



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 30 April 2024

Site visits made on 29 and 30 April 2024

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/23/3327082

Land at Cranesfield, Sherborne St John RG24 9LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by SK Planning Services Ltd against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/01669/OUT.
 - The development proposed is described as an outline planning application for the erection of up to 26 dwellings and associated infrastructure (with access only for consideration, with all other details for reserved matters).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is made in outline with all matters reserved other than for access. It was confirmed at the hearing that the only drawing for consideration at this stage is the location plan, all other drawings being for illustrative purposes.
3. As regards access, the detailed matter for consideration is the point of access to the site from the end of the spine road through Cranesfield. Other matters relating to access, including the internal road layout, do not form part of the proposal.
4. A legal undertaking pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 has been submitted which secures planning obligations for the provision of on-site affordable housing, the transfer of and contribution towards the maintenance of on-site open space, financial contributions towards off-site open space and equipped play, and implementation of a biodiversity scheme. These obligations address the Council's fourth reason for refusal. I am satisfied that they meet the requirements of Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 in that they are necessary, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind. I have accordingly taken them into account in reaching my decision.
5. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2023 after submission of the appeal. The main parties have been able to respond to it in updates and at the hearing. All references to the Framework in this decision are to the revised version.
6. The Council published a draft local plan under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 on 22 January

2024. The plan contains housing allocations and a policies map. I consider the implications of this on the need for housing land later in my reasoning.

7. A revised version of the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan was submitted for examination in November 2023. The Examiner's report was published on 11 April 2024 and concludes that, subject to modifications, the plan meets the basic conditions. Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council are scheduled to consider making the plan on 16 May 2024, after the close of the hearing. Given its advanced progress towards becoming part of the development plan for the area, I give the revised version of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Neighbourhood Plan Review), modified as recommended by the Examiner, considerable weight.

Main Issues

8. Taking account of the legal undertaking that has been submitted, I consider the main issues in this appeal to be the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the landscape
 - Heritage assets, namely Sherborne St John Conservation Area including the non-designated farm pond, grade I listed Church of St Andrew, and grade II listed Manor Farmhouse
 - Habitat and protected species
 - Housing land supply and requirement.
9. It is also necessary to consider the benefits of the scheme, and how these and other material considerations should be weighed against one another. I do this as part of the planning balance.

Reasons

Landscape

10. The Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Character Assessment 2021 identifies the site as lying within the North Sherborne landscape character area. This part of the countryside is characterised by gently undulating landform with higher ground separated by minor tributary valleys. Agriculture is a mix of arable and improved pasture fields bounded by hedgerows, with established blocks of woodland and occasional parkland. The settlement pattern outside the main towns consists of small villages and hamlets, scattered throughout the landscape, accessed via a network of small lanes and footpaths. I was informed at the hearing that Sherborne St John sits on a spring line, which feeds the brook and local ponds making water bodies a particular local feature.
11. The environs of the site exhibit many of these characteristics. The land slopes down into the shallow valley of the Wey Brook with land rising beyond, interrupted by tree belts and hedgerows. Water meadows bounding the brook give way to arable land on higher ground. There is a network of footpaths around the village, including one that runs parallel to the brook on the northern side of the valley from which views of the northern edge of the village can be seen.
12. The Basingstoke and Deane Landscape Sensitivity Study 2021 categorises the land to the north of the village as being of high sensitivity to change. This is in part because of its features being characteristic of the local landscape, and in

- part because of the cultural sensitivity of adjoining features and buildings. I consider the latter in more detail under the issue of heritage assets.
13. While I acknowledge the sensitivity of this part of the landscape to change, the site itself is physically and visually more contained than the wider landscape, abutting the edge of the village and surrounded on 3 sides by houses, hedgerows and trees. In public vantage points, views of the wider countryside from the play area at the end of Cranesfield and limited views from the churchyard and Church Path would be interrupted by the proposed development, but otherwise views from within the village looking out would be little affected.
14. The change in views from the countryside looking towards the village would be more pronounced. The northern side of the site facing towards the brook is open. Views of the proposed houses would be apparent from the footpath running along the northern side of the valley. Some mitigation would be afforded by the existing shrub and tree belts, and also from proposed planting along the northern boundary of the site. Even when the landscaping matures, the houses and associated domestic activities would be visible and would change the character of this part of the countryside. This includes views that are identified as significant or key in the Sherbourne St John Neighbourhood Plan (both the 2017 version and its 2023 review). Views from further afield, including the registered park and garden at The Vyne, would however be curtailed by the higher ground that rises on the northern side of the brook.
15. I conclude that harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the landscape, not only in immediate views but also in views from the opposite side of the valley. That harm would be moderated by the partly enclosed nature of the site, with the development infilling an area on the edge of the village rather than projecting out into open countryside. It could be further moderated by landscape planting. Nevertheless, the moderate harm that would be caused to the landscape would conflict with Policy EM1 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan 2011-2029 (the Local Plan) and Policy 2 of the Sherborne St John Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2029 (the Neighbourhood Plan), which seek to protect the countryside and its important landscape features.
16. The Council's first reason for refusal also refers to Policy EM10 of the Local Plan. This policy relates to design. As the proposal is made in outline with details of layout and appearance reserved for later consideration, I do not consider this policy to be relevant to the issue of landscape character.

Heritage assets

17. The development has the potential to impact on the settings of a number of heritage assets. These all lie to the south and east of the site.
18. The Church of St Andrew is a grade I listed building¹, in flint and plaster with stone dressings under a clay tiled roof. It is of Norman origin with later additions and alterations, including a Tudor brick porch and a Victorian spire to the tower. Its significance lies in its early origins, and its role as the religious focus of the community. Its immediate setting extends to the churchyard, with a wider setting provided by adjoining buildings, farm pond, and the countryside beyond.

¹ List entry number 1339594

19. Manor Farmhouse is a grade II listed building², lying to the north of the church. It has a 19th century symmetrical front facing east towards its entrance drive, with less regular and almost certainly older parts at the rear. Elevations are in brick under a tiled roof, and a 4-centred Tudor-style arch to the porch. Its significance lies partly in its architectural interest, and partly in its historical association with the church and with the farming of the surrounding land. Hence its setting is bound up with that of the church and wider countryside.
20. To the north of the manor house lie the former farm buildings, now converted to or replaced with residential properties in separate ownership. The residential nature of these buildings and grounds dilutes their former agricultural character, but they still recognisably form a historical group with the manor house and form part of its setting.
21. The Sherborne St John Conservation Area is divided into two parts, the eastern part of which is relevant to this appeal. It includes the older core of the village together with the church and manor house and comes up to the boundary with the appeal site, including the cemetery to the south and the farm pond to the east. It also includes a wide swathe of agricultural land to the north, as far as a former mill. Its significance lies in the grouping of vernacular buildings as well as the culturally significant pairing of the church and manor house.
22. Also discussed at the hearing was the heritage value of the farm pond, which it is suggested was originally a medieval fishpond associated with the manor house, and an indicator of the high status of that property. Although it is not identified as a feature in the Sherborne St John Conservation Area Appraisal 2000 there is sufficient evidence³ to consider it a non-designated heritage asset, and one that forms part of the settings of the church and manor house, as well as a historic element within the conservation area.
23. The settings of the church, manor house, farm pond and conservation area are intertwined. Based on the evidence presented, the church and manor farm have historically occupied a position on the edge of the village, the older core of which lies to the south and east of the church. Thus, while parts of the wider settings of the church and manor house have always contained buildings, they have also had a connection with the countryside to the north and west. In more recent times the village has expanded, particularly to the south and to the west with the development of Cranesfield, but the relationship of the church and manor house with the countryside has been retained. This forms part of the wider setting of these heritage assets.
24. The extent of that relationship is limited by the substantial amount of tree and hedge screening around the western boundary of the conservation area, and trees adjacent to the church. There is however a gap in the hedge belt opposite the manor house through which there are limited views to and from the site from the northern part of the churchyard, the rear of the manor house and obliquely across the farm pond from Church Path. These views allow glimpses of the countryside from the heritage assets. Some more medium and distant views can also be gained from the end of Cranesfield and from the footpath on the northern side of the valley, although the extent of those views varies with seasonal leaf cover.

² List entry number 1092796

³ Sherborne St John Conservation Group Hearing Statement

25. The proposed development would interrupt these views and change the character of the land from agricultural to residential. As a consequence, it would reduce the degree to which the heritage assets could be appreciated within a countryside setting. That reduction would cause harm to the significance and special interest of all 3 designated heritage assets, as well as the non-designated farm pond. Further screen planting could be provided along the eastern and northern boundaries of the site, but even though that would reduce the visual presence of the proposed houses when viewed from the heritage assets, it would not prevent a reduction in the relationship between those assets and their rural hinterland. Planting would not therefore mitigate all of the heritage harm.
26. There is general agreement that the harm so caused would be, to use the terminology from the Framework, less than substantial. However, there are varying opinions as to the magnitude of that harm. Due to the degree of separation and the level of screening that exists, the degree of harm would not amount to the upper end of the less than substantial scale as suggested by some interested parties, nor the 'high level' of harm suggested by Historic England. Conversely, the wider countryside is important in allowing an appreciation of the heritage assets in their historic setting, which elevates the level of harm above that suggested by the appellant. In my view, the degree of harm lies somewhere between those positions, such that it would amount to a low-medium degree of less than substantial harm.
27. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of the listed buildings, and Section 72 requires that special attention be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The proposed development would reduce the ability to appreciate the heritage assets in their countryside setting and thereby cause a degree of harm to their significance and special interest.
28. For the same reasons the proposed development would conflict with Policy EM11 of the Local Plan, which seeks to conserve or enhance the quality of the borough's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. That policy applies to both designated and non-designated assets. While I note the appellant's criticism of the policy, I consider it to be broadly in line with the Framework and does not prevent the weighing of less than substantial harm against public benefits, which I address in the planning balance. I therefore give it full weight.
29. Policy 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan is focused on protection of the rural character of the parish rather than heritage assets and is therefore of little relevance to this issue. However, Policy 10 in the Neighbourhood Plan Review does address the issue of heritage assets directly and, as recommended for modification by the Examiner, I give it considerable weight.

Habitat and protected species

30. Since the refusal of planning permission, the appellant has carried out further ecological survey work. The Council is now satisfied that there are no dormice on the site, and that foraging and commuting routes for bats around the field boundaries could be secured through landscaping and lighting conditions. Suitable biodiversity net gain would also be secured through the legal

- undertaking. However, there remain concerns on the width of buffer zones, surface water drainage, and the potential for harm to great crested newts.
31. Landscaping is a reserved matter and therefore the design of any landscape buffers around the edges of the sites would be for later detailed consideration. The appellant has provided several iterations of the illustrative layout plan⁴ which indicate how such buffers could be achieved on site, including the retention of all the hedgerows and dark corridors along the southern and eastern boundaries. The Council wishes to see a 20m buffer along the eastern boundary. While that boundary does contain trees, it has more the character of an overgrown hedgerow rather than woodland, with residential gardens on the other side of it. Consequently, a lesser buffer would be appropriate. At present, the ploughed field comes right up to the edge of the hedgerows and therefore any buffer would be an improvement in ecological terms.
32. A sustainable drainage system is proposed to cater for surface water drainage, with an attenuation basin shown in the corner of the site. The chalk streams rising from the spring line in the vicinity of the site are noted for their purity and therefore it is important that surface water runoff is properly handled. However, there is no reason why that cannot be achieved on site in the manner proposed. No objection has been raised by the relevant statutory drainage undertakers. I consider that, subject to a condition controlling the detailed design and implementation of a sustainable drainage system, no harm would be caused to the adjacent water bodies.
33. None of the appellant's studies have identified the presence of great crested newts on the site. However, it was unable to survey adjoining land. Given the presence of nearby water courses and survey information provided by an interested party⁵ there is a possibility of there being great crested newts in the vicinity, which might use the site for feeding and migration. To that end, further survey work, particularly of the field margins, would be necessary before any development took place. Since the hedgerows are proposed to be retained and enhanced with landscape buffers, I consider that such survey work could be made the subject of a condition, with appropriate action taken should great crested newts be found to be present. Any such action would be subject to licensing by Natural England. I was told at the hearing that the Council has just adopted a district wide licensing scheme for great crested newts, which would provide one mechanism for addressing any such finding.
34. I conclude that, subject to legal and conditional controls, the development would not cause harm to protected species and that biodiversity net gain would be achieved on the site. The proposed development would therefore accord with Policy EM4 of the Local Plan, which seeks to protect nature conservation interests in the borough.

Housing land supply and requirement

35. For residential development, the spatial strategy of the Local Plan is to direct new housing to allocated sites or to sites within defined settlements. The appeal site is not allocated, lies outside the settlement boundary for Sherborne St John as defined on the Policies Map and does not fall within any of the categories of new housing considered to be appropriate in a countryside

⁴ For example, illustrative layout plan 1052-OA-02 Rev E

⁵ Save Our Green Fields Residents Group hearing statement, appendix 5

location. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies SS1 and SS6 of the Local Plan, which relate to the scale and distribution of new housing, and new housing in the countryside.

36. Neither the spatial strategy or Policies SS1 and SS6 of the Local Plan are referenced in the Council's reasons for refusal, although they are plainly material to the appeal. The issue of housing land supply and housing land requirement is raised by the appellant, and these policies are bound up with that issue. I have therefore taken them into account in my decision. I consider the weight that should be attached to the spatial strategy and related policies in the planning balance.
37. Neither party relies to any material extent on Policy SD1 of the Local Plan, which relates to a presumption in favour of sustainable development. My reading of this policy is that it is intended to reflect the presumption in paragraphs 11c) and 11d) of the Framework. I address this presumption in more detail in the planning balance.
38. Following a change in national policy on maintaining housing supply and delivery in December 2023 and the publication of a draft local plan in January 2024, it is agreed by both main parties that in this case the need is for a minimum of 4 years' worth of housing land supply measured against the 5-year housing land requirement.
39. Both the housing land supply and the housing land requirement are disputed. I deal with each in turn.

Housing land supply

40. The parties' original statements of case on housing land supply have been overtaken by an appeal decision at Watermill Bridge issued in January 2024, which considered the same issue in some detail⁶. Consequently, when compared to the supply identified in the most recent annual monitoring report (base date 2023), differences on the 5-year housing supply have been narrowed to 4 sites, of which the delivery from 3 is disputed⁷.
41. Manydown is a strategic housing site allocated for some 3,400 dwellings, owned jointly by the Council and Hampshire County Council. It has outline planning permission with some reserved matters approved. However, a master framework needs to be approved before a housebuilder can be appointed for the first phase of development. The Inspector in the Watermill Bridge appeal considered that the scheme would be delayed and that the trajectory should be put back a year.
42. The Council accepts this position and recommends removing 270 dwellings from the trajectory. The appellant considers a further 10 dwellings should be removed because of no further progress since that decision. The Manydown Overview Committee considered a report on the scheme in February 2024 but noted that the land transaction to a developer had yet to be completed, and the master framework has yet to be approved. Consequently, it is reasonable to allow for a further delay, resulting in a reduction of 280 dwellings from the 2023 annual monitoring report trajectory.

⁶ APP/H1705/W/23/3326191: Land at Watermill Bridge, Andover Road, Wash Water, Hampshire

⁷ Statement of Common Ground, April 2024

43. Upper Cufuade Farm is a housing site allocated for 390 dwellings. The Inspector in the Watermill Bridge appeal considered no adjustment was necessary to the planned trajectory. The appellant considers that delay since this decision and optimistic projected completion rates mean that a further 60 dwellings should be removed. In this case, progress has been made with the approval of reserved matters and associated highway works for the first phase in February 2024. I consider that progress continues to be made on developing this site and no further adjustment is necessary.
44. Basingstoke Golf Course is a housing site allocated for some 1000 dwellings. It has outline planning permission and reserved matters have been approved for the first phase which is underway. The appellant has questioned the projected completion rate and suggests a reduction of 260 dwellings should be made. The Inspector in the Watermill Bridge appeal noted that this site fell to be considered as deliverable under the definition in the glossary to the Framework and found that completion rates on the part of the site under development largely met the Council's trajectory. Since then, further progress has been made with the submission of reserved matters applications for later phases. Having regard to those factors, I consider no further adjustment is necessary.
45. Evingar Road is a site including an allocation of some 60 dwellings. It is accepted by both main parties that due to delays this allocation is unlikely to be developed within 5 years and therefore 60 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory.
46. Drawing these adjustments together, I consider that 340 dwellings should be removed from the trajectory in the 2023 annual monitoring report.

Housing land requirement

47. Because the Local Plan is more than 5 years old, the 5-year housing land requirement is calculated using the standard method as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. There is no need for a buffer as the latest housing delivery test for the borough at 161% is well above the 85% threshold set out in paragraph 77 and footnote 43 of the Framework.
48. The Council has calculated the housing land requirement using the 2014 household projections for the 2024-2034 period and a revised affordability ratio published in March 2024. Based on that information the housing land requirement is for 828 dwellings per annum.
49. Conversely, the appellant considers that calculation of the housing land requirement ought to be consistent with the base date for calculation of housing land supply, the most recent information for which is as of April 2023. Using the 2014 household projections for the 2023-2033 period and the affordability ratio set in April 2023 the housing land requirement is for 850 dwellings per annum.
50. I consider it is desirable to use a consistent base date for calculation of the housing land supply and housing land requirement. Although the Council's approach of using the latest available data in many cases may be the right approach, in situations where information uses a period over time, to use different base dates for those periods when comparing related information can result in inconsistencies, particularly where the trend in those periods is diverging. Because of that reason, I prefer the method of calculation given by

the appellant, which results in a housing land requirement of 850 dwellings per annum.

Conclusion on housing land supply and requirement

51. Using a housing land requirement of 850 dwellings per annum and applying an adjustment of 340 dwellings to the 5-year housing land supply of 3811⁸ dwellings in the 2023 annual monitoring report results in a figure of 4.1 years' worth of housing land supply. I consider the implications of this level of housing supply later in the planning balance.
52. Were the same calculation to be carried out but using the Council's housing land requirement of 828 dwellings per annum, it would result in a figure of 4.2 years' worth of housing land supply. In practice, the differences between the parties in the calculation of the housing land requirement makes only a small difference and not one that I consider would alter my decision.

Other Matters

53. My attention was drawn to instances of foul sewer surcharging in the village, including on land to the north of Kingfishers, Vyne Road. Thames Water as the statutory undertaker has a duty to accommodate demand for foul water disposal. While the development would increase the use of the sewerage system to a modest extent, the onus lies with the statutory undertaker rather than the developer to maintain and where necessary increase capacity to accommodate demand. Therefore, where surcharging has happened, regrettable though it is, it does not amount to a reason to prevent new development.
54. The Neighbourhood Plan Review proposes to designate the area of countryside to the north of Cranesfield as local green space. This area includes the appeal site. The Examiner has recommended that the designation should be deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan Review as it does not meet the tests set out in the Framework. I have accordingly not placed any weight on this proposed designation in my decision.

Planning Balance

55. I have found that the development would conflict with the spatial strategy of the Local Plan, in particular Policies SS1 and SS6, because the site is unallocated and lies outside the settlement boundary of Sherborne St John. I have also found the development would cause moderate harm to the character and appearance of the landscape, and that it would cause less than substantial harm to 3 designated heritage assets and 1 non-designated heritage asset. Although the heritage harm would be less than substantial, it nevertheless attracts great weight by virtue of paragraph 205 of the Framework. That harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
56. The development would result in a number of public benefits. The provision of 26 dwellings would help to meet demand for housing in the borough and is supported by the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Ten of these dwellings would be affordable housing. I heard evidence

⁸ The Council's starting 5-year housing land supply figure (before any adjustment) is 3817. The difference between the parties appears to arise from a small discrepancy in table 5.3 of the 2023 annual monitoring report. The discrepancy of 6 dwellings makes little difference.

that there is a shortage of affordable housing in the borough and the village. Such provision would help meet that need. I give both of these benefits significant weight.

57. There would be some economic benefits arising from the construction of the development, and in the longer term additional expenditure and an increase in the workforce arising from the new inhabitants. These benefits are of moderate weight.
58. The estimated biodiversity net gain on the site exceeds that required by policy. This adds a small positive benefit to the scheme.
59. The provision of landscaping and public open space within the scheme is necessary to make the scheme acceptable in planning terms, and while new residents would no doubt add to the social life of the village, there is no evidence that would be necessary to allow such activities to continue. I therefore give these benefits limited weight.
60. Paragraph 11d) of the Framework says that where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless policies in the Framework provide a clear reason for refusal, or the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
61. Taken in isolation, I consider that the significant public benefits of the scheme do outweigh the less than substantial harm that would be caused to the significance of the heritage assets. I reach that view notwithstanding the great weight attached to the conservation of those assets. This harm does not therefore amount to a clear reason for refusing the development proposed on its own.
62. Because I have found that there is 4.1 years of housing land supply in the borough, and that the required supply is for 4 years' worth of its 5-year housing land requirement, the housing policies are not deemed to be out-of-date by virtue of footnote 8 of the Framework.
63. The appellant argues that, irrespective of the housing land supply position, the spatial strategy of the Local Plan is out-of-date because the plan is more than 5 years old and is not currently delivering the required amount of housing. My attention has been drawn to the Watermill Bridge appeal decision, where the Inspector concluded that Policies SS1 and SS6 of the Local Plan were out-of-date for those reasons.
64. I take a different view. The fact that the Local Plan is more than 5 years old does not mean that the policies in it are automatically out-of-date. It is necessary to give them due weight according to their degree of consistency with the Framework and whether they are delivering the necessary amount of housing development.
65. In that regard the change to national planning policy on maintaining the supply and delivery of housing is highly pertinent. The need to demonstrate only 4 rather than 5 years' worth of housing land supply was introduced for those planning authorities which are progressing with plan making to provide them with a degree of protection from unplanned development while the plan making process is completed. The policy is not dependent on the age of an authority's

current adopted plan. Past under-delivery is only relevant where the housing delivery test is below 85%, which is not the case here.

66. It was put to me at the hearing that the Council is only able to demonstrate the amount of housing land supply that it can because of housing sites being permitted or granted on appeal that are not policy compliant. However, no evidence was presented to support that claim, and I therefore give it little weight.
67. As such, the spatial strategy is consistent with the Framework because it is currently delivering the necessary amount of housing land required by national policy. It follows that the spatial strategy in the Local Plan is effective and Policies SS1 and SS6 are not out-of-date. I therefore give them full weight.
68. The presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in paragraph 11d) of the Framework is not triggered in this case.

Conclusion

69. The conflict with the spatial strategy of the Local Plan, the moderate harm that would be caused to the landscape, and the less than substantial harm that would be caused to the identified heritage assets lead me to conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole.
70. Although I have found that the heritage harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme when viewed in isolation, when the harm arising from all the issues identified above is taken collectively, I consider that it does outweigh the benefits of the scheme, significant though some of them are.
71. There are no other material considerations that weigh into the balance. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Guy Davies

INSPECTOR

Appearances

For the appellant:

Richard Turney KC	Counsel
Daniel Leaver	Associate Director, Stephenson Halliday
Rob Bourn	Managing Director, Orion Heritage
Peter Rainier	Principal Director, DMH Stallard
Jacqueline Mulliner	Managing Director, tor&co
James Stacey	Managing Director, Tetlow King Planning
Kim Olliver	Nature Positive/RSK

For the Council:

James Neill	Counsel
Bethan Wallington	Senior Planning Officer
Anne Priscott	Anne Priscott Associates
Tim Dawes	Planit Consulting
Roderick McDonald	Conservation Officer
Chris Slack	Biodiversity Officer

Interested parties:

Ruchi Parekh	Counsel, Save Our Green Fields Residents Group
Michael Vonka	Save Our Green Fields Residents Group
Bob Edwards	Save Our Green Fields Residents Group and Sherborne St John Conservation Group
Robyn Milliner	ET Planning for Sherborne St John Parish Council
Adam Rattray	Sherborne St John Conservation Group
Dr Paul Sterry	Sherborne St John Conservation Group
David McIntyre	Councillor, Sherborne St John & Rooksdown Ward
Hugh Barnard	Resident

Documents submitted during and after hearing:

1. Bundle of photographs and maps from Adam Rattray
2. Two photographs of a drain surcharging from the Council
2. Completed legal undertaking from the appellant