
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 7 December 2016

Site visit made on 8 December 2016

by Kenneth Stone BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H2835/W/15/3140655

land west of 123 High Street Irchester, Wellingborough, Northamptonshire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Barwood Strategic Land II LLP and Miss J Redden and Mr R E Redden against the decision of the Borough Council of Wellingborough.
 - The application Ref WP/15/00281/OUT, dated 6 May 2015, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2015.
 - The development proposed is the erection of up to 59 dwellings (including affordable homes), new vehicular and pedestrian access, open space and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural and background matters

2. The application sought outline planning permission with all matters except access reserved for future consideration. Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are therefore reserved matters. The application was supported by a red line plan (3040-02 rev B), an access plan (PBA 24351/001/015 Rev C) and a proposed parameters plan (3040-05 Rev A), and it was agreed at the hearing that these detail what consent is being sought for, and would be the basis of any approval should that be forth-coming. There were also two illustrative master plan sheets, numbers 1 and 2 (3040-03 and 3040-04 respectively). These were submitted for illustrative purposes only and I have treated them as such. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
 3. The application was originally determined at a time when the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016 (JCS) was emerging and there was significant dispute about whether the Council had a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. The JCS was adopted in July 2016 and now forms part of the development plan for the area along with saved policies of the adopted Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan 1999 (altered in 2004) (Local Plan). The appellant accepts that the Council can now provide a five year supply of housing and this is now not a point of dispute at this appeal.
 4. The application as originally considered was refused for three reasons those related to whether the proposal represented a sustainable pattern of development; the effect on the setting of the nearby Grade I listed St Katherine's Church; and harm to the character and appearance of the area and
-

the setting of Irchester village resultant from the size and extent of the area of countryside that would be developed.

5. At the start of the Hearing the Council drew attention to a recent appeal decision¹ at a site in Station Road, Irchester wherein the Inspector, whilst dismissing the appeal, addressed the question of the contribution of development outside the village policy line in Irchester would make to a sustainable pattern of development. In effect the Council's first reason for refusal. In that appeal the Inspector concluded that the proposal was consistent with the spatial strategy of the JCS primarily due to the scale of development being consistent with the allocation of 150 dwellings in the JCS for Irchester. The inspector also commented on the relevance of policy G4 of the Local Plan which defined the Village Policy Lines and was relevant insofar as it differentiated the open countryside from the villages and that development management criteria applicable to the open countryside were then set out in Policy G6. As policy G6 has been superseded by the JCS he concluded that Policy G4 had no relevance to that appeal. The Council conceded these points and did not want to take a different view at this appeal and confirmed that it did not wish to pursue those matters in this appeal and therefore withdrew the first reason for refusal.
6. The Council's second reason for refusal identified specifically the harm that would arise to the setting of the Grade I listed church of St Katherine. The Council's evidence however identified a number of other heritage assets in the locality that may also be affected and the appellant questioned whether this was outside the scope of the reason for refusal. The Council explained that its concern related to the context and place these assets had in terms of the setting of St Katherine's and not in terms of raising concerns related to the impact on those assets as such. My main issue on this matter is therefore framed in terms of the setting of St Katherine's church.
7. A Planning Obligation Agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, dated 7 December 2016, was submitted at the end of the hearing. The agreement secures financial contributions towards secondary education, primary education, improvements to a public right of way, and public transport, for the purposes of providing or extending bus services during the development. The agreement also secures the implementation of a Travel Plan, the provision of bus passes, improvement works to the permissive footpath in the vicinity of the site, affordable housing and the provision of open space. I address these matters further below.
8. I visited the site prior to the hearing and carried out an unaccompanied site visit on the following day after the hearing closed. The parties had been informed of my intention to do so and identified a number of locations from where I should view the site² I viewed the appeal site from all of the identified locations. The site was readily visible from public locations and footpaths in the surrounding area.

Main Issues

9. Given the above the main issues in this appeal are; firstly, the effect of the proposals on the setting of the Grade I listed St Katherine's church; and

¹ APP/H2835/W/15/3136236

² Document 12

secondly, the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the countryside, including the setting of Irchester village.

Reasons

Setting of St Katherine's Church

10. The Church of St Katherine dates to the late 12 century with 13 century and 14 century elements. The building is identified as a grade I listed building in the statutory list and therefore is amongst the most significant historical buildings in the country.
11. Sec 66 of the Planning (listed building and conservation areas) act requires decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) Advises that local authorities should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and should conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. It further advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
12. The Framework notes that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. The significance of a heritage asset, for heritage policy, is defined in the glossary to the Framework as the value of the asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence but also from its setting.
13. The Framework also helpfully defines, at the glossary, what is meant by setting and this is stated as being the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed. It is also highlighted that elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.
14. Those elements that contribute to the significance of the Church are not in dispute; its architectural quality, historical and cultural connections and the relationship to its setting all contribute to the significance of this building. The church has a tall visible and impressive spire; tall church spires are a feature of the wider landscape of the Nene valley and North Northamptonshire and are specifically protected in Policy 2 of the JCS. The location at the edge of the village and high in the landscape towards the edge of the village are part of the symbolism of the power of the church at that time.
15. There is no dispute between the parties that the appeal site lies within the setting of the Church, although there is significant disagreement about the impact the development would have on the appreciation of the heritage asset within the setting. There is also no disagreement that the proposed development would not affect the fabric of the listed building.
16. In views from immediately to the south of the Church, from the High Street and to the side and front of the church there would be no direct line of site with the appeal site and there would be little opportunity for views of roof tops. There would be no significant change to the appreciation of the asset from that perspective. From the old church yard there would only be very limited and glimpsed views of the roof tops of the development across the more modern

- intervening development that currently exists and any intrusion would be very limited. Similarly in longer distance views from the south south-west and south-east the development site would sit beyond the church and would not be directly visible in any views.
17. Where the views would be most affected would be from the West, North and East. In these views the relationship of the historic setting of the church and its relationship with the edge of the village and wider countryside beyond become more apparent either in terms of foreground, backdrop or in views of the context of the church.
 18. To the west and north-west is the Irchester Country Park through which public footpaths, including the nationally significant Nene Way run. There is also a public footpath running across the edge of the village where good views of the church and its relationship with the wider countryside can be appreciated. In these views there are limited opportunities to view the proposed development and the church together, but they do occur particularly from the Country Park viewing towards the church where the spire is readily evident and the expanded village would be a significant feature in part of that view. Also in walking along the edge of the village along the footpath with the church to your right as you start to see the end of the village and appreciate the proximity of the church to the village edge the edge of the proposed development would come into view and there would be an increase in the extent of built development between the church and the countryside, thereby reducing the connection between the church and surrounding countryside. The experience is dynamic as well as static and therefore the observer would fully appreciate the increased separation between the church and countryside whilst traversing this route.
 19. This separation between the church and its agricultural/ countryside relationship is more evident when approaching from the north and the long sweeping bend down from the crest of the hill beyond which lies the A45. This is a significant entrance to the village and, as appreciated by previous Inspectors, is probably one of the most attractive important and valuable views of Irchester. It is from here that one can fully appreciate the dominance of the Church Spire on the village and valley below, the location of the old village and the agricultural surroundings of the original linear form of the village. The addition of a modern housing estate of significant size and scale would be fully visible from this elevated position. It would be an evident incursion and extension of the village form. This would further embed the church within the built development of the village and further separate and divorce it from its relationship with the surrounding countryside.
 20. This view would be further emphasised as one came down towards the village along Chester Road, along which, at this point, runs the Nene Way. The impact of the development in the foreground would increase and the proposed development would dominate. Whilst there is some modern development between the village edge and the church and there is a firm village boundary this does not make a positive contribution to the existing setting of the church and to suggest that moving it further out would add no harm is misconceived. This already results in a negative, or at best neutral, effect on the setting of the church and to expand and further add to embedding the church within the village would further separate it from those aspects of the setting which add to its significance.

21. When viewed from the east, in longer distances, the impact would not be so discernible, but from closer locations the expansion of the village would be visible and the relationship between the arable fields and setting of the village at this northern end of the village would be further compromised which would dilute the importance that this has in relation to its contribution to the setting of the church.
22. Whilst I agree and accept that there would be no harm to the fabric of the listed buildings and that there would be limited change to the setting of the immediate surroundings of the Church I am concerned that there would be harm to the wider setting of the church and which contributes to the significance of the listed building. In this regard this is a Grade I listed building and any harm should require clear and convincing justification. Given that this is amongst the most important heritage assets in the country, as a grade I listed building, the weight to be given to that harm is significant. The finding of harm would result in conflict with policy 2 of the JCS. In terms of the Framework this harm is less than substantial and it needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I shall return to this in my conclusions.

Character and appearance

23. The appeal site is located in the open countryside adjacent to the northern boundary of the village of Irchester. It comprises part of a large open arable field with no readily identifiable field boundary hedges or subdivision. To the east it is bounded by Chester Road and along which there is a line of Cherry trees. To the south the site boundary is formed by an existing permissive right of way path that runs along the side boundaries of the properties at the edge of Irchester, including number 123 High Street. The Northern and Western boundaries are unrelated to any landscape or physical feature on the site.
24. There are a network of public footpaths in the area which include the nationally significant Nene Way, that runs along Chester Road and therefore along the eastern boundary of the site. The permissive right of way is an informal footpath that links Chester Road with footpaths TL6 and TL7 which run to the west of the village and on to Irchester Country Park, to the north, and back into the village to the south.
25. Policy 3 of the JCS advises development should be located and designed in a way that is sensitive to its landscape setting, retaining and where possible enhancing the distinctive qualities of the landscape character area which it would affect. The policy then identifies a number of criteria development should meet including conserving and enhancing local character and qualities, safeguard important views, protecting the landscape setting of settlements and providing appropriate mitigation. The Framework, at paragraph 17, advises that the planning system should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and at paragraph 109 that it should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.
26. The Council accept the Landscape Character baseline assessment as set out in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal submitted with the original application. In this regard there is no dispute in terms of the fact the site lies in the Northamptonshire Vales National Character Area, the key characteristics of which include distinctive river valleys including the Nene with flat flood plains

- and gravel terraces, frequent small towns and large villages with attractive stone buildings in older village centres and frequent imposing spired churches.
27. Within this National Character Area, The Northamptonshire 'Environmental Character Assessment and key Issues' provides a county level assessment and subdivides the county into 15 Character Areas. Further the Northamptonshire Current Landscape Character Assessment provides a more detailed assessment of landscape character and divides the area up into smaller landscape Character Types and then Landscape Character areas. The parties agree the site falls within the Limestone Valley Character Type (12) and more specifically Wollaston and Irchester Landscape Character Area (12a).
 28. The Key Characteristics of LCA12a are identified as including a gently undulating landform with land gently sloping from higher land in the south towards the flood plain of the River Nene to the north, both mixed and coniferous woodlands being present at Irchester Country Park, church spires being prominent features and the area which is well settled with a number of villages of varying morphology, villages often displaying a close relationship with landform in their morphology and orientation.
 29. I am of the view that the appeal site and its surroundings are representative of these characteristics. The site is located on the gently sloping valley side adjacent to a village, the early morphology of which is relatively identifiable along the main road, now the High Street, and which runs along the slopes of the valley displaying the close relationship with landform that is described in the characteristics. The Church spire of St Katherine's is an important and key feature in the landscape and readily visible from much of the surrounding area. These views are particularly prominent when travelling towards the village along the Nene Way, Chester Road, and from the Country Park approaching the village along TL6.
 30. There was some debate between the parties as to whether the site should be considered as a 'valued landscape' in the context of paragraph 109 of the Framework. The appellant was of the view that the site formed part of a larger field the landscape quality and value of which was degraded by the arable farming and removal of field boundaries and subdivision and lack of any ecological interest. In the appellant's view there were few, if any, distinct or demonstrable physical attributes that the site possessed that would elevate it above that of ordinary countryside. The appellant also noted that at no time had the Council sought to designate the site in any open space designation and that in the context of the background documents for the emerging part 2 plan no such designation was identified for this site. It was also suggested that even the Neighbourhood Plan, which should not be given anything but limited weight due to its early stage, did not seek to do so in its emerging form. On that basis they concluded that the site did not warrant being protected as a 'valued landscape'.
 31. The Council on the other hand were of the view that the site along with the surrounding field played an important contribution in the landscape setting on the approaches to the village. The wide open vistas set against the distinct village edge acted as an important and distinctive feature. The Spire of St Katherine's church was a landmark in the landscape and was readily visible across and within the landscape; the open nature displayed the gently sloping valley sides and the morphology of the early settlement of the High Street.

The Council do not accept that the site is degraded and consider it is of a high quality in visual terms. The site also has the Nene Way running along its eastern boundary, a permissive path along its southern boundary and is readily visible from public footpaths to the west and north, TL6 and TL7. The site was a well-used recreational resource and the combination of these factors contributed in the landscape being a 'valued landscape'.

32. Both parties referred to the comments of Justice Ousley in the High Court decision on *Stroud District Council v SoSCLG - CO/4082/2014*, in relation to this matter and there was a discussion around the assistance that box 5.1 in the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessments - 3rd edition* could provide. In my view the site as part of the wider field and hence wider landscape does contain elements of the key characteristics of the Landscape Character Area 12a. The approaches to the village are seen across a wide open landscape with a gently slope and on the inside of a gently sweeping bend. The village edge is well defined at this point and coincides with the inner side of the apex of the curve as the road enters the village. Development beyond that point would appear intrusive and a projection from the village into the countryside. Given the size, scale and extent of the site this would appear as a conspicuous incongruous and in my view harmful development in the setting of the village. The loss of open countryside to be replaced by built development would result in significant change it would remove the evidence of the gentle slope, the morphology of the settlement, particularly the High Street and would dominate the location.
33. I am of the view that those elements that would be lost are important contributors to what would underlay the value of the landscape in this area which in my view should be treated as a 'valued landscape' for the reasons given by the Council. The public footpaths, wide visibility of the site, the general characteristics of the landscape character area, the contribution to the setting of the entrance to the village, the landmark spire of St Katherine's are all physical attributes which combine with the value placed on the site by the local residents, as identified in their representations, and the well-used public access through the area, to justify the landscape being considered as a 'valued landscape'.
34. Given that I have concluded it is a 'valued landscape' the Framework advises that it should be protected. The loss of the site to substantial built development would not protect it and given the quantum and intensity of development proposed this could not be adequately mitigated by landscaping. Moreover, the development does not, therefore, recognise the intrinsic beauty of the countryside.
35. The construction of housing on this site would introduce significant development in the foreground on the approaches to Irchester village. I have already concluded that this would result in material harm to the setting of the listed building of St Katherine's church in its own right. But Historic buildings contribute to the landscape and the adverse effect on the setting of the listed building is also a negative impact on the visual amenities of the landscape and the views across the open fields to Irchester from the north and into which the proposed development would intrude.
36. Overall I conclude that the proposed development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of

Irchester village, and which is a 'valued landscape'. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy 3 of the JCS and the Framework, particularly paragraphs 17 and 109.

Other matters

37. A significant part of the appellant's case related to the planning history of the appeal site and in particular to the comments of the Inspector in terms of appeal APP/H2835/A/14/2215925. In that decision the Inspector identified a central area where the impact would be greatest and that led to his refusal of permission, amongst other matters. The appellant suggested that the appeal site fell outside that area and in fact was an area where the Inspector suggested may be appropriate for development. The appellant contends that their scheme has been designed around, and to take account of, those comments.
38. I have carefully read that decision and the Inspector concluded that the harm to the landscape and the setting of St Katherine's church outweighed the benefits of the scheme even in a position that he had concluded there was not a five year housing land supply. Firstly I have assessed the scheme in front of me as I am required to do. Secondly matters have moved on there are significant changes to the development plan with the adoption of the JCS and the Council can demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The context within which my decision is taken is therefore different.
39. In terms of that decision the Inspector, at paragraph 71, stated that *'In any event, the edge of the development along Chester Road would be closer to the village than the previous scheme but development could extend much further up the hillside. Like the previous Inspector³, I consider that if this part of the site were to be built upon the development would dominate the village's setting. In fact even more than the previous scheme and again "stand out as a conspicuous and incongruous incursion into the countryside'*. This is the section of the site that is now the subject of this appeal.
40. At paragraph 72, in my view, he then sets out the context within which he makes comments about the potential parameters of an acceptable scheme. Here he refers to the fact he need only be satisfied that the development could be accommodated somewhere on the site and without adversely affecting the character and appearance of the countryside to an extent that when weighed in the balance against all of the other positive and negative attributes of the scheme did not tip the scales against the proposal.
41. It is in this context that he then identifies the central section of the site as that to the west of the south-west boundary of 123 High Street or North of the hedge row that crosses the central part of the site. Paragraph 81 suggests that the development area adjacent to Chester Road, with minor adjustments to its western boundary could accommodate a higher density of development than shown. If careful attention was given to landscaping along its northern boundary in order to replicate the existing green edge to the village at this point then development could take place without adversely affecting the appearance of the village and countryside or setting of the listed building.

³ APP/H2835/A/12/2182431 – In which the Inspector refused permission for a development, including the land of this site, on the grounds of harm to the landscape (albeit this was not raised as a reason for refusal by the Council).

42. The application before me is in outline and therefore landscaping is a reserved matter, there is however a parameters plan to provide some guidance and assistance. The red line of the application site is beyond the western point of the south western boundary of 123 High Street and therefore not contained within the area identified by the Inspector. It is also not clear whether this should be a line taken directly north or whether it should follow the orientation of the boundary line. This would affect the extent of the development area that the Inspector was referring to. The Inspector suggested a higher density may be appropriate but did not indicate what that may be. However, I cannot judge what was in that Inspector's mind at that time. In terms of the scheme before me I am of the view it is, in terms of the illustrative layout in that previous scheme, of a significantly greater density. It would result in a tight urban grain at the edge of a village where density was somewhat reduced and would therefore appear out of keeping.
43. The proposed scheme is in my view on a greater area than was identified by that inspector, the slight adjustment to the western boundary is in no way suggested should be to increase the extent of the site and there would need to be significant landscaping along the northern edge. To protect views and replicate the village edge this would need to be similarly adopted along the along the western boundary, this would further reduce the developable extent of the site. In my view the harm I have identified above is not addressed by the comments of the previous Inspector and whilst I have had regard to these I am satisfied that the circumstances in terms of context, the development plan, the five year housing land supply and the balancing exercise within which his comments were made, are all significantly different to the context within which I am considering this appeal. The proposals the subject of the appeals are also significantly different in terms of quantum, size and extent.
44. The appellant and Council have entered into a section 106 agreement that secures various financial contributions and other matters to ensure the development is served by sustainable transport, or transport and connections are improved, amongst other matters. Most of these are required to address the additional pressure on those services and resources as may arise from the development and as such are not significant benefits. There is no dispute between the parties that they meet the tests in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122 and the Framework Paragraph 204 tests and I see no reason to question that and I am satisfied that they are necessary and related to the scale of development.
45. The proposal would make provision for some 59 dwellings and through the section 106 agreement secure the provision of 40% of the units for affordable housing. These are significant benefits of the scheme. The provision of affordable housing in an area of significant need especially so. The Council can however demonstrate a five year housing land supply and I weigh the provision of housing in this context.
46. At the hearing it was drawn to my attention that the Council had recently adopted a protocol to secure contributions to a scheme for measures to mitigate the impact of development on the Special Protection Area of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits to address any cumulative effects of development on the SPA. I was informed the Scheme secures contributions from developers under separate legislation and was not required to be secured through the

section 106 agreement. The appellant did not challenge that position. Given that I am dismissing the appeal I have not addressed this matter further.

Overall conclusions

47. I have concluded above that the proposed development would result in harm to the setting of the Grade I listed St Katherine's church, and that the harm would be less than substantial, in the context of the Framework. The proposals would result in minor improvements to biodiversity, would make provision for additional homes and provide affordable homes. The development of the site would also have short term economic benefits during construction and from additional residents once occupied. Whilst the harm I have identified is less than substantial, this is a grade I listed building and I give the harm significant weight and importance. I am not convinced that the public benefits attributable to the scheme outweigh the harm to this important heritage asset.
48. I have concluded that the proposal would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area; I have further concluded that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to St Katherine's church, and that this would not be outweighed by public benefits. The scheme would therefore conflict with policies 2 and 3 of the JCS and the Framework in regards to the protection of valued landscape, recognising the intrinsic beauty of the countryside and the protection of heritage assets. The scheme does not therefore fulfil the environmental or social roles required to make the scheme sustainable development and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.
49. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr S Choongh	Of Counsel instructed by Ms L Marjorary
Ms L Marjorary	BWS Law
Mr T Coleby BA(Hons) MRTPI	Peter Brett Associates
Mr A Crutchley BA(Hons) PG DIP (Oxon), MCIFA	Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd
Mr D Lewis CMLI, BA, Pg Dip	Environmental Dimension Partnership Ltd

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr K Garvey	Of Counsel instructed by Ms M Simmons
Ms M Simmons BSc (Hons) MRTPI	Principal Planning and Building Control Manager, Borough of Wellingborough
Ms E MEE IHBC (affiliate member)	Elizabeth MEE Heritage Consultant
Ms J Ede BA (Hons) PG Dip LD CMLI	Landscape Partnership Ltd

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Simon Davies	Local resident and spokesperson for Save Irchester Village
Councillor John-Paul Carr	Local Ward Councillor and Chairman of the Irchester Neighbourhood Plan Group

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

- 1 Appeal decision APP/H2835/W/16/3144277 for land adjacent to 199 Northampton Road, Wellingborough submitted by the Council.
- 2 Email exchange confirming views of Historic England, submitted by the Council.
- 3 A3 booklet of plans and figures in written statement of Ms Ede, submitted by Council.
- 4 Details of the recently adopted Mitigation Strategy of the Council in relation to the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area, submitted by the Council.
- 5 Two High Court decisions submitted by the appellants:
 - a) East Staffordshire Borough Council and SoS for

Communities and Local Government vs Barwood Strategic Land II LLP [2016] EWHC 2973(Admin).

b) Trustees of the barker Mill Estates v Test valley Borough Council, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2016] EWHC 3028 (Admin)

- 6 Note from Mr T Coleby on affordable housing need in the Borough, submitted by the Appellants.
- 7 Open Space Designations The Plan for the Borough of Welling Borough: Background Paper, a background paper to the emerging Part 2 Local Plan related to the designation of Green Space, submitted by the Appellants.
- 8 A3 Copies of 8 presentation boards prepared by Mr D Lewis, submitted by the Appellants.
- 9 Copy of the consultation Draft of the Irchester, Knuston and Little Irchester Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031, Submitted by Cllr Carr.
- 10 Irchester, Knuston & Little Irchester Neighbourhood Plan Group – Historic Landscape Assessment March 2016 by MOLA, Submitted by Cllr Carr.
- 11 Copy of letter from Peter Brett Associates to the Irchester Plan Group providing comments on the draft Neighbourhood Plan, submitted by Appellants.
- 12 Planning Obligation Agreement dated 7 December 2016, submitted by Appellants.
- 13 Map with locations of viewpoints for Inspector site visit.