



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held 21-24 April 2015

Site visit made on 24 April 2015

by Keith Manning BSc (Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 June 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/A/14/2219604

Land opposite Springfields, Napton Road, Stockton

- 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 Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd against the decision of Stratford on Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 13/02573/FUL, dated 4 October 2013, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2014.
 - The development proposed is residential development comprising 46 dwellings, site infrastructure, landscaping and with access to be gained off Napton Road.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The number of houses proposed has been reduced from 47 to 46 since the application was first lodged with the Council as a result of an agreed amendment. This is reflected in the above description.
2. A planning obligation in the form of an agreement between the Council, the County Council, the appellant and the current landowners was executed on 21 April 2015 and presented to the Inquiry. This includes provision for financial contributions in respect of bio-diversity off-setting, secondary education, off-site footpaths, off-site junction improvements, public transport, maintenance of a Local Area of Play, healthcare, off-site open space and sustainable travel packs. It also includes the provision that at least 35% of the housing would be affordable and embodies arrangements for the provision and maintenance of open space within the site and Sustainable Urban Drainage. The Council undertook to inform me of any implications for the planning obligation arising after the close of the inquiry as a consequence of Regulation 123 (3) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
3. A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) was submitted shortly before the Inquiry. A Statement of Common Ground dealing specifically with transport and highways matters had previously been agreed between the appellant and the highways authority, Warwickshire County Council as long ago as August 2014.

Decision

4. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

5. Having considered the evidence of the parties and having visited the appeal site and its locality, I consider the main issues to be as follows:-

- The magnitude and implications of the current deficit in the Council's supply of deliverable housing land.
- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to its effect on the landscape.
- The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to outlook.
- Whether the proposed development represents sustainable development for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') having regard, amongst other things, to the above considerations and relevant policy in the development plan.

Reasons

Physical Context

6. Stockton is a freestanding village a short distance from the significantly larger settlement of Southam. The original heart of the village nestles at the foot of a ridge of high ground oriented broadly south west to north east but subsequent expansion has extended the settlement onto its lower eastern slopes as well as the valley floor and an intermittent ribbon of development has occurred along Napton Road, variously on one side or the other as far as the crossroads formed by its junction with the A426, which follows the high ground just beyond the ridge line.
7. In the main, these properties are low density individual dwellings in capacious grounds with large trees, especially towards the ridge top, where Stockton House¹ is notable in this respect. To the south of the crossroads, the Millennium Way, a recreational long distance footpath, crosses the A426 between Tollgate House and Stockton House rising gently to the crest of the ridge before descending into the village of Stockton, bounding as it does so the southern boundary of the appeal site. Thereafter, it continues through farmland to the south east of the village across a broad vale towards Napton on the Hill, joining for a short while the Oxford Canal Walk at the Bridge Inn, where the waterway follows the foot of the slope of Napton Hill.
8. The site itself, which is described in detail in the SoCG, forms the fenced off eastern part of an open area between Napton Road, the grounds of Stockton House and the Millennium Way and adjacent to existing housing estates at Tuckwell Close and Mount Pleasant Close. North of the site, which is currently bounded by an overgrown hedge with hedgerow trees along Napton Road and its downward continuation known as The Hill, the ribbon of housing previously referred to is on the north side of the road, where older properties known as Hillside and Hill Top give way to a short row of modern detached properties commencing with Springfields, which is opposite the proposed access to the development at issue.
9. As a consequence of the topography, the open area including the appeal site is plainly visible from a wide range of viewpoints in the vale, including those as distant as the Oxford Canal and Napton Hill, as the Zone of Theoretical

¹ Shown on some maps as 'Kings House'

Visibility² prepared by the appellant indicates might be expected. These viewpoints are three kilometres or more away and the site is generally visible on approach from this direction until the eastern fringes of the village are reached. It appears as a green gap between the existing housing, especially the estate developments on the lower slopes and the crest of the ridge, which appears visually defined by significant trees, including specimen evergreens associated with Stockton House.

Relevant Policy

10. Relevant policy at national level is primarily embodied in the Framework, which, in its own terms³, is a material consideration and therefore capable, in principle, of outweighing the provisions of the development plan.
11. The development plan itself currently comprises the saved policies of the Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan Review 1996-2011. It is common ground between the main parties that the conflict with the development plan alleged by the Council is confined to those saved policies cited in its decision notice, namely PR.1 and DEV.1. These respectively concern landscape and settlement character and layout and design. The weight that may be accorded to those policies is dependent on consistency with the Framework.
12. The appellant agrees with the Council that policy PR.1 is broadly consistent with the Framework and I have no reason to take a different view. Insofar as policy DEV.1 does not explicitly incorporate a 'public benefit' dimension, so as to enable conflict with its intentions to be weighed against the benefits of any particular proposal it has been acknowledged in a nearby appeal decision⁴ not to carry the same weight as PR.1 in that this introduces a tension with the Framework. I have no reason to disagree with that conclusion, bearing in mind that balancing of harm against benefit is a defining characteristic of the Framework's overall approach embodied in the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as highlighted in the legal ruling to which the appellant also refers.⁵ On that basis I consider the objects of the policy to be tempered rather than altogether negated by that particular tension. The principles (a) – (h) set out in the policy are not of themselves at odds with Framework intentions; if anything the reverse is true. It is simply the case that the possibility of overriding public benefit is not acknowledged in the policy itself.
13. Fundamentally, however, policy DEV.1 is one of a suite of saved policies concerning quality of development, which is a central concern of the Framework. It is a core principle of the Framework to... "*always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings*". Saved policy DEV.2, concerning landscaping, is similarly concerned with achieving enduring environmental quality in the implementation of new development. Whilst it does not contain explicit reference to the possibility of overriding public benefit, neither is it so explicit in suggesting that failure to comply with its principles will invariably be fatal. Subject to the nuance of the necessary balancing of sometimes competing objects, I consider its intentions to be sufficiently consistent with those of the

² Figure 15 Rev A in appendices to evidence of Mr Holliday

³ Paragraph 196

⁴ APP/J3720/A/14/2217115 – paragraph 47

⁵ *Colman v SSCLG* [2013] EWHC 1138 (Admin)

Framework for it to carry weight. Moreover, bearing in mind the principle that the development plan should be considered as a whole, I consider it to be relevant, for reasons to which I return. It is notable in this context that the Council does not cite policy DEV.2 in its reasons for refusal, does not claim conflict with its intentions and does not seek to rely upon it.

14. Policy CTY.1 aims to resist development in the countryside but it has previously been found inconsistent with the Framework⁶ and in any event it is common ground that it is a policy relevant to the supply of housing in the terms of paragraph 49 of the Framework and out of date by virtue of an absence of a deliverable five year supply of housing land. On that basis it is common ground that the presumption in favour of sustainable development articulated in paragraph 14 of the Framework is engaged.⁷
15. The emerging core strategy for the Stratford-on-Avon District is currently the subject of independent examination and cannot carry the same weight as an adopted development plan. Moreover, the examining inspector's interim report has revealed fundamental concerns regarding the assessment of objectively assessed needs for housing and it is clear that adoption is some way off, dependent, inter alia, on further work to address that difficulty. It may therefore be accorded only limited weight.
16. That said, the 'direction of travel' of planning policy in the district is fairly clear in that 'balanced dispersal' of housing development is anticipated in response to needs, including to villages such as Stockton, which is identified in the emerging Core Strategy, through main modifications proposed by the Council, as a Category 2 Local Service Village (LSV) for the purposes of its draft policy CS15. This strongly suggests, because it is regarded as a sustainable location for housing development, that the principle of expanding Stockton for that purpose will be ultimately secured in the development plan. Draft policy CS16 indicates present thinking to be that Category 2 LSVs will each be subject to a requirement to accommodate between 51 and 75 homes over the plan period to 2031, albeit this is intended to be an approximate order of magnitude. The potential difficulty of accommodating additional housing at the required scale in LSVs constrained by Green Belt (Stockton is not one of these) is to be addressed through a main modification proposed in response to the Inspector's apparent concerns on that score.⁸ The greater flexibility inherent in that may or may not be instrumental in addressing the potential imbalance in the ability of LSVs across the district to individually deliver the requisite numbers, with a consequent impact on the overall capacity of the LSVs to sustainably accommodate any further increase in the overall requirement for dispersed housing development.⁹
17. In terms of local guidelines that do not have the status of development plan policy, those that were cited as relevant include the *Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide*, which has the status of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and the *Stratford-on-Avon Extending Your Home: Planning Advice Note (the 2008 Advice Note)*. Although apparently member endorsed and subject to some public consultation, this does not have comparable status as supplementary guidance.

⁶APP/J3720/A/14/2217115 – paragraph 46

⁷ SoCG paragraph 5.1.4

⁸ CD A17 paragraph 200

⁹ Ibid. paragraph 202

Main Issues

18. The fact that the application subject to appeal is a full application as opposed to an outline application with one or more matters reserved for subsequent determination has an important bearing on the consideration of the main issues. Allowing the appeal would not only endorse the principle of housing development on the site but would result in that principle being carried through into practice precisely as currently conceived of and presented. The Council's objections, reflected in its reasons for refusal, are essentially concerned with the effects of the development in practice rather than in principle. I have previously noted that Stockton as a whole is proposed to be a Category 2 LSV in the Council's emerging Core Strategy and, in any event, it has recently granted, or resolved to grant subject to completion of relevant planning obligations, a number of permissions for housing in the village, as illustrated by the annotated plan produced at the inquiry.¹⁰ Those in this category total 101 dwellings, on two small sites in the village centre and three larger sites broadly on its eastern and southern margins. The smallest of the larger sites is the land off Glebe Close where 17 affordable dwellings for local needs are currently being constructed.

The housing land deficit

19. The Council does not dispute that it does not have a five year supply of deliverable housing sites for the purposes of Framework policy. Nor does it dispute that there has been a record of persistent under-delivery, or that, on that basis, a 20% buffer is appropriately built into the requirement. The Council also accepts¹¹ that "*the adequacy or otherwise of the housing land supply is relevant in deciding what weight is to be given to the contribution made by the proposal in boosting the supply of housing*" and that, in view of the examining Inspector's concerns regarding the objectively assessed needs (OAN) which must inform the emerging Core strategy, the housing requirement on which the 5 year housing land supply is based is "*likely to increase*".
20. The Council's latest assessment of housing land supply at the time of the inquiry has been very clearly set out in its *Information Sheet 009/15*¹². It equates to 4.86 years. However, I am conscious that this calculation is based on the 11,300 total requirement deployed for the purposes of the submitted Core Strategy, a figure that does not reflect, according to the Inspector's Interim Report, an adequate assessment of objectively assessed needs. Albeit dependent on the outcome of further work yet to be done, it does seem to me entirely probable that the housing requirement on which the 5 year housing land supply is based is likely to increase, given the Inspector's interim conclusions which include an excess of job growth over labour supply and hence an increase in OAN in the context of a housing supply trajectory that is already tight but which for that reason will require more headroom.
21. It is not for me to speculate what the outcome of that process might be with any precision and it is perhaps understandable that the Council similarly declined to do so, simply suggesting that as the OAN is unknown and that because any consequential revised figure for the Core Strategy remains unknown it is not possible to give a figure against which housing land supply

¹⁰ ID3

¹¹ Evidence of Philippa Jarvis - paragraphs 6.19 and 6.16 respectively

¹² CDA4

should now be assessed. The unchallenged evidence of Mr May, for the appellant, is to the effect that the lawful approach, in the absence of an up-to-date development plan requirement, is to base the 5 year supply on OAN and that, all things considered, including relevant demographics, this leads to a conclusion of only 2.75 years supply at the present time.

22. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, for present purposes, I consider it safe for me to conclude that, whether or not Mr May's calculations and assumptions prove wholly accurate in advance of the eventual adoption of the Core Strategy, the current deficit in the deliverable supply is not simply marginal but substantial. On that basis, not only is the presumption in favour of sustainable development engaged but it is appropriate to place substantial weight on the deficit for the district as a whole, notwithstanding the approved and likely release of sites¹³ at Stockton that already exceed the currently anticipated but unconfirmed localised requirement to 2031; albeit the share of growth already anticipated for this LSV in that context is, in my view, a material consideration which should also attract appropriate weight in the balance that must be undertaken.

Effect on character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to landscape.

23. Considerable evidence was adduced by both the main parties on the range of considerations pertinent to this issue. Moreover, my assessment is properly informed by my assessment on site visits undertaken before and, in a formal sense, after the inquiry, the latter with the benefit of having heard the evidence of the relevant expert witnesses. Policy is of course relevant to the weight to be accorded to conclusions on the visual impact of the proposed development but within that context, notwithstanding differences in nuance as to the methodology of the landscape analyses undertaken, the acceptability or otherwise of the predicted impacts in this case is essentially a matter of planning judgement.
24. The Council's case is informed by the relatively fine-grained Landscape Sensitivity Study (LSS) commissioned by the Council to inform the sensitivity of sites to development from a landscape perspective. It is not a policy document but rather forms part of an evidence base to inform decisions as to which sites should be allocated for development. The fact that the Council has granted permissions for housing on sites comparably classified in the LSS, including in Stockton, does not invalidate its utility in that regard or indeed in the context of informing decisions on individual proposals for development, such as this one. Clearly it cannot, of itself, be determinative and is evidently not intended to be; it is simply a tool by which decision makers may better understand the consequences of allocation decisions in landscape terms. Equally, to simply disregard it in the development management decision making process would bring into question its usefulness altogether and would tend to artificially diminish landscape as a material consideration. Bearing in mind the fifth core principle of the Framework and associated Planning Practice Guidance,¹⁴ plainly it is an important consideration. Impact on the landscape, amongst other facets of the natural and local environment referred to in paragraphs 109 and 113 of the Framework is a substantive concern in the promotion of sustainable development. At the very least, a classification of

¹³ With planning permission or resolution to grant planning permission (as included in ID3)

¹⁴ Reference ID: 8-001-20140306

- high/medium sensitivity to housing development in the Council's LSS seems to me to demand a commensurately sensitive approach to the implementation of such development in the event that needs for it are determinative in principle.
25. In the context of such needs and the issue under consideration it is necessary to consider whether the landscape of which the site forms part is appropriately regarded as 'valued' for the purposes of the Framework, which does not define the term. 'Valued' does not equate to 'designated'. It would be illogical if it did. The Framework footnote 9 examples of designations which the Framework intends should restrict development include a number where preserving the quality of the landscape is a central purpose of designation. If those were the only valued landscapes for the purposes of the Framework it would say so.
26. I have been referred to the Secretary of State's decision¹⁵ and associated legal ruling¹⁶ of 6 February 2015 concerning a development proposal at Bishop's Cleeve. At paragraph 13 of the latter, the law is clarified to the effect that valued landscapes and designated landscapes are not one and the same thing.
27. Moreover, the ministerial letter of 27 March 2015¹⁷ removes any doubt concerning the intention of national policy on this matter. It says..... "*While National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coasts rightly enjoy the highest degree of protection, outside these designated areas the impact of the development on the landscape can be an important material consideration*". In the preceding paragraph the Minister refers to one of the core principles of the Framework in the following terms..... "*That plans and decisions should take into account the different roles and character of different areas, and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside – to ensure that development is suitable for the local context.*"
28. Insofar as the impact of the proposed development on the landscape is a central consideration concerning its effect on the character and appearance of the area for the purposes not only of PR.1 of the local plan but also relevant aspects of policies DEV.1 and DEV.2 it seems to me that the landscape relevant to the development of this site may legitimately be regarded as 'valued' for the purposes of the Framework rather than simply 'popular' in the sense that very many greenfield sites considered for development are.
29. There are a number of factors which combine to lead me to this conclusion. First, the appeal site itself does have demonstrable physical attributes. These include its slope and elevation, and therefore visibility from a wide range of viewpoints, as I have previously noted, as part of the setting of the village of Stockton. They also include remnants of ridge and furrow which are in fact distinctly perceptible on visiting the site, albeit the current lack of grazing or other form of close management has tended to obscure the feature by comparison with the land beyond Napton Road to the north.
30. Secondly, its sensitivity to housing development has been systematically classified for planning purposes. Although such classification has so far not been translated into a particular policy stance, local designation or decision not to allocate for housing; it seems to me that the very facts of comparative assessment for the purpose, and conclusions in that context that it is sensitive,

¹⁵ APP/C1625/A/13/2207324

¹⁶ ID15 Stroud v SSCLG [2015] EWHC 488 (Admin)

¹⁷ CDA26

confer value to it in landscape terms. There may be a degree of nuanced opinion amongst landscape professionals as to the precise categorisation, but the systematic and consistent approach of the LSS methodology lends weight to its outcomes. I have no reason to fundamentally question the appropriateness of the methodology or the conclusions drawn in respect of the sensitivity to housing development of the parcel Stk03 into which the appeal site falls. It is not policy, it is not of itself determinative, but it does indicate that the landscape is relatively sensitive to development because of its intrinsic characteristics.

31. Thirdly, the appeal site does have an intimate relationship, to which I return below, with a recognised, signed and publicised recreational route, namely the Millennium Way. Being around 100 miles through lowland central England, it does of course link a number of settlements and users will inevitably experience specific views of variable quality as they pass along it. However, its very *raison d'être* is to provide an opportunity to walk through and appreciate beautiful scenery. That much is evident from the publicity brochure.¹⁸ It therefore seems to me that the existence of the route must of itself confer some measure of value on the landscape closely associated with it and the broader scene through which it passes, whether specifically designated for scenic beauty or not. The thrust of national policy articulated in the Framework and its core principles suggests to me that, at the very least, care needs to be taken not to unnecessarily diminish the experience of its users through planning decisions that pay insufficient heed to its existence.
32. Finally, the village of Stockton (which seems to me to have developed into a part valley floor and part valley side settlement in the terms of the categorisation embodied in the *Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide*) does itself appear an attractive part of the broad vista of predominantly rural land viewed from the east, sitting below the ridge line previously described. The attractiveness of the settlement in that vista derives in large measure from its varied appearance and changing levels with roofs and houses of differing types and orientation broken up and backgrounded by substantial trees. It sits noticeably below the ridge, with the appeal site forming a relatively conspicuous feature in the undeveloped backdrop notwithstanding its enclosure on three sides by development. In that sense the appeal site forms part of a broad landscape which is undeniably locally distinct countryside of intrinsic character and beauty even though not formally designated. The views of the settlement in its broader context are undoubtedly part of the experience of the Millennium Way if approached via that route from the east and in any event from a wide range of viewpoints including the Oxford Canal and various other footpaths and roads. The visibility of the site in this broad vista is a consequence of the topography.
33. The broad vista seems to me typical of the Dunsmore and Feldon National Character Area and the more locally defined Feldon Lias Farmlands¹⁹ described in the Council's landscape evidence. The LSS describes the upslope setting of Stockton to the north and west where it broadly corresponds to zone Stk03 and includes the appeal site in the terms set out in this evidence²⁰ including reference to its function as a natural backdrop to the village and distant views

¹⁸ Appendix 3 to evidence of Mr Holliday

¹⁹ Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines 1993

²⁰ Evidence of Mr White paragraph 2.16

over the settlement from various footpaths. The zone's sensitivities are said.....
"to lie in the prominence of the slopes and ridgeline, its role as backcloth to the settlement, its tree cover and landscape features such as ridge and furrow".

34. All in all, I consider there to be a wealth of evidence to suggest that the appeal site forms part of a landscape which may reasonably be regarded as 'valued' in the sense intended by the Framework. Moreover, the emphasis on design and landscape in the Council's SPG the *Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide* is indicative of the importance which the Council has long placed on ensuring that needed development takes place in a manner which is harmonious with its landscape context.
35. In this case, there are a number of potential impacts to take into account bearing in mind that the world is experienced in three dimensions rather than plan form, a point which is in my view fundamental to the acceptability or otherwise of housing development on the steeply sloping and elevated appeal site in the context of the foregoing background.
36. While I am conscious that the appeal proposal was the subject of an officer recommendation for approval, following negotiations which included discussion of layout, I am obliged to consider the matter afresh in the light of the evidence presented and my own assessment. In essence, the proposed layout represents a straightforward estate, primarily of detached and semi-detached houses with gardens at a density of a little under 32 dwellings per hectare based on net developable area²¹. The houses would be arranged around a looped form of cul-de-sac, the principal alignment of which would take the form of two limbs crossing the slope with a modest concentration of sloping open space ('The Green') within the curved section towards the southern end of the site. The longest row of houses would be aligned with the upper, western edge of the site, with rows also following the lower, southern and eastern edges. These rows would face inwards towards the centre of the site, where houses fronting Napton Road, the estate road and 'The Green' as proposed would encircle an area of rear gardens backing onto each other. The whole would be encircled by a notably shallow screen of perimeter planting, formally confirmed as being retained as incidental open space subject to management arrangements.²²
37. On a flat site the proposed layout, save for the shallowness of the perimeter planting, would be an unremarkable approach but it is notable that very considerable reliance is placed on retaining walls throughout the site to achieve the desired compactness of layout, including within the area of rear gardens across the centre of the site where a limited number of necessarily small or medium sized species of tree would be planted in those gardens. Whilst those with north facing gardens may well wish to retain such trees, including for reasons of screening retaining walls, those with south facing gardens and views across the vale are unlikely to do so. I am persuaded by the evidence that a consequence of the layout is therefore likely to be a relative dearth of substantial trees at the very part of the site where such trees would be required to soften and break up what would appear as a relatively dense roofscape, discordant with the remainder of the settlement in views from the middle distance.

²¹ Drawing No. 57 Open Space Plan

²² Ibid. As bound into planning obligation

38. There was some discussion at the inquiry of privately enforced covenants to prevent removal of trees in this area and the possibility of a planning condition to require this course of action. While developers may practice the imposition of such covenants for their own reasons, it seems to me a fundamental weakness in the quality of the layout if planning acceptability in terms of character and appearance is reliant on such an arrangement, which impinges heavily on the ability of householders to manage their rear gardens as they please and, in practice, might well prove ineffective from a public enforcement point of view. This weakness of the layout in its particular context weighs heavily against the proposed scheme in context of development plan and Framework intentions regarding impacts on the broader landscape. Notwithstanding that the uppermost row of houses would be backgrounded by trees on the skyline in such views, the paucity of visual relief in the central part of the site is a negative aspect of the design not readily susceptible to effective mitigation.
39. I am less concerned, notwithstanding the thrust of the Council's evidence on the point, about the effect of the proposed development along the Napton Road frontage, the southern side of which is pleasantly rural in appearance as a consequence of the overgrown hedgerow previously noted. As the appellant's landscape witness pointed out, the ribbon of development on the north side of the road includes essentially suburban modern house types directly fronting the highway. The prospect along the road and its present character would change to a more suburban aspect but with appropriate landscape design and species choice which, along this particular boundary, could be facilitated by the proposed layout, I do not think unacceptably so.
40. During the course of my consideration of the evidence at the inquiry and my site visits a further potential impact on the landscape became very apparent, namely the prospect eastwards across the vale from the Millennium Way as the appeal site is approached from the north west. Although not formally recognised as a viewpoint in terms of being annotated on the Ordnance Survey map, this panoramic view is nevertheless a fine one by any standard and a very positive feature of the experience of the Millennium Way as the ridge above Stockton is traversed on this route. Whether being used for the purposes of a local stroll or by walkers passing through Stockton, the Millennium Way at this juncture affords an unimpeded view across the vale towards Shuckburgh Hill and Napton Hill.
41. The current layout proposed on the appeal site would obliterate this fine view and permanently replace it with the prospect of the rear elevations of a row of two storey houses projecting above the skyline, proposed to be screened by the shallow band of perimeter landscaping which would have to be of substantial height to screen the houses, of itself damaging the prospect from the Millennium Way. Without the screening the development would not present a 'fair face' to the surrounding countryside and with it the essential openness of the ridge top and broad sky followed by the view across the vale²³ as one traverses it when walking from the A426 in the vicinity of Tollgate House towards and just over the ridge top would be wholly lost. That prospect is not obtained in such an unimpeded form on descent of the Millennium Way into the settlement owing to the enclosure created by the settlement itself including hedgerows and property. Although, in an unduly literal sense, a 'localised'

²³ See, for example, viewpoint SW2 and wireframe in the evidence of Simon White

- impact over a relatively short stretch of countryside to be appreciated from the Millennium Way, I consider the proposed combination of layout, house type and landscape barrier treatment would impact disproportionately, irreversibly and harmfully on the fine prospect of the wider landscape and consequently its enjoyment by users of the route, whether local residents or distance walkers.
42. I am conscious of the care with which 'wire frame' images of the type deployed by the Council must be interpreted, not least because they appear to stand in front of established and proposed landscaping, but there was no dispute that the roof lines and position of the houses relative to the skyline and the prospect of the vale beyond had been portrayed with sufficient accuracy by the Council's landscape witness and various reference points in the landscape in any event enabled me to determine on my visit what the impact of the uppermost dwellings proposed on the site would be within the view from the Millennium Way in the progression along it from the A426 to the point where the ridge is crossed and the view beyond revealed. With or without the assistance of those images, I am clear that the harm I have described would be substantial in terms of diminishing the current opportunity to appreciate the landscape around Stockton. This negative characteristic of the proposed development would in my view conflict very directly with the intentions of policy PR.1 that development should respect the quality and character of the area. It would also conflict with the intentions of policy DEV.1 in that respect.
43. While I appreciate that DEV.1 is regarded as less consistent with the Framework because it contains no counterbalancing requirement to take account of benefits, I am conscious that the core principles of the Framework in any event include intentions to creatively enhance and improve places, recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and always seek to achieve high quality design. The insensitivity of the proposal relative to this small but important stretch of the Millennium Way as it reaches the settlement of Stockton offends all those principles.
44. There are other negative features relevant to the character and appearance of the area which must be balanced against potential benefits. As previously noted, the characteristic ridge and furrow pattern is more evident on the site than is immediately apparent from the submitted material. However I am conscious that there is no heritage objection specifically concerning this and that publicly accessible land to the north of Napton Road, within the LSS zone Stk03 provides a very good opportunity for this to be appreciated in the immediate locality. Whilst it is clearly a feature that contributes to the sensitivity of the zone to housing development it must be the case that retention of ridge and furrow and housing development on the same site are incompatible aims that cannot be addressed by sensitive scheme design.
45. I am conscious that the *Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide* provides typologies rather than a prescriptive categorisation of individual settlements whilst nevertheless extolling the virtues of retaining their recognisable characteristics relative to the topography. I have concluded that Stockton is part valley floor and part valley side. The appeal proposals would avoid the appearance, from viewpoints in the vale to the east, of extending to the top of the ridge mainly because the uppermost row of houses to which I have previously directed my analysis relative to close views from the Millennium Way would be backgrounded by the presence of mature trees outside the site boundary. To the extent that it may reasonably be assumed that vegetation of

that nature is likely to remain characteristic of the ridge top the otherwise incongruous appearance of those in the wider landscape would be mitigated. Nevertheless, for reasons previously given regarding the ability of planting within the proposed development site as currently conceived of to mitigate the harsh appearance of built development consistent with the currently pleasing mix of varied roof tops and gables intermixed with trees on the sloping land of the settlement viewed from the east, I consider this aspect of the proposed development produces conflict with the intentions of PR.1, DEV.1 and the Framework regarding the quality and character of the area; albeit the conflict in this case would be less stark than that previously identified in respect of the Millennium Way as it crosses the ridge above Stockton. In this regard, however, there would be conflict also with the intentions of DEV.2 specifically, in that criterion (f) includes the requirement that in appropriate cases there is sufficient provision for planting within the site to minimise visual intrusion on the countryside. DEV.2 is not cast in the absolute terms of DEV.1 and I find no inconsistency with the generality of Framework intentions concerning development quality in context.

46. For the above reasons I conclude that the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area would in certain important respects impinging on the landscape within which it and the settlement of Stockton is set, which I consider may properly be regarded as 'valued', would be sufficiently negative to produce clear conflict with the intentions of the development plan and the Framework. Those consequences of the design and layout proposed by the appellant, which overall I consider would be seriously adverse, would, moreover, be permanent and should be weighed accordingly.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

47. If the proposed layout of the development were to be implemented on flat land, the likelihood that there would be materially adverse consequences for neighbouring occupiers would in all probability be small, all other things being equal. However, the appeal site is particularly challenging in this respect because of its topography and the proximity of a small number of properties to the foot of the slope. These properties, in the main, are those that I visited, namely Westfield House and Nos. 5 – 11 Mount Pleasant Close. I did not visit 16 Tuckwell Close, specifically, although I am conscious that the Council's planning witness voices similar concerns in respect of that property as she does in respect of the properties to which access was arranged. However, the different circumstances of the Tuckwell Close property in respect of slope, garden configuration and the intervening footpath and vegetation suggest to me that direct comparison with the Mount Pleasant properties would not be appropriate. Be that as it may, I am able to draw sufficiently firm conclusions on those properties which I was able to visit to address the issue at hand.
48. It is significant that the Council does not have guidance specifically directed towards new residential layouts in relation to existing but as a matter of practice relies on the 2008 Advice Note as a form of proxy for more bespoke advice regarding housing layout. The advice on extensions gives guideline minimum distances for avoidance of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing impact and in common with many such guidance documents deploys a formula to increase those commensurate with changing level. I agree with the Council's planning witness that the document is potentially somewhat off the point because it essentially deals with such relationships in

existing developed and established areas, albeit loss of private view per se is not a material consideration when a greenfield site is being developed alongside existing houses.

49. To my mind the advice note is a useful starting point, but simply that, and should be used with discrimination in particular circumstances, even where, as here, it is the case that the guideline minimum distances can be met. Of more relevance, especially in judging whether or not a proposed new development would be overbearing in the outlook from home or garden, having regard to the individual circumstances of the existing properties likely to be affected, is the assessment in the round that can only be made with the benefit of envisaging the impact on site, having regard to actual slope configuration and not simply a formulaic approach to level differences.
50. With these principles in mind, I am satisfied that the disposition of Westfield House, the side boundary of which is in any event flanked by substantial vegetation that could no doubt be effectively replaced and the fact that it has land to the right hand side and is offset from the proposed dwellings (plots 8-11) on the sloping land to the north, combine to make for a relationship within the bounds of acceptability as far as the living conditions of its occupants are concerned.
51. I am not satisfied, however, that the same can be said in respect of Nos. 7-11 Mount Pleasant Close. The lie of the land²⁴, as opposed to the simple difference in level, is such that the gently upward sloping linear rear gardens, which run towards the appeal site directly from the rear elevations of the houses, create an impression of the houses and gardens being settled down in the slope of the land. This contrasts with the impression of the proposed houses surmounting a steepened slope beyond the site boundary and would thereby create a perception of closeness which would cause the proposed houses to appear to loom oppressively close to the established properties, dominating the direct outlook from their rear elevations and gardens against the skyline. Steeper rear gardens combined with a shallower slope beyond would tend to mitigate rather than exacerbate the impact over the same difference in level but, in this case, the topography would exacerbate the perception; and perception is an important component in outlook.
52. Having stood in the rear gardens of each property and considered this, aided but not over-influenced by the Council's wire frame images (which, as previously noted, must be deployed with due caution), I consider the circumstances would be such as to cause the houses proposed on plots 4-7 in particular, flanked by the dwellings proposed on plots 3 and 8-11 to be unacceptably oppressive in the outlook of residents of Nos. 7-11 Mount Pleasant Close. In order to mask the dwellings visually it would be necessary to achieve tall vegetation along the perimeter, perhaps of a type that the current occupant of No 11 appears to favour. But that is a matter of choice which, if extended by necessity along the entire interface between these properties and the appeal site would in my view be oppressive in itself, potentially creating a gloomy tunnel effect and certainly restricting views of the sky and leading to a claustrophobic impression of enclosure not currently endured by most residents of these properties. The impact of the proposed two storey houses on the elevated ground to their rear would not therefore be

²⁴ Indicated in sections at Appendix 12 to evidence of Mr Hill (3-3, 4-4, 5-5 and 6-6)

effectively mitigated by the proposed planting at the site perimeter, whether or not it was tall enough to obscure the new houses.

53. All in all, for these reasons, I consider that, notwithstanding ready accordance with the Council's minimum guidelines on extensions, the negative impact on the outlook of the residents of Nos. 7 – 11 Mount Pleasant Close which would be caused by a limited number of the new houses proposed in this case would conflict unacceptably with the intentions of the principle (e) set out in policy DEV.1 concerning the amenity of adjoining properties. This impact would also engage a core principle of the Framework which includes the intention that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. The unacceptable impact on the outlook of a limited number of existing residents at the southern periphery of the site, as I have identified, would be contrary to that principle.

Sustainability – The Planning Balance

54. I am conscious that, in relation to the two preceding issues, the Council's own officers were satisfied that the proposed development would be acceptable, although, following their site visit, this was clearly not a view shared by the relevant councillors who are entitled to take a different view on planning merits. For my part, I am obliged to take the proposal as I find it in the light of the evidence put to me and weigh the relevant considerations.
55. For the reasons I have given, I consider the development, in the form proposed, would conflict with important intentions of the development plan and the Framework. These are site-specific physical planning reasons particular to my assessment of the consequences of the layout proposed in response to the challenging site topography and I am conscious that the appellant company has invested much time and resources and has negotiated with the relevant Council officers to arrive at the scheme as presented. However, I am nevertheless clear in my view that the harm I have identified would be serious and permanent but also in many respects avoidable in the context of a different approach to developing the site.
56. It is not for me to suggest an alternative layout to address my concerns, although I have given consideration to whether a condition to amend the layout might overcome them. I do not consider it would be possible to reasonably impose such a condition in this instance as it seems to me that house types, density of development and numbers of dwellings would necessarily be at issue. I must therefore take the development as it is proposed in its detailed form and weigh harms against benefits in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development which is undoubtedly engaged by the substantial current shortfall in deliverable housing across the district. Paragraph 14 of the Framework of the Framework explains that where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date permission should be granted unless the impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.
57. Examples of the latter policies are set out in footnote 9 to the Framework and the local circumstances are not such that restrictive policies of this type would be contravened by the development. Moreover, following the approach of paragraph 49 of the Framework it is clear that, because relevant policies for

the supply of housing cannot be considered up-to-date, the presumption is engaged, contrary to the submission that it is somehow disengaged by conflict with other policies of the development plan, notably PR.1 and DEV.1 referred to by the Council in relation to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

58. Equally, engagement of the presumption does not mean that conflicts with development plan policy to which weight may legitimately be accorded may be lightly set aside. The statutory primacy of the development plan requires that not to be the case as the Framework itself recognises at paragraphs 11-13 and 196. The Framework is a material consideration, albeit a weighty one in all its constituent parts, which must be read together as a whole. Moreover, the Framework explains that there are three dimensions to sustainable development; economic, social and environmental.
59. The harms and conflicts with the development plan and the Framework's intentions are essentially environmental and it should also be borne in mind that the Framework intends that planning decisions should be plan-led, thereby lending weight to clear conflict with policies that are relevant, not out-of-date and sufficiently consistent with the Framework to be accorded due weight in themselves.
60. The social and economic benefits of facilitating housing development including affordable housing as proposed on the appeal site are clear and it is a national priority to boost significantly the supply of housing. Aside from the social benefits and the economic stimulus including employment in the construction project, the New Homes Bonus due locally would also be a material benefit.
61. I therefore accord the prospect of housing delivery on the appeal site substantial weight, particularly in view of the district wide shortfall in supply. The emerging development plan is moving clearly towards a strategy of balanced dispersal to villages such as Stockton, as previously noted, albeit in an apportionment yet to be determined. In this context I consider some counterbalancing weight may legitimately be accorded to the permissions and resolutions to grant permission (subject to the execution of planning obligations) notwithstanding that the housing shortfall remains district-wide. Otherwise, the emerging desired distribution of housing might simply be set aside in favour of numbers alone, regardless of spatial distribution factors. Nevertheless, I have no persuasive evidence to suggest that the quantum of development actually proposed on the appeal site, in combination with the other sites under consideration or permitted around Stockton would of itself cause a lack of balance, as the precise composition of the balanced dispersal strategy has yet to be resolved. The fact that other sites around Stockton are likely to be developed for housing does not of itself militate against the development of the appeal site in principle at the present time, but it is clear that the village will make a significant contribution to the housing needs of the district in any event.
62. I acknowledge that, being a full application, the instant proposal could be implemented relatively quickly. Equally, I have no reason to doubt that the various full and imminent outline permissions²⁵ awaiting completion of legal agreements will begin to deliver housing within a relevant and reasonable timescale.

²⁵ As per ID3

63. Whilst the prospect of early delivery is a material benefit, the harms I have identified stem directly from the fact that the proposal is worked up in detail and effectively fixed, for present purposes, but with insufficient sensitivity to important site-specific and local context considerations, as I have identified. Moreover, if the scheme is permitted as currently presented, those harms would be irreversible and therefore permanent, whereas the land supply situation across the district and more locally is inherently dynamic and susceptible to resolution, including with the benefit of the potential contribution that a more acceptable scheme for the appeal site might in due course deliver.
64. Although there is an imperative within the Framework to boost the supply of housing, there is nothing in it to suggest that achieving that objective should be at the expense of other important intentions, including respect for valued landscapes and residents' living conditions. On the contrary, the Framework emphasises that the Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and that good design is indivisible from good planning.²⁶ Moreover, it is clear in its intention that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.²⁷ Notwithstanding the conclusions of the Council officers and the fact that the appeal site is inevitably challenging from the point of view of designing and achieving an appropriate layout, I am clear, for the reasons I have explained, that the current proposal is of a poor design which fails in those respects. As a consequence, valued elements of the landscape important to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of certain residents would be harmfully compromised, in my view unacceptably so.
65. To the extent that they are compliant with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations of 2010 I have taken into account the benefits embodied in the planning obligation albeit, leaving aside the affordable housing, these are largely intended to be in mitigation of potential impact. I have also taken into account all other matters raised, including other appeal decisions and court rulings referred to.
66. In the final analysis, however, while I accord substantial weight to the economic and social benefits of this proposal for housing development, not least in view of the substantial shortfall in deliverable sites, I also accord very substantial weight to the harmful conflict with development plan policy and corresponding intentions of the Framework I have identified concerning environmental quality. Therefore, I consider the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. On that basis the specific proposal at issue, as conceived of and presented as a detailed estate design and layout, is not acceptable in its local context and cannot be said to represent sustainable development. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Keith Manning

Inspector

²⁶ Paragraph 56

²⁷ Paragraph 64

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY: Ian Ponter of Counsel

He called

Simon White DipLA,
DipUD(Dist), MA, CMLI White Consultants

Philippa Jarvis BSc
(Hons), DipTP, MRTPI PJPC Ltd

FOR THE APPELLANT: Peter Goatley of Counsel

He called

Gary Holliday BA (Hons)
MPhil, CMLI FPCR Environment and Design Ltd

Chris May BA (Hons)
MRTPI Pegasus Planning Group

Paul Hill BA (Hons), MA,
MRTPI RPS Planning and Development

Stephen Bernard Clyne
LCP (Dip.SMS) Cert Ed
MAE EFM Ltd

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr A Stanley Local resident
Mrs M Duffy South Warwickshire NHS Foundation Trust
Mr B Lowe Warwickshire County Council

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

ID1 Council's Notification Letter
ID2 CIL Compliance Statement
ID3 Plan of housing permissions and proposals in Stockton
ID4 Appellant's opening submissions
ID5 Council's opening submissions
ID6 Revised Drg. No 59 showing Buffer Planting Exclusion Areas
ID7 Email from Andrew Thomas to Kate Tait 22/04/2015 @13:11
ID8 Statement by Andrew Stanley
ID9 List of 28 draft conditions

- ID10 Draft condition 29
 ID11 Australian guidance: Victoria Planning Practice Note 27
 ID12 CIL Regulation 123 compliance note (interim)
 ID13 Council's closing submissions
 ID14 Appellant's closing submissions
 ID15 [Stroud v SSCLG \[2015\] EWHC 488 \(Admin\)](#)

CORE DOCUMENTS

	Local Policy and Evidence Base Documents
A1	Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan Review 1996 to 2011 (July 2006)
A2	Stratford-on-Avon Local Plan Review – Saving Direction Letter (9 July 2009)
A3	Submission Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (June 2014)
A4	Interim Five Year Housing Land Supply Calculation Summary as of 31 December 2014 (17 February 2015)
A5	Stratford-on-Avon District Design Guide. Issue 1. April 2001.
A6	Stratford-on-Avon Extending Your Home – Planning Advice Note –(April 2008)
A7	Stratford-on-Avon Local Development Scheme (December 2014)
A8	National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)
A9	National Planning Practice Guidance (Design/Determining Planning Applications/Rural Housing, / Natural Environment)
A10	Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2012) (<i>Stockton Extracts</i>)
A11	Stratford-on-Avon Landscape Sensitivity Study (2012) (<i>Stockton Extracts</i>)
A12	Stratford District Landscape Sensitivity Study (2011)
A13	Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines - <i>Avon Map/Guidelines</i>
A14	Stockton Parish Plan 2006
A15	Coventry and Warwickshire Joint SHMA (November 2013)
A16	Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy (Relevant extracts)

	(December 2014 and January 2015)
A17	Core Strategy Inspector's Interim Report, dated 19th March 2015
A18	Meeting Housing Needs SPD
A19	Stockton Housing Needs Surveys, December 2006 and January 2013
A20	Sustainable Low Carbon Buildings SPD, October 2007
A21	Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD, April 2007;
A22	Provision of Open Space SPD, March 2005;
A23	Planning Obligations SPD, 2005.
A24	Land North of Napton Road Application Site Boundary Plan (August 2014)
A25	Land South of Napton Road Application Site Boundary Plan (October 2014)
A26	Letter from Brandon Lewis (Minister for Housing and Planning) to Simon Ridley (Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate) 27 March 2015
A27	Letter to Inspector Pete Drew regarding revised Core Strategy timescale for further work in light of the Inspectors Interim Conclusions 2 April 2015
	Application and Appeal Documents
B1	Appeal Timetable
B2	Appeal Questionnaire
B3	Statement of Common Ground (including Highways SoCG)
B4	LPA Hearing Statement
B5	Planning Committee Report, Planning Committee Update Report & Decision Notice
B6	Appellant's Statement of Case
B7	LPA Statement of Case
B8	Section 106 Agreement - To Be Provided
	Appeal Decisions and Court Judgments
C1	APP/J3720/A/11/2163206 - Land West of Shottery (24/10/2014)

C2	APP/J3720/A/12/217643 - Land rear of 18 Salford Road, Bidford-on-Avon (9 January 2013)
C3	APP/J3720/A/12/2181956 - Land west of Hornsby Close, Shipston-on-Stour (29 January 2013)
C4	APP/J3720/A/12/2185727 - Former IMI Norgren Site, Campden Road, Shipston-on-Stour - (27 June 2013)
C5	APP/J3720/A/12/2194314 - Corrielaw, Alcester Road, Stratford-upon-Avon (26 September 2013)
C6	APP/J3720/A/13/219629 - Cadle Pool, The Ridgeway, Stratford-upon-Avon (30 September 2013)
C7	APP/J3720/A/13/2202961 - Gaydon Road, Bishop's Itchington, Southam (29 January 2014)
C8	APP/J3720/A/13/2202101 - Land north of Allimore Lane, Alcester - (5 March 2014)
C9	APP/J3720/A/13/2207880 - Land at 42 Avon Crescent and north of Milestone Road, Stratford-upon-Avon (30 April 2014)
C10	APP/J3720/A/13/2205108 - Former Stratford Cattle Market Site, Alcester Road, Stratford-upon-Avon (7 May 2014)
C11	APP/J3720/A/14/2217247 - Land south of Campden Road and west of Oldbutt Road, Shipston-on-Stour (4 August 2014)
C12	APP/J3720/A/14/2215757 - Land off Stratford Road, Hampton Lucy (3 November 2014)
C13	APP/J3720/A/14/2215042 - Land to the rear of Fairlea, Barton Road, Welford-on-Avon (12 November 2014)
C14	APP/J3720/A/14/2216615 - Land off Dovehouse Drive, Wellesbourne (24 November 2014)
C15	APP/J3720/A/2217115 - Land off Godson's Lane, Napton-on-the-Hill, Southam (12 December 2014)
C16	APP/J3720/A/14/2217945 - Land north of Milcote Road, Welford-on-Avon (18 December 2014)
C17	APP/J3720/A/14/2215940 - The Willows, Long Marston Road, Welford-on-Avon (23 January 2015)

C18	APP/J3720/A/13/2194850 – Land North of Campden Road, Shipton-on-Sour (23 February 2015)
C19	Land at Stretton Croft – Appeal recovered by Secretary of State: APP/E3715/V/12/2179915
C20	APP/J3720/A/14/2215276 - Land south of Oxhill Road, Tysoe
C21	APP/J3720/A/14/2221692 Stockton Road, Long Itchington
	Application Documents
D1	Application Form
D2	Affordable Housing Statement (03/10/2013);
D3	Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (03/10/2013);
D4	Landscape Visual Impact Assessment Addendum Revision A (February 2014);
D5	Phase I Habitat Survey (July 2013);
D6	Statement of Community Involvement (05/09/2013);
D7	Transport Statement and Appendices (04/10/2013);
D8	Tree Survey Schedule & Constraints Plan (06/02/ 2013);
D9	Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (June 2013);
D10	Design & Access Statement (September 2013);
D11	Design & Access Statement Addendum (February 2014);
D12	CGMS Archaeological Statement (March 2014);
D13	Energy Statement Revision A (November 2013);
D14	Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Scheme (September 2013);
D15	Reptile Survey (October 2013);
D16	Badger Species Surveys (October 2013);
D17	Great Crested Newt Survey (April 2014);
D18	Planning Statement including S106 heads of terms (23/09/2013);
D19	Statement of Community Involvement (September 2013);

D20	Frontage Assessment of Trees (January 2014);
	Application Plans
E1	Location Plan RPS1 (03/10/2013);
E2	Aerial Photograph Plan RPS2 (03/10/2013)
E3	Planning Site Layout. Drg 6, Rev E (11/03/2014);
E4	External Works. Drg Sk2, Rev B (14/03/2014)
E5	Coloured Planning Site Layout. Drg 6, Rev E (11/03/2014);
E6	Typical Street Scene. Drg 7, Rev D (14/03/2014);
E7	Perspective Views. Drg 8, Rev C (17/03/2014);
E8	2BR Plans & Elevation Plots 6, 7 & 13. Drg 9, Rev B (21/01/2014);
E9	2BS Plans & Elevation Plots 4/5. Drg 10, Rev B (21/01/2014)
E10	2BR Plans & Elevation Plot 12. Drg 11, Rev C (02/09/2013);
E11	3BS Plans & Elevations Plots 14/15. Drg 12, Rev B (21/01/14);
E12	3BR Plans & Elevations Plots 41/42. Drg 13, Rev B (21/01/14);
E13	4BR Plans & Elevations Plots 40/43. Drg, 14, Rev B (21/01/2014);
E14	MA-R Plans Plots 8-11. Drg 15, Rev B (28/01/2014);
E15	MA-R Elevations Plots 8-11. Drg 16, Rev B (28/01/2014);
E16	Chedworth V1 Plans & Elevation Plots 2,17,46, 18, 32-33, 45.Drg 17, Rev B (23/01/2014);
E17	Chedworth V2 Plans & Elevation Plot 19. Drg 18, Rev B (23/01/2014);
E18	Clayton V1 Plans & Elevation Plots 39,3,44. Drg 20, Rev A (24/01/2014);
E19	Clayton V2 Plans & Elevation Plot 16. Drg 21, Rev B (24/01/2014);
E20	Clayton V3 Plans & Elevation Plot 31. Drg 22, Rev A (21/01/2014);
E21	Hanbury Plans & Elevations Plots 20-23. Drg 23, Rev B (21/01/2014);
E22	Roseberry V1 Plans & Elevation Plots 34, 24 and 27. Drg 24, Rev C (14/03/2014);
E23	Roseberry V2 Plans & Elevation Plot 29. Drg 25, Rev B (24/01/2014);

E24	Winster V1 Plans & Elevation Plots 25-26, 28, 30, 35-36. Drg 26, Rev C (23/01/2014);
E25	Double Garage Plans & Elevations. Drg 30, Rev B (11/02/2014)
E26	Optional Conservatory Plans. Drg 31 (09/09/213)
E27	Sub Station Details. Drg 32 (09/09/2013)
E28	Soft Landscape strategy sheet 1. Drg 33, Rev D (14/03/2014);
E29	Soft landscape strategy sheet 2. Drg 34, Rev D (14/03/2014);
E30	Site Sections Plans. Drg 35, Rev C (01/04/2014);
E31	Bin Store Details. Drg 36 (21/11/2013);
E32	Cycle Store Details. Drg 37 (21/11/2013);
E33	Refuse, Recycling and Removals Plan. Drg 38 (16/01/2014)
E34	Buffer Planting Exclusion Areas. Drg 39, Rev A (11/03/2014);
E35	Hatfield Plans & Elevations Plots 37/38, Drg 40 (14/03/2013)
E36	Wildlife Corridor and Green Space Layout. Drg 41 (14/03/2014);
E37	'The Green' Perspective View. Drg 42 (24/03/2014);
E38	Additional Site Section. Drg 43, Rev A (15/04/2014);
E39	Additional Site Sections. Drg 44, Rev A (08/04/2014);
E40	Proposed Access Arrangements. Drg JNY7907-01, Rev C (20/03/2013)- Superseded
E41	Conceptual Levels and Drainage Strategy (14/03/2014);
E42	Topographical Survey (Sheets 1&2). Drg UAE3286_A. Rev A (September 2012)
E43	Proposed Access Arrangements. Drg JNY7907-01, Rev D -