



## Appeal Decision

Hearing 25 November 2015

Site visit made on 26 November 2015

**by J S Nixon BSc(Hons) DipTE CEng MICE MRTPI MCIHT**

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

**Decision date: 04 February 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/A/15/3132655**

**Land off Blackwell Road, Tredington, CV36 4NU.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) against the refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Braemar Property Developments Ltd against the decision of Stratford-upon-Avon District Council.
  - The application Ref. No: 14/03600/OUT, dated 23 December 2014 was refused by notice dated 31 July 2015.
  - The development proposed is for a residential development of up to 56 dwellings with associated open space, landscaping, drainage and infrastructure.
- 

### Decision

1. For the reasons given below, this appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matters

2. The application was made in outline, with all matters other than access reserved for future consideration. A Statement of Common Ground was agreed between the main parties, but submitted to PINS after the due date. This was not, therefore, forwarded to the Inspector and formed no part of the evidence considered at the hearing. A signed s.106 Undertaking was submitted shortly after the close of the hearing. The appeal has been determined on this basis.

### The relevant policies

3. The Development Plan (DP) comprises the saved policies from the adopted Stratford-on-Avon District Local Plan Review 1996-2011 (LPR). In this Plan, the appeal site lies in open countryside, thereby attracting the usual restrictions on housing development. In addition, Tredington is not identified as a Local Centre Village under saved LPR Policy STR1, where residential development should be focussed. However, as these policies were saved prior to publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), they can only be afforded weight relative to their consistency with the Framework.
  4. This LPR is undergoing replacement by the emerging Core Strategy 2011-2031 (CS). The CS is the subject of a concurrent examination and in his interim conclusions, the Examining Inspector asked for more work to be undertaken in connection with a number of matters, including housing. This has now been completed and the hearings will resume in the New Year, with adoption of the Plan anticipated in the summer of 2016.
-

5. To fill the gap before adoption of the CS, the Council decided to select a number of policies, where it considers there are no material outstanding objections, and to adopt these for development control purposes. Although these cannot attract full weight, they do follow the Inspector's interim conclusions and can, therefore, be seen as a clear indication of the direction of travel and afforded some weight. While these do not include the overall housing requirement figures and the identification of specific sites, emerging Policy CS16 does identify Tredington as a Category 3 Local Service Village (LSV), with guidance as to quantum and location.
6. Turning to the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), these clearly deliver the Government's position. Of relevance to the appeal scheme, there is the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the urgency to boost significantly the supply of housing and the consequences of not being able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of readily available housing land and a continuing failure to deliver at the planned annual rate.

### **Main Issues**

7. Having regard to the above, and from the evidence presented to the hearing, the written representations and visits to the appeal site and surroundings, it follows that the main issues to be decided in this appeal are:-
  - a) whether the Council has a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land;
  - b) whether the proposed development can be considered sustainable having regard to the identification of Tredington as a Category 3 LSV; and
  - c) in the event of the Council not being able to demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land, whether other material considerations, especially having regard to effects on the physical and social character of the Village and highway safety, would significantly and demonstratively outweigh the benefits of the scheme.

### **Reasons**

#### Housing land supply

8. The Council accepts that, in advance of the adoption of its CS, it cannot currently show a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land. The figure lies somewhere shy of 4-years, though the Council believes it would be able to show a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land once the CS is adopted and that figure would be high enough to meet a buffer of either 5% or 20%, depending on how the Examining Inspector rates its delivery performance over recent years. The Council submits that the existing figure is robust and allows for phasing on larger sites. The Appellants are not so confident and believe the Examining Inspector will decide on a higher requirement once the revised figures for Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) have been recalculated.
9. In any event, where local planning authorities cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land, DP policies for the supply of housing cannot be considered up-to-date. In turn, this triggers paragraph 14 of the Framework, which explains that under such circumstances, planning permission should be granted unless the adverse impacts of the particular scheme would

- significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies evinced by the Framework, taken as a whole.
10. In this case, the appeal site comprises agricultural Land Classification Grade 3. Where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated, agricultural land on the edge of a village, with no higher level of protection, as here, would become vulnerable. However, in this case, there are several reasons why this should not be compelling.
  11. In the first place, the emerging CS is advanced and, following the Examining Inspector's interim conclusions, the Council's 'adopted' policies look for the growth in Category 3 LSVs to be restricted and generally within the village boundary. The way this happens is to be informed by Parish and Neighbourhood Plans. For Tredington, a Parish Plan was adopted in September 2015 and endorsed by the Council. This does not look for outward extension of this magnitude to provide its growth, but a more organic and incremental approach.
  12. It is recognised that the Parish Plan is not part of the statutory DP and does not carry the weight of a Neighbourhood Plan. Nevertheless, draft CS Policy AS10 is quite specific that the needs of the community can be influenced by a Parish Plan and that for villages residential development should, other than for conversions or a range of exceptions, be within the Built-up Area Boundary of LSVs, where defined, as in this case.
  13. The next point stems from the Examining Inspector's interim conclusions into the CS. In these he does not demur from a total housing contribution for Category 3 LSVs of approximately 450 dwellings or that no more than 13% of this figure should be built in any single village. Although the extent of consultation leading to this point is not wholly transparent, there is a clear direction of travel that seeks to limit the growth and extension of the smaller villages. Looked at this way, this places a maximum figure for the growth of Tredington of some 59 additional dwelling during the CS period 2011-2031. The greater element of growth for the District would be directed generally to larger designated centres.
  14. Finally, there are no sites outside the Village boundary shown on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). This is a further indication that the intention embodied in the emerging CS policies is that growth should take place within the existing village envelope. As the explanation says, this is not a strict rule, each village would have to be looked at on its merits and it may be in time that, owing to a shortage of suitable sites coming forward, some of the growth would have to take place beyond the village boundary. A future review of the CS, or a Neighbourhood Plan, would be able to ascertain if the small sites approach was succeeding, or whether an extension to the village would be necessary. However, this is not a sound reason for abandoning the preferred approach from the outset.
  15. To ignore these factors would leave a position where all the potential growth for the Plan period would occur on one site, outside the village boundary and over a very short time. This would mean that in the future additional development proposals within the village boundary would run counter to the emerging CS policy. This seems illogical.

16. In summary on this point, the Council cannot boast a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land. As there is a dispute about the OAN, little, if any, weight can be afforded the fact this may be resolved sometime in mid-2016, when the CS is adopted. However, when it comes to looking at specific sites in and around LSVs, the interim conclusions into the CS examination, consistent with the recently published Parish Plan, imposes criteria about how these should be addressed. These clearly direct growth in Tredington to be small scale with a strong preference for locations within the present village boundary.

#### *Sustainability*

17. The Framework defines sustainability as the golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking, and looks for proposals to be assessed against the three dimensions, economic, social and environmental. The Framework also sets out the 12 core planning principles underpinning planning decision taking and these provide useful guidance on how the sustainability accreditation of individual applications should be assessed. I have factored in these principles when weighing the benefits and disbenefits of the appeal scheme.

#### *Economic benefits*

18. As for the economic dimension, this particular proposal would generate most of the benefits of any housing development and Government recognises the importance of these. There would be the short term construction jobs and purchase of building materials and, in the future the generation of service jobs such as cleaning, child care, decorating and household repairs. A proportion of the income of new residents would be disposable and this could be used to support the Village pub, which by all accounts has gone through a precarious period, local buses and other activities in the Village, whether through the Parish Council precept or other less formal organisations and events.
19. It is fair to say, however, that there is no claim that the construction workers would be drawn from village residents or that local jobs exist in the village. Neither is it demonstrated that there exists a pool of labour to take on the service jobs once the new houses are occupied. As such, it seems likely that most would commute into the Village. Moreover, the lack of protection for the pub and, without a village shop, means that the former remains vulnerable and that all retail activity would be elsewhere. In fact, should the Village be extended in such a manner as to further dilute and undermine its historic character, this might discourage visitors to the Village to see the heritage assets, including the Church, Listed Grade 1. In turn, this could have a negative effect on the viability of the local pub. Taken together, these factors severely dent the sustainability accreditation of this dimension, though it might just be judged marginally positive overall.

#### *Social benefits*

20. Turning to the social benefits, the big gain would be the 35% affordable housing provision. Notwithstanding, the Appellants have not produced an Economic Viability Assessment for the scheme and, without this, there must be questions about delivery. Although the Appellants and the Council express confidence, the opportunity to appeal the s.106 Undertaking cannot be discounted as several costs of developing the site remain unknown and the final decision would fall to the construction company. Then there would be the

- provision of general housing, in a situation where the supply and delivery falls short of the planned figure.
21. It is argued that these benefits would only be delivered by a site of this size and if growth was achieved on an incremental scale, the benefits would be seriously reduced. Clearly this is a point, but if the growth were incremental, then the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations should be in place for most of the Plan period and this would secure contributions to affordable housing and infrastructure, thereby delivering a similar end result.
  22. Next, there would be the support for the Village School, play area and Church along with other organisations and these would benefit from the input of newcomers. Even so, when one looks a little deeper, the benefits would be greatly reduced for a number of reasons. The School is not a single site operation, with only the younger children attending in the Village, with years three to six being housed on another site in a nearby village. The other key points are that there is no village shop or Post Office, where new residents could congregate or meet casually with existing residents. Visits to the Doctors or Dentists would not be in the Village, and, although there is a bus service connecting to Shipston-on-Stour for a much wider range of services, this is not the same. Moreover, the remoteness of services would not make it easy for those living in the affordable housing, who generally have a lower car ownership and would be reliant on a moderate bus service.
  23. However, the key point is that, when completed, this would be a large increase in the village population (25%), would not be within the current village envelope and would offer no permeability of layout to assist integration with existing residents. As described by some, essentially it would be a 'bolt-on' development, screened from the existing development in the village, with an access where half the journeys would not need to pass through the Village to reach any external settlement or service.
  24. Experience shows that the delivery of houses on sites is commonly one completion each week. This would mean a build-out in approximately a year and, if this were the case, one can readily understand the local population's worries about this scale of increase on the social fabric of the Village over such a short time. This would be especially so with 35% of the dwellings being classed as affordable. With very few businesses and attractions in the Village, there would be wholesale migration out of the Village for employment, shopping, health and leisure pursuits. Whether this was by bus or car, it would do little to add to the social fabric of the Village and counts as significant negative. There can be little doubt that the preferred option of small scale development over the Plan period would be much easier to assimilate into village life.
  25. Against this background, I find it hard to reconcile this proposal with the Framework (paragraphs 54 and 55) that looks to new development to reflect local needs and be located where it would enhance or maintain the vitality of the rural settlement. As such, I find the social benefits of the proposed development extremely limited, if not negative.

#### *Environmental benefits*

26. Finally, when considering the environmental dimension, benefits are very definitely harder to find. As for the visual impact, while the appeal scheme is

in outline, save for access, the Design and Access Statement (D&AS) and indicative layout does establish the Appellants' intention behind the plans. On the plus side, a landscape belt on the north-eastern boundary would soften the hard edge of the significant 1970s development, which introduced an incongruous urban influence on the edge of a picturesque rural village that clearly had not seen great change for many decades.

27. However, the downside of this would be that, in time, the landscape would screen not only views of the 1970s dwellings, but, grow up to block some views towards the Church and Village from Fosse Way. This would be exacerbated by the rising ground from the Village towards the Fosse Way. While the landscape proposals could be amended, it does emphasise the lack of integration envisaged with the historic core of the Village and the visual segregation that would ensue.
28. The 1970s development clearly portends the danger of outward extension and, even today, it has not visually settled into its location on the edge of an historic village. The character and appearance of the buildings is so different from those in the core and, on the evidence presented to the hearing, this proposal would compound this and extend the built-up area further away from the village core. The indicative layout of the appeal site is essentially low density suburban development fronting a regulation urban highway format.
29. As such, the site layout and house designs could, with one minor exception, be planted on any suburban site of similar size. The exception would be some minor referencing to the historic village buildings though the use of similar materials, though only in a very small way. Overall, the concept is so far away from the original village ethos and isolated from its heart that the character of the Village would be severely damaged. It is recognised that the indicative layout and house plans could be revamped, but it is difficult with the parameters evinced by the D&AS to see an acceptable scheme being produced that would accord with the developer's aspirations.
30. The next key area of concern pertains to movement. In the first place, the appeal site is next door to the Village School, though, as noted above this only caters for half the infant and junior pupils. Thus, for half the life of a child attending the local junior school s/he would have to travel. The nearest secondary school is in Shipston and so travel would have to be by car or bus. In this case, walking or cycling could be excluded, owing to the lack of segregated facilities, busy roads and the absence of street lighting.
31. As pointed out earlier, all shopping and health trips would be remote, though again a moderate bus service would be available. For employment there is little or none in the Village, but there are buses to Shipston and Stratford and even Banbury. Even so, the service is not particularly frequent at certain times of the day and in the evenings and at weekends is very much reduced, if it runs at all. Thus, where more flexibility is required in the employment place, early starts or overtime, for retail and leisure visits reliance is likely to be on car travel.
32. As mentioned earlier, there is virtually no cycle facility beyond the Village and very little to attract use inside the Village. Walking is equally unlikely, with the extremely limited range of destinations and the absence of a lit route is likely to deter walking to the pub or Church during hours of darkness.

33. There is an existing public right of way located along the north-western boundary of the appeal site that links back into the 1970s development. However, this is unlit and separated from the appeal site by a hedge that the indicative plan shows to be reinforced. As such, and bearing in mind the limited destinations available, this is unlikely to be a useful travel feature and would probably be used almost exclusively for recreation. Although the Police might have views about security when using the right of way, they did not include anything in their consultation response. Consequently, it would be inappropriate to count this against the appeal scheme.
34. All in all, this is not the most sustainable of developments in travel and accessibility terms, and great reliance would likely default to the car for the vast majority of journeys, despite the opportunities offered by the bus services. Whereas the Village is confirmed as a Category 3 LSV, it seems to me that it lies on the cusp of a Category 4. It has no shop or Post Office, a primary school that serves only half of the time until a child moves on to secondary education, a small 'Community Building' owned by the Women's Institute and no guarantees that the pub will survive, with it not having protected status and having only recently reopened following a period of closure.
35. Next under this head, we turn to look at the access itself in terms of safety. Access would be gained to the adopted highway network by way of a new junction onto Blackwell Road, which links Fosse Way A429 with the A3400 Stratford Road. Blackwell Road has a metalled carriageway of varying width, narrowing to a little over 3m towards the western end. This means that there is little room for vehicles to pass, especially if one is a larger vehicle and the verges show evidence of regular overrunning. The Road is unlit and for most of its length subject to the national speed limit of 60mph.
36. However, it is the junction of Blackwell Road with Fosse Way that causes most concern. In the consultation response from Warwickshire County Council (WCC) as local highway authority (LHA) it opined that "*...this section of A429 Fosse Way is a well-known accident blackspot*" and "*...the layout of the junction (Fosse Way/Blackwell Road) does provide significant constraint.*" WCC goes on to say that "*Due to the location of the development, ...it is considered by the highway authority this could increase the incidence of accidents at this location further.*" The upshot of this is that the LHA has identified the sum of £50,000 to enable the implementation of a road safety scheme at this location and this figure has been included in the submitted s.106 Undertaking.
37. This seems to have been accepted by the Appellants at face value, without questioning what would be required and whether the £50,000 would fund a scheme that would address the problems or even when it would be executed. In anticipation of this being raised, the Council had spoken to the LHA to seek further information. It had been informed that no particular scheme was proposed and the scale of the improvement would depend on the total sum secured, possibly from two or three development projects. The LHA was not available to answer questions, but this seems to me to leave the Appellants in an untenable position.
38. In the first place, without a scheme the mere request for £50,000 would achieve very little. Moreover, the indication that this figure could be added to similar contributions from other forthcoming developments complicates matters further. The junction of Blackwell Road and Fosse Way serves the village of

Tredington and so logic informs that any other contributions would have to come from development in or around the Village, and the hearing was informed that one or two are in the pipeline. However, if this appeal succeeded, this would meet virtually all the growth planned for the Village until 2031 and any other development of any size in or adjoining Tredington would fall foul of the emerging CS policy, with little expectation they would be approved. Thus the £50,000 could be the upper limit. Crucially, there would be no date for implementation of any improvement and so the appeal site could be built out and completed with the accident risks still in place.

39. As a consequence, I looked very carefully at the junction in question and I agree with the LHA in all aspects of its conclusions, except that a figure of £50,000 would achieve a solution. The junction allows all movements, albeit it has a geometric layout that makes several potentially unsafe. The angle Blackwell Road meets Fosse Way makes it extremely difficult to gain visibility to the right, in circumstances where the speeds on Fosse Way are high and the visibility to the right curtailed by the topography. The left turn into Blackwell Road is very tight and larger vehicles would cross the centreline of Fosse Way to complete the manoeuvre. For the right turning traffic into Blackwell Road, there is no protection while waiting for a gap and so through traffic is impeded. Rear end shunt accidents are mentioned by the LHA.
40. I have little doubt that to implement anything meaningful would, at the very least, require straightening the junction intersection and possibly providing some protection for right turning vehicles from Fosse Way into Blackwell Road. Without a scheme to consider, my professional opinion is that merely signing and lining would not provide a solution.
41. In summary and conclusion on this matter, I consider that this length of Fosse Way is already recognised as an accident blackspot and that the poor alignment of its junction with Blackwell Road constitutes a situation that is severe. Further use of the junction, with no guarantees of a satisfactory improvement to address the clear risk, would only make matters worse. As such, and without the guarantees for the implementation of a road safety scheme, the default position of the LHA must pertain and this is one of objection on highway safety grounds and conflict with paragraph 32 of the Framework.
42. Turning now to other possible environmental effects, drainage and land contamination are raised. Despite the Environment Agency's Flood Map showing the site in Zone 1, the information from residents is that the site has flooded in recent years around its boundary with the School. This is supported by photographs.
43. The proposal is for no surface water to drain from the site, but for it to percolate naturally through the upper layers to the groundwater, which is at a suitable level to accept the run-off. Having said this, anecdotal evidence is that the site is overlain by a layer of clay. This is consistent with the flooding identified, where the rainwater would lie on the surface to slowly percolate through the clay layer. Crucially, no percolation tests have been undertaken so far to demonstrate that the dissipation of surface water could be managed naturally.
44. There is no objection to this approach from the responsible authority and from an engineering perspective I can see no barrier to securing an acceptable



outcome. The only note of caution is that, without the details of how this could be achieved, there can be no realistic estimate of the cost or the effect this could have on layout. Both these factors could materially reduce the viability of the scheme, and the potential to deliver the 35% affordable housing.

45. The land contamination is again an unknown quantity, but a condition attached to any permission could resolve this, though the start date for the development could be delayed. However, once again, this is an unknown cost that would be a factor in the viability assessment. On the topic of ecology, the appeal site does not host any particular asset of merit, with most inhabitants being of low interest value. There may be rarer visitors, but the redevelopment of the site would provide an opportunity to enhance the habitat. Next, while appreciating there are no density targets in the Framework, the density of this proposed development at some 18 dwellings per hectare does not make good use of a scarce resource.
46. A number of the third party representations raise objections to the loss of view and the consequent fall in house values that would follow building on the open land. I have attributed only very little weight to these lines of argument. The resulting view might be foreshortened, but it would not be untenable and no-one has the right to an uninterrupted view. As for house prices, this is not a planning matter. Lastly the loss of Grade 3 agricultural land is cited. This is a negative component, especially if it proved to be Grade 3a. However, this is tempered somewhat by the fact that such a large proportion of the District is of similar land quality and much has a higher level of environmental protection.
47. Summarising on the environmental dimension, this falls well short of a positive sustainable outcome for a number of reasons, but primarily the harm to the character and fabric of the Village, the lack of attractions to keep people from outsourcing employment, shopping, medical visits etc and the highway safety concerns.

#### Other matters

48. The Appellants submitted a draft s.106 Deed of Planning Obligation to the hearing, which was being circulated for signature. This covers affordable housing, and contributions towards education, libraries, health, open space, rights of way, transport and highway infrastructure. A note of CIL compliance was submitted by the Council, but on examination at the hearing, there appeared to be one or two factors where matters were unclear. The final signed version has been revised to take account of some of these points, though there are still doubts about two key elements. The contributions to libraries and rights of way are not dedicated and may breach the requirement for not more than five contributions under a specific generic head since 2010.
49. More specifically, although the £50,000 contribution to highways would be to address the existing safety problem at the junction of Fosse Way and Blackwell Road, it does not purport to be a solution. It is said that the scheme could grow depending on contributions from other developments. Put briefly, there is no scheme in existence, no timescale for implementation and, importantly, no claw back should the LHA decide to spend the money elsewhere. In particular, without a firm commitment as to timescale, the problem could go on for many years and, on this basis, I do not consider this aspect to be CIL compliant.

50. As for the delivery of the 35% affordable housing, without an Economic Viability Assessment, and despite the confidence expressed by both the Council and the Appellants, this cannot be guaranteed.
51. The contribution to secondary school and sixth form education cited in the draft Obligation also seemed to encounter some difficulty. All the money for secondary and sixth form education was to be directed to the school in Shipston, where there is no sixth form. However, this is more focussed in the signed version and now appears satisfactory.
52. Overall, however, I am not persuaded that the Undertaking in its present form meets the tests set out in the current CIL Regulation 122.

#### Overall planning balance

53. The starting point must be to consider the appeal scheme's conformity with the DP. In a strict application of the LPR, it would not comply. Moreover, the emerging CS does little to change this situation, with no sites identified and a clear steer to small-scale development within the village boundary.
54. As for the current housing position, it is agreed that the Council cannot currently identify a 5-year supply of readily available housing land. Accordingly, the provision of 56 new dwellings, of which 35% would be affordable/ social, would be a substantial benefit that attracts significant weight in favour of the appeal proposals. Additional benefits would be the generic economic and social benefits that are delivered by any housing scheme, including support for the local school and public transport. On the environmental front, the indicative landscape would screen an unsympathetic 1970s development extension to the Village.
55. On the negative side of the equation, for a variety of reasons I have not found the appeal scheme would be sustainable development in the terms expressed by the Framework. In the first place, it would increase the population of the village by approximately 25% over a short period, with little or no suggestion about how integration would be achieved, not least for the large number of residents in social/affordable housing, who would be looking outside the village for support. This would place great strain on the social fabric on a small village and make integration much less likely. Trips for employment, shopping, health and virtually all leisure would require leaving the Village, and, although there is a public transport connection, this is not comprehensive, meaning that most journeys would be by private car.
56. In environmental terms, the extension would extend the Village further from its core and the indicative layout and plans show a distinct departure from the historic character of the centre of the Village. The immediate access would be satisfactory, but the junction of Fosse Way and Blackwell Road, a short distance to the west of the appeal site, is substandard and on a length of Fosse Way designated as an accident blackspot. As such, this must be judged severe in the terms of the Framework (paragraph 32). A contribution to improvement is offered, but there is no guarantee this would overcome the concern in terms of geometry or programming. The absence of an Economic Viability Study and the unquantified costs of drainage and land contamination poses a question about the full delivery of affordable/social housing.

57. Finally, in cases where a 5-year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated, agricultural land on the edge of a village would become vulnerable. However, as noted above, in this case there are several reasons why this should not be compelling.
58. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal scheme is not sustainable. Moreover, the negative impacts including shortcomings in the sustainability accreditation of the site, the adverse effects on the character and social fabric of the Village and highway safety issues attract very great weight. In this, they are sufficient, cumulatively, to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the appeal scheme taken as a whole, including the contribution to market and social housing and other benefits.

### **Formal decision**

59. Having regard to the evidence presented to the hearing, the written representations and visits to the appeal site and surroundings, I have found that the adverse impacts of the appeal scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the appeal scheme, when looked at against the Framework as a whole. This leads to the conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed. Accordingly, and having taken into account all other matters raised, I conclude, on balance, that the appeal should fail.

*J S Nixon*

Inspector

**APPEARANCES**

**FOR STRATFORD ON AVON DISTRICT COUNCIL:**

Mr J Whitehouse	Senior Planning Officer, Stratford District Council
Cllr C Saint	Local Councillor

**FOR THE APPELLANTS:**

Mr P Deeley	RCA Regeneration
Mr R Brunt	Robert West Consultancy
Mr P Bennett	Appellants

**INTERESTED PERSONS**

Mr D Thomlinson	Tredington and District Action Group
Councillor N Dunn	Parish Councillor
Councillor P Clayton	Parish Councillor
Ms A Walton	Resident

**DOCUMENTS HANDED IN AT THE HEARING**

Document 1 - Attendance List (not included)

Document 2 – Letter of notification and circulation list

Document 3 – Agenda

Document 4 – Parish Plan

Document 5 – Draft s.106 Deed of Planning Obligation

Document 6 – Statement of CIL Compliance

Document 7 – Core Strategy proposed modifications in response to Inspector's  
Interim Conclusions