



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 12 January 2016

Site visit made on 12 January 2016

by Y Wright BSc (Hons) DipTP MSc DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 February 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P1045/W/15/3132535

Land off Wheeldon Way, Hulland Ward, Derbyshire

- 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 Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd against the decision of Derbyshire Dales District Council.
 - The application Ref 14/00698/OUT, dated 13 October 2014, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2015.
 - The development proposed is residential development of up to 48 dwellings, creation of new access and associated public open space, landscaping and drainage infrastructure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and outline planning permission is granted for residential development of up to 48 dwellings, creation of new access and associated public open space, landscaping and drainage infrastructure in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 14/00698/OUT, dated 13 October 2014, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters, except for the point of access, reserved for future determination. I have considered the appeal on this basis, although I note the illustrative housing layout provided.

Main Issue

3. The main issue as regards this proposed development is whether it would be consistent with the principles of sustainable development having regard to the Framework and the development plan, particularly in relation to the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Planning legislation clearly states that proposals should be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. However, the weight to be attached to policies in the existing development plan must be assessed in accordance to their degree of consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which sets out the Government's planning policies and is a material consideration.
-

5. The site is outside the defined settlement boundary of Hulland Ward as identified in the *Derbyshire Dales Local Plan 2005* (LP). However, the Council acknowledges that in the absence of a five year housing land supply (5YHLS), adopted local plan policies relevant to the supply of housing are considered to be out of date and planning decisions on housing development must therefore be made in the context of Paragraph 14 of the Framework. As such although the Council in the decision notice cites LP policy SF4 within its reason for refusal, the Council confirmed in its written statement of case and again at the Hearing that it no longer wished to rely on the content of this policy in defending the appeal. I therefore determine the appeal on this basis.
6. The Framework supports housing development through the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It then goes on to advise that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental which are mutually dependent and should not be taken in isolation. As specific reference is made to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area within the Council's reason for refusal, I will consider the environmental role first.

Environmental role including character and appearance

7. The appeal site is located on the western edge of Hulland Ward within the open countryside in the Parish of Biggin-by-Hulland. Hulland Ward is considered to be one of the larger villages within the Derbyshire Dales District and comprises predominantly post-war residential development, located mainly to the north of the main A517 road.
8. The site extends to approximately 2.12 hectares and is rural in character comprising two agricultural fields, used as pasture. There are further fields adjacent to the north and north east. Due to the topography of the area the site slopes down in a north easterly direction. Native mature hedgerows, trees and vegetation line the boundaries of the site and a hedgerow divides the upper and lower fields. The site is currently accessed through a farm gate directly off Wheeldon Way.
9. The appeal site is enclosed by existing village development on two sides. Properties on Wheeldon Way, Ashes Avenue and Eaton Close back directly on to the south eastern boundary of the site. Beyond and raised above the appeal site to the south west is further development including the dwellings at Biggin View. To the north east is an existing playing field, multi-use games area, playground and a public footpath (Hulland Ward FP14).
10. The Council's reason for refusal states that the development would result in harmful encroachment into the countryside which would be detrimental to its character and appearance and that of the settlement. The Council states that the proposal would be contrary to LP Policy NBE8 which indicates that planning permission will only be granted for development that protects or enhances the character, appearance and local distinctiveness of the landscape. The development would clearly be contrary to this policy.
11. However at the Hearing I heard different points of view as to the degree of consistency Policy NBE8 has in relation to the Framework. In this regard I have considered the High Court judgements¹ and appeal decisions² drawn to

¹ Colman v the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Others [2013] EWHC1138 (Admin) and Gallagher Homes and Lioncourt Homes Ltd v Solihull MBC [2014] EWHC1283 (Admin)

- my attention by the appellant though I note that some of the latter relate predominantly to LP Policy SF4.
12. Whilst I recognise that Policy NBE8 seeks to protect the character of local landscapes, I consider it significantly restricts development which is at odds with the Framework's more balanced approach on determining planning applications. On matters including landscape character and development in the countryside, the Framework accepts that development may be permitted unless adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies within the Framework indicate that development should be restricted. On this basis I consider that Policy NBE8 is not consistent with the Framework and consequently I give it limited weight.
 13. However notwithstanding this, character and appearance and the effect of development on local landscape remain important considerations in the determination of applications and appeals, having regard to the policies in the Framework as a whole. The Council has referred to a relevant Ministerial Statement in this regard and I am mindful of the Framework's requirement to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
 14. This part of the Derbyshire Dales District is not part of a designated landscape. However it has been suggested that the site forms part of a valued landscape. By the level of consultation responses before me it is clear that local residents greatly value the appeal site and the surrounding landscape. Nevertheless when questioned at the Hearing the Council confirmed that the appeal site was not a valued landscape for the purposes of paragraph 109 of the Framework. I also note that the Council's Landscape Officer does not object to the proposal.
 15. The Council's Landscape Sensitivity Study 2015 was submitted to me at the Hearing by the appellant (doc 4). This was commissioned by the Council to assess the sensitivity of the landscape surrounding settlements for housing development as part of the production of the emerging new Local Plan. This study concludes that the majority of land around Hlland Ward is of high landscape sensitivity due to the topography of the area which affords long distance views of the surrounding landscape. However it specifically highlights land to the west of the village, which includes the appeal site, as having medium sensitivity due to its *'semi-enclosure by tree belts and hedgerows and the presence of development on higher topography above'*. In addition the appeal is supported by a *Landscape and Visual Report 2015* submitted by the appellant, which concludes that the appeal proposals would be acceptable in landscape and visual terms.
 16. On my site visit I viewed the appeal site from a number of public vantage points within the area, including a new caravan/campsite to the east. Whilst I saw for myself the generally open nature of the landscape surrounding the village, I saw that views of the appeal site from the west and north were restricted to some degree by the hedgerows and trees which form natural screening along its boundary and by other intervening vegetation on adjacent land. I also saw that views of the site from the east were limited due to the extent of existing village development. Overall I saw that the adjacent urban form of the village dominates views of the site including the houses at Biggin View which are particularly prominent on the skyline above the appeal site.

² Appeal Refs: APP/P1045/A/14/2218952, APP/P1045/A/13/2195546, APP/P1045/A/14/2226401 and APP/P1045/A/14/2227116

17. Nevertheless I acknowledge that the proposal would clearly introduce urban development on to what is currently a site of rural character which locally would inevitably cause some adverse impact to the character and appearance of the area. However taking account of such factors as the site's location adjacent to and lower than existing development, the proposed retention of landscape features and the provision of additional planting and public open space within the site, I consider that the visual impact of the development would be limited when viewed in the context of the wider landscape setting. I also consider that in terms of scale, the proposal would be seen as a proportionate extension to the present built up area. Whilst concerns have been raised about the density of the development and the heights of the proposed houses, these would be considered at the reserved matters stage. Therefore overall I conclude that the harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area would be limited.
18. The site is within close proximity to a range of local services and facilities including a primary school, medical centre, village hall, general store, two public houses, a recreation ground and a children's playground. I also note that the nearest bus stops on the A517 are located around 150 metres from the site entrance, providing access to further services and facilities in Ashbourne, Derby and Belper which would reduce dependence on the private car. Furthermore it is not part of the Council's case that Hulland Ward is an unsustainable location for development. The Highway Authority also does not object to the proposal on sustainable transport grounds. On this basis I consider the appeal site is within a sustainable location.
19. Concerns have also been raised about the impact of the development on highway safety in relation to the additional traffic that would be created and the narrow, sloping and single point of entry and exit from the site. I was told at the Hearing that during the winter the existing roads are prone to severe ice and become dangerous to drive on as they are not salted or cleared. I was also told that the narrowness of the access would be of concern for emergency vehicles. Whilst I recognise these concerns, there is no substantive evidence before me to support the view that the proposal would cause demonstrable harm to highway safety or would result in a severe impact on the existing highway network. Furthermore I note that the Highway Authority does not object to the proposal and I have no reason to disagree with this view.
20. I accept that during the construction period there would be an increase in traffic locally due to the construction works, but this would be temporary and I am satisfied that such traffic could be adequately managed through the imposition of a suitable construction management statement condition.
21. Reference has also been made by interested parties to the effect of the development on a number of listed buildings within the area. Both main parties agree that the considerable distances between the appeal site and these heritage assets mean that the proposal would not have any significant effect on their settings. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree with this view.
22. I have taken account of other environmental concerns raised by local residents including those related to the sewage works, flooding and the findings of the drainage survey carried out by the Hulland Ward Village Committee. However I note that the statutory agencies and the Council do not object to the proposal

on these grounds. As such, whilst I acknowledge the concerns of local residents I have no reason to consider that foul and surface water drainage could not be adequately provided through the imposition of a suitably worded condition as suggested by the Environment Agency. I also have no evidence that wildlife would be adversely affected by the proposal and note that the local Wildlife Trust does not object to the development.

23. I conclude therefore that in terms of environmental matters, whilst I have identified some harm to character and appearance at a local level, in terms of the impact from the development on the wider landscape I consider this would be minimal. Overall taking all the above factors in to account I consider that the harm I have identified has limited weight.

Social role

24. The Framework aims to boost significantly the supply of housing and there is no dispute that the Council does not have a 5YHLS. Consequently the contribution that up to 48 dwellings would make to the housing supply for the District therefore weighs substantially in support of this appeal.
25. In addition whilst it was agreed at the Hearing that there is an identified need for affordable housing within the District, the Council indicated that within Hulland Ward it was not needed to the level proposed by the development. I was informed therefore that this element of the proposal should be given lesser weight. In contrast I heard from some local residents who stated that more affordable housing was needed in the village rather than market housing, as some residents had found it difficult to sell their homes. The evidence before me suggests that the Council has requested 8 affordable houses are provided within the site, with the remainder to be delivered elsewhere within the District through a financial contribution. As the need for affordable housing has been clearly demonstrated and a mechanism appears to be in place to deliver it where it is needed I see no reason why affordable housing should be given lesser weight. Consequently this factor weighs significantly in favour of the proposal.
26. Local residents have suggested that smaller developments spread throughout the village would be more appropriate over a longer timeframe to encourage integration of the new residents in to the community and would place less pressure on existing services. Whilst I acknowledge these concerns, no evidence of the availability of other such development sites within the village has been provided to me. In any case I must consider this appeal on its own planning merits. I also consider that the future occupiers of the development would be likely to support and help sustain the provision of existing services and facilities.
27. A number of local residents also consider that there would be harm to their living conditions from noise and loss of outlook, privacy and light. Whilst I acknowledge that the outlook from some properties would change, the proposals are in outline and although layout, appearance and landscaping are reserved matters, in my judgement I see no reason why adequate landscaping and separation distances between properties could not be achieved to avoid undue harm to living conditions in relation to these matters.
28. Concerns have also been raised about the loss of a community asset as the appeal site is used for sledging during the winter. However the land is private

property and whether this use has established any rights is a matter that does not form part of the planning merits of the case.

29. Overall, taking all the above in to account I consider that the social benefits of the development would weigh significantly in support of the proposal.

Economic role

30. I recognise that the development would be likely to boost the local economy by providing construction jobs and supporting local building trades, albeit that this would be for a temporary period. I also acknowledge that the future occupants of the development would be likely to support businesses within the village and local area. I consider such economic benefits would weigh moderately in support of the appeal.
31. At the Hearing concerns were raised that the harm to the landscape would have an adverse impact on the important tourism industry in the area. However I have already established that there would be limited visual impact on the landscape and furthermore I have no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would result in adverse harm to local tourism businesses.

Section 106 agreement

32. A completed and signed certified copy of a S106 planning obligations agreement between Clowes Developments (UK) Ltd, Derbyshire Dales District Council and Derbyshire County Council dated 12 January 2016 was submitted to me at the Hearing (doc 3). This includes the provision of 45% affordable housing to include a proportion of on site provision and a financial contribution towards off site provision. It also includes contributions towards the provision of primary education at the Hulland Ward C E Primary School and an open space scheme. The S106 agreement sets out the specific details of what the different contributions would actually provide including the formula for calculating the education contribution.
33. LP Policy CS8 requires that where a development proposal generates a need for community infrastructure it should be secured through a Section 106 agreement. LP Policy L6 requires the provision of appropriate levels of open space on residential development sites of 0.4 hectares or more.
34. Concerning the education contribution, I have no reason to question that the local primary school is projected to be almost full in the near future and so consider the contribution towards the provision of additional pupil places is appropriate and would be in accordance with LP Policy CS8.
35. As regards open space, the appellant proposes the provision and management of open space within the site for use of the future occupiers of the development and other local residents. As such this would be in accordance with LP Policy L6.
36. Whilst the LP states that most residential development within settlement boundaries should provide 33% affordable housing in accordance with LP Policy H11, the Council confirmed at the Hearing that there is no such percentage provision set out within LP Policy H12 for such development outside settlement boundaries. The Council instead refers to the emerging new Derbyshire Dales

Local Plan which states that 45% affordable housing would be required on such sites.

37. I note that whilst this requirement has not yet been examined the Council considers that this level of provision is based on the most recent housing evidence, which has been produced to support the emerging Local Plan. The appellant confirmed at the Hearing that they were in agreement with this level of provision and have included it within the S106 agreement. As I have no substantive evidence to the contrary, I have no reason to disagree with this level of provision.
38. I note that the request from NHS England for a financial contribution towards local healthcare is not supported by the Council and has not been included in the S106 agreement. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree with this view.
39. I therefore conclude that the obligations set out within the S106 agreement are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the proposal and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed, which satisfies the tests in the Framework and Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy 2010.

Planning balance

40. Whilst I have found that there would be some adverse impact to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, I have concluded that this would be limited. I have found that the development would be within a sustainable location and other environmental matters raised would not weigh against the proposal. The Council accepts that it is unable to demonstrate a 5YHLS and as relevant policies for the supply of housing are out of date the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. The provision of up to 48 dwellings including a significant number of affordable houses weighs substantially in support of the proposal. Other social and economic benefits also carry significant and moderate weight respectively in the appeal's favour.
41. Consequently in accordance with paragraph 14 of the Framework I conclude that the adverse impacts highlighted would not significantly or demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the development.

Conditions

42. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the light of the advice given in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). As such I do not impose all of them, combine some and amend the wording of others, in the interests of precision and enforceability. I am satisfied that the conditions set out in my decision meet the tests within the PPG.
43. Conditions on setting reasonable time limits and the provision of details on reserved matters are necessary as the application made is for outline permission.
44. Whilst layout is a reserved matter, in the interests of highway safety I impose conditions on internal layout design and bin storage. In addition conditions on vehicle parking spaces, manoeuvring and visibility splays for driveway access points are also attached to ensure highway safety. As agreed by both main parties at the Hearing I do not attach a condition that removes permitted

development rights regarding garages and parking spaces nor impose restrictions on driveway gradients at this time, as these are not essential for the development to proceed.

45. To prevent increased risk of flooding, protect water quality and ensure the future maintenance of the sustainable drainage structures, I impose a condition on foul and surface water drainage. However I do not find it necessary to include a separate condition on the disposal of highway surface water drainage and therefore do not impose this.
46. Two land contamination conditions have been suggested by the Council. As there is no evidence before me that there is contamination within the site I do not impose the condition requiring site investigation, risk assessment and the submission of a remediation scheme. However I do include the precautionary condition should any unforeseen contamination be identified during development, in order to ensure that there would be acceptable living conditions for neighbouring residents and future occupiers of the dwellings.
47. A condition requiring a Construction Method Statement is imposed in the interests of highway safety and the living conditions of neighbouring residents. I also attach conditions requiring archaeological site investigations to safeguard the identification and recording of features of historic interest.
48. Whilst landscaping is a reserved matter, I attach conditions to ensure the protection of existing trees and hedges within the site. I also impose a condition to protect wildlife and their habitats through the retention of trees, hedges and shrubs during the bird nesting season.

Conclusion

49. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Y Wright

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters, or in the case of approval of such matters on different dates, the date of the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.
- 3) Details of the access (save for the point of access to the site off Wheeldon Way as referred to as 'Street 01' on drawing EMS.2094_005 D), appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development begins and the development shall be carried out as approved.

- 4) Notwithstanding the submitted information, any subsequent reserved matters in accordance with condition 3 shall include design of the internal layout of the site in accordance with the guidance contained within Derbyshire County Council's 6C's design guide and the Manual for Streets document issued by the Departments for Transport and Communities and Local Government.
- 5) The scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to Condition 4 above shall provide for bin stores within private land to prevent refuse bins and collection vehicles standing on the new estate street for longer than necessary, causing an obstruction or inconvenience for other road users. The facilities shall be provided prior to the first occupation of the dwellings to which they relate to and shall be retained free from any impediment to their designated use thereafter.
- 6) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials and turning of vehicles
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development and site accommodation
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding
 - v) wheel washing facilities
 - vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
 - viii) routes for construction traffic.
- 7) No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Environment Agency. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme to be submitted shall demonstrate:
 - i) Surface water drainage system/s to be designed in accordance with CIRIA C697 and C687, or the National SUDs Standards, should the latter be in force when the detailed design of the surface water drainage system is undertaken.
 - ii) Limiting the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to the 100 year plus 30% (for climate change) critical rain storm, ideally to Greenfield rates for the site but as a minimum so that it will not exceed the run-off from the undeveloped site and will not increase the risk of flooding off-site.

- iii) Provision of surface water run-off attenuation storage in accordance with the requirements specified in 'Science Report SC030219 Rainfall Management for Developments'.
 - iv) Detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details of any attenuation system and the outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the design system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.
 - v) Details of how the on-site surface water drainage systems shall be maintained and managed after completion, and for the lifetime of the development, to ensure long term operation to design parameters.
- 8) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted a remediation strategy to the local planning authority detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with and obtained written approval from the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.
- 9) a) No retained tree shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).
- b) If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the local planning authority.
- c) No equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to the site for the purpose of the development, until a scheme showing the exact position of protective fencing to enclose all retained trees beyond the outer edge of the overhang of their branches in accordance with British Standard 5837 (2005): Trees in Relation to Construction has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and; the protective fencing has been erected in accordance with the approved details. This fencing shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.
- d) In this condition 'retained tree' means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs (a) and (b) above shall have effect until the last property is occupied.
- 10) No removal of hedgerows, trees or shrubs shall take place between 1 March and 31 August inclusive unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of vegetation for active birds' nests

immediately before the vegetation is cleared and provided written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting bird interest on site. Any such written confirmation shall be submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the local planning authority.

- 11) No development shall take place until a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological work has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and until any pre-start element of the approved scheme has been completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority. The scheme shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and
 - a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
 - b. The programme for post investigation assessment
 - c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
 - d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
 - e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
 - f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organization to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation

The initial trial trenching phase shall have taken place, and the report submitted to the local planning authority, before the submission of any further application with details of layout. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation.
- 12) The development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 12 and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.
- 13) Prior to the occupation of each dwelling, the proposed estate roads between that dwelling and the existing public highway shall be laid out in accordance with the approved scheme, or as subsequently revised and approved in writing by the local planning authority, constructed to base level, drained and lit in accordance with Derbyshire County Council's specification for new housing development roads.
- 14) No dwelling shall be occupied until space has been provided within the site for the parking and manoeuvring of residents and visitors vehicles associated with that dwelling, laid out in accordance with a scheme that has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The parking spaces and manoeuvring areas shall be retained throughout the life of the development for those purposes.
- 15) Private driveways/parking spaces to the proposed estate streets, the subject of Condition 4 above, shall not be taken into use until 2m x 2m x 45 degree pedestrian inter-visibility splays have been provided on either

side of the access at the back of the footway, the splay area being maintained throughout the life of the development clear of any object greater than 0.5m in height relative to footway level.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr G Lees	Pegasus Group (Director) – Appellant agent
Mr J Atkin	Pegasus Group, Landscape Architect
Miss J Althorpe	Pegasus Group

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Cllr R Bright	Derbyshire Dales District Council
Mr B Wilson	Barrister, Derbyshire Dales District Council
Mr J Bradbury	Development Manager, Derbyshire Dales District Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Mr M Baxter	Biggin Parish Meeting (Chair)
Mr W Ward	Local resident and member of Hulland Ward Village Committee
Mr M Wise	Local resident and member of Hulland Ward Village Committee
Ms W Whitbread	Local resident and member of Hulland Ward Village Committee
Mr M Hayworth	Local resident and member of Hulland Ward Village Committee
Mr B Potts	Hulland Ward Parish Council (Chair)

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

- 1 Copies of Derbyshire Dales District Council's notification letters for the appeal and Hearing
- 2 Copy of statement made by Hulland Ward Village Committee, Hulland Ward Parish Council and Bigin by Hulland Parish Meeting
- 3 Signed Section 106 Agreement dated 12 January 2016
- 4 Derbyshire Dales District Council Landscape Sensitivity Study 2015

- 5 Copy of agenda and item nos 4 and 5 for the Local Plan Advisory Committee for 12 January 2016 – Derbyshire Dales Local Plan – Key issues consultation and housing target 2013-2033
- 6 Copy of agenda and item no 5 for the Local Plan Advisory Committee for 18 January 2016 – Derbyshire Dales Local Plan – Allocation of sites for residential development 2013-2033 (Southern area)

Richborough Estates