



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 28-29 April 2026 & 28 May 2026

Site visit made on 30 April 2026

by A Dawe BSc (Hons), MSc, MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th July 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/W/25/3365027

Land West of Wellesbourne Road and South of Allotments, Kineton Road, Wellesbourne, Warwickshire CV35 9LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Richborough against Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03281/OUT.
 - The development proposed is Outline Planning application with all matters reserved except access, for up to 300 dwellings and associated green space and biodiversity enhancements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Outline Planning application with all matters reserved except access, for up to 300 dwellings and associated green space and biodiversity enhancements at Land West of Wellesbourne Road and South of Allotments, Kineton Road, Wellesbourne, Warwickshire CV35 9LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03281/OUT, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule in Annex A.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site address in the above header is taken from the original planning application form. Whilst this differs from the wording of the address set out on the Appeal form, which reads as Land East of Kineton Road, Wellesbourne, I am satisfied that both adequately describe the same site concerning this appeal.
3. The appeal relates to an outline planning application with all matters reserved for future consideration other than access. The matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale would therefore be for future consideration were the appeal to be allowed. The Appellant has however submitted a Parameter Plan and an Illustrative Framework Plan along with other plans relating to proposed off-site highways works which I have therefore taken into consideration, together with a Proposed Site Access Junctions with Visibility Splays plan. In considering access this relates solely to the vehicular access points from the Wellesbourne Road and to the pedestrian and cycle access onto Kineton Road.
4. A draft National Planning Policy Framework 'Plan-making and national decision-making policies' was issued by the Government for consultation on 16 December 2025 (Consultation Draft Framework) with the deadline for comments of 10 March 2026. A written ministerial statement was also published on 16 December 2025 outlining the key changes proposed. A new National Planning Policy Framework

relating to that draft remains to be published. The Consultation Draft Framework has limited weight as a material planning consideration. In respect of the main issues which are pertinent to the consideration of this appeal I have continued to afford full weight to the published National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (as amended) (the Framework) as a whole from the point of view of determining this appeal. The Consultation Draft Framework does not alter or outweigh my conclusions below.

5. The Emerging South Warwickshire Local Plan (eSWLP) was due to be presented to Joint Cabinet Committee on 28 May 2026 with a recommendation to the respective two Councils that it be approved for public consultation. The eSWLP was then to be heard at the Full Council's of the two Councils in early June 2026 with anticipated adoption in March 2028. It is therefore still some way before adoption and may be subject to change. As such, the Council and Appellant agree that very limited weight should be afforded to the eSWLP for the purposes of this appeal. I have no substantive basis to find otherwise.
6. The Council's original putative reasons for refusal (putative RfRs), as set out in its Statement of Case, included matters relating to its spatial strategy, flood risk and surface water drainage, archaeology, design, and the provision of a mechanism to deliver affordable housing and various infrastructure to mitigate the effects of the proposed development. This was also in the context, at the time, of the Council considering that it could demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites (5 year HLS).
7. On 30 March 2026 the Council published its latest assessment of 5 year HLS, using the base date of 31 March 2025. As a result, it is now agreed that the Council is able to demonstrate 2.21 years' worth of HLS.
8. Since the appeal was submitted, the Appellant submitted additional information, including an extension to the site boundary, increasing the site area to accommodate additional drainage mitigation measures, and in relation to various other matters including those that the Council previously raised as putative RfRs. Re-consultation on those documents occurred from 6 to 27 February this year. Following that, I accepted the amended red line site boundary plan and associated amended or updated documents for consideration in the appeal. That was on the basis that increasing the red line would not involve a substantial difference or fundamental change to the application, noting that the total number of homes, the net developable area and the description of development would remain unchanged and that no additional built development is proposed; and that appropriate re-consultation was conducted, enabling comments to be made by interested parties and other relevant consultees.
9. With regard to archaeology, the Appellant undertook further work to address the Council's concerns, including in relation to insufficient information having been previously provided. Whilst the parties agree that there would remain some harm to regionally significant remains comprising non-designated heritage assets, they also agree that this would not be sufficient to warrant a reason for refusal when weighing the application, having regard to paragraph 216 of the Framework. I shall consider this matter further later in this decision.

10. In respect of design, the Council is now satisfied, having regard to the submitted Design and Access Statement and Parameter Plan that a well-designed scheme can be secured on the site at the reserved matters stage.
11. Following the submission of that additional information by the Appellant referred to above, and given the change in circumstances with the HLS dropping to 2.21 years' worth, the Council reviewed its position, and has withdrawn the putative RfRs, with remaining harms identified found to be outweighed by the benefits of the proposed development. That position is set out in the submitted General Statement of Common Ground No2¹, subject to conditions and section 106 planning obligations. The Council is therefore no longer contesting the appeal, again subject to conditions and appropriate planning obligations. Nevertheless, all matters relevant to this appeal remain for my consideration, taking account of all the evidence and submissions, including the substantial number of objections from local residents on various issues.
12. Furthermore, the Council and Appellant have agreed the planning obligations contained in the submitted section 106 agreement, addressing the Council's original fifth putative RfR relating to section 106 obligations.

Main Issues

13. In terms of those remaining harms identified by both the Appellant and the Council, this includes the proposed development's conflict with spatial strategy policy, albeit that the nature of, and weight given to, such conflict differs between them. This is also in the context of the Council no longer contesting the first original putative RfR, relating to the principle of development, when applying the planning balance.
14. Whilst the Council no longer raises any objections in relation to local surface water drainage and flood risk, this matter remains of considerable concern to local residents, and it generated significant discussion at the Inquiry. I have therefore considered this as a main issue in its own right.
15. I therefore consider that the main issues in this case are:
 - i) Whether the proposed development would comply with the Council's spatial strategy;
 - ii) The effect of the proposed development on local surface water drainage and flood risk;
 - iii) Other related planning matters including any benefits of the proposed development to be weighed in the planning balance.
16. The Council and Appellant also agree that there would be less than substantial harm, at the lowest end of the scale, relating to local built heritage assets; and some harm in terms of loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (BMVAL). These and all other matters relevant to the appeal, will be dealt with under the third main issue.

¹ Core Document E2

Reasons

Spatial strategy

17. Policy CS.15 of the Stratford on Avon District Core Strategy 2011 to 2031 (the Core Strategy) states that the distribution of development in the District during the plan period will be based on a pattern of balanced dispersal, in accordance with the distinctive character and function of the wide range of sustainable locations across the District. It goes on to refer to specific main rural centres, comprising rural market towns and large villages, including Wellesbourne, which are identified as suitable locations for housing and business development and the provision of local services. In this respect it states that development will take place on allocated sites identified in the Area Strategies and shown on the Policies Map; sites identified in a Neighbourhood Plan; and through the redevelopment and re-use of suitable land and property within their Built-Up Area Boundaries as defined on the Policies Map. That policy also expects all development at existing settlements to protect and enhance the character of the settlement involved and its setting.
18. Policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy sets out, amongst other things, the housing requirement for the District together with how the homes will be distributed based on the sustainable locations identified in policy CS.15, including 3800 homes in the Main Rural Centres. That policy also sets out the Council's commitment to giving local people the opportunity to influence where homes are built in their communities and encourages Parish Councils to prepare Neighbourhood Plans that identify sites to meet or exceed the housing requirements relating to this policy.
19. Policy CS.16 also states that the Site Allocations Plan will identify Reserve Housing Sites, with no reference to Neighbourhood Plan reserved sites in this respect, and sets out the circumstances under which they will be released including, amongst other things, to rectify any identified shortfall in housing delivery in order to maintain a five year supply of housing land in the District. Not only is limited weight afforded to the emerging SAP, as it remains in draft form, but the reserved site relating to the appeal site is shown in the SAP with only a portion of the site nearest to Kineton Road as being suitable for development.
20. Policy WW7 of the Wellesbourne and Walton Neighbourhood Plan Made Version Plan Period 2016-2031 (the Neighbourhood Plan) relates to the location of new houses. It states that new housing, other than infill, should be contained within Area 1 shown on map 11, which does not include the appeal site. However, it goes on to refer to Area 2 on map 10, identified as a Reserve Site for possible residential housing use beyond 2030, which includes the appeal site. No new housing will be allowed outside the built-up area other than for development on a Reserved Site.
21. Notwithstanding the above, Area 2 does not include the whole of the appeal site, albeit does include the proposed built development area, with the swale and other flood mitigation being outside of it but nevertheless part of the overall proposals.
22. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not strictly accord with the policies referred to above. I shall return to this in the planning balance.

Local surface water drainage and flood risk

23. The proposals, including the further flood mitigation submissions referred to previously, take account of updates to the Environment Agency document Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) in January 2025 and to the Flood Map for Planning in March 2025. This followed hydraulic modelling work, with the Appellant's Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) updated accordingly. Furthermore, I understand that in terms of the nature of flows within the Brook that runs to the north of the site, referred to by the Appellant as Newbold Brook, the model and updated FRA took account of flows in tributary water courses.
24. In terms of flood risk to the proposed development, the built areas, with the exception of the proposed outfall swale which would cross into an area of fluvial floodplain, are proposed to be positioned within Flood Zone 1 and therefore at low risk of fluvial flooding. There is evidence that the Brook has overtopped in more extreme events, with the section of the bank top in the vicinity of the proposed swale connection being slightly raised above the land immediately to its south, causing flood water to flow in that direction. However, based on the submissions, I have no substantive basis to consider that there would be anything other than a low risk of fluvial flooding to the proposed dwellings.
25. There is an acknowledged potential risk of flooding of the site from surface water, relating to flows generated in extreme rainfall events, by direct rainfall runoff from the upstream catchment to the east and south-east. However, this is modelled to be very shallow flooding, albeit across a broad area, prior to it reaching the watercourse, with some localised ponding on the site. The proposed mitigation measures would comprise interception channels, to direct water that would otherwise flow onto the development site around the development to storage pond basins. Such measures, whilst not controlling the flow out of the basins, would ensure that the proposed development would not then be at risk of flooding from that source for up to and including the 100-year plus climate change flood event. Furthermore, the routing of the interception channels would ensure no new or increased risk of flooding to existing development adjacent to the site or in the wider village.
26. Surface water from the development site itself, with the change from existing agricultural land to substantial areas of hard surfacing would be likely to generate more surface water flows. However, this is proposed to be captured in attenuation chambers, with controlled release at the existing greenfield runoff rate or better.
27. Furthermore, because the proposed surface water storage basins would be located outside of the flood plain, it is not anticipated that they would fill up with water from the Brook overtopping its banks. Additionally, the control structure for regulating the outflow of surface water from the site would be outside of the fluvial floodplain. Whilst the proposed swale would cross into it, as referred to above, the control structure would replicate or better existing greenfield flow rates such that the situation would not be made worse and if anything likely to be improved in this respect. Whilst flood water from the Brook and outfall water in the swale from the site would merge, that is in the context of the merging that would already be likely to occur, without the proposed development and swale, with surface water via the site. I understand that the proposed swale is designed only to be full at extreme events.

28. Generally, the evidence presented indicates that whilst the proposed flood mitigation measures would not prevent any ongoing flooding of the existing village, they would ensure that the existing situation would not be worsened, also with the potential for improving it.
29. Other sources of potential flooding, including from groundwater, sewers, reservoirs and canals, have been found in the FRA to pose only a low risk. In relation to groundwater, I understand that the monitoring undertaken showed that such water has not recently come up to a level within two meters of the ground surface, including after a very wet winter.
30. Paragraph 175 of the Framework sets out that the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding, except in situations where a site-specific flood risk assessment demonstrates that no built development within the site boundary, including access or escape routes, land raising or other potentially vulnerable elements, would be located on an area that would be at risk of flooding from any source, now and in the future (having regard to potential changes in flood risk). Policies CS.4 of the Core Strategy and WW12 of the Neighbourhood Plan reflect this.
31. The FRA demonstrates clearly that the proposed layout, design and mitigation measures would ensure that the occupiers of the proposed development would remain safe from current and future surface water flood risk, without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Furthermore, as also referred to above, the risk of flooding from other sources would be low. A sequential test relating to the location of development is therefore not required in this case.
32. For the above reasons, subject to appropriate conditions to secure the proposed flood mitigation and surface water drainage works, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of local surface water drainage and flood risk. As such, in respect of this issue, it would accord with Policies CS.4 of the Core Strategy and WW12 of the Neighbourhood Plan which together, amongst other things, require development proposals to minimise flood risk from all sources.

Other Matters

Highways matters

33. There are acknowledged existing local traffic congestion problems at peak times of day, in relation to the nearby primary school collection and drop off times, and other activities such as the market. Modelling undertaken in relation to the submitted Transport Assessment (TA) was carried out taking account of peak traffic volumes and therefore the worst-case scenario. The TA demonstrates, including with the provision of proposed improvements to the Wellesbourne Road/Kineton Road and Newbold Road/Kineton Road junctions, that the proposed development would not significantly exacerbate any such existing problems. I have no substantive basis to consider differently, also relating to other local road junctions in the wider area. I also understand that those improvements to the two specific junctions referred to above, including the provision of mini roundabouts, would have the potential for betterment over the existing situation. Furthermore, those works, and measures to control construction related traffic, could be secured by condition.
34. The proposals would also upgrade the widths of existing footways along Kineton Road, taking account of the inevitable increase in pedestrian and cycle movements

resulting from the proposed development. That on the eastern side of the road would be of sufficient width to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists. A pedestrian and cycle parallel road crossing facility on Kinton Road close to the entrance to the allotments is also proposed. I have no substantive basis to consider those works would not provide acceptable mitigation or that the proposed crossing would be unsafe in terms of traffic speeds along that stretch of road.

35. Such pedestrian and cyclist provision would result in encroachment onto the existing verge on the western side of Kinton Road. Concerns have been raised about the threat to the variety of trees lining the road along that stretch of verge, between Kinton Road and Willow Drive. In this respect, an arboricultural method statement included as part of a finalised scheme for active travel infrastructure and off-site highway works, for submission and approval, identifying measures to protect trees affected by those works, could be secured by condition.
36. There are a number of facilities, shops and services in the village, a significant number being within walking or cycling distance from the appeal site. Those upgrading works referred to above would be likely to further encourage prospective residents to walk or cycle into the village and to the nearby primary school as opposed to car use. Bus stop infrastructure within walking distance of the site is also intended to be upgraded with measures secured through planning obligations. Together with the current frequency level of busses, and provision for maintaining a bus service for the proposed development to various local and wider destinations through a financial contribution secured in a planning obligation, prospective residents would have the option to travel to such destinations via public transport.
37. I have no substantive evidence to indicate that the proposed development would be likely to significantly exacerbate or cause highway safety problems associated with on-street parking within the village, particularly given that degree of accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists referred to above.
38. The proposed vehicular accesses for the development would be onto Wellesbourne Road. Whilst the speed limit along that stretch of road is 50 mph, with the likelihood of faster moving traffic than on Kinton Road, the proposals demonstrate adequate visibility splays, taking those factors into account. Whilst there is no footway or cycleway on Wellesbourne Road, pedestrians and cyclists would have the option of direct access to the existing village and its facilities and services via the proposed pedestrian/cycle access onto Kinton Road. In these respects, the proposed access works set out on drawing nos. T24596 001 Rev. D and T24596 004 Rev. D are agreed by the Highway Authority and I have no substantive basis to find differently.
39. The current plans nevertheless show provision on the site for pedestrians and cyclists right up to the proposed northern site access onto Wellesbourne Road. Whilst the current plans only show a shared path on one side of that proposed access, the intention would be to secure cycle provision on both sides, which would be achievable without changing the currently proposed bellmouth access arrangement and visibility splays. Such an amendment could therefore reasonably be secured by condition.
40. With regard to the relationship between the proposed pedestrian/cycle access onto Kinton Road and the vehicular access from 33 Kinton Road, visibility of drivers exiting No. 33 would be obscured to some extent by a combination of the entrance

pillar and boundary vegetation, more so if reversing. Nevertheless, the proposed access would be offset from No. 33's boundary wall to a degree, and any vegetation overhanging that boundary could be trimmed back. That would enable scope for oncoming pedestrians and cyclists from the site to see any vehicle exiting no 33. It would also not be a completely new situation as the route concerned is currently used by pedestrians, albeit likely to be significantly less so than with the proposed development in place.

41. Furthermore, it is likely that vehicles exiting no 33 would be doing so cautiously as is currently likely to be the case. It is also likely that pedestrians and cyclists approaching Kinton Road via that route would do so with caution. Increased space for pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of that junction is also proposed through the intended widening of the footway alongside Kinton Road. It is therefore likely that intervisibility between drivers exiting No. 33 and pedestrians and cyclists approaching the junction along the Kinton Road footway from the north would be improved.
42. I have also had regard to existing concerns associated with speeding traffic on Wellesbourne Road in relation to visibility for drivers exiting the driveway of 75 Kinton Road and vehicles crashing into the garden of that property. However, I have no substantive evidence to indicate that the traffic generated by the proposed development would be likely to exacerbate any existing problems associated with speeding vehicles.
43. The existing public footpath running through the site would be retained with the proposed pedestrian/cycle path alongside it, subject to detailed design at the reserved matters stage. A potential additional pedestrian access from and to the north-west point of the site is also shown on the Parameter Plan. However, its effectiveness would be reliant on off-site factors not under the Appellant's control. As such, I have no substantive basis to consider that this would create an alternative route to the village and the nearby primary school. Nevertheless, the proposed access onto Kinton Road would itself provide suitable access to services and facilities in the village, albeit not directly to the school. That route to the school, whilst partially alongside Kinton Road would have the safety provided by the proposed widened footway/cycleway.
44. With regard to proposals for a Restricted Byway running along the western edge of the site, this has to go through a separate statutory procedure before being added to the definitive map. Nevertheless, the appeal proposals are currently in outline form and the Council and Appellant agree that there is nothing in the proposals that would be inconsistent with any such future Byway provision. I have no substantive basis to consider differently.
45. For the above reasons, subject to appropriate conditions and planning obligations, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its effect on the local highway network, highway and pedestrian safety, accessibility to local facilities and services, and its effect on local street trees.

Archaeology

46. The original planning application was accompanied by reports setting out the results from an Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and a Geophysical Survey. An Archaeological Evaluation report was submitted in December 2025 detailing the results from a programme of trial trenching. Optically Stimulated

Luminescence (OSL) dating analysis has also been carried out for samples from two features on the site.

47. Two parallel ditches running through the site were uncovered in various trial trenches, initially interpreted as a possible Neolithic cursus monument. The OSL data could not provide any additional evidence to support the Neolithic date for the remains concerned. As such it is the agreed position of the Council and Appellant that there is no determinative evidence available to support the suggestion that these remains are demonstrably of equivalent significance to a Scheduled Monument or to indicate that they are of greater than regional significance, but instead are non-designated heritage assets (non-designated HAs).
48. Ditches defining an enclosure uncovered in various trial trenches are stratigraphically of a later date than the above parallel ditches. OSL dating of sediments from this feature were dated 9070 BC to 5950 BC and 17,400 BC to 11,250 BC, however due to the morphology of the feature, the Council and Appellant agree that it is highly unlikely that a date within either of those ranges is correct. Again, these are assessed to comprise non-designated HAs. Those parties also agree that pits uncovered in two other trenches, including of possible Neolithic and Bronze Age dates, are non-designated HAs.
49. Enclosures and associated features in the southwestern area of the site of later prehistoric date are agreed by the Council and Appellant to be of up to regional significance and non-designated HAs. The same applies to a feature found in another trench, comprising two curving ditches with a reduced internal area, which may be of later prehistoric or early Roman date and which may represent a pond barrow.
50. No dateable material was recovered from two ring ditches uncovered in two other trenches, with associated cremations and a burial, albeit assessed to be consistent with prehistoric funerary practices, in particular those from the Bronze and Iron Age. A further large undated enclosure, with nearby pit containing a small Iron Age globular jar, was also uncovered in two more of the trenches, again agreed by the Council and Appellant to be a non-designated HA.
51. I have no substantive basis to find differently to the Council and Appellant on the findings relating to the above features and the assessment of them as being non-designated HAs. Other features relating to field boundaries shown on historic maps and evidence of former ridge and furrow earthworks now indicated by furrows are agreed by those parties not to comprise HAs. Again, I have no substantial basis to find differently.
52. The proposed development would therefore result in the loss of those non-designated HAs referred to above. Consideration of that loss is required in the context a paragraph 216 of the framework, requiring a balanced judgement to be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage assets. I shall consider this further in the planning balance below; also taking account of the agreed position of the Council and Appellant that the loss of such assets should be offset by means of an agreed archaeological mitigation strategy. That would include a programme of archaeological investigation, recording and publication of results together with an element of outreach and public engagement, all of which could be secured by condition.

Built Heritage

53. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset (designated HA), great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Paragraph 213 goes on to state, amongst other things, that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated HA should require clear and convincing justification.
54. The proposed development would be close to and within part of the setting of the Grade II listed buildings (LBs) immediately to the south of the site comprising 71 & 73 Kineton Road and 75 & 77 Kineton Road (list entry numbers 1382031 and 1382032 respectively). Furthermore, the proposals would involve alterations to the road junction between Wellesbourne Road and Kineton Road, adjacent to which the LBs are located, involving the creation of a mini-roundabout and associated works. I have therefore had regard to the statutory duty to have special regard to desirability of preserving the setting of those LBs.
55. The significance of those assets relates to their group value as two pairs of semi-detached houses, located either side of Wellesbourne Road at its junction with Kineton Road, composed of brick and timber-frame with plastered infill, gabled tile roofs with large brick stacks.
56. Either side and opposite those LBs on Kineton Road are more modern houses. However, the open countryside to the east of the Kineton Road houses currently retains that historic context to the setting of the LBs, although I have no evidence to indicate any historic functional or other associations between the site and the LBs. The pairs of LBs also frame views eastwards from the road junction along Wellesbourne Road and to the open countryside either side of that road. Nevertheless, the buildings themselves are most significantly appreciated at close range from Kineton Road and to their sides from Wellesbourne Road.
57. The proposed development would substantially change that open countryside setting on the northern side of Wellesbourne Road, including the potential for some raised levels relating to the proposed drainage strategy for the development, and would alter the framed views eastwards along Wellesbourne Road to some degree. However, the proposals would involve the housing development being set away from Wellesbourne Road, separated by a buffer of green open space albeit punctuated by the proposed access roads. Such open space would be located to the immediate rear of 71 & 73 Kineton Road, thereby partially retaining an open backdrop to those LBs. The other two LBs at 75 & 77 Kineton Road, on the opposite side of Wellesbourne Road, would retain the existing backdrop of an open field.
58. Furthermore, as referred to in the submitted Design and Access Statement (DAS), it is proposed that the building heights of the dwellings adjacent to that buffer of open space referred to above would not exceed 2 storeys, which would be broadly consistent with those existing non-listed dwellings immediately to the side of 71 Kineton Road. Additionally, whilst there would be a vehicular access on to Wellesbourne Road close to the LBs at that southern corner of the site, with associated visibility splays resulting in relocation of the existing roadside hedgerow, the access itself would be set away from the rear garden boundaries of 71 & 73 Kineton Road to some degree.

59. Any potential raising of site levels, relating to the proposed drainage mitigation works, would be unlikely to be such as to significantly add to the extent to which the proposals would urbanise the existing setting of the LBs, particularly as this could be controlled through any reserved matters application. Additionally, the fabric and group value of the LBs, already set in a context of more modern buildings in their close vicinity would not be affected by the proposed development.
60. The proposed mini-roundabout at the existing junction of Wellesbourne Road and Kineton Road would be close to the LBs. Currently, the road junction is characterised by a grass verge on either side of Kineton Road in front of the LBs and opposite, together with a footway. The proposed mini-roundabout would result in a re-alignment of the existing kerb lines and footways and some infringement of the verges. There would also be tactile paving at the pedestrian crossing point, together with new painted road markings associated with the roundabout. However, those proposals would represent a relatively minor change to the setting of the LBs in the context of an already existing modern road junction and its associated infrastructure. Again, those highways works would not affect the existing appreciation of the fabric and group value of the LBs on either side of Wellesbourne Road.
61. I have also had regard to concerns expressed about the exacerbation of cracks within the fabric of the LBs due to passing HGVs. However, I have no substantive evidence as to the extent of any such existing cracking or to indicate that any increased HGV movements would be likely to cause or exacerbate that situation.
62. I have also had regard to the setting of the Grade II listed building comprising Wellesbourne Farmhouse, 2, 3 and 4 Ash Tree Close, to the west of the site. That LB, now relating to three houses, is located at the end of a residential cul-de-sac comprising more recent housing. It is also separated from the site by intervening more modern houses fronting Kineton Road and Willow Drive, and as such the likelihood is that there would be little or no intervisibility between the LB and proposed development. Due to those existing interventions and circumstances, that LB's setting would be preserved.
63. The Wellesbourne Conservation Area (the CA), at its nearest point, is located approximately 270 metres to the west of the site. There is significant intervening existing built development which has clearly affected the character of those immediate surroundings of the CA. There is also no clear intervisibility between the site and CA. The site does not therefore contribute to the significance or setting of the CA. Furthermore, the nature of the proposed development, comprising building heights of a maximum 2.5 storeys would also be unlikely to result in any clear intervisibility between the site and CA, due to that degree of separation and presence of intervening buildings. As such, the proposed development would preserve the integrity of the CA in terms of its significance and setting.
64. Staple Hill House is a non-designated HA located to the east of the site, separated from the site by agricultural land. This asset is associated with Staple Hill Farm and is likely to date to the 19th Century, expressing local farming trends at that time. Architecturally, it is also a good example of the Jacobean Revival style. The building concerned is set away from Wellesbourne Road and partially screened within the wider landscape by associated mature trees. The building is set within the context of surrounding fields which provide an appreciation of the building's former agricultural use.

65. The proposed development would occupy agricultural land which forms part of the wider setting of the Staple Hill House. However, a large area of agricultural land would remain between that asset and the site, together with other existing surrounding fields. As such, the open countryside context enabling that appreciation of the building's former agricultural use would be largely maintained, albeit with a reduction in the wider farmland context. Furthermore, whilst there would be some intervisibility between the proposed development and Staple Hill House, the degree of separation and partial screening from vegetation would ensure that its integrity both in terms of appreciating its historic functionality, and architecturally, would not be significantly compromised. As such, the proposed development would be unlikely to harm the integrity of this non-designated HA.
66. I have found that the setting of Wellesbourne Farmhouse would be preserved as would the integrity of the CA and Staple Hill House. However, for the reasons given in relation to 71 & 73 and 75 & 77 Kinton Road, the proposed development would harm the significance of those LBs through a failure to preserve their setting. Having regard to the Framework and policy CS.8 of the Core Strategy, in relation to those specific designated HAs, also for the above reasons, the harm to those assets would likely be less than substantial and at the lowest end of the scale. As such, again having regard to Core Strategy policy CS.8 and paragraph 215 of the Framework, it is necessary to weigh that less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the proposal. I shall return to this later in the heritage balance.

Character and appearance

67. The proposed development would fundamentally change the character of the site through the development of an existing open field in the countryside. However, it would be located on the edge of, and closely relate to, the village with existing houses on Kinton Road extending alongside the site's south-western boundary and allotments to the west, in between the site and further residential development.
68. As set out in the submitted DAS, the proposed development would comprise predominantly two storey dwellings. Occasional taller buildings are proposed to be located in nodal spaces and along the primary street, and buildings of up to 2.5 storey would be focussed within the development core, taking account of the open countryside beyond the site to the north and east and the character of Kinton Road. I have no substantive basis to consider that such an approach would be inappropriate in the context of the form of existing nearby built development.
69. The proposed open space on the northern and eastern edges of the site would provide a further buffer between the built development on the site and open countryside. The DAS also identifies an opportunity to include some single storey bungalows, not only to meet local identified need but also to address local character. Details of site levels associated with the proposed development could also be secured by condition, so as to inform any Reserved Matters proposals.
70. Furthermore, the submissions demonstrate that sufficient provision can be made for green space, including public open space, children's play areas and community garden. In terms of the positioning of play areas, whilst these are currently indicated on the Illustrative Framework Plan to be located on the periphery of the built area, I have no substantive basis to consider that the detailed scheme could not be designed to enable appropriate accessibility and safety for such areas.

71. As such, subject to further details at the Reserved Matters stage, I have no substantive basis to consider that the proposed development could not be designed to complement the existing village. Furthermore, it is agreed by the Council and Appellant that the Illustrative Framework Plan demonstrates that the proposed development can accommodate an average density of 37 dwellings per hectare without undue harm to the character of the area. I have no substantive basis to find differently.
72. The proposed vehicular accesses to the site would result in the removal of a significant length of hedgerow currently alongside Wellesbourne Road, also including four common ash trees recorded as being of low quality, so as to achieve the required visibility splays. Whilst the hedge is recorded as comprising common hawthorn of low quality, it is nevertheless a feature consistent with the hedge-lined character of that road generally in the vicinity. Nevertheless, it is proposed to be translocated where feasible and replanted as part of the proposed buffer planting intended to surround the eastern and northern boundaries of the site.
73. As such, the intended new planting, albeit set further from the road, would be likely to re-establish a degree of containment and ecological function. Furthermore, the BNG metric has taken account of the proposed hedgerow removal, together with intended new hedgerow planting on the site. Additionally, general accordance with mitigation measures recommended in the submitted Ecological Appraisal (EA), including hedgerow creation, and the submission of soft landscaping details concerning the proposed public open space could be secured by condition, for detailed consideration at the Reserved Matters stage.
74. The various street trees on the existing verge between Kineton Road and Willow Drive provide a pleasant softening effect to the streetscene along that stretch of the main approach towards the centre of the village from the south-east. As referred to previously, an arboricultural method statement included as part of a scheme for active travel infrastructure and off-site highway works, identifying measures to protect trees affected by those works, could be secured by condition.
75. Subject to detailed considerations of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale at the Reserved Matters stage and appropriate conditions, for the above reasons, the proposed development would be unlikely to cause a residual unacceptable level harm to the character and appearance of the area beyond the less than substantial harm I have found would be caused in relation to the setting of the LBs comprising 71 & 73 and 75 & 77 Kineton Road.

Living conditions of existing residents

76. The proposed development would be adjacent to the rear boundaries of existing dwellings fronting onto Kineton Road. The proposed development would inevitably change the outlook from the rear of those properties with the introduction of built development where there is currently an open field. However, I have no substantive basis to consider that the proposed development, based on the outline submissions, would result in a harmful effect on outlook in terms of any overbearing impacts, nor on the privacy or sunlight and daylight to those adjacent properties.
77. Furthermore, details of layout and scale are reserved for future consideration at which point such matters relating to living conditions could be considered in detail, including the precise location and height of proposed dwellings relative to surrounding properties, and associated site levels. Any condition to set a specific

height limit for any proposed buildings at this outline stage would therefore be unnecessary. Detailed consideration of any effects of potential land raising relating to the proposed drainage mitigation works could also occur at the Reserved Matters stage. Additionally, a condition could be imposed to secure the submission of a detailed levels strategy for determination at the Reserved Matters stage.

78. In terms of any matters of noise and vibration from construction on the site, such activities could be controlled through a Construction Management Plan (CMP). Furthermore, whilst I have no substantive evidence that construction traffic would significantly exacerbate any existing traffic noise and vibration experienced by existing local residents, the CMP would also include measures to control the means of access and routing of construction traffic as referred to previously.
79. I have also had regard to any potential harm from vehicle headlights shining into existing dwellings in the vicinity of the proposed mini-roundabouts. However, both of those road junctions are existing junctions with turning vehicles. It is therefore unlikely that the situation would be significantly different or more harmful than is currently the case.
80. The proposed development would be adjacent to existing allotments to the west of the site. However, the submissions indicate the intention for the proposed built development and nearest associated road to be set away from the allotments' boundary, separated by a proposed strip of open space along which a proposed pedestrian/cycle route would run, and any retained vegetation along that boundary. As such, I have no substantive basis to consider it likely that the proposals would cause unacceptable shading to the allotments through reduced levels of sunlight, including in the Autumn and Winter months. I also have no substantive basis, including for the above reasons, to consider it likely that the proposals would cause harm to the allotments in terms of additional noise and disturbance, vehicle pollution and a feeling of enclosure experienced by allotment holders. Notwithstanding that, the proposed development's relationship with its surroundings could be appropriately further considered at the Reserved Matters stage.

Foul drainage

81. Foul drainage from the proposed development would be pumped to the local sewerage system. Further modelling by Severn Trent Water (STW) would be required having regard to whether any reinforcement works of the existing system would be necessary. However, it is agreed by the Council and Appellant to be a standard requirement and that the connection to the existing system, with the proposed pumping solution, would enable the additional foul drainage generated by the proposed development to be released at times of lower demand on the system. I have no substantive basis to consider differently. Furthermore, STW has raised no capacity concerns, albeit I understand that they did not respond to the Council's consultation relating to the planning application concerned.

Ecology and biodiversity

82. The site primarily comprises a large arable field which from a biodiversity point of view is identified in the submitted EA as a habitat of negligible intrinsic importance and I have no substantive basis to find otherwise. Nevertheless, hedgerows and individual trees around the edge of the site are identified to have local level importance and are intended to be retained where practicable.

83. As referred to previously, the hedgerow running alongside the south-eastern site boundary is proposed to be removed to allow for adequate visibility splays at the proposed vehicular access points. Furthermore, the hedgerow running parallel to the northern site boundary would be removed to enable the creation of the proposed drainage basins, along with a short length of hedge to facilitate the pedestrian/cycle access to the south-west corner of the site. However, the submissions indicate that translocation of the south-eastern hedgerow, where feasible, and new hedgerow planting would more than compensate for that, which together with other proposed new habitat created, would contribute to an overall biodiversity net gain on the site. The indicative biodiversity net gain (BNG) calculations show that the required 10% net gain can be delivered on the site, including a net gain in hedgerows. I have no substantive basis to find otherwise.
84. Survey work reported in the EA indicates that great crested newts are absent from the site and that on-site habitats are unlikely to support protected or notable plant species. Furthermore, the EA generally indicates that protected, priority or other notable species, including breeding birds, bats, otter and water vole, badgers, hedgehogs, local brown hare, reptiles and other amphibian species would not be significantly impacted by the proposed development. However, that would be subject to conditions and further consideration of any effects in relation to the detailed reserved matters proposals and any further survey work needed to be undertaken.
85. Such conditions would include securing mitigation measures for retained habitats and protected and notable species contained in the submitted EA; the submission of a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) and a Habitat Management and Monitoring plan (HMMP); and protection of intended retained trees and hedges during construction. The planning obligations would also include provision for an appropriate BNG land monitoring contribution. Detailed consideration of external lighting effects on such species could also be undertaken at the reserved matter stage along with conditions to secure appropriate landscaping of the site.
86. The EA highlights that the Brook running adjacent to the northern boundary of the site is a designated Local Wildlife Site, confirmed also by the County Ecologist. Mitigation would therefore be required to avoid adverse effects on that feature, and I have no substantive basis to consider those conditions referred to above would not address this.
87. In respect of badgers, the proposed drainage features to the north of the site would result in the damage or destruction of sett tunnels and chambers and it is possible that disturbance from noise and vibrations would occur during construction, such that a Natural England mitigation licence would be required. The EA identifies that inherent mitigation would include the retention of vegetated boundary habitats, where feasible, and corridors of open space along all site boundaries in terms of providing dispersal and foraging opportunities within the site.
88. Were the appeal to be allowed, under the statutory framework for BNG, that would be on the basis that it is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met. This objective is for development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the on-site habitat.

89. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be unlikely to have an adverse effect on the site's ecology and biodiversity, and there would be the benefit of BNG.

Best and most versatile agricultural land (BMVAL)

90. I have taken account of the Framework which states in paragraph 187 that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by, amongst other things, recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services, including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.
91. It is common ground that the proposed development would result in the loss 15.5 hectares of BMVAL, and therefore a high proportion of the site. However, this is in the context of a high likelihood of the wider area of land around Wellesbourne being predominantly BMVAL such that a significant amount would be retained locally. As such, whilst there would be some harm from the loss of BMVAL, the extent of such harm would be limited in that wider context. I shall return to this in the planning balance.

Conditions and planning obligations

92. The Council has provided a schedule of suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. The Appellant has commented upon that schedule and, with the exception of condition 2, the two parties have reached agreement on its content following further discussion and some suggested amendments during the course of the Inquiry. I have considered the schedule in the light of advice in the National Planning Practice Guidance and made some amendments where necessary, including the removal of 'tailpiece' phrases where there may otherwise be a risk of significant changes being introduced. I have referred to the condition numbers, cross referenced to the attached annex, in brackets for clarity purposes.
93. The standard conditions (1 & 2) would be necessary to secure the submission of the reserved matters and to set the timescales for that and the commencement of development. The timescales set out in condition 2 are disputed by the Council and Appellant. I acknowledge the Council's position about ensuring delivery in as timely a manner as possible, particularly given the 5-year HLS situation and with the site being a reserve housing site. However, in terms of the date by which the reserved matters application(s) would be made, particularly allowing for the scale of the proposed development and likely level of details required for submission, I consider up to two years would be reasonable and appropriate in this case as opposed to 18 months, without causing significant additional delay.
94. Furthermore, in terms of the date by which commencement of development would be required, the parties do not dispute that two years from the final approval of the reserved matters would be appropriate in clause (ii) of condition 2, and I have no substantive basis to find differently. As such, even if the reserved matters were submitted within 18 months, that would allow a potential deadline for commencement of over three years in total from the date of permission, were the appeal to be allowed. It is therefore reasonable and appropriate to set the deadline in clause (i) of the condition to three years, also taking into account that the proposals are currently in Outline. For clarity I have also amended the remaining wording of clause (ii) to make it clear that this relates to the date of approval of the

last of the reserved matters to be approved, thereby also negating the need for clause (iii) in the submitted schedule.

95. For certainty, conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans (3) and in respect of the DAS and Illustrative Development Framework Plan, in general accordance with the principles set out in them (4); and stipulating the maximum number of dwellings (5), would also be necessary.
96. In the interests of the safety of prospective residents, a condition securing appropriate provisions on the site for fire fighting purposes would be necessary (6). Conditions would also be necessary to protect occupants, other users of the site and neighbouring land, construction workers, controlled waters and ecological systems from the risks of land contamination (7 & 8).
97. To protect the amenities of local residents and the local area generally, and in the interests of highway safety, a condition to secure adherence to a CMP would be necessary (9). Also in the interests of highway safety, conditions would be necessary to secure the submission of a finalised scheme for the proposed active travel infrastructure (ATI) and off-site highway works, and its subsequent implementation, also in the interests of the character and appearance of the area relating to the inclusion of measures to protect trees affected by the ATI works (27); and the implementation of the proposed vehicular accesses to the site, including visibility splays (28), and including cycle provision on both sides of the carriageway at the northern access, details of which would need to have been submitted for approval (29).
98. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area, conditions would be necessary to secure a scheme for the protection of all existing trees and/or hedges proposed to be retained (10), and also details of all service runs, having regard to the location of existing trees and hedgerows to be retained and those proposed to be planted (26); the submission of a Public Open Space (POS) Specification (19) and a Site Infrastructure (SI) Specification (21), both relating to the submission of Reserved Matters landscaping details, also in the interests of the amenities of prospective residents, and schemes for the on-going management and maintenance of all the POS and SI (20 & 22 respectively); and a detailed levels strategy as part of the reserved matters submissions, also in the interests of the living conditions of local residents (23).
99. In the interests of the ecology and biodiversity of the site, conditions would be necessary to ensure mitigation measures are carried out relating to retained habitats and protected and notable species (11); to secure adherence to a CEMP (12), and to a HMMP to ensure delivery of biodiversity net gain (13).
100. Having regard to the risk of flooding, conditions would be necessary to secure the submission and implementation of the detailed design for proposed flood mitigation works and associated implementation timetable and verification report (14 & 16); and a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site and associated implementation timetable, also in the interests of water quality and local habitat (15 & 16). It would also be necessary to secure adherence to a detailed, site specific drainage maintenance plan (17).
101. In interests of the archaeological integrity of the site, a condition would be necessary to secure the submission and implementation of an Archaeological

Mitigation Strategy informed by the results of the archaeological work previously undertaken across the site (18).

102. In the interests of environmental sustainability, a condition would be necessary to secure details at the reserved matters stage, and subsequent implementation, of mitigation measures identified in a completed Climate Change Checklist (24). To ensure the delivery of appropriate and essential infrastructure, a condition would also be necessary to secure connection to facilitate superfast Broadband connectivity for each dwelling (25).

103. Planning obligations are set out in the s106 Agreement, dated 13 May 2026, that would secure covenants relating to:

- A minimum of 35% affordable housing provision comprising 60% social rented, 20% affordable rent and 20% shared ownership. Furthermore, a minimum of 10% of the total number of affordable housing units would be provided in the form of two-bedroom 4 person bungalows. Such provision would be necessary to meet local needs and, notwithstanding detailed design, dwelling type and layout considerations at reserved matters stage, would accord with policies CS.18 and CS.19 of the core strategy and policy WW8 of the Neighbourhood Plan in so far as they relate to affordable housing.
- Appropriate financial contributions to mitigate the impact of the proposed development in respect of early years and pre-school, primary, secondary, and post 16 education, including for primary, secondary and post 16 SEN education; acute and clinical health provision; and libraries. Such contributions would be necessary to mitigate the likelihood of otherwise insufficient capacity/provision relating to those respective elements of local education, health and library provision. That concerning acute health provision would be required to address the additional impact until contracted activity volumes include the population increase. As such, those contributions would accord with policies CS.25A and CS.27 of the Core Strategy which together relate to provision of infrastructure, services and community facilities and appropriate developer contributions.
- Appropriate financial contribution to mitigate the additional use impact resulting from the proposed development on public rights of way within a 1.5 mile radius of the site, due to increased wear and tear, and to encourage active travel. This would accord with Core Strategy policies CS.9 B(4) and B(6), CS.26 and CS.27 which together, amongst other things relate to provision of acceptable local pedestrian routes and appropriate developer contributions relating to this.
- Appropriate financial contributions to mitigate the impact of the proposed development in respect of the provision for bus services and bus stop infrastructure. The latter would relate to cleaning and maintaining two bus shelters on Kinton Road near to the site, and marketing and fare promotion, in particular to ensure the provision of an acceptable bus service for prospective residents and to encourage the use of public transport over the private car. There would also be an appropriate financial contribution towards road safety initiatives due to additional residents that would be using the local roads. These contributions would accord with policies CS.26 B(4)

and CS.27 of the Core Strategy which relate to provision for contributions towards local public transport services and support for community transport initiatives.

- An appropriate financial contribution towards the Council's costs of monitoring compliance with the HMMP referred to previously under the conditions, to ensure delivery of biodiversity net gain.
- The provision of the proposed on-site POS and SI, including its management and maintenance. The POS would include parks/gardens and amenity space, unrestricted natural accessible green space, children and young people's equipped play facilities, allotments and community gardens. The SI would include footpaths, visitor parking spaces and bin stores if any, and any incidental open space, including woodland, landscape buffers and acoustic fencing, not forming part of the POS and not including Public Right of Way 119a. The detailed location and specifications for the POS and SI would be determined under reserved matters. This would accord with policies CS.25A&B and CS.27 of the Core Strategy which together relate to provision of infrastructure, services and community facilities, open space and recreation and appropriate developer contributions relating to this.
- The provision for appropriate District and County Council s106 compliance monitoring and administration fees.

104. The planning obligations concerned meet all of the tests set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 58 of the Framework, given that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Heritage and Overall Planning Balance

Benefits of the proposed development

105. The proposed development would provide a significant number of new dwellings to boost local supply, a factor that supports the Government's objective to do so, and in a location that would be acceptably accessible to facilities and services within the village. Furthermore, a significant number of affordable homes would be provided to meet the needs of the District. These would represent substantial benefits. That is particularly so given that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5-year HLS, and the significant extent of the shortfall, with the supply standing at 2.21 years' worth, a shortfall of 3,261 dwellings. I therefore afford substantial weight to the proposed delivery of the market and affordable housing.

106. The provision of increased ecological habitat on the site, with a minimum 10% BNG would also represent a significant benefit, to which I afford significant weight.

107. The proposed development would also have likely economic benefits arising from both the construction and occupation phases including, at the construction phase, associated jobs and any local expenditure albeit for a temporary period of time; and the likely additional local spending and support to local services and facilities resulting from the prospective new residents. I attach moderate weight to such benefits.

108. The proposed development would provide for public open space in excess of policy requirements. This would include increased publicly accessible and landscaped green space at this location on the edge of the village as well as provision for children's play areas. Whilst serving the proposed residents, such provision, including increased options for walking and cycling would also be a likely benefit to existing nearby local residents, such that I afford it moderate weight.
109. Similarly, whilst the proposed financial contribution relating to provision for bus services and bus stop infrastructure would be for the purposes of encouraging the prospective new residents of the proposed development to use public transport over the private car, such improvements would also be to the likely benefit of existing nearby residents, albeit that I afford it limited weight.
110. I have also had regard to the intended archaeological mitigation strategy referred to previously. This too would have benefit in terms of the recording and publication of results of the investigation work, in particular given the inclusion of an element of outreach and public engagement, albeit I afford this limited weight.

Heritage balance

111. I have found that the setting of Wellesbourne Farmhouse would be preserved as would the integrity of the CA and Staple Hill House. However, I have also found that the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the LBs comprising 71 & 73 and 75 & 77 Kineton Road through a failure to preserve their setting. That harm, though, would be at the lowest end of the scale.
112. As referred to previously, this is set in the context of the special attention that has to be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of the LBs and the great weight that should be given to the conservation of designated HAs; and that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of such assets, including from development within their settings, should require clear and convincing justification.
113. When taking account of my finding in relation to the level of less than substantial harm, whilst acknowledging the importance of any harm, the above public benefits would nevertheless outweigh that harm when applying paragraph 215 of the Framework. As such, the application of policies in the Framework that protect those assets do not provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed, having regard to paragraph 11d(i) of the Framework. In light of the Council's 5-year HLS position, it is therefore necessary to apply the planning balance set out in paragraph 11d(ii) of the Framework. I shall return to this below in the overall planning balance where consideration of benefits relates to those set out above, affording them the same respective weightings.

Overall Planning balance

114. In terms of the main issues, I have found that the proposed development would be unlikely to cause harm or pose a risk in terms of surface water drainage and flooding. However, I have found that the proposed development would not strictly accord with the development plan policies relating to spatial strategy. Nevertheless, I have noted that the majority of the site, including the proposed built development area, is identified as a Reserve Site for possible residential housing use, albeit beyond 2030. Furthermore, it remains the case that there is a clear need for housing in light of the shortfall in 5 year HLS.

115. In terms of other matters, I have found that the proposed development would result in the loss of non-designated heritage assets relating to archaeological features on the site. However, the scale of harm would be significantly reduced by the intended archaeological mitigation strategy. Although there would be less than substantial harm caused to the significance of the LBs comprising 71 & 73 and 75 & 77 Kineton Road through a failure to preserve their setting, that harm would be at the lowest end of the scale.

116. I have also found that there would be limited harm caused by the loss of BMVAL. In respect of all other matters, including in relation to highways, character and appearance, living conditions of existing residents, foul drainage, and ecology and biodiversity, I have found that the proposed development would be acceptable, subject to conditions and planning obligations.

117. In balancing the above levels of harm with the benefits referred to previously, the adverse impacts of granting permission would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

118. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

A Dawe

INSPECTOR

ANNEX A – CONDITIONS

1. Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any development commences and the development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.
2. Application(s) for the approval of the matters reserved by conditions of this permission shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than whichever is the latest of the following dates: -
 - (i) The expiration of three years from the date of this permission; or
 - (ii) The expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
3. Except for any detail(s) required to be submitted in accordance with the requirements of any conditions attached to this grant of permission, and notwithstanding such detail(s) as may be indicated on the submitted drawing(s), in all other respects the development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following submitted plans and drawings:
 - Site Location Plan (drawing no: 01329-1001 revision C)
 - Parameter Plan (drawing no: 01329-2001 revision G)
 - Proposed Site Access Junctions with Visibility Splays (drawing no: T24596.001 revision D).
4. The Development hereby permitted shall be delivered in general accordance with the principles set out in the Design and Access Statement dated December 2025 and Illustrative Development Framework Plan (Drawing Number 01329-3000 Revision D).
5. The number of residential dwellings (Class C3) hereby permitted shall not exceed 300 in number on the site.
6. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a scheme for the provision of adequate water supplies and fire hydrants necessary for fire fighting purposes at the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to occupation of any dwelling to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
7. Development shall not commence until clauses (a) and (b) have been complied with in respect of contamination:
 - a) A detailed site investigation shall be carried out and a Site Investigation Report submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Report shall detail all investigative works and sampling on site, together with results of analysis and risk assessment to any receptors.

- b) Where unacceptable risk is identified by the Site Investigation Report, a proposed Remediation Strategy (including a Quality Assurance Scheme) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be of such a nature as to render harmless the identified contamination given the proposed end-use of the site and surrounding environment including any controlled waters.
8. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, clauses (a), (b) and (c) shall be complied with in respect of remediation:
- a) All remediation work approved under the Remediation Strategy in Condition 7 above shall be completed as approved and be carried out under the Quality Assurance scheme to demonstrate compliance with the proposed methodology and best practice guidance. If during the works, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified, the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme and timescales shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - b) A Completion Report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Completion Report shall include details of the remediation works and Quality Assurance certificates to verify that the works have been carried out in full in accordance with the approved methodology. Details of any post-remedial sampling and analysis to show the site has reached the required clean-up criteria shall be included together with the necessary waste transfer documentation detailing the waste materials that have been removed from the site.
 - c) A certificate signed by the developer shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming that the appropriate works have been undertaken as detailed in the Completion Report.
9. No development shall take place, including any demolition works, until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The details within the approved CMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The CMP shall provide for:
- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - b) loading and unloading of plant and materials, including the times of such loading and unloading;
 - c) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development or stockpiling during development;
 - d) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - e) wheel washing facilities including the location of those facilities;
 - f) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - g) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;

- h) no demolition and/or construction works (including the deliveries) shall take place outside 08.00 hours to 18.00 hours Mondays to Fridays, 08.00 hours to 13.00 hours on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Public Holidays;
 - i) details of any piling and how any associated vibration will be monitored and controlled;
 - j) the location and noise levels of any site electricity generators or industrial equipment and hours of use of such equipment;
 - k) means of access and routing plan for construction traffic;
 - l) management of surface water run-off;
 - m) contact telephone number(s) and email address(es) of the site manager(s) which shall also be displayed on the site;
 - n) details of external lighting required during construction;
 - o) measures to prevent degradation of the public highway by construction vehicles;
 - p) no site security fencing may be erected on or within 1m of public footpath SB119a (unless closed by legal order);
 - q) details of temporary buildings, compounds, structures, caravans or enclosures which are required in connection with the development hereby permitted. No temporary buildings, compounds, structures, caravans or enclosures shall be placed, stationed or erected on the site or adjacent land until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any matters covered by this condition shall thereafter only be sited in accordance with these approved details.
10. No demolition, site clearance or building operations of any type shall commence or equipment, machinery or materials brought onto site until a scheme for the protection of all existing trees and/or hedges has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The tree/hedge protection measures within the scheme shall include and make reference to:
- a) the submission of a Tree Protection Plan and appropriate working methods - the Arboricultural Method Statement in accordance BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations;
 - b) details of the erection of stout protective fencing in accordance with British Standard BS5837:2012, Clause 6.2; and
 - c) fencing shall be shown on the Tree Protection Plan and installed to the extent of the tree Root Protection Area (RPA) as defined in BS5837:2012 and as agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme shall be kept in place on the site until all parts of the development have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site.

Furthermore, the following work shall not be carried out within the RPA of any retained tree or hedgerow, except with the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority:

- No materials, equipment, machinery or structure shall be attached to or supported by a retained tree or hedgerow, nor stored or stacked within said RPA;

- No mixing of cement or use of other contaminating materials or substances shall take place within a RPA, or in a location close to a RPA where seepage or displacement could cause them to enter an RPA;
 - No fires shall be lit within any RPA or in a position where the flames could extend to within 5 metres of the foliage, branches or trunk of any retained tree or hedgerow within or adjacent to the site as per the requirements of BS5837 :2012;
 - Levels shall not be raised or lowered in relation to the existing ground level within the RPA of any retained tree or hedgerow;
 - No roots shall be cut, trenches dug or soil removed within the RPA of any retained tree or hedgerow;
 - No buildings, roads or other engineering operations shall be constructed or carried out within the RPA of any retained tree or hedgerow; and
 - No vehicles shall be driven over the area within the RPA of any retained tree or hedgerow.
11. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in general accordance with the recommended mitigation measures for retained habitats and protected and notable species contained in Section 5 of the Ecological Appraisal prepared by EDP Ltd, dated November 2025.
12. Any application for reserved matters shall include a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEMP) that is to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP, which shall be informed by up-to-date survey work for protected species as appropriate, shall detail the mitigation and compensation measures for protected/notable species to be implemented during the demolition, site clearance and construction works, and any mitigation measures to ensure retained habitats are not adversely affected. The approved CEMP shall thereafter be implemented in full for the duration of the construction period.
13. Any application for reserved matters shall include a Habitat Management and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) that is to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The HMMP shall be for a minimum 30-year timeframe, and its content shall include the following:
- a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed;
 - b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management;
 - c) Aims and objectives of management;
 - d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives;
 - e) Prescriptions for management actions;
 - f) Preparation of a work schedule;
 - g) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan;
 - h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures;
 - i) Details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery;
 - j) Where results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the HMMP are not being met, the contingency and/or remedial actions that will be

implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The approved HMMP shall thereafter be implemented in full.

14. No development shall take place until the detailed design of the flood mitigation works and timetable for implementation, in general accordance with the indicative works set out within the approved Flood Risk Assessment (ref: RACE-RE-KRW-FRA08, revision 8, dated January 2026) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable therein. The scheme to be submitted shall:
 - a) Develop the conceptual measures (set out in Section 7 of the Hydraulic Model Report) into detailed engineering proposals (see "Informatives for the next stage of design" below);
 - b) Provide engineering plans, cross-sections and standard details of the mitigations;
 - c) Refine the post-development modelling to represent, in detail, the engineering proposals;
 - d) Undertake independent review of the Baseline and Post-Development Model to ensure its robustness.
15. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site and timetable for implementation, based on sustainable drainage principles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details and timetable therein. The scheme to be submitted shall:
 - a) Limit the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year (plus an allowance for climate change) critical rain storm to the QBar Greenfield runoff rate (with a 20% reduction/betterment) of 12.16l/s for the site in line with the approved surface water drainage strategy (ref: RACE-RE-KRW-FRA08).
 - b) Provide drawings / plans illustrating the proposed sustainable surface water drainage scheme. The strategy agreed to date may be treated as a minimum and further source control SuDS (such as permeable paving) shall be considered during the detailed design stages as part of a 'SuDS management train' approach to provide additional benefits and resilience within the design.
 - c) Provide detail drawings including cross sections, of proposed features such as permeable paving, attenuation features, and outfall structures. These shall be feature-specific demonstrating that the surface water drainage system(s) are designed in accordance with 'The SuDS Manual', CIRIA Report C753.
 - d) Provide detailed network level calculations demonstrating the performance of the proposed system. This shall include:

- i) Suitable representation of the proposed drainage scheme, details of design criteria used (including representation surcharged outfall conditions), and justification of such criteria where relevant;
 - ii) Simulation of the network for a range of durations and return periods including the 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change events;
 - iii) Results shall demonstrate the performance of the drainage scheme including attenuation storage, flows in line with agreed discharge rates, potential flood volumes and network status. Results shall be provided as a summary for each return period;
 - iv) Evidence shall be supported by a suitably labelled plan/schematic (including contributing areas) to allow suitable cross checking of calculations and the proposals.
 - e) Provide plans, such as external levels plans, supporting the exceedance and overland flow routeing provided to date. Such overland flow routeing shall:
 - i) Demonstrate how runoff will be directed through the development without exposing properties to flood risk.
 - ii) Consider property finished floor levels (FFLs) and thresholds in relation to exceedance flows. The LLFA recommend FFLs are set to a minimum of 150mm above surrounding ground levels.
 - iii) Recognise that exceedance can occur during any storm event due to a number of factors and therefore exceedance management shall not rely on calculations demonstrating no flooding.
16. Prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved, a Verification Report(s) for the installed flood mitigation measures (to be approved under Condition 14) and surface water drainage system (to be approved under Condition 15) shall be submitted in writing by a qualified independent drainage engineer and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include:
- a) Any As-Built Drawings and accompanying photographs;
 - b) Results of any performance testing undertaken as a part of the application process (if required / necessary);
 - c) Copies of any Statutory Approvals, such as Land Drainage Consent for Discharges etc;
 - d) Confirmation that the system is free from defects, damage and foreign objects.
17. No occupation and subsequent use of the development hereby approved shall take place until a detailed, site specific drainage maintenance plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved plan. The maintenance plan to be submitted shall:
- a) Provide the name of the party responsible, including contact name, address, email address and phone number;

- b) Include plans showing the locations of features requiring maintenance and how these should be accessed;
 - c) Provide details on how each relevant feature shall be maintained and managed for the lifetime of the development;
 - d) Be of a nature to allow an operator, who has no prior knowledge of the scheme, to conduct the required routine maintenance.
18. No development shall take place until an Archaeological Mitigation Strategy document (including a Written Scheme of Investigation for any archaeological fieldwork proposed) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall detail a strategy to mitigate the archaeological impact of the proposed development and shall be informed by the results of the archaeological work previously undertaken across the application site.

The development, and any archaeological fieldwork, post-excavation analysis, publication of results, archive deposition and public engagement detailed in the Mitigation Strategy document, shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved Mitigation Strategy document and the timetable set out therein.

19. Any Reserved Matters application(s) in relation to the approval of Landscape details pursuant to Condition 1 shall include a Public Open Space (POS) Specification. For the purposes of this condition and Condition 20, "Public Open Space" shall mean the area to be provided pursuant to this permission within the site for recreation and amenity space purposes, the exact location of which shall be determined as a result of a Reserved Matters application, which is to be permanently retained and maintained as open space to serve the development. The POS Specification shall include:

- a) a plan showing the exact location and dimensions of the elements of the POS and managed communal spaces;
- b) the design specification for the hard and soft landscaping elements of the POS and managed communal spaces:
 - i) planting plans;
 - ii) written specifications including cultivation and other operations associated with tree, plant and grass establishment;
 - iii) a schedule of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities;
 - iv) existing landscape features such as trees, hedges and ponds to be retained, accurately plotted (where appropriate);
 - v) existing landscape features such as trees, hedges and ponds to be removed, accurately plotted (where appropriate), and historic landscape features to be retained, removed or restored (where appropriate);
 - vi) existing and proposed finished ground levels (to include details of grading and contouring of earthworks and details showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing trees and hedges and surrounding landform with cross sectional details where appropriate);
 - vii) the means of accommodating change in level (e.g. steps, retaining walls, ramps where appropriate);

- viii) hard surfacing materials - details of manufacturer, type and design, colour and bonding pattern where appropriate. Samples may be required to be submitted and approved;
- ix) the position and design of all site enclosures and boundary treatment specifying the type, height, composition and appearance;
- x) car parking layout for the POS, if necessary;
- xi) other vehicular and pedestrian areas;
- xii) minor artefacts and structures (e.g. street furniture, play equipment, refuse areas, signage, lighting, cycle parking, lifebuoys and rings etc);
- xiii) the routeing and depth of all proposed services within a 10m distance of any POS and managed communal space.

The POS Specification shall be in compliance with the District Council's adopted Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy and particularly 'Policy 25: Healthy Communities' or supplementary planning guidance/policy that may be adopted to replace or complement the same or as otherwise updated with the written agreement of the District Council.

No new utilities, foul/surface water drainage or Sub-Stations shall be located in, on or under the Public Open Space unless shown on an approved plan forming part of the permission or as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority prior to installation.

The POS shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

20. No development shall take place until a scheme for the on-going Management and Maintenance of all the Public Open Space (POS) (as defined in Condition 19), subject to any transfer arrangements as set out in the S106 Agreement associated with this permission, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The POS Management and Maintenance Scheme shall set out:
- a) Maintenance schedules, details of the nature and frequency of maintenance for all elements within the POS, measures to repair or replace any equipment (including play equipment), facilities, paths or hardstandings that become damaged, and to replace any trees, hedges, shrubs, flowers or turf which may die or become diseased, long term design objectives and BS standard of maintenance and repair to be achieved.
 - b) Management responsibilities, where the Owner retains the ownership of the POS or where a Management Company is created and constituted to manage the POS, including:
 - i) Mechanism for recovery of maintenance costs from each of the future owners of the Dwellings, where appropriate under the terms of the S106 Agreement;
 - ii) Within the terms of the S106 Agreement, mechanisms that will be used by the Management Company to ring fence any funds received by the Management Company for use solely in relation to the management and maintenance of the POS on this site.

- iii) A timetable and phasing plan, as necessary, for the delivery of the POS within the terms of the S106 Agreement, with timings for commencement of works through to completion of the relevant POS and subsequent maintenance period. The maintenance period shall be not less than 12-months unless agreed otherwise in writing by the LPA and in any case until the responsibility for maintenance of the land is transferred in accordance with the transfer arrangements as set out in the S106 associated with this permission.

The POS shall thereafter be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

21. The Reserved Matters application in relation to the approval of Landscape details pursuant to Condition 1 shall include a Site Infrastructure (SI) Specification. For the purposes of this condition and Condition 22, "Site Infrastructure" shall mean all communally managed areas and features within the development site that do not form part of the Public Open Space (POS) (as defined in Condition 19) or the adopted highway, including but not limited to bin collection points, visitor parking spaces, incidental open space, planting around sustainable drainage features, internal footpaths, lighting, landscape buffers and any other areas or features managed communally, and for the avoidance of doubt does not include Public Right of Way 119a. The SI Specification shall include:

- a) a plan showing the exact location and dimensions of the elements of the SI and managed communal spaces;
- b) the design specification for the hard and soft landscaping elements of the SI:
 - i) planting plans;
 - ii) written specifications including cultivation and other operations associated with tree, plant and grass establishment;
 - iii) a schedule of plants noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities;
 - iv) existing landscape features such as trees, hedges and ponds to be retained, accurately plotted (where appropriate);
 - v) existing landscape features such as trees, hedges and ponds to be removed, accurately plotted (where appropriate), and historic landscape features to be retained, removed or restored (where appropriate);
 - vi) existing and proposed finished ground levels (to include details of grading and contouring of earthworks and details showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing trees and hedges and surrounding landform with cross sectional details where appropriate);
 - vii) the means of accommodating change in level (e.g. steps, retaining walls, ramps where appropriate);
 - viii) hard surfacing materials - details of manufacturer, type and design, colour and bonding pattern where appropriate. Samples may be required to be submitted and approved;
 - ix) the position and design of all site enclosures and boundary treatment specifying the type, height, composition and appearance;

- x) POS car parking layout if necessary;
- xi) other vehicular and pedestrian areas;
- xii) minor artefacts and structures (e.g. street furniture, play equipment, refuse areas, signage, lighting, cycle parking, lifebuoys and rings etc);
- xiii) the routeing and depth of all proposed services within a 10m distance of any POS and managed communal space.

The SI shall be in compliance with the District Council's adopted Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy and particularly 'Policy 25: Healthy Communities' or supplementary planning guidance/policy that may be adopted to replace or complement the same or as otherwise updated with the written agreement of the District Council.

The SI shall thereafter be retained in accordance with the approved details.

22. No development shall take place until a scheme for the on-going Management and Maintenance of all the Site Infrastructure (SI) (as defined in Condition 21) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The SI Management and Maintenance Scheme shall set out:

- a) maintenance schedules, details of the nature and frequency of maintenance for all elements within the SI, measures to repair or replace any equipment, facilities, paths or hardstandings that become damaged, and to replace any trees, hedges, shrubs, flowers or turf which may die or become diseased, long term design objectives and BS standard of maintenance and repair to be achieved.
- b) A timetable and phasing plan, as necessary, for the delivery of the SI within the terms of the S106 Agreement, with timings for commencement of works through to completion of the relevant SI and subsequent maintenance period. The maintenance period shall be not less than 12-months unless agreed otherwise in writing by the LPA and in any case until the responsibility for maintenance of the land is transferred in accordance with the transfer arrangements as set out in the S106 Agreement associated with this permission.

The SI shall thereafter be implemented, managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

23. Any application(s) for reserved matters shall include a detailed levels strategy which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall include the following:

- a) Existing site levels across the entire site, shown on a topographical survey with spot heights and contours at a maximum of 5m intervals, including cross-sections to illustrate the full slope gradient;
- b) Proposed site levels, clearly identifying:
 - i) any areas of cut and fill;
 - ii) formation of terraces or plateaus;
 - iii) proposed slopes or embankments (with gradients);

- iv) interface with existing landforms and vegetation;
 - v) the means of accommodating change in level (e.g. retaining walls, steps, railings, walls, gates or other supporting structures, ramps);
- c) The finished floor levels of all buildings, showing the vertical relationship between dwellings/buildings, access roads, garages, garden levels, and existing ground levels;
- d) The maximum ridge heights and overall building heights (including chimneys and parapets) of all proposed structures, measured from finished ground levels and related back to a fixed datum point;
- e) Details of retaining structures, boundary treatments (e.g. walls or fences), and any necessary balancing of cut and fill to minimize import/export of material and retention of the natural landform as far as reasonably practicable.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy.

24. The Climate Change Checklist for new build dwellings (the CCC) at Appendix 1 to Part V: Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation, July 2020, of the Stratford-on-Avon District Council Development Requirements Supplementary Planning Document, or such a checklist contained in any supplementary planning document that may be adopted to replace the same, shall be completed and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval as part of any reserved matters application(s) relating to layout and appearance. All mitigation measures indicated in the CCC shall be illustrated on the plans and/or in the documents submitted with that/those application(s) as appropriate. The approved mitigation measures relevant to each dwelling shall be implemented prior to first occupation of that dwelling.
25. No dwelling shall be occupied until it has been provided with a connection to facilitate superfast Broadband connectivity.
26. Before preparation of any groundworks and foundations for the development hereby permitted, full details of all service runs shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the location of all existing services above and below ground and the location of all proposed services (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc.) including routes, supports etc. Such details shall be included on a plan which also illustrates the accurate location of trees to be retained on the development site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
27. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a scheme for active travel infrastructure (ATI) and off-site highway works, including pedestrian crossing facilities, pedestrian footpath improvement, cycle-path improvements and the provision of two mini-roundabout junctions, as shown indicatively on plans T24596 004 rev D, T24596 005 rev D, T24596 007 and T24596 008 rev D shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme

shall include an arboricultural method statement identifying measures to protect trees affected by the ATI improvements and any mitigation measure contained therein shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details. The pedestrian crossing facilities and footpath improvements shall be delivered in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved. The provision of the two mini-roundabout junctions shall be delivered in accordance with the approved scheme prior to the occupation of 50% of the dwellings hereby approved.

28. No dwelling shall be occupied until the proposed accesses, including visibility splays, have been laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved drawing T24596 001 rev D and the approved details pursuant to condition 29. The visibility splays shown on drawing T24596 001 rev D shall be free of any obstruction exceeding 0.6 metres in height and shall be retained as such thereafter.
29. Notwithstanding the details shown on plan ref. T24596.001 Rev D (Proposed Site Access Junctions with Visibility Splays), no development shall commence until a scheme to secure cycle provision on both sides of the carriageway at the northern site access junction with Wellesbourne Road has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme for site access shall include details of a raised table cycle crossing point within the site to connect these two cycle routes and shall be submitted with an accompanying Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.

----- *End of Schedule* -----

ANNEX B - APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Sarah Reid KC (Constanze Bell on 28/5/26)	Instructed by Richborough
who called:	
Tom Armfield BA(Hons), MA, MRTPI	Director and Head of Planning Midlands, Turley
Fiona Lee-McQueen BA(Hons), MSc, MRTPI	Director, Turley
James Parker BSc(Hons), MSc(ENG), MILT, MCIHT	Founding Director, Hub Transport Planning Ltd
Iqbal Abdool Rassool MCIWEM, CWEM, CEng, BEng(Hons)	Divisional Director, BWB
Stuart Nelmes BSc(Hons), MRes, MCIWEM, CWEM, CEnv	Group Technical Director, Richborough
Will Thomas BA(Hons), LLB	Partner, Browne Jacobson

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Gary A Grant	Instructed by Aimee Shipley Solicitor with Stratford on Avon District Council
Stuart Flaherty BA(Hons), MSc, MRTPI	Senior Planner, Stratford on Avon District Council
Dave Pilcher FIHE, CMILT	Development Management Engineer, Warwickshire County Council (Highway Authority)
Chris Brammeier CEng, MICE	Senior Flood Risk Management Engineer, Warwickshire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)
David Jeffery BA(Hons), MPlan, MRTPI	Development Delivery Manager, Stratford on Avon District Council
Aimee Shipley	Solicitor, Stratford on Avon District Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Councillor Anne Prior	Wellesbourne and Walton Parish Council
-----------------------	---

Councillor David Johnston	Ward Member for Wellesbourne East and Rural Stratford District Council
Kenneth Manning	Local Resident
Colin Roberts	Local Resident
Cathy Knight	Local Resident
Kerri Lane	Local Resident
Tony Stephenson	Local Resident
Anthony Wykes	Vice Chairman, Wellesbourne & Walton Flood Action Group
Peter Hatcher	Local Resident
Gareth Roberts	Local Resident

ANNEX C - INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

1. Submissions on behalf of the Appellant.
2. Statement made by Anne Prior on behalf of Wellesbourne and Walton Parish Council.
3. Letter dated 27 April 2026 from Rt Hon Sir Jeremy Wright KC MP.
4. Opening statement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority.
5. Statement made by David Johnston, Ward Member for Wellesbourne East and Rural Stratford District Council.
6. Statement made by Kenneth Manning.
7. Statement made by Colin Roberts.
8. First statement made by Cathy Knight.
9. Second statement made by Cathy Knight.
10. Statement made by Kerri Lane.
11. Statement made by Tony Stephenson.
12. Statement made by Anthony Wykes on behalf of Wellesbourne & Walton Flood Action Group.
13. Statement by Matthew Day presented by Stuart Nelmes and Iqbal Rassool in Mr Day's absence.
14. Statement made by Gareth Roberts.