



Ministry  
of Defence

Secretariat  
Defence Infrastructure Organisation  
Kingston Road  
Sutton Coldfield  
B75 7RL

E-mail: [diosec-parli@mod.uk](mailto:diosec-parli@mod.uk)  
[www.gov.uk/DIO](http://www.gov.uk/DIO)

Ref. 2015/FOI07672

2 October 2015

Dear

Thank you for your emails dated 5 September 2015 requesting the following information:

*"Please could you provide the 12 Archaeological Site Group management plans referenced in your promotional leaflet below for Salisbury Plain. If it does not say in the reports could you also provide the criteria used to pick which sites are covered if it does not cover all sites present?"*

*Could you also elaborate on the damage military and its tenant farmers are allowed to do to ancient monuments without prosecution?"*

You also asked:

*"If Scratchbury hill is not part of the training estate why does the map claim that it is? If it is part of the training estate why is it not part of the IRMP covering the rest of the area to ensure it receives adequate protection? What is the difference between this site and other farming sites on the same ridge line that are all used for training despite being farms?"*

I am treating your correspondence as a request for information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

A search for the information has now been completed within the Ministry of Defence (MOD) and I can confirm that all of the information in scope of your request is held.

Some of the information you have requested is attached, but some of the information requested falls entirely within the scope of the absolute exemption provided for at section 40 (Personal Data) of the FOIA and has been redacted.

Section 40(2) has been applied to some of the information in order to protect personal information as governed by the Data Protection Act 1998. Section 40 is an absolute exemption and there is therefore no requirement to consider the public interest in making a decision to withhold the information.

Under Section 16 of the Act (Advice and Assistance) you may find it helpful to note that there is a requirement to maintain condition of the protected monument, The Control scrub, ensure rabbits and badgers are excluded, prevent vehicle damage and ensure protection measures are maintained, In a most recent survey undertaken the site was noted as being in a good condition.

Also you may find it helpful to note that Scratchbury Hill is owned by the MOD, (thus within the SPTA map which you have referenced) but it is Schedule 1 land and thus not under the MOD's direct guardianship. The protection of the land would be covered by the farmer working directly with Historic England and Natural England.

Yours sincerely,

DIO Secretariat

If you are not satisfied with this response or you wish to complain about any aspect of the handling of your request, then you should contact me in the first instance. If informal resolution is not possible and you are still dissatisfied then you may apply for an independent internal review by contacting **the Information Rights Compliance team, 1st Floor**, MOD Main Building, Whitehall, SW1A 2HB (e-mail [CIO-FOI-IR@mod.uk](mailto:CIO-FOI-IR@mod.uk)). Please note that any request for an internal review must be made within 40 working days of the date on which the attempt to reach informal resolution has come to an end.

If you remain dissatisfied following an internal review, you may take your complaint to the Information Commissioner under the provisions of Section 50 of the Freedom of Information Act. Please note that the Information Commissioner will not investigate your case until the MOD internal review process has been completed. Further details of the role and powers of the Information Commissioner can be found on the Commissioner's website, <http://www.ico.gov.uk>.