



---

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 9 and 10 October 2018

Site visit made on 9 October 2018

**by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> November 2018

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/W/17/3185445 Hammond Ground, Whalley Road, Read BB12 7QN**

- 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 the Trustees of Hammond Ground against the decision of Ribble Valley Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 3/2016/1192, dated 21 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2017.
  - The development proposed is residential development.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Procedural matters**

2. I opened an Inquiry in respect of the appeal on 1 May 2018. The main parties agreed that the Inquiry should be adjourned until 9 October to enable further ecological surveys to be undertaken. In this period of adjournment, the main parties and the Hammond Ground Residents Group were afforded the opportunity to update their evidence in regards to the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
3. Prior to the resumption of the Inquiry, the main parties requested that the procedure be changed to a Hearing due to the narrowing in the areas in dispute between them. The Inquiry resumed on 9 October and I heard submissions on behalf of the Main Parties and the Hammond Ground Residents Group in this regard. After careful consideration, I determined<sup>1</sup> that the appeal should proceed by way of a Hearing. Consequently, I closed the Inquiry and opened a Hearing. The Hearing was adjourned on 9 October after which a site visit was undertaken, with the Hearing being resumed on 10 October.
4. The application is in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration except for access. A site location plan and site access design drawings were submitted with the application. I have had regard to these plans in determining the appeal. Illustrative masterplans showing landscaping and sections<sup>2</sup> were also submitted. The appellant confirmed at the Hearing that the masterplans were illustrative of just one way in which the site could be developed. Further illustrative plans were submitted in evidence. The appellant confirmed at the Hearing that these plans do not form part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Under s319a of TCPA 1990 (as amended)

<sup>2</sup> 1155-RSP-1 rev C (4/12/2016) and 1155-RSP-2 rev A (4/12/16)

appeal scheme and are intended to show a further way in which the site may be developed.

5. Prior to the Hearing, the appellant provided a signed but undated Planning Obligation in the form of a Unilateral Undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (S106 UU). The S106 UU includes obligations relating to affordable housing and off site planting provision. A signed copy of the S106 UU was provided after the Hearing was closed.
6. The Council refused the planning application for four reasons. It is common ground between the main parties that the areas of dispute between them have narrowed since the planning application was determined and consequently the Council is not defending reasons for refusal 2 and 4, or reason for refusal 1 in part. These are concerned with the level of development at Read and Simonstone in relation to that anticipated in the development plan and with the development setting a harmful precedent. The Council still pursues its reasons in respect of the effect of the development on the countryside and its effects upon parkland and the setting of the village of Read and the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Agreed statements of common ground were submitted which set out the development plan policies that are relevant to the proposal, the matters of agreement and disagreement between the two main parties and in regards to housing land supply.

### **Main Issues**

7. Having had regard to the procedural matters and in light of all that I have read, heard and seen, I consider the main issues for the appeal are:
  - Whether the proposal would comply with the development plan strategy for new housing development in the countryside;
  - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the countryside, with particular regard to the setting of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Read village and any effects on 'parkland';
  - The effect of the proposal on the setting of nearby listed buildings; and
  - Whether there are material considerations sufficient to outweigh any conflict with the development plan and any other harm arising from the development.

### **Reasons**

#### *Planning policy context and background*

8. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The *Core Strategy 2008-2028, A Local Plan for Ribble Valley (CS)* was adopted in December 2014. CS Key Statement DS1 sets out the settlement strategy for the Borough which includes, amongst other things, that development will be focused towards Tier 1 settlements. Read and Simonstone together are defined as a Tier 1 settlement.
9. CS Policy DMG2 states that development should be in accordance with the CS development strategy and support the spatial vision. The appeal site is

situated outside of the defined settlement boundary adjacent to the village of Read and it is common ground that it is within the 'countryside'. Policy DMG2 also includes that within the open countryside, development will be required to be in keeping with the character of the landscape and acknowledge the special qualities of the area. Whilst the policy makes provision for development proposals in Tier 1 settlements that should consolidate, expand or round-off development so that it is closely related to the main built up areas, the appeal site in this case is not in the defined settlement boundary.

10. CS Key Statement EN2 is concerned with landscape and includes that the landscape and character of those areas that contribute to the setting and character of the AONB will be protected and conserved and wherever possible enhanced. CS Policy DMH3 is concerned with dwellings in the open countryside and the AONB and includes amongst other things that development will be limited to that which is essential for the purposes of agriculture or residential development which meets an identified need. CS Policy DMG1 sets out general considerations for development including amongst other things that all development must be sympathetic to existing and proposed land uses in terms of its size, intensity and nature as well as scale, massing, style, features and building materials. CS Key Statement DS2 sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and CS Policy DME2 is concerned with landscape protection and includes that development proposals will be refused which significantly harm important landscape or landscape features.

#### *Emerging development plan*

11. The Council's *Housing and Economic Development, Development Plan Document* (HED DPD) has been submitted for examination. The HED DPD provides more detailed policy coverage on the key issues of the CS and includes allocations and settlement boundaries necessary for the implementation of the CS. I understand that the Council has recently been consulting on a number of additional housing allocations in regards to its ability to clearly demonstrate a five year supply of housing sites.
12. Although I have been provided with little specific information, I understand that there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies of the HED DPD and in regards to the proposed allocations. Therefore, having regard to paragraph 48 of the Framework, on the evidence before me, I afford any conflict with the relevant policies of the HED DPD little weight.

#### *Housing land supply*

13. It common ground that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years worth of housing against their housing requirement as set out in the adopted strategic policies<sup>3</sup>. The Council considered that at the time of the Hearing the supply was equivalent to about 4.9 years (5% buffer) or 4.3 years (20% buffer) whilst the appellant considered that the supply was 4.41 years (5% buffer) or 3.86 years (20% buffer).

---

<sup>3</sup> Hearing document 9

*Development plan strategy for new housing development in the countryside*

14. I agree that the Tier 1 settlement of Read and Simonstone is tightly constrained by the defined settlement boundary and I note the limited opportunities for housing development within the settlement. I also have had regard to the development on greenfield sites which is contributing towards the existing housing land supply and to the existing settlement boundaries which might not be sufficiently contributing to the five year housing land supply. Nevertheless, the appeal site is situated in the countryside and not within the settlement of Read and Simonstone as defined by the settlement boundary. Consequently, the appeal scheme conflicts with CS Policies DMG2 and DMH3. However, whilst CS Policies DMG2 and DMH3 also contain provisions in respect of the character and appearance of the countryside, in terms of the conflict with the development plan strategy, the lack of a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites reduces the weight I would apply to any conflict identified with them. I shall return to this in the planning balance.

*Character and appearance of the countryside*

15. The appeal site forms part of Hammond Ground, an area of land in agricultural use, situated to the west of Read. Hammond Ground has an open character, includes a number of mature trees and has the character and appearance of parkland. It provides an attractive setting to the western part of the village. The western boundary of Hammond Ground is with an area of woodland known as Clough Syke. To the north of Hammond Ground are dwellings along Hammond Drive. The appeal site is bounded by the rear gardens of dwellings on George Lane to the east and by Whalley Road to the south, with its boundary with the remainder of Hammond Ground being unmarked. The site falls generally down towards Whalley Road.
16. Hammond Ground once formed part of the Read Hall Estate, as indicated on the plan of the estate dated 1896 and associated sales particulars. Those sales particulars describe Hammond Ground as 'a valuable enclosure of park land' and refer to 'some enclosures of ornamental plantation'. It is clear from the historic maps produced in evidence, including the 1830 Hennets Map, the Greenwood Map 1830 and first and subsequent editions of the Ordnance Survey, that Hammond Ground was considered cartographically as parkland in the nineteenth Century (C19). At that time, Hammond Ground is shown as being an open area of land with scattered trees, enclosed by woodland to the west, north and to the east of what became George Lane. The photograph provided at the Hearing<sup>4</sup> indicates a significant stone wall boundary along George Lane. This has not been disputed.
17. I have had regard to the lidar images which indicate former field boundaries on the estate. As I saw during my site visit, the area to the west of Hammond Ground known as 'Front Field' includes a number of distinct plantations as well as isolated trees along former field boundaries and has a greater species mix than Hammond Ground. However, as I observed, the retention of trees on the former field boundaries is not uncommon on land which made up the Read Hall Estate and in this regard I also note the examples of this practice in the wider landscape. I have taken into account that a coal pit was situated within Hammond Ground, but do not consider that the presence of such activity within a country estate to be unusual or to mean that the land should not be

---

<sup>4</sup> Hearing document 6

considered as being parkland. Whilst there is no evidence before me which documents the setting out of a designed landscape in the Read Hall Estate, on the balance of probability, I am not convinced that Hammond Ground has developed the appearance of parkland 'accidentally'.

18. Hammond Ground has seen the loss of the planting and boundary walls along George Lane and along Hammond Drive to modern development. However, whilst the site has been altered since C19, it nevertheless is an attractive area of countryside.

#### Valued landscapes

19. The Council and some local residents consider the appeal site to fall within a 'valued landscape', which is disputed by the appellant. The Framework in paragraph 170 seeks to protect and enhance 'valued landscapes' in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan. The Framework does not define 'valued landscapes' and in terms of paragraph 170, the appeal site is not subject to any statutory or local landscape designation, nor is it identified within the development plan for its particular landscape quality.
20. Having carefully considered the evidence, I am of the opinion that as a greenfield site in the countryside the appeal site has value both in its own right and as part of the wider landscape. I also acknowledge that local residents value the site and the surrounding area. However, this does not necessarily mean that it is a valued landscape in the context of the Framework.
21. Both the appellant and the Council undertook assessments of landscape value against the criteria in Box 5.1 of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3) within their landscape evidence. I have had careful regard to these assessments.
22. Whilst Hammond Ground has lost the boundary planting to the north and east as indicated on the historic maps, it retains a number of mature trees which are indicated on the historic mapping and has the character and appearance of parkland. The appellant's arboricultural impact assessment indicates that the common oak trees within or near the appeal site are of moderate or high quality and from what I saw, they together have significant amenity value within the open land at Hammond Ground. I find that the landscape has a good scenic quality with attributes and characteristics which are easily recognisable from the landscape to the south.
23. In terms of rarity, I note that the *Lancashire Historic Landscape Characterisation Programme* identifies the parkland within the 'ancient and post-medieval ornamental' HLCT which covers about 0.5% of the Lancashire Study Area. With regards to conservation interest, Hammond Ground formed part of the Read Hall Estate, within which there is a number of designated heritage assets, a country house, lodge and gates and an ice house.
24. Hammond Ground is not however publically assessable and so has no public recreational value. Given the location of the appeal site adjacent to George Lane and Whalley Road, the perceptual aspects are not of significant value.
25. Overall, the appeal site and the wider Hammond Ground, is not designated nor identified in the development plan for its landscape quality, but scores well against a number of the criteria in Box 5.1 of GLVIA3. Whilst these attributes

are reflective of an attractive area of parkland which has a greater quality than say the improved land to the south, I am not convinced that it is so special or has features of particularly special worth to conclude that it should be regarded as being a valued landscape in terms of the Framework. That said, the Framework in paragraph 170 also sets out that decisions should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

### Landscape effects

26. I have in evidence the appellant's *Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment* (LVIA) submitted with the planning application and at the appeal a *Landscape and Visual Effects Statement*. Further analysis of the landscape and visual baseline has been undertaken for the Council, whilst I also have regard to the representations on behalf of the Hammond Ground Residents Group.
27. The appeal site lies within National Character Area (NCA) 35 Lancashire Valleys. Broadly, this includes that farmland is predominately pasture for grazing livestock and identifies numerous large country houses with associated parklands. The parties agree that the development proposal would have slight effects on this regional landscape, a view with which I concur.
28. Within the Landscape Strategy for Lancashire, the site falls within Landscape Character Type (LCT) 6, Industrial Foothills and Valleys. This includes as key environmental features, hedgerow trees and parkland trees, large country houses and designed parklands. The parties dispute the magnitude of change which would arise from the development, with the appellant concluding that it would be localised and negligible, whilst the Council conclude moderate-substantial in year 1 and moderate by year 15 due to mitigation.
29. The *AONB Landscape Character Assessment* (LCA) includes the appeal site within its study area, and characterised the area within which the appeal site is situated as being 'Undulating Lowland Farmland with Parkland'. The parties disagree as to the landscape effects in regards to this LCA.
30. The character of the site is derived from its open parkland appearance and character, and due to its elevated position above the Calder Valley, there are expansive views across the site to the wider landscape. Whilst there is built development to the north, east and south of Hammond Ground, the appeal site and wider Hammond Ground provide a sharp contrast with the built edge of the village.
31. The appeal scheme is for up to 50 dwellings, accessed via a new access onto Whalley Road situated within the south eastern part of Hammond Ground. I have had regard to the submitted viewpoint assessments and visited the identified viewpoints during my visits to the site. I saw that due to effects of topography and intervening tree and vegetation cover, the most notable visible effects would be experienced at the local level, in and immediately around the village.
32. Hammond Ground currently provides an attractive open parkland setting for this part of the village when viewed from Whalley Road. There are key views of the appeal site from Whalley Road, from where the proposed development would appear very prominent on the edge of the village rising up the slope to the north. The proposed residential development, within part of Hammond

- Ground, would erode the parkland character and openness, giving rise to a significant adverse effect upon the setting of the village within the countryside.
33. In addition, there would also be significant adverse visual effects for residents and pedestrians arising from the proposed development from and between properties on George Lane and Hammond Drive, due to the harm to the parkland character and openness of Hammond Ground. The effect upon the wider setting of the village would also be seen from the footpath (3-34-fp8) to the northwest of Houlikers Farm from where the effect of the proposed development on the countryside setting of the village would be appreciated within the extensive views of the wider landscape.
34. Whilst the appeal scheme is in outline with all matters reserved except for access, I have had regard to the indicative master plans. I acknowledge that the development could be set back from Whalley Road, bungalows could be situated on the higher ground, trees retained, properties reoriented to front onto Hammond Ground, a permissive footpath and landscaping provided and a green infrastructure Plan implemented to provide landscape enhancement, as set out in the S106 UU. Whilst the harmful landscape and visual effects could diminish over time as a result of landscaping conditioned by way of a future reserved matters proposal, the proposed mitigation measures would not prevent the development from having substantial harmful effects on the character and appearance of the countryside.
35. Consequently, the proposed development, through the loss of parkland would give rise to substantial harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and the setting of the village and have significant harmful effects upon both the Industrial Foothills and Valleys LCT and Undulating Lowland Farmland with Parkland LCA.

#### Effects on the Forest of Bowland AONB

36. The Forest of Bowland AONB is situated about 650 metres to the north of the appeal site. From some viewpoints, the proposed development would be seen against the backdrop of the AONB. Whilst the appeal scheme would have an adverse effect upon the 'Undulating Lowland Farmland with Parkland' LCA I do not consider this change would be significantly harmful to the AONB itself, This is because in longer distance views, the development would be seen in the context of the existing settlement, with views filtered by trees.
37. The CS states that over 75% of the area is designated as AONB. Consequently, given the provision of new development in the Borough, it is inevitable that views to or from the AONB would be affected. I do however give great weight to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB as per paragraph 172 of the Framework. Whilst I agree that the setting of the AONB would change, I am not convinced that the harm to the AONB would be anything more than minor. This does not change my findings on the local landscape however. Given my findings in respect of the AONB, I do not find conflict with CS Key Statement EN2.

#### *Character and appearance conclusions*

38. To conclude on this matter, whilst I do not consider that Hammond Ground is a valued landscape as per the Framework or that the appeal proposal would give rise to any more than minor harm to the setting of the AONB, I find that the

appeal scheme would give rise to substantial harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and the setting of the village and would have significant harmful effects upon both the Industrial Foothills and Valleys LCT and Undulating Lowland Farmland with Parkland LCA. The proposal conflicts with CS Policies DMG1, DMG2 and DME2. I also find that the appeal scheme fails to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment through the identified harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

*The setting of nearby listed buildings*

39. Read Hall is a grade II\* listed building situated to the west of the appeal site. The large house dates from 1818-1825 and is said to be by George Webster of Kendal. The significance of the listed building is mainly derived from its architectural interest, as noted in its listing description. At the junction of Whalley Road and Hammond Drive is situated the grade II listed Lodge to Read Hall and gateposts. These are also said to be by George Webster and their significance is also largely derived from their architectural interest. In addition a grade II listed icehouse is situated to the northwest of Read Hall, the significance of which is principally due to its historic interest.
40. At the time of my site visit, Read Hall was not visible from the appeal site due to intervening mature trees. There was some discussion at the Hearing regarding the visibility of the Hall in winter, but I am not convinced that it would be clearly seen from the appeal site, given the extent of intervening woodland. Hammond Ground was part of the Read Hall Estate and there is therefore an historical association between the appeal site and the listed buildings.
41. Having regard to the definition of setting of a heritage asset in the Framework and the Historic England Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets 2017, I find that the appeal scheme would cause some modest harm to the setting of Read Hall, due to the loss of parkland. I do not find harm to the settings of the grade II listed Lodge to Read Hall and gateposts or ice house, given the lack of intervisibility or harm to significance.
42. I have also taken into account the potential effect of the appeal scheme on other nearby listed buildings. In regards to the grade II listed Church of St John the Evangelist, this building will continue to be seen within the context of the village and no harm would occur to its significance or setting. In addition, given the separation distances and effects of intervening land and vegetation, I do not find that the settings or significance of the grade II listed Houlker's Farmhouse or the Milestone of Whalley Road would be harmed.
43. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires that special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting. The Framework sets out 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. Any harm to, or loss of significance of a designated heritage asset including from development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification. The harm in this case would however be small. The Framework in paragraph 196 requires that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits. I shall return to this below.



### *Planning obligations*

44. The S106 UU includes obligations relating to affordable housing and off site planting provision. Having had regard to the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the tests set out in paragraph 56 of the Framework and Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations are met in that the obligations would be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
45. The Council confirmed that there was no reason under CIL Regulation 123 regarding the pooling of the contributions set out in the S106 as to why I could not take the obligations into account. I do not disagree. I am satisfied with the form and drafting of the Section 106 UU and I therefore take the obligations into account as material planning considerations.

### **Other matters**

46. I have had regard to the comments made about the proposed additional housing provision in the HED DPD but those are matters for the examination of that plan. I also take into account that the Borough is constrained by Green Belt and the AONB and the comments regarding the scale of development which has taken place in the settlement of Read and Simonstone in relation to its size and function, but these matters do not lead me to a different conclusion.
47. The appellant included a number of appeal decisions including decisions by the Secretary of State in evidence<sup>5</sup>. Whilst I have had regard to these, I have little information regarding the evidence which was before those decision makers to determine whether the circumstances in those cases is similar to that before me.

### **Planning and Heritage balance**

48. I have found conflict with CS Policies DMG1, DMG2, DMH3 and DME2. Whilst I afford moderate weight to the conflict with CS Policies DMG2 and DMH3 given the lack of a 5 year supply of housing sites, I consider that the appeal proposal through the identified conflict does not accord with the development plan as a whole. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise in accordance with S.38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
49. The Council accepts that it cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, though it has demonstrated that in the past 3 years, delivery has exceeded the annualised CS requirement and that it is making efforts to establish a 5 year supply through the HED DPD. I also note that the recent delivery of housing is taking place at a rate which meets the CS requirement and is reducing the historic backlog. The range of figures before me for the supply of housing is between 4.3 to 4.9 years if a 5% buffer is applied to 3.86 to 4.3 years if a 20% buffer is applied. For the purposes of the planning

---

<sup>5</sup> APP/C1625/A/13/2207324; APP/G1630/A/11/2146206/2148635/2159796; APP/T2350/A/13/2190088; APP/H1840/A/13/2199426/2199085; APP/R0660/A/13/2209335; APP/N4720/A/13/2200640; APP/C1760/A/14/2222867; APP/R3325/A/13/22096802/2203867; APP/A0665/W/15/3005148; APP/C3105/A/2201339; APP/Y3940/A/14/2222641; APP/T2350/W/17/3174924; APP/J0405/W/16/3152120/3152132; APP/R0660/A/13/2189733; APP/P0119/A/12/2186546; APP/U1105/A/12/2180060; APP/G5180/W/16/3144248

- balance, I shall nevertheless assume the position of the appellant of 3.86 years supply in my assessment on a worse case basis.
50. CS Policies DMG2 and DMH3 are reliant upon the settlement boundaries which were produced for the Councils District Wide Local Plan 1998. The strict application of these policies would prevent improvements to the shortfall in the supply of housing and I have taken into account the evidence of development taking place outside of the settlement boundaries in the Borough. The development limits do however continue to mark the edge of the village and the countryside and accordingly I afford conflict with them moderate weight.
51. Paragraph 196 of the Framework requires that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits. In this case, I identify some small harm to the setting of the Grade II\* listed Read Hall and I apply great weight to the asset's conservation.
52. The appeal scheme would provide up to 50 dwellings to include bungalows and provision for older people adjacent to a Tier 1 village in an accessible location, 30% of which would be secured by way of the S106 UU as affordable housing. Given the shortfall in housing supply, national policy to significantly boosting the supply of homes and the local need identified for affordable housing in the appellant's assessment, these are significant benefits. The Council and appellant agree, that should I allow the appeal, a shorter timescale should be imposed for the commencement of the development to ensure that it is delivered promptly. Whilst the appeal site is in a single ownership and there is evidence of housing demand locally, there is not clear evidence before me however to demonstrate that housing completions would begin on site within 3 years. Given the scale of the development proposed, I additionally afford limited weight to the generation of employment and increase in spending power locally which would arise from the development. The harm identified to heritage assets would not outweigh these public benefits and in terms of paragraph 11 d) I of the Framework, the application of policies of the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance do not provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.
53. In Paragraph 11 dii), the Framework sets out that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
54. In this case, the substantial harm which would arise to the character and appearance of the countryside, regardless of any other harm significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework when taken as a whole.
55. Overall, taking account of the Framework, which is an important material consideration and the benefits of the development and all other matters raised, I find that material considerations do not indicate that planning permission should be granted for the development, which is in conflict with the development plan.

**Conclusion**

56. For the above reasons and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Philip Lewis*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Paul G Tucker QC	Of Counsel, instructed by Jane Dickman
Jane Dickman BSc(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI FRGS FRICS	Dickman Associates
Gary Holliday BA (Hons), MPhil, CMLI	FPCR (adopted the evidence of Mr P Rech)
Jo Upton BA (Hons) MTP, MSc, IHBC	Orion Heritage

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Sarah Reid	Of Counsel
Nicola Hopkins MRTPI MTCP	Ribble Valley Borough Council
John Macholc BSc Hons, DIP TP, MRTPI, DMS	Ribble Valley Borough Council
Colin Hurst BA (Hons) Dip Png, DMS, MCIM MRTPI	Ribble Valley Borough Council
Carl Taylor BA (Hons) Dip LA CMLI	TMP Landscape

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Martin Crabtree	Chairperson of the Hammond Ground Residents Group
Calvin Lord	Local resident
Councillor Richard Bennett	Councillor and local resident

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING**

- 1 Statement Tim Brown TB Planning BA MRTPI
- 2 Statement by Carol Ashley
- 3 Statement and appendix by Richard Bennett
- 4 Statement and appendix by Martin Crabtree
- 5 Statement and appendix by Paul Shenton

- 6 Statement by Calvin Lord
- 7 FAS Heritage Note: review of heritage evidence for Public Inquiry
- 8 Agreed note Re CEG Land Promotions II Limited V Secretary of State for Housing Communities and local Government v Aylesbury Vale District Council
- 9 Second Supplemental Statement of Common Ground 10 October 2018

**DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE HEARING**

- 1 Dated Unilateral Undertaking
- 2 Agreed planning conditions