



Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 28 May 2008

Site visit made on 5 June 2008

by **C J Ball** RIBA IHBC FRSA

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
12 August 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/A/07/2054481

Land at Eastington Park Farm, Eastington, Stonehouse GL10 3RY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Sport Partnership Ltd against Stroud District Council.
- The application, Ref S.07/1256/FUL, is dated 30 May 2007.
- The development proposed is the relocation of Stroud RFC, FC and Squash Club and the provision of new sporting facilities.
- The inquiry sat for 4 days on 28-30 May and 5 June 2008.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal and refuse planning permission for the relocation of Stroud RFC and Squash Club and the provision of new sporting facilities.

Preliminary matters

2. I note that during the course of the appeal, the appellant company changed its name to Sportoptima Ltd. This does not affect the appeal process.
3. Although this is an appeal against the non-determination of the application, the Council subsequently resolved that, had it been in a position to do so, it would have refused the application because:

(1) The site is located outside any defined settlement and is not well related to areas of population, and has poor pedestrian and public transport links for potential users. The development would thus be heavily reliant upon the motor vehicle and increase the length and number of motorised journeys, contrary to the accessibility aims of central and local government planning policies and guidance. This would be contrary to Policies TR1 and RL1 of the adopted Stroud Local Plan, November 2005.

(2) The entire application site lies within the designated Stroud Industrial Heritage Conservation Area. The development would lead to the loss of an important open space which contributes to the character and historic value of the Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE5 of the adopted Stroud Local Plan, November 2005.

(3) The proposed development would harm the setting of the listed building, Eastington Park, undermining the relationship between the building and its grounds. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE12 of the adopted Stroud Local Plan, November 2005.

I shall take this resolution into account.

4. Before the inquiry, on 26 April, Stroud FC indicated that it had withdrawn from the proposal and no longer gave support to the development.

5. Before the inquiry, on 30 April, the appellant put forward an amended layout plan (Drawing PL01F) with a request that it be considered at the inquiry in place of the application plan. Changes include the removal of an indoor arena, relocation of the access road, a reduction in parking provision and the introduction of a pedestrian/cycle path. The changes are within the site and reduce the scale of development. The appellant sent details to all those involved or notified during the application process. Because of the reduction in development proposed and the prior notification, I concluded that the substitution of the amended scheme would be unlikely to be prejudicial to the interests of any other party. I therefore agreed that the amended scheme should be considered at the inquiry. Some local residents felt that they had not been able to respond properly to the amended scheme. However, they were able to speak at the inquiry and their comments have been taken into account.

Agreed matters

6. Before the inquiry, the parties submitted a statement of common ground. This sets out the Council's intended reasons for refusal; lists the application drawings; describes the site and the surrounding area; summarises the proposals; indicates relevant national and local policy guidance; explains the matters not in dispute, including a description of the existing club facilities, the site selection process, the nature of the conservation area and the listed building, and relevant key priorities; and a list of agreed conditions.
7. A separate highways statement of common ground describes the local highway, footway and cycle networks; gives details of local bus services; confirms the highway safety record of the area; describes the proposed facilities and the forecast traffic attraction; and outlines agreed highway related planning obligations intended to fund public transport improvements and to ensure the provision of a Travel Plan.

Planning obligation

8. At the inquiry the appellant submitted a unilateral undertaking as a deed of planning obligation under s106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The final signed version, amended in response to comments made at the inquiry by the County Council, was submitted by agreement after the close of the inquiry. If the appeal succeeds, this effectively commits the owners of the site, when work commences, to paying £25,012 towards the relocation of the southbound bus stop on Spring Hill and improvements to the northbound bus stop, and £25,000 to support existing bus services serving the site for 5 years. The Council confirms that the undertaking overcomes highways objections in those respects. The undertaking also commits the owner to implementing a Travel Plan for a minimum of 5 years, to making one of the pitches available to local schools and to transferring a strip of land adjacent to the Stroudwater Canal to the Cotswold Canals Trust. I shall take this undertaking into account.

Main issues

9. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be:
 1. the sustainability of the development in terms of its location and accessibility; and
 2. the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the Stroud Industrial Heritage Conservation Area and on the character and setting of Eastington Park as a building of special architectural and historic interest.

Reasons

10. There is no real dispute between the parties that the club's current facilities at Fromehall Park are inadequate; there is one rugby pitch and a small training area, the junior and mini teams play elsewhere and the clubhouse is old and run down. There is no space to expand. The substandard facilities have led to poor revenues and

difficulties in attracting and keeping players. There is a clear need for the club to relocate in order to provide higher grade facilities to ensure its financial viability and to secure its future. The Council supports relocation in principle. As a minimum, the club needs 3 rugby pitches and a new clubhouse, although this proposal also includes 2 mini rugby pitches and 2 football pitches. The football pitches were part of the original joint scheme with Stroud FC but are now intended to be available for hire. It would clearly be of considerable benefit to the club to have all its pitches together on 1 site, served by a modern clubhouse. While the club intends to promote the use of the clubhouse for other non-rugby uses, such as conferences and weddings, this would clearly be secondary to its main purpose and is a relatively normal sports club aspiration for increasing income through making the best use of available facilities. I do not consider, as the Council suggests, that this amounts to a mixed use sports, recreation and leisure facility requiring a location in or adjacent to the town centre.

The sustainability of the development in terms of its location and accessibility

11. Because of the nature of the local topography, it is difficult to find suitable land for playing pitches within the Stroud and Stonehouse urban area. The Council's 2004 survey of outdoor playing space identified a current shortfall of 17.77 ha. While the Stroud District Local Plan 2005 is generally supportive of the provision of new playing pitches, it does not allocate any sites within or around the Stroud urban area and the Council has no strategy for meeting the shortfall. Furthermore, it became clear at the inquiry that the Council can identify no suitable site for the relocation of the rugby club. Since there is a clear absence of suitable land within the settlement boundaries of the Stroud and Stonehouse urban area, in accordance with paragraph 25 of PPG17 it is appropriate to consider the location of sports facilities in the countryside around towns, the urban fringe areas.
12. The appellant carried out the search for a site in a number of potential locations in a sequential approach; first, sites within the existing settlement; second, sites adjacent to the urban area, well served by public transport; and third, sites beyond the urban area but in accessible locations. No sites are available in the first category. Of 4 sites in the second category (A, B, C & D), 1 is unavailable and another, a former refuse tip, is accepted as contaminated to the extent that remediation work would not be viable for the club. 2 other sites were rejected out of hand because they are in the flood plain. In the third category, 1 site (F) is unavailable, another (E) was rejected because it is in the flood plain, and site G was rejected because it is prominent in the landscape and has poor accessibility. Site H at Eastington Park, almost 11 ha of relatively flat land, was therefore selected.
13. While I recognise the club's apprehension about the use of flood plain sites, particularly following last year's severe flooding events at Tewkesbury and Pershore, PPS25 makes it clear that outdoor sports pitches, including changing rooms, are deemed water-compatible development. While a clubhouse would be more vulnerable, no assessment has been made of the sites in the flood plain as to the probability, characteristics and level of flooding or the viability of mitigation work. The out of hand rejection of the flood plain sites without undertaking the sequential test set out in PPS25 indicates that these sites have not been fully investigated and so have been too readily discounted. Since most of these sites would be in locations well served by public transport, and should therefore have a higher priority in the search sequence, this omission is a serious shortcoming of the proposal.
14. I also note that site G was rejected despite it being closer to the built-up area of Stonehouse than Eastington Park and no further from Stroud. This site is on the B4008, the main road through Stonehouse, and should be reasonably accessible. While it did not compare favourably with Fromehall Park at the Local Plan inquiry stage, I have no detailed explanation of why in current circumstances it is considered unsuitable. Although it is said that the site is prominent in the landscape, it is not in a

- conservation area like Eastington Park and there is no assessment or comparison of the balance of harm in this respect.
15. Furthermore, the original site search was based on the area of land necessary for the inclusion of the football club and the indoor arena, some 9 ha. Neither of these facilities is now included in the scheme so the area of land required for relocation is considerably less. While the additional football pitches would contribute to the local shortfall of playing pitches – and that could be seen as a benefit of the proposal – they are not essential to the relocation of the rugby club and should not be a determinant factor in the site area required. Critically, the amendment of the scheme did not trigger a reassessment of the site search procedure. Other potential sites not considered were discussed at the inquiry. I therefore consider there to be significant failings in the site search process which in my view serve to undermine its conclusions. Without the assurance that all potential sites have been properly assessed, it would be unsafe to conclude that Eastington Park is the best available site for the relocation of the rugby club.
 16. Nonetheless, since any reassessment could conclude that that is the case, I shall go on to consider the accessibility of Eastington Park. All the sites considered lie to a greater or lesser extent on the fringes of the urban areas of Stroud and Stonehouse. Eastington Park, while it is close to new industrial development on the edge of Stonehouse, is beyond the urban area and serves to separate the increasingly built-up areas of Stonehouse and Eastington. It therefore has a less clear-cut status as urban fringe land, and has a distinctly rural character. Nonetheless, a use as playing pitches could ensure that the site remains open and undeveloped. While local residents are concerned that this proposal might open the way for future built development, PPG17 makes it quite clear that playing fields must not be regarded as previously-developed land; any future development proposals would be subject to planning policies intended to protect the countryside.
 17. PPG17 encourages the exchange of a poor quality site for one that will provide significant qualitative improvements. That would clearly be the case here. However, PPG17 also advises that the new site should be at least as accessible to current and potential new users. The existing site, within the built-up area, is very accessible by all means of transport. I accept that an equally accessible site is very unlikely to be found in the search area. It is therefore necessary to look for the best possible degree of accessibility.
 18. Eastington Park is adjacent to the A419 linking Stroud to the M5. Given the spread of current members, and the catchment area of potential new members, I do not doubt that it would be easily accessible by car, and probably more accessible to visiting team coaches than Fromehall Park. However, in order to achieve local and national sustainability objectives, any site in the urban fringe must be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport as realistic alternatives to the use of the car.
 19. In preparation for the application, members were asked how they would expect to travel to Eastington Park. Over 75% said they would travel by car. 12% would walk, cycle or use public transport with the balance using a taxi or minibus. The appellant's Travel Plan uses this survey as a baseline for demonstrating changes in travel methods. The Travel Plan sets a 5 year target to reduce car travel, with a varying proportion of car sharing, from a baseline 77% to a 5 year outcome of between 60% and 73%. Tellingly, the target aim for access by walking, cycling and public transport would remain relatively unchanged at between 10 and 13%.
 20. The site is some 6 km from Stroud although somewhat closer to Stonehouse. The footpath along the Stroudwater Canal to the north of the site continues east to the south of Stonehouse and on to Stroud. A dedicated cycleway, with some on-road routing, connects the site to Stroud and beyond. I note that improvements to the cycle

route are planned. The proposal includes an on-site pedestrian/cycle track linked to the eastern edge of the site from the access track serving East Lodge. It seems to me that, while some users of the sports club might cycle this distance, it is unlikely that many would access the site on foot. The distances involved are unlikely to encourage these means of travel, particularly in the darker winter months of the playing season. I consider a 12% share to be an ambitious target which, even so, compares unfavourably with the 29% who currently travel to Fromehall Park by these means.

21. There are bus stops close to the main entrance to the site with an hourly Monday-Saturday service. The last bus to Stonehouse/Stroud leaves at approximately 18.30. There is thus no public transport available on weekday practice evenings or for Sunday matches. The appellant's s.106 undertaking indicates contributions totalling more than £50,000 towards the relocation and improvement of bus shelters at the site entrance and to the support of the existing bus service for 5 years. This would not result in any change to the existing timetable which might make bus travel more attractive. While some might travel by bus to and from the site on Saturday match days, the service would not cater for those who wished to stay on for post-match socialising, something which is seen as particularly important to the success of the club.
22. While there would clearly be opportunities for travel to the site by walking, cycling and public transport I am not convinced that they would be sufficiently attractive to ensure more than minimal use. I do not consider the site to be particularly accessible by these means of travel.
23. There would be limited parking space available on the site - 50 paved spaces and 50 overflow spaces. The restriction of parking space accords with the advice in PPG13 as a method of promoting other more sustainable means of travel. However, given the ease of road access, I share the concerns of local residents that, on busy match days, restricted on-site parking could result in extensive off-site parking on the residential roads to the east and west of the site, particularly if on-site parking charges were introduced. This would cause considerable congestion and inconvenience. The appellant indicates that a contribution (eg: £5,000) may be made towards Road Traffic Orders if necessary to control overspill parking on local roads. However, restrictions on on-street parking in a rural area where it would not otherwise be necessary would be a severe inconvenience for local residents.
24. The Travel Plan includes a number of measures intended to encourage sustainable travel, notably the provision of a minibus service. Most of these measures are laudable. The restriction on car parking is expected to reduce single-driver car use and promote car-sharing, while it is expected that the major reduction in those walking to the site (from 24% at Fromehall Park to 3% at Eastington Park) would be offset by the use of the minibus. Much reliance is placed on the use of the minibus service.
25. To my mind, this is a mark of the inherently inaccessible location of the site. While the minibus service could be successful with the mini, and perhaps junior, teams playing on Sundays, the site is so readily accessible by car and so unattractive by other means of travel, that a much more robust approach is necessary if realistic opportunities for more sustainable means of travel are to be achieved. While the Travel Plan sets out further proposed initiatives, including further restrictions on parking space, there is no certainty of commitment. Although the arrangements for monitoring the Travel Plan have been set out, there are no arrangements for its enforcement in the event that agreed objectives are not met. The suggested non-compliance tariff of £5,000 pa for 5 years relates not to those target levels set out but to negotiated levels deemed feasible through operator surveys after occupation and then annually. These could be even less ambitious, so in my view there is no certainty that the Travel Plan would be an effective way of influencing the choice of means of travel.

26. I consider that the Travel Plan would not provide sufficient certainty that the locational disadvantages of this somewhat remote urban fringe site would be overcome. It is explicitly recognised that opportunities for travel by foot, cycle and public transport would be very limited and that these more sustainable means of travel would not be a realistic alternative for the great majority of visitors, who would be likely to choose to travel by car. Encouragement of a greater degree of car sharing and the effective use of the minibus service could make a real difference, but there is no sufficiently rigorous scheme of enforcement to make sure of it.
27. I therefore find on this issue that there is no clear evidence to show that the site is in the best location available or that it would have a good level of accessibility by a realistically wide choice of transport modes. The choice of location would not encourage walking or cycling and the level of public transport is not adequate to provide a realistic alternative means of travel at the times it would be most required. The ease of access by car makes the choice of other means of travel unlikely. The Travel Plan would not overcome the inherent disadvantages of the site's location. I consider that, without more effective measures to control their use, the development would be heavily reliant on the use of motor vehicles. This would be contrary to national sustainability objectives and the aims of Stroud Local Plan Policy TR1. I consider that, in terms of its location and accessibility, the scheme as proposed would not be a sustainable development.

The effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the Stroud Industrial Heritage Conservation Area and on the character and setting of Eastington Park as a building of special architectural and historic interest

28. The whole of the site lies within the Stroud Industrial Heritage Conservation Area. This mainly rural conservation area stretches along the length of the Stroudwater canal and the valleys of the River Frome and Nailsworth Stream which link the historic mill sites of the Stroud valleys. The conservation area is intended to protect the historic transport infrastructure routes and the unique context of Stroud's industrial legacy. As the Council's draft Conservation Area Statement indicates, the occurrence of undeveloped green spaces along the length of the canal is very important to its character. They act as physical and visual buffers between historically isolated mill groups and settlements, allowing an appreciation of the historic distinction and physical separation between these sites. They provide a valuable insight into the historic coexistence of agriculture and industry which resulted in the locally distinctive pattern of settlement.
29. The grade II listed Eastington Park house, formerly 'The Leaze', was built in the early 19th century for a mill owner, Henry Hicks, on open land some little distance from his 3 Eastington mills. The house was set in open, meadow-like parkland south of the canal. This layout clearly illustrates the wealth and social aspirations of the mill owners of the time to the lifestyle of the landed gentry, and the parkland setting is clearly an important aspect of the character of the listed house. The site is therefore not only a distinctive feature of the conservation area but has added importance as part of the original setting for a mill owner's house. While the loss of parkland trees has diminished its quality somewhat, the subsequent change in its ownership does not reduce the importance of the parkland to the setting of Eastington Park house. The site is clearly in a very sensitive location.
30. In principle, use as sports pitches would to a large extent retain the openness of the meadow and the rural green setting of the listed house. However, all that goes with that use – access roads, parking space, clubhouse, floodlighting and so on – needs to be very carefully considered if the distinctive character of the site is not to be undermined. I accept that the design of the clubhouse, while not distinguished, is reminiscent of modern agricultural buildings and so would not be particularly out of place. It would have the preferred orientation, sheltering spectators from the

prevailing weather, and to some extent would be integrated into the landscape by its location close to a group of mature parkland trees.

31. The last-minute alteration to the scheme resulted in some significant changes to the layout. Importantly, the arena building was deleted, reducing the overall impact of the proposal. The access road was relocated from the southern boundary, where it ran beside the western drive to Eastington Park house, to the northern edge of the site beside the trees screening it from the canal. This substantially reduces the impact the access road would have on the setting of the house. However, while the parking and overflow parking areas could have been similarly sited, perhaps hidden within trees, they remain located on open land adjacent to the southern boundary, close to the listed house. While the paved car park would be partly screened by trees, the clubhouse car and coach park and the overflow parking, ostensibly on grass, would be in direct open view from the house, close to it on the southern boundary of the site.
32. I consider that the road crossing the middle of the site to give access to the parking areas, seen in conjunction with the clubhouse, would have a profoundly urbanising effect on the meadow. This would be reinforced by the pedestrian/cycle pathway alongside the southern boundary beside the, albeit currently unused, eastern driveway. I consider that these elements of the scheme have not been sufficiently carefully considered and that these features of the development would be to the considerable detriment of the rural character of the meadow. While I accept that appropriate conditions could ensure that some of the impact of the overall scheme could be effectively mitigated – restrictions on hours of use, floodlighting, etc - these urbanising features would significantly damage the essential quality of a distinctive feature of the conservation area and the special interest of the listed house in its setting.
33. I therefore consider that, in conflict with Local Plan Policies BE5 and BE12, as it stands the proposal would seriously undermine the essentially rural quality of this important open space and the contribution it makes to the distinctive character and appearance of the Stroud Industrial Heritage Conservation Area and to the character and setting of Eastington Park house.

Other matters

34. I note the existence of a legal agreement dated 1938 between the owner of Eastington Park and the County Council restricting the future use of the site to private recreation or farmland. Ownership of the land involved has subsequently been split. Whether this agreement still has force is a matter for legal argument but I understand that it was primarily intended to preserve the openness of the setting of the house and to prevent built development on the site by industries associated with the impending war. It seems to me that, by ensuring that the site would remain predominantly open, the proposed use could at least reflect something of the spirit of the original intention. However, until this matter is properly resolved, the existence of this agreement is a material consideration which can only lend weight against the proposal.

Conclusions

35. I believe that there is a clear need for the club to relocate from Fromehall Park if it is to survive and thrive. The proposed development at Eastington Park, other considerations aside, would undoubtedly result in a high quality sports facility. However, the search for a suitable site was predicated on a need for 9 ha of land. Some potential sites were too readily discounted or were not considered during the site search process. During the course of the appeal, the scheme was considerably downsized so less land was needed for relocation. The site selection criteria therefore changed substantially but, fatally, this did not trigger a review of the discarded sites, or other smaller potential sites, most of which would be in more sustainable locations. It cannot therefore be argued that this is the best available site.

36. The site is fairly remote from local settlements and, while it is readily accessible by car, it is not easily accessible by a realistically wide choice of other transport modes. The Travel Plan would not entirely overcome the inherent disadvantages of the site's location and I have no doubt that most people would choose to travel by car. An increase in car sharing and a targeted minibus service might reduce overall vehicle numbers but the development would be heavily dependent on the use of motor vehicles. The site would not therefore have a good level of accessibility. The partial urbanisation of the open parkland site to accommodate car access and parking would also result in significant damage to the distinctive character of the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area and would undermine the designed relationship between Eastington Park house and its parkland setting.
37. The current under-provision of sports facilities in the district and the difficulty of finding suitable sites are strong arguments in favour of the proposal. However, I consider that, as it stands, these arguments are outweighed by the uncertainties attached the choice of location, the poor level of accessibility of the site and the damage the proposed development would cause to its historic context. Unless and until it can be clearly shown that there are no more appropriate sites, and the problems I have identified can be overcome, I cannot conclude that, on a balance of all the considerations, the advantages of this proposal outweigh its disadvantages.
38. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and that planning permission should not be granted for the proposal as amended.

Colin Ball

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Paul Cairnes of Counsel He called: Richard Clare-Gray IEng AMICE	Instructed by the Council's Solicitor. Environment Directorate, Gloucester County Council.
John Longmuir BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI	North Area Development Control Manager, Stroud District Council.
David Corker DipTP	Principal Appeals and Enforcement Officer, Stroud District Council.

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Christopher Young of Counsel He called: Tim Payne	Instructed by Hunter Page Planning. Professional rugby player (Wasps and England), 142 Cobbold Road, London.
Paul Fong BA(Hons) MRTPI	Hunter Page Planning, Thornbury House, 18 High Street, Cheltenham.
David Crampton	Chairman Stroud Rugby Club, Sunnycroft, Chapel Lane, Minchinhampton.
David Tighe CEng BSc MICE DipTEng	Pinnacle Transportation, 21 Berkeley Square, Bristol.
Angela Daniels David Stubley	Teasel Cottage, Selsley Hill, Stroud. Rugby Football Union Funding and Facilities Manager, South West Region.
Nigel Evers DipLA(Glos) MLI	Cooper Partnership, 127 Hampton Road, Redland Bristol.
Andrew BROWN BA BArch MSc MRTPI RIBA	Woodhall Planning and Conservation, Woodhall Lane, Calverley, Leeds.

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Alison Brown BSc DipTP MCD MRTPI, representing Eastington Parish Council.	Buchanan Partnership, 50 Clarence Square, Cheltenham.
Mike Johnson, representing Blanchworth Care Homes.	Hoddell Associates, Barley Wood Stables, Long Lane, Wroughton.
Tom Low	Hazel Cottage, Millend, Eastington.
Mark Jones	Millend House, Millend, Eastington.
Elisabeth Greenaway	6 Churchend, Eastington.
David Papps	East Lodge, Newtown, Stonehouse.
Pauline Allen	Brook Cottage, Churchend, Eastington.
Mark Wild	3 Newtown Cottages, Newtown, Stonehouse.
Ceri Sheppard	William Morris Community, Eastington.
Alex Bomberg	Chipmans Platt, Eastington.
David Granger	Old Orchard, Millend, Eastington.
Colin Frith	Ivy Cottage, Westend, Eastington.
Cllr Ken Stephens	Eastington and Standish Ward District Councillor, Albertine Cottage, Alkerton, Eastington.
Cllr Christine Headley	Rodborough Ward District Councillor, 2 Montserrat Cottages, Butterrow, Stroud.
Cllr Nigel Cooper	Rodborough Ward District Councillor, Stroud District Council, Ebley Mill, Stroud.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- 1 Appellant's letter of 30 April 2008 and suggested alternative layout drawing 5664-L01F.
- 2 Drawing 5664-PL06A missing from the appeal bundle.
- 3 Additional letters of objection from Ms Greenaway and Mr & Mrs Croad.
- 4 Stroud District Council Outdoor Playing Space Survey 2004.
- 5 Draft copy of the appellant's s106 unilateral undertaking.
- 6 Extract from RPG (RSS)10; Annex A – Accessibility and parking standards.
- 7 Minutes of the Development Control committee meeting 14 August 2007.
- 8 Committee Schedule 11 September 2007.
- 9 Pedestrian catchment plan related to the amended layout.
- 10 Bus timetables for services 46 and 93.
- 11 Note of meeting on 27 February 2008 between the appellant and the County Council.
- 12 Email correspondence dated 16 & 17 April 2008 between the appellant and the County Council.
- 13 Appellant's illustration of the Council's various descriptions of the site.
- 14 Extract from the Planning Encyclopaedia relating to 'old-style' planning agreements.
- 15 Tithe map of Eastington dated 1839.
- 16 Details of planning applications relating to East Lodge.
- 17 Drawing 5664-PL01F marked up to show position of floodlights.
- 18 Details of scrub machines.
- 19 Copy of Stroud RFC Members survey form.
- 20 Letter (undated) from Cinderford Rugby Club to Hunter Page Planning.
- 21 Letter dated 10 August 2007 from Clarke Willmott to the Council.
- 22 Letter dated 22 May 2008 from the Cotswold Canals Trust to Hunter Page Planning.
- 23 Website extracts relating to the effects of 2007 flooding on local rugby clubs.
- 24 Letter dated 28 May 2008 from Leisure Lakes Bikes to Hunter Page Planning.
- 25 Conservation Area Statement for the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area – Consultation Draft May/June 2008 (4 volumes).
- 26 Note to the Inspector listing 3rd party objectors wishing to speak.
- 27 Extract from the Stroud Local Plan: Section 2 Strategy.
- 28 Extract from the Stroud Local Plan – Inspector's Report.
- 29 Mr Low's statement.
- 30 Ms Sheppard's statement.
- 31 Amended list of agreed conditions.
- 32 Mr Jones' note on a possible condition.
- 33 Summary of the evidence of third party objectors from Eastington.
- 34 Completed copy of the appellant's s106 unilateral undertaking.
- 35 Gloucester County Council comments on the s106 undertaking.
- 36 Mr Cairnes' closing submissions for the Council.
- 37 Mr Young's closing submissions for the appellant.
- 38 Final copy of the appellant's s106 unilateral undertaking, received by agreement after the close of the inquiry.