



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 18 November 2025

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by C Rose BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/25/3365232

Land adjacent Sandways Farm, New Road, Bourton SP8 5BQ

- 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 T & A Land Ltd against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/OUT/2023/06654.
 - The development proposed is demolition of barns, erection of up to 30 dwellings and provision of site for village hall with parking area, wildlife area, attenuation pond and public open space (outline application to determine access).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of barns, erection of up to 30 dwellings and provision of site for village hall with parking area, wildlife area, attenuation pond and public open space (outline application to determine access) at Land adjacent Sandways Farm, New Road, Bourton SP8 5BQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/OUT/2023/06654, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. This appeal (Appeal A) was co-joined with another appeal reference APP/D1265/W/25/3370051 Land at Chaffey Moor Farm New Road, Bourton, Dorset SP8 5BZ (Appeal B). As a result, a single hearing was held dealing with both appeals concurrently. However, Appeal B is the subject of a separate decision.
3. The appeal is accompanied by a signed Planning Obligation Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that has been agreed with Dorset Council. This details the provision of obligations towards allotments, NHS Infrastructure, education, pre-school provision, community leisure, amenity space maintenance formal outdoor sports facilities, libraries, bus service and sustainable transport, rights of way, affordable housing and land and parking for a new village hall. As a result of this, the Council advised in advance of the hearing that this addresses the third reason for refusal. Accordingly, and as I have no reason to disagree, I do not need to deal with this matter as a Main Issue.
4. Prior to the hearing, the Council confirmed that as of 1st November 2025 Dorset Council's Annual Position Statement expired and that Dorset Council is now no longer able to demonstrate a 5-year housing supply as required by national policy. In addition, the Council stated that the strategies for meeting housing needs in the adopted local plans are not designed to deliver the housing need under the Government's standard method and therefore, in accordance with National

Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) footnote 8, the housing policies within the adopted Development Plan are out of date and the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies.

5. Furthermore, the Council confirmed that The Emerging Dorset Local Plan is not sufficiently progressed and can be afforded very limited weight in decision making. Based on the latest information and evidence available, Dorset Council advised that it can currently demonstrate a deliverable supply of new homes on deliverable sites equivalent to 2.53 years.

Agreed Matters

6. Before the Hearing the two main parties for Appeals A and B submitted a joint Appellants' Statement of Common Ground. This describes the areas of agreement between the two appellants and states that there is overlap between the two proposals with regard to the first reasons for refusal for each appeal. It goes on to state that there is no overlap between the two proposals with regard to the other reasons for refusals in relation to both appeals with Appeal A providing a site for a new village hall with Appeal B proposing a financial contribution towards the existing, or new village hall. Furthermore, it states that the Council housing land supply is 2.67 years with the Local Plan settlement boundaries out of date and that both appeals would result in proportionate growth for the village.
7. The main parties agreed orally at the hearing that the proposal would not harm the nearby Cranbourne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs National Landscape (NL). Given the size and topography of the site and distance to the NL with intervening buildings and vegetation, I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issues

8. In light of the Preliminary and Agreed Matters above, the main issues are:
 - whether the appeal site is an appropriate location for the proposed development, with particular regard to the local development strategy and need; and,
 - the effect of the proposed development on the setting of the designated heritage asset forming Sandways Farmhouse.

Reasons

Whether appropriate location

9. Policy 2 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 January 2016 (LP) sets out the Core Spatial Strategy for development. It defines the countryside as the areas outside of the defined boundaries of the four main towns, Stalbridge and the larger villages where the best access to facilities are provided. Policy 2 identifies Bourton as a larger village and as such it is expected to take growth to meet local needs. There is no dispute between the main parties that the site lies in the countryside outside of, but adjoining the edge of, the settlement boundary for Bourton and I have no reason to disagree.
10. LP Policy 6 states that in the countryside, the level of housing and affordable housing provision will be the cumulative number of new homes delivered to contribute towards meeting identified local and essential rural needs. It further states that at least 825 dwellings will be provided in the countryside during the

- period 2011-2031. Mr Lennis confirmed orally at the hearing that Policy 6 does not put a limit on the number of dwellings allowed in the countryside.
11. Mr Lennis also confirmed orally that LP Policy 20 allows for development outside of defined settlement boundaries if identified for development in a Neighbourhood Plan and that LP Policy 20 allows housing development in the countryside where it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need.
 12. Mr Lennis went on to explain that the proposal causes harm due to its location outside of the settlement boundary as a result of the quantum of development, and size of the application site exceeding that identified in Policy 5 of the Bourton – Dorset Neighbourhood Plan 2016 – 2031 Made on 26 January 2028 (NP).
 13. With regard to NP Policy 5, there is no dispute that the appeal site is one of the two sites identified under Policy 5a) deemed suitable for development of a village hall, provision of associated amenity space and a small housing development to make the release of the land viable for the use of a village hall and amenity space.
 14. Mr Lennis and Mr Matt Williams confirmed orally that the appeal proposal complies with NP Policy 5b) by virtue of providing approximately 0.3ha to the village hall and a parking area, and approximately 1.5ha to amenity space. While I acknowledge that the amenity space is shown as 1.4ha, this is approximately 1.5ha. Furthermore, there was no dispute between the main parties that the proposal complies with NP Policy 5c), d), and e) (setting aside measures to protect heritage assets that I will address in the second main issue below).
 15. With regard to NP Policy 5c), I have had regard to the Parish Council, local residents and to Mr Peter Williams and Mr Curry orally stating that the proposal does not comply with this part of the policy given that the Parish Council no longer wish to take on ownership of the village hall site. Mr Peter Williams and Mr Curry explained at the hearing that post COVID-19 the use of the hall has changed such that the Parish Council no longer need, and could not afford, to provide a new village hall. As a result, the Parish Council did not engage in detailed negotiations with the appellant regarding the transfer of the land. In relation to this Mr Peter Williams confirmed construction costs in the hundreds of thousands of pounds with the existing village hall leased.
 16. Notwithstanding, the S.106 legal agreement accompanying the appeal contains provisions to ensure that the ownership of the sites for the village hall, car parking and amenity space is offered for transfer to the Parish Council within reasonable timescales. Regardless of whether the Parish Council ultimately decide to accept transfer of the land (and there is no requirement for them to do so), by virtue of the inclusion of a suitable S.106 agreement containing provisions to transfer the land to the Parish Council, I find that the proposal complies with NP Policy 5c).
 17. Mr Lennis also confirmed orally that the Council accepts that NP Policy 5f) allows consideration of its five-year housing land supply position and other material considerations in the decision-making process in relation to NP Policy 5.
 18. As a result of the above, the main area of dispute between the main parties relates to the proposal seeking outline consent for 30 dwellings on a site larger than the approximately 0.3 ha for housing identified under NP Policy 5b). The Council and Parish Council confirmed that the 0.3ha referred to in NP Policy 5b) was expected

to result in approximately 9 dwellings and that as such, the proposal does not represent a small housing development as identified under NP Policy 5a).

19. In response to this, Mr Matt Williams did not dispute that the proposal represents more than a small housing development with the scheme as a whole covering approximately 3.1ha and the housing development occupying approximately 1.4ha. However, Mr Matt Williams stated that the proposal complies with NP Policy 5 by virtue of the policy acknowledging that housing development may be provided in order to make the release of the land viable for the use of a village hall and associated amenity space. In relation to this, the application is accompanied by a Viability Report, that has been agreed with the District Valuer on behalf of the Council, confirming that with the identified planning obligations including the provision of a site for a village hall, car parking and amenity space, 30 dwellings are only viable with a reduction in the affordable housing provision to 20%.
20. Although I have had regard to the Parish Council advising of their desire to amend NP Policy 5 to reflect their latest position regarding the village hall, this has not taken place. As such and given that the NP covers the period of 2016 – 2031, NP Policy 5 as written carries significant weight in the decision-making process.
21. As a result, and given that NP Policy 5f) states that the decision-making process should be carried out in accordance with the policy and taking account of any other material considerations, the proposal complies with NP Policy 5. Given this, the proposal also complies with LP Policy 20 as it has been demonstrated that there is an overriding need for the proposal to be located in the countryside.
22. The Council's first reason for refusal references LP Policy 8 that relates to affordable housing. However, at the hearing, Mr Lennis accepted that by reason of the Council accepting the appellants viability assessment, the proposal complies with LP Policy 8d that seeks to secure the maximum level of provision of affordable housing achievable at the time of the assessment.
23. I do however acknowledge the concerns raised by the Parish Council, local residents, and the Interested Parties at the hearing, regarding the size of the residential element of the proposal not being directly related to any identified local or essential rural housing need arising in Bourton as required by LP Policy 6. However, the scale of the development has been justified with regard to being needed to provide the land for the new village hall, associated parking, amenity space, affordable housing and other planning obligations, and this demonstrates an overriding need for the proposal under LP Policy 20. As such and given that Mr Lennis confirmed orally that the Council find no difference between the reference to 'overriding need' in NP Policy 20 and 'local need' in LP Policy 6, I find that a local need for the level of residential development has been identified and justified. As such, the proposal also complies with LP Policy 6.
24. It follows from the above that the appeal site is an appropriate location for the proposed development, with particular regard to the local development strategy and need. As such, the proposal complies with NP Policy 5 and LP Policies 2, 6, 8 and 20, the aims of which I have outlined above.
25. The Council's first reason for refusal also references NP Policy 2. However, it was confirmed at the hearing that the Council do not raise any concern with regard to the effect of the proposal on the settlement pattern and character of the area. Furthermore, as the policy generally relates to trees, hedges, open space, planting,

spaces between buildings and boundaries, with matters of layout and landscaping reserved for future consideration, this policy is not determinative in relation to this main issue.

Setting of designated heritage asset

26. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
27. Prior to the hearing, the Council confirmed that its second reason for refusal relates to harm to the setting of Sandways Farmhouse only. Given the distance to other designated heritage assets and intervening buildings and topography, I have no reason to disagree.
28. Sandways Farmhouse is a Grade II Listed farmhouse (Listing Number 1110352) dating from the late C18 although it is possibly a rebuilding of an earlier house. Although a farmhouse fronting New Road, the evidence before me indicates that it was likely related to a smallholding. Nonetheless, the building is raised above the site with the rear elevation of Sandways Farmhouse facing out over, and visible from parts of the site, albeit slightly offset in orientation. As a result, the appeal site falls within the setting of the listed building with its significance derived from its age, architectural detailing and open countryside setting, particularly to its rear.
29. There is no dispute between the main parties that as a result of the above and given the introduction of the proposed development within its rear open countryside setting, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of Sandways Farmhouse. Furthermore, Mr Carleton-Pragnal and Mr McConnell agreed that the harm is at the lower end of less than substantial. Given the location of the appeal site, given that the topography of the site generally falls away from Sandways Farmhouse and given that significant open views from and to the rear elevation would be maintained, I have no reason to disagree.
30. Accordingly, the proposal would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the setting, and significance, of the heritage asset, although as this is at a very local level and for the reasons given above, the harm would be at the low end of the spectrum. It is important to note however that 'less than substantial harm' does not equate to a less than substantial planning objection. Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires that 'less than substantial harm' should be weighed against public benefits of the proposal.
31. In this regard, Mr Lennis confirmed orally that the public benefits include the delivery of the village hall site, parking and amenity space, provision of housing, provision of affordable housing and ecological mitigation given that the proposal is not subject to mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain. Mr Matt Williams agreed with the Council but orally added public benefits in the form of economic benefits from construction, local spend and support for existing services and facilities.
32. I acknowledge all of the public benefits put forward by the main parties, and it is relevant to add here that there would be benefits to the supply of housing generally given that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing

sites. As a result, I find that the public benefits arising from the scheme are significant and outweigh the 'less than substantial harm' to the heritage asset.

33. It follows from the above that although the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of the designated heritage asset forming Sandways Farmhouse, the harm is clearly outweighed by the public benefits. As a result, the proposal complies with LP Policy 5. Amongst other things, this states that clear and convincing justification for any development that would cause harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be required, and that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Other Considerations

34. There is no dispute between the appellant and the Council that the site is well located close to a range of services and facilities. Furthermore, and while I acknowledge the very restricted bus services and stops serving the settlement, the site is located within a reasonable walking distance of the village hall, church, shop/garage, public house, school and doctors' surgery. While the very limited public transport options will result in the use of the car for some journeys, the location of the site close to a range of services and facilities will minimise their number and it is relevant to note that Paragraph 110 of the Framework acknowledges that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural locations.
35. I further acknowledge the points made at the hearing regarding the school and doctors' surgery being at capacity, and to the lack of play space. Nonetheless, the proposal seeks to address the school and outdoor recreation facilities matter through the payment of financial contributions agreed with the relevant providers towards education and outdoor sports facilities, and the proposal includes a sizable area of outdoor planted amenity space. Moreover, the proposal includes a financial contribution towards Primary and Secondary NHS Community Care to mitigate its effects.
36. Mr Peter Williams and Mr Curry made it clear at the hearing that the Parish Council are not supportive of the indicative location for the new village hall site and associated car parking, or to the car parking numbers. This was for a number of reasons but mainly due to the lack of road frontage and levels questioning the suitability of the site for local residents and visitors and its future use and viability. However, NP Policy 5 does not specify the location for the uses it seeks with Mr Matt Williams clarifying at the hearing that the S.106 Agreement includes provisions allowing for a different location for the hall and car parking that could be subject to further discussions with the Parish Council. Moreover, the proposal is in outline with the matter of layout reserved for future consideration and as such the location of the village hall and parking is not fixed at this stage.
37. I have had regard to the comments received regarding the proposal representing overdevelopment of the site, to traffic, parking and highway concerns, ecological impacts, flooding and living conditions. However, I have no reason to believe that the site is not large enough for the proposed development or that a suitable layout that is not overly urban in appearance with adequate space between and around the buildings could not be achieved whilst enhancing biodiversity and protecting

living conditions. With regard to traffic, parking, highway and flooding concerns, again I have no substantive evidence before me that the proposal would result in harm in these regards subject to the imposition of suitable conditions. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the Council came to the same conclusion in relation to these matters.

38. I acknowledge that the number of dwellings is greater than that envisaged by the Parish Council and local residents. Nonetheless, given the topography of the site and the sites identification in the NP for possible development, and subject to a suitable design and layout at reserve matters stage, I have no reason to conclude that a suitable development that preserves the wider character and appearance of the area, and key views could not be achieved. It is again noteworthy that the Council came to a similar conclusion in this regard.
39. I do not have any substantive evidence before me to indicate that the development would not be able to suitably connect to the existing sewage system.
40. Details of sustainability benefits to be incorporated into the buildings and provision of electric vehicle charging points can be considered at the reserve matters stage once the detailed design of the buildings are known and submitted for consideration.
41. Concerns have been raised that allowing the proposal will set a precedent for bypassing the plan-led system that would undermine the NP and the wider democratic process given the high number of objections to the proposal. However, I have found above that the proposal complies with the LP and NP with a number of the reasons for objecting to the application being addressed by the proposal, the legal agreement and need for a reserve matters submission detailing the layout of the site and appearance of the buildings.
42. Finally, I acknowledge that there have been recent housing completions and planning permissions in the settlement, in nearby settlements and with large developments planned for Gillingham with the proposal being considered at the same time as Appeal B for 50 dwellings close to the settlement. Nevertheless, the proposal complies with LP and NP policies providing a number of benefits for the area in terms of a site for a village hall, parking and amenity space. Furthermore, in light of the Council not being able to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, there is a need for additional housing in the wider area and severe shortage of affordable housing that the proposal will help to address.

Conditions

43. I have had regard to the conditions discussed at the hearing and to the conditions provided by the Council. I have considered these against the advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I have amended some conditions in the interests of precision, brevity and clarity.
44. In addition to the standard reserve matters and time conditions, it is necessary for a condition to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty.
45. Conditions are necessary to ensure an updated noise report, and a tree report accompany the relevant reserve matters applications to ensure that noise from the village hall is adequately mitigated and to ensure that the condition of trees on the site is suitably assessed. These are necessary in order to protect the living

- conditions of nearby occupiers, to protect valuable trees and in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.
46. A condition is necessary to ensure that the proposed access is completed to at least binder course prior to any other development commencing. This is necessary in the interests of highway safety.
47. A condition is necessary to ensure that a construction method statement is submitted to and approved by the Council prior to commencement of any development. This is necessary in the interests of health and safety and to protect the living conditions of nearby occupiers from the start of construction works.
48. A condition is necessary in order for details of a surface water management scheme and ongoing maintenance and management to be submitted to and approved by the Council. This is to prevent flood risk and to protect water quality. I have combined the Council's two suggested conditions into a single condition for reasons of brevity.
49. A condition is necessary to ensure that prior to commencement of any development, an Arboricultural Method Statement is submitted to and approved by the Council. This is in order to protect trees and hedges during and after construction.
50. A condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in full accordance with the Biodiversity Plan in the interests of protecting and enhancing biodiversity.
51. The Council suggested two conditions related to contamination. However, following discussion at the hearing regarding contamination, and in the absence of substantive evidence of contamination on the site, only a single condition is required to ensure that any contamination found during construction is reported and remediated in accordance with approved details. This is necessary in the interests of protecting living and working conditions on the site.
52. Conditions are necessary to ensure that details of the internal access, highway, turning and parking arrangements and cycle parking facilities are agreed in writing prior to first occupation. This is in the interests of highway safety and in order to support sustainable modes of transport.
53. A condition is necessary to ensure that the approved visibility splays are provided prior to first occupation in the interests of highway safety. The wording of the suggested condition from the Council has been amended to reflect the latest submitted plan showing the visibility splays.
54. The Council have suggested two further conditions related to the submission of a planting scheme and hard and soft landscaping works. However, as such matters are covered by the landscaping reserve matter that requires further submission and approval, these conditions are not necessary.

Conclusion

55. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted subject to conditions and the completed S106 Agreement.

C Rose

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Matt Williams – Brimble, Lea & Partners

Richard McConnell – Context One

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Robert Lennis - Lead Project Officer, MRTPI

Tobias Carleton-Pragnal - Senior Conservation Officer, Spatial Planning & Majors, Masters Degree (World Heritage Conservation)

Sophie Duke - Senior Urban Design Officer, BSC (Hons) MA Planning, PG Dip (Urban Design)

Alex Skidmore - Lead Project Officer

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Peter B Williams OBE - Chairman, Bourton Parish Council

Paul Curry - Parish Councillor

Cllr Valerie Pethecarry - Ward Member (Gillingham)

James Holmes - Local Resident

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos:
20083 – 12 A Location Plan
20083 – 22 C Parameter Plan
20083 - 24 Access Plan
- 5) An up-to-date noise assessment for the proposed development, with particular regard to ensure a suitable relationship of the village hall to residential properties, shall be submitted for approval with the first set of reserved matters. Any mitigation measures identified within the assessment shall be provided before first use of the relevant building.

The reserved matters application related to landscaping shall include a tree survey which covers the entire development site detailing the condition of all trees and mitigation for the loss of any trees
- 6) Prior to commencement of any works on-site (other than those required by this condition) the first 15 metres of the proposed access road, including the junction with the existing public highway, shall be completed to at least binder course level.
- 7) Prior to commencement of development, a construction method statement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed statement. This statement should include as a minimum:
 - agreement to no bonfires,
 - details of protection of nearby receptors from dust arising from construction,
 - vehicle movements and parking on-site,
 - storage of waste materials prior to removal from site,
 - operating times of construction,
 - mitigation measures to reduce noise during the build.
- 8) Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed surface water management scheme for the site, along with details of the lifelong operation, maintenance and management of the scheme, based upon the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, and providing clarification of how drainage is to be managed during construction and a timetable for implementation of the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details including the timetable for implementation.
- 9) Prior to the commencement of any development hereby approved, an Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) prepared by a qualified tree specialist providing comprehensive details of construction works in relation to trees that have the potential to be affected by the development must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. Thereafter, all works must be carried out in accordance with the approved details. In particular, the method statement must provide the following:
 - a) a specification for protective fencing to trees and hedges during both demolition and construction phases which complies with BS5837 (2012) and a plan indicating the alignment of the protective fencing;

- b) a specification for scaffolding of building works and ground protection within the tree protection zones in accordance with BS5837 (2012);
 - c) a schedule of tree work conforming to BS3998;
 - d) details of the area for storage of materials, concrete mixing and any bonfires;
 - e) plans and particulars showing proposed cables, pipes and ducts above and below ground as well as the location of any soakaway or water or sewerage storage facility;
 - f) details of any no-dig specification for all works within the root protection area for retained trees;
 - g) details of the supervision to be carried out by the developers tree specialist.
- 10) Development must be completed in accordance with the Biodiversity Plan signed and dated by the applicant 29/02/2024.
- 11) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority and an investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with requirements of BS10175 (as amended). Should any contamination be found requiring remediation, a remediation scheme, including a time scale, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. On completion of the approved remediation scheme a verification report shall be prepared and submitted within two weeks of completion and submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- 12) Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted details of the access, geometric highway layout, turning and parking areas shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details and thereafter these areas shall be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purposes specified.
- 13) Prior to use or occupation of development hereby approved, a scheme showing details of the proposed cycle parking facilities shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved cycle parking facilities shall be maintained, kept free from obstruction and available for the purpose specified.
- 14) Before the development hereby approved is first occupied or utilised the visibility splay areas as shown on the approved plans (or Drawing Number 20083-24) must be cleared/excavated to a level not exceeding 0.6 metres above the relative level of the adjacent carriageway. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, the visibility splay areas shall thereafter be maintained and kept free from all obstruction above this height.

END OF SCHEDULE