



---

# Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 5 April 2011

Site visit made on 8 April 2011

**by Geoffrey Hill BSc DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 17 May 2011**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/U3935/A/10/2140734**

**Land North of Hook Street, Grange Park, Swindon SN5 3NY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Primegate Properties (Hooknorth) Ltd., on behalf of Bovis Homes S.W. Ltd., against the decision of Swindon Borough Council.
  - The application Ref S/10/1153/HECO, dated 23 July 2010, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2010.
  - The development proposed is an outline application for residential development of up to 175 dwellings with primary vehicular access off Hook Street and all other matters reserved.
- 

## PRELIMINARY MATTER

1. The appeal is in respect of an application for outline planning permission where all matters except access are reserved for subsequent consideration.

## DECISION

2. I dismiss the appeal.

## MAIN ISSUES

3. There are two main issues in this appeal.
  - i) Whether this is an appropriate location for new development in the context of adopted and emerging development plan policies, and national planning policies and guidance, with particular regard to housing land supply and the strategy for housing growth at Swindon.
  - ii) The effect of the proposed development on the Lydiard Ridge Landscape Character Area, the setting of Lydiard Park and the rural/urban edge of Swindon.

## REASONS

### i) Appropriate Location for Development

4. The development plan for Swindon comprises the Regional Strategy for the South West (RSS), the Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (WSSP), and the saved policies of the Swindon Borough Local Plan 2011 (SBLP). The WSSP and SBLP policies set housing growth figures to be achieved in Swindon, which have been carried through from the RSS.

5. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, requires that a planning application should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The government has announced its intention to abolish the RSS, which is a material consideration. However, it is not yet certain how or when this will be achieved: the intention has to be enacted, and the Localism Bill has not completed its passage through Parliament. Further, before RSS can be abolished the consequences of its abolition will need to be considered in the light of a strategic environmental assessment<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, because it is at only an early stage in the parliamentary process to achieve abolition and further assessment has yet to be carried out, the intention to abolish the RSS can be given little weight in this appeal.
6. Also relevant, and which may also be regarded as a material consideration, is the recent written ministerial statement published by the Minister of State for Decentralisation. Here the government affirmed its post-Budget emphasis on promoting sustainable growth – including housing development – with a strong presumption in favour of granting planning permission for development which complies with up-to-date plans and national planning policies, and “*whenever possible to approve applications where plans are absent or out of date ...*”<sup>2</sup>
7. National planning policy on housing is set out in Planning Policy Statement 3 *Housing* (PPS3). Here local authorities are expected to be able to identify sufficient sites to give a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites<sup>3</sup>. A range of interpretations of the current understanding of the housing land supply in Swindon is set out in Document SBC5. This gives an overview of the number of sites with planning permission and which are considered capable of contributing to housing land supply within the next five years, and how those permissions would meet various assumptions of the requirement, depending upon which variant of the policy base is used, and assessed against the average rate of completions in Swindon over various time periods. All elements of the analysis except one show that Swindon does not have a five year land supply. There are some queries over how many sites are currently regarded as being able to contribute to a deliverable supply, but these are relatively minor variations. Taking the adopted development plan targets, the worst case would be that there is just over two years land supply, and the best case would give just over four years.
8. The only circumstance where a five year supply is exceeded is where the number of available sites is assessed against the Council’s review of the Core Strategy (CS). This reduces the annual need to 850 dwellings per year, for the next five years or so. Under this assessment the available supply of deliverable sites could be as much as 5.64 years. However, the CS figures have only recently been produced (January 2011) and were only published for consultation purposes in March 2011, about two weeks before the inquiry into the present appeal opened. That is, whilst the CS figures are based on the Council’s appreciation of economic growth and performance of the housing market in Swindon, having regard to the recent economic down-turn, the CS cannot be given much weight at this stage as the views of other stakeholders

---

<sup>1</sup> Ministerial Statement by Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (Robert Neill), 5 April 2011.

<sup>2</sup> Written Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth (23 March 2011).

<sup>3</sup> PPS3, paragraph 54

(not least the house builders, local residents and neighbouring local authorities) have yet to be received, and the conclusions of the consultation exercise worked up into a final version of the CS which has been scrutinized at a formal examination. This being the case, for the purposes of this appeal, it has to be accepted that there is not a five year supply of housing land in Swindon.

9. Paragraph 71 of PPS3 advises that where there is not a five supply of deliverable sites planning applications for housing should be considered favourably, but subject to other considerations in the PPS noted at paragraph 69. That advice includes, amongst other matters, the need to assess the suitability of the site for housing, including its environmental sustainability, and ensuring that the site is in line with the spatial vision for the area.
10. Policy DS1 of the SBLP sets an Urban Area Boundary. The justification for this boundary draws upon many policy objectives, but amongst these (in general terms) is the wish to direct new development onto sites within the urban area so as to encourage urban renewal and regeneration in the town centre, and to safeguard the rural hinterland from undesirable new development. That is, the spatial vision for the area is to concentrate new development within the defined urban area boundary and to restrict development in the countryside, including peripheral sites around Swindon. The appeal site is outside the urban boundary established in Policy DS1 and shown on the Proposals Map.
11. Nevertheless, SBLP policy H4 does allow for land outside defined settlement boundaries to be used for housing where it can be shown that this is necessary to meet the 2011 Structure Plan housing requirement. The 2011 Structure Plan has been superseded and hence, pedantically, it could be argued that this aspect of Policy H4 has no force. However, having regard to the spirit of the recent Ministerial Statement on Planning for Growth referred to above, it would be reasonable to accept that this saved Local Plan policy could be applied to the (extant and saved) replacement Structure Plan (WSSP) requirement. In which case, on the face of it, there is policy support for taking sites such as the appeal site for new housing development to ensure the five year land supply is maintained.
12. However, a shortage in the five year housing land supply does not inevitably support the release of all greenfield sites on the periphery of the built up area. The suitability of such sites needs to be assessed against the requirement in PPS3 to have regard to their environmental sustainability. Other policies of the SBLP applicable to this site give a context to assess its environmental value. Policy ENV10(viii), and its geographic coverage defined on the Proposals Map, shows this site to be wholly within the Lydiard Ridge Landscape Protection Area, where the policy is to seek to protect and enhance the character and quality of the environment. New development must have regard to the natural surroundings and the landscape character. Also, Lydiard Park is a Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest, which has its own levels of protection from development which would harm the heritage asset itself or its setting.
13. Therefore, whilst there may be underlying policy support for the release of additional land for housing development in principle, a conclusion on the first main issue can only be arrived at once the second main issue has been considered.

## **ii) Landscape and Heritage Asset Impact**

### ***Local landscape and the urban edge***

14. The Lydiard Ridge Landscape Character Area is not just the appeal site: the appeal site is a small part - which happens to lie within the boundaries of Swindon Borough - of a wider landscape area. The area was identified in the Swindon Principle [*sic*] Urban Area *Study of Landscape Impact of Possible Development* (the PUA Study)<sup>4</sup>. Study Cell G – Purton and the Lydiards - included the appeal site in Area H – Area between the M4 and Hook Street, as shown on the relevant map of Landscape Character Sub Regions in the report.
15. The character area is an appreciable and easily discernable element in the landscape hereabouts, with a distinct lack of modern built development. It is an area of countryside which runs up to the western edges of Swindon's urban area. For the most part it is wide, open and gently undulating countryside with the occasional farm group, isolated dwelling and the small settlement of Hook. The appeal site is readily seen to be part of the countryside running away to the north and west, rather than the adjacent urban area.
16. The physical edge of the character area in this vicinity is marked by Windmill Hill. The top of Windmill Hill is on the opposite side of Hook Street to the appeal site, and its slopes fall away, presenting a low ridge or crest running generally south - north across the appeal site. There is some urban development in the area to the south of Windmill Hill, on this side of Hook Street and at the Windmill Hill Business Park, but this is relatively self-contained and stands a respectful distance back from the crest. It does not significantly impinge upon the rural character of the area to the north and west. Houses in King Henry Drive, Loughborough Close and Clinton Close are not seen to protrude over the crest of the slopes of Windmill Hill in views over the appeal site from north of the access, from the footpath which crosses the appeal site adjacent to Lydiard Park, or looking back from further north along Hook Street.
17. Views along Hook Street - either walking or in a car - travelling north from Bess Road become increasingly rural in character with agricultural hedges, grass verges, no street lighting beyond the 30 mph signs, no kerbs beyond the houses in Clinton Close, and fields to either side as one rises past the last of the houses. Beyond the access to the appeal site the views are almost wholly rural, with only the houses in Jewel Close and Gower Close (and the school behind) seen at a distance across the field. As noted above, looking back from view points to the north, the crest of Windmill Hill is seen as a physical and visual break between the countryside and the urban area.
18. Immediately north-west of the appeal site and on the same side of Hook Street is Lydiard Country Park. This is a substantial element in the landscape and, whilst not agricultural and not truly open, it is essentially a rural feature, and appreciated as a country (rather than urban) park.
19. The PUA study found that development of the area around Park Farm, an area not defined on a map but which quite reasonably could include the appeal site, would have a severe effect on the setting of Lydiard Country Park. The matter of the setting of Lydiard Park as a heritage asset is discussed in

---

<sup>4</sup> Inquiry Document 5.15B

greater detail below, but the point here is that new urban development was considered to be incongruous and undesirable in this rural context. Little or no new development has seemingly taken place in this locality since the report was published, and no new local or strategic policy requirements have identified this as an appropriate direction for growth, and hence there is no reason to accept that a different conclusion would be justified at the present.

20. Development on the appeal site would spill over the crest and housing would stand on falling ground facing onto the periphery of Lydiard Park. Even if housing is kept away from the highest parts of the site, because of the shallow angle of the slopes an open area at this point would be largely screened by surrounding houses, whose roof lines would be higher than the open land. That is, keeping the highest points free from built development in the way shown in the indicative masterplans would offer negligible landscape benefit. I acknowledge that the present edge to the built up area at Gower Close, Jewel Close, Clinton Close and Loughborough Close is abrupt, and a sympathetic softening would be beneficial. However, the proposed scheme itself would be more of an intrusion into the landscape overall, and the potential benefits would be more than outweighed by the harm.
21. Development at this scale and extent would be a noticeable and significant encroachment into the Lydiard Ridge landscape character area. To encroach on a piecemeal basis would undermine its present integrity and value as a rural scene. Small-scale incursions of this kind (in relation to the scale of the wider character area) would notably harm what is at present a pleasant and attractive area of countryside.

### **Lydiard Park**

22. Lydiard Park is a Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest. It is an historic asset, as discussed in Planning Policy Statement 5 *Planning for the Historic Environment*.
23. The Park can be appreciated as an historic asset both from within the registered boundary of the Park, and as a landscape feature viewed from the wider area around it. Within the Park the area is recognisably the formal landscaped surrounding of Lydiard House, with its lake or ponds, lawns, garden features and areas of tree planting. At present, views out from the Park towards the built up area take in houses at Darcey Close and Gower Close as well as Greendown Community School. These are urban elements which are not sympathetic to the historic interest of the Park, but which are now an established part of its surroundings and the outlook from viewpoints within it.
24. Development on the appeal site is not likely to be as conspicuous in views out from the Park as these other urban elements; houses are only likely to be seen from points close to the south-eastern edges of the Park and from the footpaths through the wooded periphery. In longer views from the Chinese Bridge and the opposite side of the lake filtered views of the development might also be seen through the under-storey of tree cover. However, these views could be mostly, if not entirely, screened out by new tree and shrub planting on the appeal site. Having said that, such screen planting itself would be unsympathetic to the setting of the heritage asset, as discussed further below.

25. It is claimed that the Park represents a tranquil area in which to enjoy its facilities. However, because of its proximity to the built up area, it is not truly peaceful. Whilst it may offer a more tranquil environment than the urban area, noise is readily heard of traffic passing on Hook Street, and ambient noise from the school playgrounds, the M4 and over-flying aircraft is a constant in the background. The existing closest housing at Darcey Close and Gower Close is not noticeably a source of undue noise and disturbance, and there is no reason to suppose that the proposed new housing would be any more disruptive. The appeal scheme would not, therefore, seriously undermine the appreciation and enjoyment of the Park and walks through the peripheral woodland, including the memorial garden area.
26. However, the peripheral woodland planting of the Park boundary is an intrinsic element of the Registered Park and Garden. It represents a strong, deliberate physical and visual barrier to mark the separation of Lydiard House and Park from the surrounding countryside, and stands as a statement to emphasise the historic status, social superiority and exclusive nature of the Park. The evergreen shrubs amongst the peripheral woodland may have originally been planted for ornamental purposes, but inevitably these grew to form a dense screen across the boundary which, whether intentional or not, reinforced the privacy of the Park and obscured views both out of, and into, the Park. The boundary is important in establishing two different, but equal and complementary perceptions of the historic asset; firstly of the Lydiard House and Church group in its enclosed and introspective formal parkland landscape, and secondly marking the difference or separation of this landscaped park as an assertive element in the surrounding countryside.
27. That is, the setting of the Park in this vicinity is the surrounding undeveloped rural landscape, from which views of the Park's boundaries are important in appreciating its historic asset value. The approach to the Park along Hook Street is part of the experience of the heritage asset, with the visitor passing through a zone of transition from an urban to an increasingly rural environment, where the perimeter of the Park is gradually revealed as the crest of the hill is approached and eventually the foreground of the Park is fully open to view. It is, therefore, important that the boundary woodland planting should not be seriously encroached upon or screened; as much as possible should be seen across an open setting. New housing and any associated screen planting would interfere with an appreciation of the significance of the Park boundary.
28. At the inquiry reference was made to the Pearson Report<sup>5</sup> and Figure 20 in that report which shows a boundary for the "essential setting" of the Park. It was argued that this was drawn to allow for the reinstatement of views from Lydiard House towards an architectural folly once believed to have been sited on Windmill Hill as a landscape "eye catcher". Evidence that there was once a folly is disputed. At the inquiry the Friends of Lydiard Park strongly asserted the folly did once exist. However, the appellant and the Council agreed that it is unlikely that a physical feature had been constructed on Windmill Hill, which would justify the idea of reinstating (or creating) an open view out towards the south west from Lydiard House over the appeal site.

---

<sup>5</sup> Core Document 10.6

29. Nevertheless, irrespective of whether there was a folly which would require an open view to be maintained, as discussed above, the slopes of Windmill Hill to either side of Hook Street are part of the setting of the heritage asset and views over the appeal site towards Lydiard Park are part of the experience (visual and emotive) of the heritage asset.
30. Nothing in the appeal scheme can be seen as of such value or necessity to be regarded as public benefits which would outweigh the harm to the heritage asset, as looked for in Policy HE9.4 of PPS5.

### **Conclusions on the Main Issues**

31. Drawing these points together, closer encroachment of built development, which would be visible above and beyond the crest of the landform on the appeal site, would undesirably introduce urban scale and form development into this rural landscape character area. Lydiard Park is at present used and appreciated as a country park, close to the urban area, but very much regarded as having a countryside ambiance and separate from the urban area. This would diminish the level of enjoyment and appreciation of the country park.
32. The appeal scheme would have no direct, physical effect on the heritage asset of Lydiard Park, but development on the appeal site would notably degrade its setting, contrary to the objectives of SBLP Policy ENV4. The scheme would have a minor impact on appreciation of the heritage asset from points within the Park, but a more serious impact upon the views of the approach to the Park from the south along Hook Street, where the peripheral woodland edge would be screened either by houses or by new landscape planting, thereby diminishing the physical and psychological importance of the strong boundary feature.
33. So, to conclude on the second main issue, the proposed development would undesirably spread urban development onto the Lydiard Ridge Landscape Character Area, harming its rural character and widening the present urban/rural edge of Swindon. It would also detract from the setting of Lydiard Park. This being so, irrespective of the need to find additional sites to meet the required five year supply of deliverable housing sites, because of the harm it would cause to the landscape and the heritage asset of Lydiard Park, the proposed scheme would not meet the provisions of SBLP Policy H4 and Policy HE9.1 of PPS5. In which case, and returning to the first main issue, this would not be an appropriate location for new development in the context of adopted and emerging development plan policies, and national planning policies and guidance, with particular regard to housing land supply and the strategy for housing growth at Swindon.

### **OTHER MATTERS**

34. Interested persons raised a number of additional points, both in written representations made before the inquiry opened and at the inquiry itself. The main points are addressed below.

#### ***Bats***

35. Bats have been noted in Lydiard Park and the appeal site is likely to be part of their foraging area. Whereas bats are a protected species, not every part of

their environment is statutorily protected. Complete protection is generally limited to identified breeding roosts. No evidence has been submitted to show that breeding roosts are found on the appeal site. The foraging range of bats can be extensive and, for the bats noted in Lydiard Park, this would include the woodland and grassed areas of the Park itself, and the open agricultural land to the north and west of the Park. Whilst development of the appeal site would result in a reduction of the foraging area, this is unlikely to represent a serious threat to the continued existence of the local bat population.

### **Badgers**

36. A badgers' sett has been established in the wooded margins of Lydiard Park. Whilst the appeal site is likely to be part of the foraging area, badgers forage over an extensive area and new development here is unlikely to represent such a loss (perhaps 10% of the present foraging area) that it would seriously threaten the viability and continued existence of the badger population. In response to any development, the foraging area is likely to adapt to include more of the Park and surrounding farmland. Furthermore, if the scheme were to proceed, new landscape planting as part of the appeal scheme could be required to include appropriate tree and shrub species to introduce new food sources on the edges of the site closest to the Park.

### **Protected duck**

37. A Ferruginous Duck has been spotted within Lydiard Park. This is a protected species, which is an, albeit a rare or unusual, migratory visitor to the UK. It has been listed in the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. It has not been reported on the appeal site itself, and the appeal site is unlikely to be a significant part of the habitat of this basically aquatic bird. Its habitat is primarily the lake in the Park and its margins.
38. Development on the appeal site would not represent a serious threat to the interests of this bird in view of the fact there are other houses already closer to the Park, as well as a large school. Noise and activity at these other points has seemingly not deterred the bird from taking up temporary residence, nor has the number of visitors and the activity within the Park. Housing on the appeal site, and the associated activity, noise and lighting, are unlikely to add so significantly to the present degree of urbanisation around the Park and its boundary that this would represent a serious threat to a protected species.

### **Drainage and flooding**

39. There have been recent incidents locally of properties being affected by flooding, notably in Loughborough Close. Understandably, this has given rise to concerns that additional housing here would exacerbate the risks and lead to more frequent, and possible worse, flooding in the future.
40. Recent flooding events may be more attributable to poor maintenance of drains and ditches locally rather than an underlying high risk *per se*. The Flood Risk Analysis submitted to support the planning application has been considered by the Environment Agency and Swindon Borough Council, who have not raised overriding objections. The drainage measures would be required to accord with the flood protection guidance given in Planning Policy Statement 25 *Development and Flood Risk*, to allow for a 1 in 100 year storm event. At detailed application stage the drainage scheme would have been scrutinised for



its adequacy, having regard to known recent events in the locality. A fully compliant scheme would have been necessary, should the development have been allowed to proceed.

### **Highways**

41. There was much concern expressed over the capacity of the local highway network, including Junction 16 of M4, to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the proposed development. Queuing on lengths of carriageway and long waits at junctions were cited to support the contention that local roads are already congested.
42. The proposed scheme includes a commitment to off-site improvements to the Whitehill Way / Hook Street roundabout to mitigate the impact of the development. The application was considered by the local highway authority (Swindon Borough Council) and the Highways Agency, and neither raised overriding technical or engineering objections, concluding that the scheme would have no detrimental impact on highway safety or traffic flows.
43. Without cogent technical evidence to set against the considerations of the relevant highway authorities there is no basis to support dismissing the appeal on highways grounds.

### **Accessibility/ public transport**

44. Local residents argue that the site is remote from shops, services and schools and public transport is poor, leading to an unsustainable use of private cars. However, no objections on these grounds have been raised by the Local Planning Authority.
45. Linkages from the appeal site into adjacent development would provide walking or cycling access to the adjacent urban area. The centre of the site would be within 1km or so of a wide range of local shops and services and schools, which would be an acceptable walking distance. There would be no need to use a private car for such trips, although individuals might choose to do so. Similarly, employment opportunities exist at Windmill Hill and Blagrove Industrial Estate, which would also be accessible on foot, albeit at perhaps up to 1.5km distance. Higher level services, such a cinema, leisure centre and the town centre are likely to need a bus journey or private car – but this would be so for any peripheral housing development.
46. Stagecoach and Thamesdown bus services pass in the vicinity of the appeal site, with a bus stop on Whitehill Way about 850m from the centre of the appeal site, with other services stopping on Great Western Way 1.4km away. These services run to the town centre, the hospital and to employment locations. The submitted planning obligation (Section 106 agreement) includes contributions to improve local bus stops and a one-off distribution of bus passes to new households to encourage use of public transport.
47. The site is at the edge of the present built up area and, without new services being provided, those living on the site would inevitably be at a greater distance from local services. However, measures are included as part of the scheme to improve or optimise opportunities for accessibility other than by private car. The circumstances for this appeal proposal are not so deficient

that this would justify dismissing the appeal on grounds of accessibility and transport sustainability.

### ***Archaeological interest***

48. It is claimed that the appeal site may be part of the site of the Battle of Ellandun. The exact location of the battlefield is not certain, and the possibility of it being at Windmill Hill and Lydiard Park is disputed. Windmill Hill and the appeal site are not registered as a battlefield by English Heritage. There is some evidence to indicate that the battlefield might be in Wroughton, rather than close to the appeal site.
49. With such doubts it is not reasonable to accept the claim as an overriding reason to resist development here. Nevertheless, it would be appropriate to have required prior archaeological investigation of the site were permission to have been granted and developed allowed to go ahead.
50. None of the other matters mentioned in the written representations or at the inquiry raise points which can be regarded as overriding objections to the possibility of development on the appeal site which could not be addressed at detailed design stage, through planning conditions or through the developer contributions offered in the submitted planning obligation.

### **CONCLUSION**

51. The lack of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites is a serious matter which has to be met having regard to both the requirement of PPS3 and the more recent government encouragement to allow planning applications for development which would support growth. Whereas there is policy support in SBLP for the development of non-allocated sites outside the designated urban boundary of Swindon, this is subject to the caveat that schemes must be assessed against other relevant development plan policies, a position supported by PPS3. Development of the appeal site would not be acceptable: at the local scale and under current circumstances it would undesirably spread urban development into the rural hinterland of Swindon and it would also harm the setting of the Registered Park and Garden. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

*Geoffrey Hill*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### For the Local Planning Authority:

Mr Anthony Crean QC instructed by The Borough Solicitor,  
Swindon Borough Council

#### *He called:*

Mr Peter Garitsis BAS MCPUD	Urban Designer / Masterplanner
Mrs Liz Smith-Gibbons BSc IHBC	Conservation Officer
Mr Philip Smith BA(Hons) MSc(Town Planning)	Strategic Policy Manager
Mrs J Trajan	Transport Development Manager

### For the Appellants:

Mr Patrick Clarkson QC instructed by Mr A Macdonald, DPDS  
(Agents)

#### *He called:*

Dr S N Colcutt MA(Hons) DEA DPhil FSA	Archaeologist and cultural heritage manager, Oxford Archaeological Associates Ltd.
Mr Patrick Maxwell Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipLA CMLI	Landscape Consultant, DPDS
Mr Alistair Macdonald BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Director, DPDS
Mr J A Easdon BSc CEng FICE MCIHT	Cole Easdon; Consulting Engineers

### Interested Persons:

Mrs A Henshaw	Chairman, North Wiltshire and Swindon CPRE:
Mrs G Barnard	Lydiard Fields Action Group:
Mr A Drinkwater	Lydiard Fields Action Group:
Miss S Finch-Crisp	Friends of Lydiard Park:
Mr M Gray	Friends of Lydiard Park:
Mr P Greenhalgh	Councillor and Cabinet Member, Swindon Borough Council;
Mr T Caple	
Mr T Swinyard	
Mr R Buckland MP	

## DOCUMENTS

Document	1	Letter informing interested persons of the inquiry and list of those notified
Document	2	Digest of representations from interested persons, circulated by Inspector.
Document	3	Extracts from two Secretary of State decisions re: weight attached to intention to revoke RSS policies, circulated by Inspector.
Document	4	List of Core Documents for the inquiry

### Documents for Swindon Borough Council

Document	SBC.1	Copy of a paper written by Dr Colcutt <i>The Setting of Cultural Heritage Features</i> : extract from JPL
Document	SBC.2	Extracts from Inspector's Report for Wind Farm Developments at Steadings, Ray Estate and Green Rigg Fell, Northumberland
Document	SBC.3	Appearances List for Wind Farm Developments at Steadings, Ray Estate and Green Rigg Fell, Northumberland
Document	SBC.4	Copy of English Heritage Letter dated 4 March 2011
Document	SBC.5	Summary comparative table of housing land availability calculations.
Document	SBC.6	Secretary of State's decision letter for appeals at Coate, dated 5 August 2009
Document	SBC.7	Press Release for James Gray MP, dated 6 April 2011
Document	SBC.8	Schedule of draft planning conditions
Document	SBC.9	Proof of evidence including appendices for Mr Gatritsis
Document	SBC.10	Summary proof of evidence for Mr Gatritsis
Document	SBC.11	Rebuttal proof of evidence for Mr Gatritsis
Document	SBC.12	Proof of evidence including appendices for Mrs Smith-Gibbons
Document	SBC.13	Summary proof of evidence for Mrs Smith-Gibbons
Document	SBC.14	Rebuttal proof of evidence for Mrs Smith-Gibbons
Document	SBC.15	Proof of evidence including appendices for Mr Smith
Document	SBC.16	Summary proof of evidence for Mr Smith
Document	SBC.17	Rebuttal proof of evidence for Mr Smith

### **Documents for the Appellants**

Document	APP.1	Clip of announcements relating to abolition / revocation of Regional Strategies, Localism Bill and Planning for Growth
Document	APP.2	Copy of e-mail dated 6 April 2011 re: RSS abolition
Document	APP.3	Signed S.106 Planning Obligation
Document	APP.4	Written responses to points raised by Lydiard Fields Action Group
Document	APP.5	Extracts from application drawings showing locations of surveying poles set out for site inspection.
Document	APP.6	Proof of evidence including appendices for Dr Colcutt
Document	APP.7	Volume of appendices to proof of evidence for Dr Colcutt
Document	APP.8	Summary proof of evidence for Dr Colcutt
Document	APP.9	Proof of evidence including appendices for Mr Griffiths
Document	APP.10	Summary proof of evidence for Mr Griffiths
Document	APP.11	Proof of evidence for Mr Macdonald
Document	APP.12	Volume of appendices to proof of evidence for Mr Macdonald
Document	APP.13	Summary proof of evidence for Mr Macdonald

### **Documents for interested persons**

Document	IP.1	Text of statement made by Mrs Henshaw
Document	IP.2	Statement of Representation on behalf of Lydiard Fields Action Group

### **PLANS**

#### ***Application plans (initially submitted with planning application)***

	<i>Drawing No.</i>	<i>Subject/ Description (area noted)</i>
Plan A.1	C3700/09/771 Rev A	Site Location Plan
Plan A.2	C3700/09/801 Rev J	Indicative Master Plan
Plan A.3	C3700/10/725	Topographic Survey
Plan A.4	C3700/09/SK808 Rev B	Site Context Diagram
Plan A.5	C3700/09/SK750 Rev D	Constraints and Opportunities Drawing
Plan A.6	SK02C	Illustrative Layout
Plan A.7	C3700/09/SK804 Rev C	Areas Plan

Plan A.8	C3700/09/SK807 Rev B	Key Frontages, Views and Vistas Plan
Plan A.9	C3700/09/SK809 Rev B	Affordable Housing Plan
Plan A.10	C3700/09/SK806 Rev B	Storey Heights Plan
Plan A.11	C3700/09/SK810 Rev B	Character Areas
Plan A.12	C3700/09/SK803 Rev B	Pedestrian and Cycle Links
Plan A.13	C3700/10/01 Rev B	Landscape Framework
Plan A.14	C3700/09/SK802 Rev B	Vehicle Access Strategy

***Further or alternative application plans accepted by Swindon Borough Council***

Plan B.1	C3700/09/801 Rev K	Indicative Masterplan
Plan B.2	2833/SK103 Rev B	Proposed Access Arrangements
Plan B.3	2833/209 Rev B	Swept Path Analysis for Refuse Vehicle
Plan B.4	C3700/10/812	Alternative Indicative Masterplan in response to Design Review (CABE)
Plan B.5	C3700/10/813	Sketch Layout (Alternative Masterplan) in response to Design Review (CABE)

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer

Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: [customers@english-heritage.org.uk](mailto:customers@english-heritage.org.uk)