative layout was supplied and a number of details given in the Design and Access Statement.
4. A signed and dated S106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) was submitted by the appellant. This covers the completion and transfer of open space and SUDS to the Parish Council or a Management Company, a biodiversity contribution, a travel pack contribution, a bus contribution, a gateway contribution, a bus stop contribution, a library contribution, an off-site public open space contribution and a healthcare contribution. In the light of the evidence presented at the Inquiry, I consider that the obligations in the UU meet the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and satisfy the requirements of regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. I can therefore give the UU significant weight.
5. Although not included in the UU, South Warwickshire NHS Foundation Trust made representations to the Inquiry in relation to a contribution to offset the cost of securing sufficient acute healthcare provision to meet the population growth which would result from the appeal scheme. However, since the appeal

does not succeed for matters unrelated to the UU, it is not necessary for me to deal with that request in this Decision.

6. It was confirmed at the Inquiry that in the light of an evaluation of the reasons for refusal by an external consultant, the Council no longer intended to pursue its 3rd reason for refusal in respect of social cohesion and integration in relation to NPPF paragraph 7. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
7. The appellant's witness, Mr R Bailey BSc(Hons) MBA (Director, Levvel Ltd) who was going to give evidence on affordable housing, was not called. The evidence of Mr Gomez on behalf of the appellant was presented by Mr S Nichol.
8. At the Inquiry, the Council argued that it could demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. Following the close of the Inquiry, appeal Decisions ref. APP/J3720/A/14/2215757 and APP/J3720/A/14/2217495 were issued which relate to housing development elsewhere in the District. Those Decisions dealt with, to varying degrees, the housing land supply situation in the District, with both Inspectors concluding that the Council could not demonstrate an appropriate supply. The parties were given the opportunity to comment on the implications of those Decisions in relation to their respective cases in this appeal.
9. The development plan includes the saved policies of the adopted Stratford on Avon District Local Plan Review 1996-2011 (LPR). Whilst the LPR may be time expired, policies can continue to be given due weight according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF. In the case of policies relevant to the supply of housing, this depends on whether or not the Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The policies referred to in my reasoning below are those I consider to be most relevant to the main issues set out below.
10. At the time of the Inquiry, the Council's Submission Core Strategy July 2014 had been submitted for Examination although the Hearings had not commenced. Since the policies could change, I therefore afford them little weight. Nevertheless, I have noted that Tysoe is identified as a Category 2 Local Service Village, offering a range of community facilities and services.
11. The Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan is currently being prepared. However, whilst a lot of work had been done, it has not yet been submitted to the Council and was still at a draft stage. As a consequence, the document can be afforded only limited weight.

Main Issues

12. I consider the main issues to be:

- 1) whether or not a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land can be demonstrated;
- 2) the effect of the proposal on the setting of the Grade II* listed Tysoe Manor;
- 3) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
- 4) whether this would be a sustainable form of development having regard to national and development plan policies in respect of the delivery of new housing.

Reasons

Housing Land Supply

13. NPPF paragraph 47 states that local authorities should boost significantly the supply of housing and should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of either 5% or 20% depending on previous delivery.
14. NPPF paragraph 49 makes clear that 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 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.
15. At the Inquiry, the parties were in dispute regarding the housing requirement, the appropriate buffer and the housing supply. The Council's position at the Inquiry was based on its Policy Advice Note; *5 Year Housing Land Supply*; August 2014, which identifies a supply of between 5.3 and 6.4 years (including a 5% buffer), whereas the appellant argued that depending on how it is calculated and which buffer is applied, the supply varies between 1.5 and 3.8 years.
16. Since the close of the Inquiry, 2 appeal decisions ref. APP/J3720/A/14/2215757 and APP/J3720/A/14/2217495, were issued. In both cases the Inspectors considered at length the *housing requirement for the District, the appropriate buffer* (both considered 20% to be appropriate), *housing land supply, Class C2 Uses, windfall allowance, sites with planning permission, Local Plan allocations, dwellings with a resolution to grant planning permission, stalled sites, objectively assessed need, demographic projections, employment growth, unmet need from other Districts, affordability and market signals*. Evidence on these matters was tested at this appeal and from what I heard I have no reason to differ with the conclusions on housing land supply reached by my colleagues.
17. The parties were asked for their comments on the implications of these decisions to their respective cases. Following the submission of further information on housing land supply, the Council confirmed by way of Information Sheet no. 009/2015 dated 17 February 2015, that based on a housing requirement of 11,300, it has 4.86 years worth of housing land supply. This shortfall in supply was acknowledged by the appellant.
18. Against this background, the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land and I have afforded this matter substantial weight in my consideration of this appeal.

The setting of Tysoe Manor

19. The appeal site abuts the north-east boundary of Tysoe Manor, a Grade II* listed building, and concerns were raised that the proposal would have an adverse effect on its setting. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special regard should be paid to

- the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings, where those settings would be affected by proposed development.
20. The NPPF defines the setting of a heritage asset (in this case the listed building) as the surroundings in which it is experienced. The extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset; may affect the ability to appreciate that significance; or, may be neutral. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight attaches to the asset's conservation; the more important the asset, the greater that weight should be. Significance can be harmed through development within an asset's setting.
 21. English Heritage guidance; *The Setting of Heritage Assets*, indicates that setting embraces all of the surroundings from which an asset can be experienced or that can be experienced from or within the asset. Setting does not have a fixed boundary and cannot be defined, in perpetuity, as a spatially bounded area or as lying within a set distance of a heritage asset.
 22. The significance of a heritage asset is defined in the NPPF as its value to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. Significance may be harmed by a development and it is necessary to determine the degree of harm that may be caused.
 23. The parties have described the significance of the heritage asset, including the contribution made by its setting and have also assessed the effect on significance which would arise as a result of the impact on setting. This approach is in line with the advice in NPPF paragraphs 128-9. I note from these descriptions that the earliest part of the listed building dates from the 14th century with further building phases in the 17th, 18th and 20th centuries.
 24. The immediate setting of the Manor comprises the garden which was created in the early 20th century and includes modern features such as a tennis court. The boundaries of the Manor House contain mature vegetation. In places the vegetation has been enhanced to form small areas of woodland. This serves to accentuate the presence of the manorial site when viewed across the open countryside from the north and west, rather than divorce it from its surroundings. From the appeal site, the trees obscure views of the listed building although I heard that winter views afford sight of its outline.
 25. A feature of the local area is the survival of ridge and furrow displaying, in a well preserved condition, the characteristic "S" shaped furlongs produced by medieval ploughing methods. This feature is particularly prominent within the appeal site and continues into the field to the north of Oxhill Road. While no evidence was put forward to show that the ridge and furrow was part of the demesne land with the Manor and noting the appellant's argument regarding the Council's Historic Environment Assessment not setting out a historical significance link between the ridge and furrow and the designated heritage asset, I nevertheless consider that it is part of the historic development of the landscape which includes the Manor, as this form of strip farming was characteristic of the adjoining open field system. This was altered by the 18th century enclosures also evident in the local agricultural field system, the later

hedges and tracks of which intersected much of the ridge and furrow system in the area.

26. Although an undesignated heritage asset of itself, and not identified as a priority for preservation as is the case with other examples of the numerous remnant areas of ridge and furrow elsewhere in the District (following the information obtained in the reports *Turning the Plough* and *Turning the Plough Update Assessment 2012*), I consider that the appeal site ridge and furrow system is important to the significance of the Manor as a designated heritage asset. It documents an agricultural practice that is contemporaneous with the Manor, giving it an historical association with the listed building and providing its setting with a historical context. In that sense, Tysoe Manor displays the typical characteristics of a medieval manor house standing next to a related settlement and agricultural landscape whose roots go back to the medieval period. In my judgement, the setting, including the ridge and furrow, makes a strong contribution to the significance of the heritage asset as an associative attribute. The majority of the ridge and furrow system within the appeal site would be lost under the proposed housing development.
27. I note the appellant's argument that the tree belt on the north east boundary would obscure inter-visibility between the proposal and the listed building. However, taking account of the possibility that setting may change as a result of the removal of impermanent landscape features such as planting, and taking setting to embrace all of the surroundings from which the Manor can be experienced or that can be experienced from the Manor, I consider its setting to be inextricably linked to the tranquil nature of its location abutting open countryside. While this has been compromised to some degree by the housing development at Windmill Way and Poolgate, I observed that this is a long linear development that is peripheral to the listed building and more closely knit with the grain of Tysoe. By contrast, this proposal would intrude into this tranquil, rural area by introducing a large, urbanising development that would bring with it noise and bustle from traffic and domestic activity as well as light pollution at night from the houses and the streetlighting. This would change the nature of a large element of the setting of the Manor from that of an associated historical agricultural landscape to a developed, sub urban townscape, diluting the tranquil nature of the setting.
28. I have taken account of the appellant's arguments that matters such as lighting could be controlled by conditions while layout and landscaping could be used to reduce the impact of the proposal on the setting of the listed building were outline planning permission to be granted. However, the introduction of a substantial built development into the open countryside, in a field next to the listed building, would noticeably alter the characteristics of the area, and the proposed mitigation would not, in my view, sufficiently ameliorate its impact.
29. Against this background, I consider that the setting of the Manor would have a high sensitivity to change because of the historical relationship between it and its agricultural landscape, and the sense of tranquillity the agricultural landscape provides. In a physical and perceptive sense, the proposal would sever the Manor from its rural hinterland setting. Paying special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building, I consider that the contribution the setting makes to the Manor's significance would be harmfully reduced by the proposal but not to the point where it would be completely or almost completely lost. Accordingly, the proposal would result in less than

substantial harm to the significance of the heritage asset as a development within its setting.

Character and appearance

30. The appeal site is located adjacent to the western edge of the village, within the open countryside. Part of the appeal site was included in the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and Policy CS16 of the emerging Core Strategy (which I have already noted is of limited weight) is permissive of growth in settlements like Tysoe and this may need to take place beyond the existing boundary. Nevertheless, consideration must also be given to the impact of such development on the character and appearance of the local area.
31. The Core Planning Principles at NPPF paragraph 17 include the requirement to 'take account of the different roles and character of different areas'. Tysoe lies within the Natural England National Character Area 96: Dunsmore and Feldon. The key characteristics are noted as large fields many of rectilinear shape, numerous areas of remnant ridge and furrow, nucleated settlement pattern and unplanned enclosure of open fields extending from the villages over large parts of the area. The Cotswold Wold, in which Tysoe is also located, displays characteristics which include broad rounded hills, a large scale geometric field pattern and a remote landscape of small nucleated stone villages.
32. The appeal site, which extends to around 5.4 hectares, is a pasture field. It is bounded to the south by Tysoe Manor and to the east by a modern housing development. Oxhill Road runs along its northern flank. The Centenary Way footpath (including part of footpath SS41) passes nearby to the south and west while 2 no. footpaths (SS40 and SS40a) cross the appeal site east to west. Proposed is a housing development of up to 80 dwellings to include parking, public open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure. The development would be built on the edge of the village, extending the built form into the open countryside.
33. The proposal has been revised to reduce the developed area of the appeal site from 3.9ha to 3.65ha and to increase the density on the eastern edge while reducing it towards the west of the site. It is envisaged that the ridge heights of the proposed dwellings on the western side of the site would be lower and a landscape buffer would be provided on the western boundary of the site.
34. I observed, notwithstanding the enclosure that is created by the boundary hedges, that the appeal site forms a strong demarcation between the countryside and the existing urban development on the edge of Tysoe. This would be more apparent in winter due to a reduction in foliage along the site boundaries. As such, I do not consider the appeal site to be urban fringe. It shares its affinity with the countryside with which it forms an integral and functional part. This is reinforced by the survival of ridge and furrow which displays a historic agricultural association with the wider rural area. In my judgement, the ridge and furrow is perceived from within the appeal site as being part of a larger agricultural landscape, particularly given the shorter sections near to Oxhill Road which give the impression of the ridge and furrow having being truncated but continuing beyond the road. I consider the appeal site to be part of a landscape with a distinctive rural character which stretches from the western edge of Tysoe to the north and west.

35. This is apparent when approaching Tysoe on Oxhill Road, the Centenary Way footpath and the footpaths which traverse the appeal site. Accepting that it would be the case that from these approaches, those moving towards the village would be expecting to encounter built development, and whilst layout is a reserved matter, I nevertheless consider that the indicative layout gives an indication of how a large housing development at this location would be seen as an incursion into the countryside rather than as a 'rounding off', or a sympathetic organic expansion, of the village. This would harmfully change the character of the landscape when approaching the village from Oxhill Road and the footpaths, as the appeal site is more readily seen as an integral part of the open countryside that sweeps up to the western edge of the village.
36. While I note the existing hedges along the boundary with Oxhill Road, I nevertheless consider that the roofs of the proposed dwellings and the main access to the development would be apparent on this approach and the overall built form would be noticeable at night when street lights and other lights from the development would be likely to be seen. In addition, although rights of way (SS40 and SS40a) would be retained, the quality of the experience would radically diminish, given the proximity and likely density of the housing proposed. It would create a hard developed environment through which the footpaths would pass in place of the current pasture field. Moreover, while I note the proposal to retain a small amount of ridge and furrow as part of the development, this would not mitigate the loss of the vast majority of this historic feature from the site.
37. I have given careful consideration to the appellant's landscape evidence, including the LVIA, and fully appreciate that the landscape to which the appeal site belongs is not rare, or of exceptional quality, and that the site itself has no particular landscape or historic heritage designation. However, it forms part of the wider open countryside to the west and north of the village and is an integral part of the local landscape character. In my judgement, the development would introduce an overtly urban form of development that would be highly incongruous within this rural setting. I observed from Oxhill Road and the footpaths identified above that there are views of the existing houses on the western edge of Tysoe. What this proposal would do however, would be to bring the settlement edge out into the countryside, making it more prominent, particularly in winter despite the proposed landscaping.
38. The proposal would, I conclude, have a significant adverse effect on local landscape character. It would change the intrinsic rural character of the area which would be seen from Oxhill Road and footpaths SS40, SS40a and SS41, resulting in a significantly adverse visual impact. There would be conflict, in this regard, with Policy PR.1 of the LPR which requires that development should respect, and where possible enhance the quality and character of the area. The proposal would also be at odds with NPPF paragraph 7 which makes clear that 'contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment is an aspect of sustainable development'.

Other matters

39. The Tysoe (Upper and Middle) Conservation Area includes Tysoe Manor, (excluding the garden), within its boundary but is otherwise located away from the appeal site boundaries. Notwithstanding the comments of English Heritage, I find myself in agreement with the Council and the appellant in respect of the

effect of the proposal on this particular heritage asset. I consider that the majority of the Conservation Area is only experienced and appreciated as a heritage asset in peripheral views from, and across, the appeal site. What is more, given the intervening development between the appeal site and the Conservation Area, the appeal site itself is not integral to an understanding or appreciation of the Conservation Area. As a consequence, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in any harm to its significance as a heritage asset.

40. In addition, I note that in terms of highway safety, ecology, biodiversity, drainage and flood risk, the Council, as advised on these matters by the County Highways Officer, the County Ecologist and the Environment Agency, raised no objections, subject to suitably worded conditions being attached to any grant of outline planning permission. From my assessment, I have no reason to disagree.
41. The appellant drew my attention to several appeal decisions where housing developments were permitted elsewhere in the District and further afield, which also dealt with effects on character and appearance and the settings of heritage assets. Be that as it may, I am not aware of the detailed considerations of those Inspectors on these issues, and in any event, I do not consider them to be directly comparable to the site specific circumstances of this proposal, as set out above.

Benefits of the proposal

42. The provision of up to 80 dwellings, some 35% of which would be affordable, in a District where there is a shortfall in the provision of housing land, is a material consideration to which I attribute substantial weight.
43. In addition, it is claimed that the proposal would create around 97 full time equivalent construction jobs per annum over a 2 year build period and £9.8 million investment in construction. The development could also give rise to £0.6 million total annual household expenditure supporting 5 jobs in the local area and attract a New Homes Bonus of around £0.6 million. Other benefits may include the attraction of people of working age and younger families who are economically active, increasing the economic contribution of the community. I afford these benefits considerable weight.
44. The submitted UU includes a biodiversity contribution, a travel pack contribution, a bus contribution, a gateway contribution, a bus stop contribution, a library contribution, an off-site public open space contribution and a healthcare contribution. Although some of these contributions would be to the benefit of occupiers of the development in the main, some could also benefit the wider community.

Planning balance and conclusion

45. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. I recognise, in this regard, that Tysoe is a sustainable village that offers a range of community facilities and services, and links to public transport connections. However, the NPPF makes clear that sustainability encompasses economic, social and environmental dimensions, which go beyond whether or not a proposal would be situated within a sustainable location.

46. The benefits of the proposal as set out above are substantial and would accord with the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. However, the environmental dimension of sustainability is also concerned with protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment, and conserving heritage assets.
47. In this regard, I have found that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to a heritage asset as a development within its setting. NPPF paragraph 134 states that in such circumstances the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I consider that a number of the provisions that would be secured under the UU would benefit the occupiers of the development in the main, rather than the wider public. Moreover, having regard to the overarching statutory duty imposed by section 66(1), and giving considerable weight to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building, I consider that collectively the public benefits set out in paragraphs 42-44 above, would not overcome the harm that would arise from the adverse effects on the heritage asset's significance resulting from the diminution in the quality of its setting caused by the urbanising effect of the proposal and the loss of the ridge and furrow remnant which is a local historical, agricultural feature. In which case, the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage asset.
48. In addition, I have identified that the proposal would cause significant harm to local landscape character and would have a significantly harmful visual impact from nearby vantage points. Accordingly, there would be substantial environmental harm in allowing the proposed development to take place. In my judgement, the totality of that harm is sufficient to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would not be sustainable development and thus, the presumption in favour, set out at NPPF paragraph 14, does not apply.
49. Notwithstanding the officer's recommendation to the Council's Committee to approve outline planning permission for the proposal, on the basis of the evidence before me and for the reasons given above, I conclude on balance, that the appeal should not succeed.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr J Findlay QC	Instructed by the Council's Solicitor
He called	
Mr P Smith BA(Hons)	Director, Brian Barber Associates
Dip TRP MRTPI	
Mr S White DipLA,	Director, White Consultants
DipUD (Dist), MA, CMLI	
Mr N Molyneux FSA,	Principal Inspector of Historic Buildings and
IHBC	Areas, English Heritage
Ms A Stocks BSc(Hons),	Planning Archaeologist, Warwickshire County
AiFA	Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Ms S Reid of Counsel	Instructed by Mr K Waters, Gladman Development Ltd
She called	
Mr J Tait BA(Hons)	Director, Planning Prospects Ltd
DipTP MRTPI	
Mr S Nichol MA, BA	Managing Director, Regeneris Consulting
Mr D Beardmore MSc,	Principal, Beardmore Urban
MA, Dip LD (Dist), Dip	
LArch (Dist), Dip UD,	
Dip Bldg Cons, FRTPI,	
CMLI, IHBC	
Mr N Shepherd	Director, CgMS Ltd
BA(Hons)	
Mr R Hindle BSc(Hons)	Director, Rural Solutions Ltd
MRICS	
Mr A Dolan I.Eng, FIHE,	Executive Director, Curtins
MCIHT, CMILT	
Mr B Wright BA(Hons)	Director, Aspect Landscape Planning Ltd
Dip LA CMLI	

FOR THE TYSOE RESIDENTS' GROUP

Mr G Stepney	
He called	
Mr G Cressman	Local resident
Prof. J Hunter OBE	Local resident
Dr M Sanderson	Local resident
Mr B Dellanura	Local resident

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor C Saint	Leader, Stratford-on-Avon District Council
Mr M Sewell	Chair of Tysoe Parish Council
Dr G Collier	Tysoe Parish Council
Councillor G Roache	Ward Member

Ms S Gilkes

South Warwickshire NHS Foundation Trust

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

On behalf of the Appellant

- A1 Appearances on behalf of the Appellant
- A2 Ecological Statement in relation to Great Crested Newts and Reptiles by FPCR
- A3 Extract from Turning the Plough – identifying reasons for saving Ridge and Furrow.
- A4 Supplementary information from Mr Dolan – Curtins
- A5 Committee report for land adjacent to Service Station, Banbury Rd, Southam – ref 14/00503/OUT A10
- A6 Letter from David Lowe – Principal Ecologist Warwickshire County Council Reptile and Great Crested Newt clarification
- A7 Land south of Cirencester Rd, Fairford: Appeal decision letter and note from Regeneris Consulting
- A8 Regeneris note on C2 and OAN by Mr S. Nichol
- A9 Copy of Statement of Common Ground for appeal site at Hampton Lucy. Appeal ref: APP/J3270/A/14/2215757
- A10 Table indicating estimate of the 5 year housing land supply in Stratford on Avon District with different OAN figures
- A11 Biography of Mr Stephen Nicol – Regeneris
- A12 Correction to Mr Tait's Tables in respect of changes to housing supply between 31/3/14 & 30/6/14
- A13 Signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking
- A14 Response to NHS evidence

On behalf of the Council

- C1 Notification letter of the Inquiry
- C2 Rebuttal Evidence on Housing Land Supply Matters by Philip Smith
- C3 Rebuttal to Proof of Evidence from Ricardo Gomez (GLAD7/PSA) by ERM
- C4 Table of comparative visual effects
- C5 Proof corrections for Simon White
- C6 Planning for Housing in the Post-Barker Era (copy document)
- C7 Commentary on the GL Hearn Forecasts – Ian Gilder ERM
- C8 List of suggested conditions

On behalf of the Tysoe Residents Group

- R1 Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire
- R2 Letter from Compton Estates regarding land to rear of Roses Farm, Upper Tysoe
- R3 Biography of Prof Hunter
- R4 Biographies of Dr M Sanderson and Mr G Cressman
- R5 Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan – Project timeline
- R6 Letter to Tysoe Residents Neighbourhood Planning Group from The Vale of The Red Horse Health Care Centres
- R7 Letter from Tysoe Parish Council to Gladman Developments regarding input into the Neighbourhood Plan process – 7 March 2014
- R8 Extract from the Planning Portal – Neighbourhood Plans
- R9 Letter from Tysoe Utility Estate – 8 September 2014
- R10 Email of 3/9/14 regarding ecology

On behalf of interested parties

- I1 South Warwickshire NHS Foundation Trust Statement in respect of S106 Developer Contributions
- I2 Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan Survey Results – September 2014
- I3 Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan Survey - Key Conclusions
- I4 Submission by Ward Councillor – Cllr Mrs G Roache
- I5 Statement from Councillor C. Saint, Leader of Stratford on Avon District Council
- I6 Evidence of Mr M Sewell, Chair of Tysoe Parish Council
- I7 Letter from South Warwickshire NHS Foundation Trust, 17 October 2014
- I8 Suggested itinerary for the site visit

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE INQUIRY

- 1 Appeal decision ref. APP/J3720/A/14/2215757
- 2 Appellant response to appeal decision ref. APP/J3720/A/14/2215757
- 3 Core Strategy Housing Requirement
- 4 5 Year Housing Land Supply, November 2014
- 5 State of the District, October 2014
- 6 Schedule of quarterly permissions 1/7- 30/9/2014 & Information Sheet 047/2014
- 7 Appeal decision ref. APP/J3720/A/14/2217495
- 8 Calculation 5 Year Housing Land Supply, 2 January 2015
- 9 Appellant's response to appeal decision ref. APP/J3720/A/14/2217495
- 10 Tysoe Residents Group response to the Core Strategy Housing Requirement, 5 Year Housing Land Supply (November 2014) and State of the District (October 2014) documents
- 11 Draft Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan
- 12 Appellant's comments on the draft Tysoe Neighbourhood Plan
- 13 Council's Information Sheet 009/2015, dated 17 February 2015, and appellant's response

PLANS

- 1 Surviving Ridge and Furrow layout from Turning the Plough (1999) by CgMs
- 2 Composite plan indicating viewpoints of Mr Wright (for Appellant) and Mr White (for Council)

PHOTOGRAPHS

- 1 Winter Photographs – photograph I from Mr White (omitted from original proof)
- 2 Winter photograph of view from appeal site to Tysoe Manor taken by the Council's Planning Officer