

Email to Programme Officer 8th August 2016

Dear Mr Banks

1 Thank you for the programme sent on 27 July.

2 There were two points raised in this Residents' Association's representation on the draft Placemaking Plan:

(i) its inadequate assessment of the impact of housing development on highway capacity, and the need to defer further development until this issue was resolved (especially in the south of Bath, with special reference to Mulberry Park, Sulis Meadows and proposals for further large-scale development to the south of Englishcombe Lane); and

(ii) its rejection of our proposal under NPPF §§76-77 for designation as a Local Green Space of an area on the south side of Beechen Cliff.

3 We understand, from the programme you have sent, that point (i) is scheduled for discussion on Thursday 22 September, and point (ii) on Tuesday 20 September (pm). If this is correct, we believe that our concerns about point (i) – though a good deal wider in their impact – are sufficiently explained in our written representations for the Inspector to be able to take delivery of that point. We therefore no longer wish to appear in person on Thursday 22 September in respect of that point (*viz.*, transport infrastructure). We do, however, both wish to appear on Tuesday 20 September in respect of point (ii) (*viz.*, designation as a Local Green Space of an area on the south side of Beechen Cliff).

4 The process of advocating point (ii) has been lengthy and sometimes repetitious, and not all the arguments have remained the same throughout. We are therefore taking the step of presenting the Inspector now with a written summary of our case. That is attached to this email, and briefly recapitulates its main points. It in some

respects enlarges on, but does not replace, the material previously submitted. The principal arguments are:

- (i) That a partial view has been taken of policy, and the proposed LGS ought on its merits to be designated;
- (ii) That the rejection of the LGS depended on an assumption that §72 NPPF was the only policy statement relevant, which was incorrect;
- (iii) That there were procedural irregularities.

5 I also enclose for ease of reference a copy of an email from the Council to this Residents' Association dated 27 July 2016, informing us of an error in the officer report which informed a decision on the Local Green Spaces for the draft Placemaking Plan; and a copy of that officer report dated 14 December 2015. I also enclose a copy of Appendix 5 of our submission to the Council in 2015 proposing the land as Local Green Space, the relevance of which is explained therein and also in the attached summary.

Best wishes

Mark O'Sullivan
*for Margarida Dolan (Chair) and Mark O'Sullivan (Planning
Policy Officer),
Greenway Lane Area Residents' Forum*

Summary of the case for a Local Green Space at land on the south side of Beechen Cliff, Bath (*Matter 12, Issue 1*)

Aide-mémoire by the Greenway Lane Area Residents' Forum

I: The Strength of the Case in Favour

In terms of the NPPF criteria, the policies of the Development Plan, and the nature of public support, the case in favour of this proposal is extremely strong!

NPPF criteria

> §§76-77: This is a green area of particular importance to the local community: we cite its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity [and] richness of wildlife.

> §115: “**Great weight** should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks..” (recall, that under the 1949 Act AONBs “satisfy the essential requirements of a National Park in scenic quality”, and that the site in question is within the setting of the Cotswolds AONB and of the listed Devonshire Buildings).

> §132: “When considering the impact of..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..Significance can be harmed..through alteration..of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, **any harm** or loss should require clear and convincing justification..Substantial harm to..designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably..World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.”

The Development Plan

> City of Bath World Heritage Site Setting SPD: Green Hillside

Forming Prominent Features of the Landscape Setting (Map 5, page 36) includes playing fields and rest of Beechen Cliff. “§5.03: The green setting of the City in a hollow in the hills – the deliberate appreciation of the landscape in the creation of a beautiful city.” “§5.06: ..there is often no clear demarcation between the Site itself and its setting. The green nature of the landscape characteristically not only surrounds the Site but punctuates and weaves through it towards the very heart of it through the river valleys, hillsides and areas of open space. Al- though this document deals with the setting beyond the Site boundary **the green elements within the WHS** have a similar function and are often..visually connected to the setting.”

> Bath City-wide Character Appraisal SPD §7.17.9: “The contained, yet sky-filled, formal open space of Alexandra Park, the intimate field network of the eastern slope fields and the rather more open and ex- posed school playing fields are three quite different areas of open space. However, **they merge and blend together to form one coherent and distinctive landscape.**”

> City of Bath World Heritage Site Management Plan (not in the development plan, but here making re- ference to it): one of “7 Important Hillsides, within the urban area, protected in the Local Plan”. It is important to note that Bath is alone with Venice as **a city inscribed in its entirety** by UNESCO: it is not only the historic centre which is of world heritage value, but the character of the whole city.

> Cotswolds AONB Management Plan 2013-18 (not in the development plan, but to be taken into ac- count by virtue of S85 Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000): “LPI: The key characteristics, principal elements, and special qualities (including tranquillity), which form the natural beauty of the Cotswolds landscape are conserved and where possible enhanced”.

> Cotswolds AONB Position Statement on the Setting §§4-5 (also attracted by S85): “The Board consi- ders the setting of the Cotswolds AONB to be the area within which development..proposals, by virtue of their nature, size, scale, siting materials or design can be considered to have an impact..on the land- scape, scenic beauty and special qualities of the Cotswolds

AONB..The surroundings of the AONB are also important to its landscape and scenic beauty. **Views out of the AONB** and into it from surrounding areas can be very significant in this regard.”

¹ Evidence is given in detail in the proposal submitted to the Council on 20 January 2015.

Summary of the case for a Local Green Space at land on the south side of Beechen Cliff, Bath (*Matter 12, Issue 1*)

Aide-mémoire by the Greenway Lane Area Residents' Forum

> Cotswolds AONB Landscape Strategy and Guidelines (also attracted by S85): 4. Enclosed Limestone Valley: “Maintain the open, undeveloped slopes of the valleys” “**Avoid development that will intrude negatively** into the landscape” “Identify and maintain key views to and from the City of Bath” “**Promote and link to the green infrastructure** in Bath”.

Popularity and public support

- > Over 400 people have signed up to support this Local Green Space.
- > Messages of support have been received from Bath Preservation Trust, the Federation of Bath Residents' Associations, the Widcombe Association, the Ramblers Association (Bath), the National Trust, the Somerset Playing Fields Association; and all the Councillors for the Widcombe and Lyncombe wards at the time of the application.
- > An extensive file of photographs has been submitted showing local people planting trees on the green space at their own expense to replace elms felled because of disease, and using the green space for exercise, for access across the vicinity using the public rights of way, for children's games and winter sledging, for community football, for an annual Easter egg hunt, and for community events such as the 50th anniversary of VE Day, the 60th anniversary of D-Day, and the “Greenway Olympics” in 2008 and 2012.

2: The Flaws in the Case Against

> The Council has stated (in an email of 27 July 2016 from Richard Daone of the Planning Department to Margarida Dolan, Chair of *Greenway!*) that its reason for rejection was NPPF §72: LPAs should “give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools”.

- However, this sentence in the NPPF continues “and work with schools promoters to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted”, which suggests that it is primarily to be seen in the context of development control rather than development planning.
- We have cited evidence of use of the land as public open space over 200 years, and we believe it is in dual use, and that even if §72 were to constrain the case for designation *qua* playing field, it could not constrain the case for designating it as a Local Green Space *qua* public open space.
- Most importantly, the officers’ document (“Local Green Space Designations”, as revised on 14 December 2015²) drew Members’ attention (at page 2) to an assertion that “The NPPF places great weight (para 72) on the need for Schools and Colleges to expand/alter”: it summarised this further by declaring that because the land in this case was in educational use it was “exempted” (at page 7). However, it failed to mention that §115 of the NPPF (which does not mention “exemption”) also places “great weight” on conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and implicitly in their settings, while §132 also places “great weight” on the conservation of heritage assets such as World Heritage Sites. It failed to point out that the policy in §72 must be balanced with these other two policies which have a contrary sense, and an objective judgement made about which policy is to prevail. It also failed to point out that the NPPF was not the only statement of policy to be taken into account, but that the policies of the development plan were also relevant and needed to be weighed in the same balance. It failed to mention that the conservation of the green hillsides surrounding the Bath World Heritage Site was a matter to which the Inspector at the Core Strategy EIP “**attached particular... importance**”. It is the submission of this Residents’ Association that the balance is

such that the weight of the conservation policies is in this case much greater than that of the education policy, and that as a matter of fact and degree the Council's decision to refuse the application for designation was wrong. ² No earlier draft of this document is publicly available, but the draft considered by the Local Development Framework Steering Group is believed in relevant respects to have been similar.

Summary of the case for a Local Green Space at land on the south side of Beechen Cliff, Bath (*Matter 12, Issue 1*)

Aide-mémoire by the Greenway Lane Area Residents' Forum

> It has been argued that there is no need for designation, since the School needs the field as space for formal and informal play. And it is the case that the 1998 OFSTED inspection report found that the playing fields were already small for the size of the school. Yet, despite this, when faced with financial difficulties the school decided in 2001 to sell the Lower Field to a housing developer (planning permission was refused, though the DfEE granted permission for disposal – however, DfEE criteria were subsequently tightened; and pupil numbers, and with them the need for the green space, have since then increased markedly). In 2013 the Governors considered provision for boarding pupils on the Lower Field, but later changed their minds. The School, whose academic record is outstanding, has many priorities in managing education, and the future of a patch of land on its periphery will not be among the most salient. Yet, in perspective, the current use of the land is important, both to the School and to the local community. No organisation is monolithic: all have from time to time different currents of managerial opinion. And open land once lost to development is lost forever. The uncertainty of the 2001 and 2013 events suggests that fuller scrutiny by the Council would be a useful support to the School itself in helping it to ensure that the amenity and educational implications of any developments are properly balanced, both in the School's and the wider public interest. But in any event we should recall that designation would not prevent the School either from exercising its current permitted development rights, or from making an application for planning permission to be decided on its

merits in the ordinary way.

> Appendix 2 to the officers' document "Local Green Space Designations" also informed Members of "Comments received by the landowners" (page 35). This appears to contain not in fact comments received by landowners, but comments made by them. Among these is a statement, attributed to Beechen Cliff School, that in relation to the present proposal "Approximately 50% of the site is also part of the highway". The potential relevance of this remark is unclear, but its accuracy is not: it is clearly untrue. It emerged, in Mr Daone's email of 27 July, that this remark was never made by the School, or apparently by anyone else. It seems to derive from a general observation by the Council that land which is part of a highway "is unlikely to be suitable as it may need to be utilised for works associated with the highway". The Council seems to have used the expression "adjoining the highway" rather than "part of the highway"; the School, no doubt misled by this, responded that half the land in question adjoined a street, Greenway Lane³. The land in question is quite clearly outside the boundary of highway land. Mr Daone's email makes it clear that the Council now accepts that its summary was misleading, and does not wish to stand on any highway-related argument in relation to the present issue.

3: The Procedural Issues

Section 1 of the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 provides "any meeting of a .. body exercising public functions, being a body to which this Act applies, shall be open to the public" and "proceedings in committee shall for the purposes of this Act be treated as forming part of the proceedings of the body".

The B&NES Statement of Community Involvement (at §2.17) has undertaken that community organisations, Residents' Associations and interest groups would be encouraged to be engaged in the preparation of the LDF, and (at Figure 3) that information about a variety of opportunities to be involved in the preparation of the LDF would be disseminated widely, and advertised in good time, and noting that, unlike residents in the rest of the district, residents of Bath are not represented by either Town or Parish Councils, so that extra effort is needed to reach these residents, that Residents' Associations would also be used as a way

of disseminating information.

> The Council admits (see above) that the officers' document "Local Green Space Designations" was misleading in relation to highway issues. We say that this clouded the minds of decision-makers and prejudiced them against the Beechen Cliff Local Green Space proposal.

³ If this were truly ground for objection, then any land with access to a road would be ineligible, and there would be very few Local Green Spaces – this is clearly not what the NPPF has in mind.

Summary of the case for a Local Green Space at land on the south side of Beechen Cliff, Bath (*Matter 12, Issue 1*)

Aide-mémoire by the Greenway Lane Area Residents' Forum

> We understand that officers did not report to Councillors the substantive discussion of the relevance of the NPPF policy on schools argued in Appendix 5 to our Local Green Space proposal. We say that this evidence was not taken into account in the Council's decision, and should have been.

> The officers' document "Local Green Space Designations" claimed that the land was "exempt" because it was in educational use. A strange term! But the inference is unsupported: there is no similar statement in the NPPF. The document failed to draw attention to §§115 and 132 of the NPPF, and misled officers and members in their decision-making, which was obliged to judge all three "great weight" issues against each other, and also to take into account the rest of the development plan.

> We understand that the Council's decision was influenced by private representations from Beechen Cliff School of which residents were not informed and to which they were unable to respond, contrary to the established planning principle of *audi alteram partem* (*per contra*, we consulted the School on our proposals directly in a letter to the Headmaster of 21 July 2014, which we were told had been referred to the Governors, although no reply has been given).

> We became aware in Spring 2016 that the Council had set up a Local Development Framework Steering Group. This is a cross-party group of members and officers which meets in private and which considered various issues on the Placemaking Plan, including the fate of the Local Green Space proposals, which only came to a formal decision meeting in highly condensed summary when they reached Cabinet in December 2015 as a minute part of the massive Placemaking Plan overall. Thus the Cabinet never seems to have seen the Local Green Space proposals themselves, though we have been assured that the brief summary document “Local Green Space Designations” was available for consultation if Cabinet members so wished. No doubt the actions of the LDFSG are seen as *advice* to the Cabinet rather than as *decisions*, thus satisfying the specific requirements of the 1960 Act. However, given that details of the Local Green Space proposals were apparently not considered by the Cabinet, and that at the meeting at 4 pm on 2 December 2015 they considered not only the 6-volume 82 Mb Placemaking Plan, but also CIL, a community health and care services review, establishment of a local property development company, a local flood risk strategy, and (an irony, perhaps) a review of the Green Spaces Strategy, we think one must infer that any substantive Member consideration of the matter was not by the Cabinet but by the LDFSG, and that the 1960 Act consequently may have required that the times and papers of meetings be published in advance, and the public admitted, which did not happen. Even if this is not the case, we believe it is hard to argue that residents’ associations in Bath were involved with the process of sifting the Local Green Space proposals as well as was required by the Statement of Community Involvement. We believe that if we had been involved at an earlier stage, as we should have been, we could have prevented a number of errors of process, such as the apparent neglect of §§115 and 132 of the NPPF.

Email from Bath and NE Somerset Council to M Dolan 27th July 2016

Dear M Dolan

Thank you for your email sent to Lisa Bartlett regarding the Placemaking Plan and the land at Beechen Cliff School nominated for designation as Local Green Space which has been passed to me for a response.

The issues that you raise are pertinent to the Examination into the Placemaking Plan and should be brought to the attention of the Inspector. As such I have copied in Chris Banks (Examination Programme Officer) to both your original email and the Council's response.

As you correctly state the Cabinet in agreeing the Draft Placemaking Plan for public consultation (December 2015) determined that the land at Beechen Cliff School should not be designated as a Local Green Space. Following public consultation on the Draft Placemaking Plan earlier this year and taking account of representations received on this issue, the Council agreed in March 2016 to submit the Draft Plan for Examination (still not proposing to designate the land as a Local Green Space). The Inspector has now confirmed that the issue will be considered at the Examination hearings (see the Inspector's document entitled 'Matters & Issues for the Examination', reference number ID/3).

In recommending that the land should not be designated as a Local Green Space in the Draft Placemaking Plan the Local Green Space Designations Recommendation Report (CD/PMP/DM12/1) identifies that this is because it is, in part, school land and that it should therefore, be exempted from

designation. The issue regarding highway land was not set out as the reason for recommended non-designation.

As part of the process of considering nominated Local Green Spaces the Council contacted land owners, including Beechen Cliff School, by letter during September 2015 to inform them of the nomination of their land and to invite their views. This letter suggested that nominated land may not be taken forward for designation for a number of reasons including:

- National planning policy gives great weight to the need for schools to expand and develop – therefore land within school grounds may not be considered suitable for designation
- Land adjoining a highway is also unlikely to be suitable as it may need to be utilised for works associated with the highway

In response to this letter Beechen Cliff School wrote to the Council and in respect of the highways issue advised that *“Around 50% of the nominated area adjoins Greenway Lane and is therefore deemed unsuitable for designation, according to the criteria concerning land adjoining the highway set in your letter”*. This response was summarised in the Council’s Designations Recommendation Report (CD/PMP/DM/12/1) (see page 35 in table of summary of comments received from landowners) as follows *‘Approximately 50 % of the site is also part of the highway’*. It is considered this summary is inaccurate and this matter will be brought to the attention of the Inspector. However, as set out above this was not the reason as to why the land was not proposed for designation.

I trust that the above explanation is clear. These issues are likely to form part of the discussion at the Examination hearings and as set out above will be brought to the attention of the Inspector

Regards

Richard Daone

Team Manager – Planning Policy

Bath & North East Somerset Council

**Email from M Dolan to Bath and NE Somerset Council 7th
July 2016**

§§76-98 of the NPPF encouraged local planning authorities to designate Local Green Spaces where there was a presumption against development.

The Council's decision on what areas to propose for this in the Placemaking Plan was made in December 2015 on the basis of an officers' report. That report attributed to Beechen Cliff School the statement that approximately 50% of land proposed for designation within its playing fields was highway land.

At a meeting today attended by myself, two other members of the Greenway Lane Residents' Forum and Cllr Mark Shelford, we were assured by the headteacher of Beechen Cliff School that the school had never made such a statement.

This proposal will come before the EIP into the draft Placemaking Plan in September 2016. We seek clarification, in good time before the EIP, of the terms of the School's evidence to the Council on the Local Green Space proposal.

Yours sincerely,

M Dolan

Chair, Greenway Lane Residents' Forum

Appendix 5

Two questions

1 In the course of development of this proposal, two bigger issues arose which should be elaborated in a little more detail. These are (i) why does the green space need protection, when it is not currently identified for development?; and (ii) how does this proposal fit with §72 of the National Planning Policy Framework (educational development)?

Why does the green space need protection?

2 Though we have over 400 supporters, there are also a few who object. It has been put to us by sceptics that this is not a green space that needs protection. They say that it is not used; or that there is another green space in the locality at Bloomfield Road and that if the latter space is kept then the Beechen Cliff space can readily be abandoned. Or, to the contrary, they argue that the Beechen Cliff space already has protection in various ways, and does not need more; or that “everyone” has always agreed that the space is needed and should not be developed, so that additional protection is otiose.

3 None of these arguments will hold water. The fact that the space is in active daily use both by the School and by the local community is very clearly established by the evidence set out in this document. And there is no competition between the open spaces at Bloomfield Road and Beechen Cliff: they are half a mile apart and separated by the busy Wellsway, serving different patrons in the Oldfield Park/Moorlands and Widcombe Village/Lyncombe Vale areas; the level character of the Beechen Cliff space is unusual in this part of the city, but much valued by those playing ball games, or who are disabled and cannot manage slopes – while the Bloomfield Road space is more extensive; the Council has had so poor a response to its call for Local Green Space proposals that it has been obliged twice over to extend the timetable for submissions, so that the need for Local Green Spaces in the city is absolutely patent. Moreover, it is not possible for this protection to be called upon as and when a need arises: a Local Green Space may only be brought forward in the context of a Local Development Framework process, and these seldom take place more often than every five

years.

4 On the other hand, other current protections are evidently not robust. The School's own unstable and inconsistent attitude to the open space causes anxiety (see below), and it has persistently been very reluctant to communicate with its local community. In the Deposit Draft Local Plan of January 2002, the open space was to be found within the Bath Conservation Area and the World Heritage Site, and within the setting of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and of the listed Devonshire Buildings; it was classified as protected playing fields, and as part of a special designation of important hillsides "vital to the City's landscape setting and character". The Inspector, in a determined search for housing sites, rejected the designation of important hillsides altogether, and went on to recommend the development of the Beechen Cliff open space without troubling to consider the impact of this on the World Heritage Site, on the listed buildings, on the AONB, on the public open space or on the ecological issues; the land was only saved by the good sense of the Councillors, who at that time had power to reject an Inspector's findings. Within a few years the developers were back, demanding that the Beechen Cliff open space be declared suitable for development in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. They were seen off once more by the Council. But the land is clearly under siege: should the Council's vigilance at any time slip for a moment, this vital local amenity will be lost. Given its extremely strong amenity merits as set out in the present document, it is by no means excessive that this land should carry the proper and accurate designation of Local Green Space under the NPPF.

§72 of the National Planning Policy Framework

5 §72 of the NPPF states, "The Government attaches great importance to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local

planning authorities should take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to meeting this requirement, and to development that will widen choice in education. They should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools; and work with schools promoters to identify and resolve key planning

issues before applications are submitted”.

6 We welcome and applaud this concern for education, and for Beechen Cliff School in particular. However, we consider that the final words of that paragraph imply that it is a policy for the use of development control rather than development planning powers. In particular, we note with surprise the potential implication, in some notes prepared by Council officers to help those making Local Green Space applications, that there might be some conflict between a school’s use of land and a Local Green Space designation. Nowhere in the NPPF is there any suggestion that schools should be exempt from planning control, even though it would be open to the Government to grant a GPDO permission with that effect: developments in schools can have significant amenity impacts, and they fall to be considered on their merits just like others. Hence if a proposal were made for school land to become a Local Green Space, that proposal would need to be judged on its own merits; if any subsequent planning application for the development of the land were later to come forward, that would in turn be judged, as a matter of fact and degree, in accordance with the national and local policies applying to such development on that site, with appropriate weight being given both to §72 and to §76 of the NPPF. All this notwithstanding, it is our contention that, even if §72 were seen to be directed at planning policy as well as development control, the evidence put together in this document is more than sufficient to demonstrate a sound case for designation of the Lower Field as a Local Green Space.

7 There are more specific considerations to suggest that the designation of the playing fields of Beechen Cliff School as a Local Green Space would be in the public interest. The 1998 OFSTED inspection report found that the playing fields were already small for the size of the school, yet faced with financial difficulties the school decided in 2001 to sell the Lower Field to a housing developer (it managed to persuade the DfEE to grant permission for disposal, but the Government’s criteria have since been tightened; the project failed at the time because planning permission was refused); pupil numbers have since then increased markedly, and it is far from clear that it would now be in the school’s or the public interest for the land to be developed – certainly our Councillors are not of that mind. In 2013 the Chair of Governors

reported on the School's first year as an Academy, explaining its ambitions to expand a budding provision for boarding pupils and remarking that the Lower Field would be suitable for this purpose – a plan which on fuller consideration was abandoned. We can well understand that the School, whose academic record is outstanding, has many priorities in managing education, and the future of a patch of land on its periphery will not be among the most salient. Yet, looked at in perspective, the land is important, both to the School and to the local community, as this document shows. The instability of the 2001 and 2013 events suggests that proper scrutiny by the Council would be useful to the School itself in helping it to ensure that the amenity implications of any developments are properly resolved in the public interest. But in any event it should be borne in mind that a declaration of the land as Local Green Space would in no way prevent the School either from exercising its current permitted development rights (for example, for the use of the open land as a temporary car park when there are major events), or from making an application for planning permission to be decided on its merits in the ordinary way.

8 Moreover, we have the evidence of Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* to show that as long ago as the early nineteenth century the land behind the summit of Beechen Cliff was used as public open space (referred to in §5.4.6 of the WHS Management Plan); and we know that the land sold to the Council for the erection of the school in the 1930s was assessed by the Minister of Health at that time as public open space (see extract from conveyance attached). We believe that this long and continuous history of use of the Lower Field as public open space demonstrates that it has, in planning terms, for many years been as a matter of fact in dual use, both as playing fields and as public open space, and we maintain that even if §72 were seen to constrain the case for designating it as a Local Green Space *qua* playing field, it could not constrain the case for designating it as a Local Green Space *qua* public open space.

Appendix 5a: Extract from 1936 conveyance

Source: B&NES archives

This Conveyance

is made the *fourteenth*
 day of *March* One thousand nine hundred and thirty-~~six~~^{eight} Between ALFRED
 HOLE of Rosemount Farm Lyncombe Hill in the City of Bath Gentleman (hereinafter
 called "the Vendor") of the one part and THE MAYOR ALDERMEN AND CITIZENS
 OF THE CITY OF BATH (hereinafter called "the Corporation") of the other part.

WHEREAS:—

(1) By a Conveyance dated the twenty-fifth day of March One thousand nine hundred and thirty-six and made between Edward Tompkins of the one part and the Vendor of the other part the property hereby conveyed was with other property conveyed to the Vendor in fee simple subject as to part thereof as is hereinafter mentioned but otherwise free from incumbrances.

(2) On the second day of May One thousand nine hundred and thirty-six application was made to the Corporation as the Interim Development Authority under the Town and Country Planning (General Interim Development) Order 1933 for that portion of the Bath and District Joint Planning Scheme as is comprised within the City of Bath for permission to develop and erect certain houses on the property hereby conveyed which development the Corporation refused to permit.

(3) On the third day of July One thousand nine hundred and thirty-six an appeal was made pursuant to the provisions of Section 10 (5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1932 (hereinafter called "the Act") to the Minister of Health against the said refusal of the Corporation to permit such development and the said Minister on the second day of September One thousand nine hundred and thirty-six caused an inquiry to be held with reference to the matter.

(4) By an Instrument under his hand and seal dated the twenty-first day of September One thousand nine hundred and thirty-six the Minister of Health dismissed the said Appeal on the ground that the land ought to be reserved by the Bath and District Planning Scheme for a Public Open Space and for the purposes of Section 10 (6) of the Act certified that he was satisfied that if such appeal had been allowed development of the property hereby conveyed would have taken place within a reasonable period.

(5) The Vendor in pursuance of the provisions of Section 10 (6) of the Act being then entitled to dispose of the fee simple in the land with vacant possession by a Notice dated the twenty-sixth day of January One thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven