



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 20-23 January 2015

Site visit made on 23 January 2015

by John Chase MCD DipArch RIBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/K2420/A/12/2181080

Land East of Groby Village Cemetery, Ratby Road, Groby, Leicestershire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Bloor Homes East Midlands Ltd against the decision of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 12/00250/FUL, dated 19 March 2012, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2012.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 91 dwellings with garages, parking spaces, open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure.
 - This decision supersedes that issued on 22 January 2013. That decision on the appeal was quashed by order of the High Court.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the Inquiry, the appellants submitted a Unilateral Undertaking to make provision for a range of obligations, including contributions towards infrastructure and the supply of affordable housing. In the latter case, there is a clear need for such accommodation, and the requirement arises out of Policy 15 of the Core Strategy¹. In other respects, the obligations do not bear on the main issues, which form the basis on which the appeal is dismissed, and there is no need to determine whether they satisfy the tests in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations, 2010.
3. This decision is made afresh, or 'de novo', and replaces an earlier appeal which was quashed by the courts. There was some debate at the inquiry whether the previous version was a material consideration and, if so, the weight to be attached to it. Whatever conclusion may be reached on this point, and as will become apparent from the reasoning below, there is sufficient change in circumstances arising in the two years since the earlier decision was written for the conclusions of the previous inspector to have little bearing on those now reached.

¹ Hinckley and Bosworth Local Development Framework, Core Strategy, adopted December 2009

Main Issues

4. The main issues are: 1) whether the Council are able to demonstrate a five year housing supply, 2) the effect of the development on the Green Wedge, and 3) whether the proposal is premature so as to undermine the preparation of the Site Allocations Plan.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is an open field of approximately 4.4ha, forming part of a larger triangular tract of land, which includes a cemetery, and which is bordered on two sides by roads, and on the third by the line of a former tram track, which separates it from residential development in the village of Groby. There is a public footpath on its western boundary, and permissive footpaths on the tram track and on a narrow strip of open land to the south. The wider area contains playing fields attached to the Brookvale High School, and open countryside. To the south west is the M1 motorway, in a cutting, and then the village of Ratby. The open land between Groby and Ratby, including the appeal site, is designated by Policy 9 of the Core Strategy as part of a Green Wedge. It is the appellants' intention to construct 91 dwellings on the land, of which 40% would be affordable housing. The properties would be in a range of sizes, set around an estate road served by a new access from Ratby Road.

Housing Supply

6. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) creates the intention to boost significantly the supply of housing, by, amongst other measures, requiring planning authorities to identify their full, objectively assessed need (FOAN) for market and affordable housing, and to identify a five year supply of deliverable sites to meet this requirement. During the Inquiry, the main parties agreed a schedule setting out their respective positions in achieving this five year supply. In summary, the Council claim that they are able to demonstrate 5.49 years, whereas the appellants consider that it is 3.68 years.
7. In calculating these estimates both main parties have used a FOAN of 450 dwellings per annum (dpa). This figure is derived from the Core Strategy, adopted 2009, which in turn is based on the, now withdrawn, Regional Strategy. However, it is the Council's contention that it is also supported by more recent data. The appellants do not accept this to be so, but are willing to adopt the figure for the purposes of this appeal alone. There is, therefore, no reason to prefer an alternative FOAN in the present case.
8. The main outstanding areas of difference are i) whether the existing shortfall in meeting housing need should be made up throughout the term of the Core Strategy (the 'Liverpool' method), or during the next five years (the 'Sedgefield' method); ii) whether the shortfall amounts to persistent under delivery, so as to attract the 20% buffer described in NPPF para 47; and iii) whether the Council have over-estimated the level of supply.

Liverpool v Sedgefield Methods

9. Whilst it is the appellants' contention that the Sedgefield method has been endorsed in the majority of appeals, there have been instances of a preference for the Liverpool method in this Council area. This approach gains support

from the Core Strategy Inspector's report², which notes that the supply trajectory indicated an undersupply in the early years of the plan period, but that there would be a surplus later, when the planned Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) would come on stream. It was anticipated that the shortfall would be addressed after 2017/18.

10. However, the Core Strategy Inspector based his conclusion on a trajectory which showed a much more rapid delivery of housing in the early years of the plan than has actually occurred, and on the expectation of an earlier adoption of the Site Allocations Plan³. Preparation of this plan has been delayed, as has delivery from the SUEs, with an expectation that Barwell and Earl Shilton will produce only 220 units within the forthcoming five years⁴.
11. Having regard to the uncertainty inherent in supply projections, and the cyclical nature of economic conditions, there is some strength to the appellants' argument that delaying the remedy of the shortfall until later in the plan period would increase the likelihood that it would never be fully addressed. It is also the case that the current under-supply represents an unmet need which exists now, rather than at a later date, and that the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) indicates that planning authorities should aim to deal with any undersupply in the first five years of the plan period, where possible.
12. The Council draw attention to the recent Secretary of State appeal decision at Sketchley House, Burbage⁵, within this Borough, which, amongst other matters, notes that the use of the Liverpool method would achieve the FOAN over the course of the plan period, and that the PPG advice is mainly aimed at the preparation of new plans. However, it falls short of clearly preferring the Liverpool approach, noting that a five year supply in that case could not be identified whichever method was used.
13. Overall, it is the conclusion in this appeal that the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to boost significantly the supply of housing would be best served by making up the existing undersupply during the shorter term, in accordance with the Sedgfield methodology.

Whether there has been persistent under-delivery

14. Again, appeal decisions in the Borough have varied in their approach to this matter. Recent decisions include that at Sketchley House, referred to above, which did not discover persistent under-delivery, noting that, whilst the housing target had been met only once since the adoption of the Core Strategy, there was no requirement that the delivery of dwellings should always match the annual average provision. By comparison, decisions at Stanton Under Bardon Primary School⁶ and Ashby Road, Hinckley⁷ came to the opposite conclusion.
15. The evidence presented in this case indicates that, since the plan period commenced in 2006/7, there has been a deficit in 6 of the 8 years, amounting to a cumulative shortfall of 630 dwellings, or about 18% of the requirement. However, over a longer period, between 2001 and 2014, there has been an

² Final Report on the Examination into the Hinckley and Bosworth Core Strategy, 27 November 2009

³ Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document

⁴ Joint summary of housing supply, Appeal Document A6

⁵ APP/K2420/A/13/2208318, issued 18 November 2014

⁶ APP/K2420/A/13/2200224, issued 31 March 2014

⁷ APP/M2460/A/14/2213689, issued 4 December 2014

overall surplus of 355 units. There is some merit in taking a longer view than the period which is mainly encompassed by the recent recession in the housing market. The Planning Practice Guidance notes that the assessment of the local delivery record is likely to be more robust if a longer term is taken, which reflects the peaks and troughs of the housing market cycle. There are grounds to consider that persistent under-delivery has not been demonstrated, and a buffer of 5% would be sufficient to ensure choice and competition in the market and to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply.

Supply of Housing Land

16. The Council claim a five year stock of deliverable sites for 2787 dwellings, the appellants 2319, a difference of 468 units. The areas of disagreement include the level of discount necessary to reflect the likelihood that some of the identified supply will not be delivered. The Council's figure of 4% for larger sites is based on records of the rate of lapses of planning permission, but the appellants argue that sites may also be delayed during the currency of a planning permission. Whilst there is no evidential base for their preferred figure of 10%, there are examples of a discount at this level being accepted in other appeals, and it is not wholly out of keeping with the level of uncertainty which is a characteristic of housing assessments.
17. There is also a case to support the removal of potential sites, and those where construction has started, if there has been no progress over an extended period. However, in an improving market, and with the passage of time, it seems likely that some of these sites will come forward and it would not be reasonable to wholly eliminate their number. For the purposes of this appeal, a middle position is taken between the parties' figures by discounting half of those in this category.
18. Finally, a strategic site has been identified to the west of Hinckley, in the control of the present appellants, which could deliver some dwellings within five years. A number of documents were provided to the Inquiry indicating both the developer's expectation that the site would come forward, and a range of potential building rates. However, although the proposal has attracted relatively few objections at this stage, there is a likelihood that their number and substance would increase once the proposals become more advanced, and, in the absence of a planning permission or adopted site allocations plan, there is no certainty about either the timing or nature of the development. In terms of the definition at footnote 11 of the NPPF, the site cannot be considered deliverable for the time being.

Whether the Council can demonstrate a five year housing supply

19. It is the outcome of this analysis that the Council estimate of the supply of deliverable sites should be reduced to approximately 2400 dwellings. If the FOAN is adjusted to take up the outstanding shortfall, in accordance with the Sedgefield method, and a 5% buffer is applied, the total requirement amounts to 553 dpa⁸. Therefore, the supply would equate to about 4.34 years, indicating that the Council are not able to demonstrate a five year housing supply.

⁸ Appeal Document A6

The Green Wedge

20. The site falls within the Rothley Brook Meadow Green Wedge, which is described in the Core Strategy as intended to protect the green infrastructure of the Borough. Policy 9 sets out the acceptable uses, which do not include residential development. It goes on to require that any development in the Green Wedge should meet a number of criteria, including: retaining its function; retaining and creating green networks between the countryside and urban open spaces; retaining and enhancing public access, especially for recreation; and retaining the visual appearance. The Core Strategy also makes reference to a review of the Green Wedge, with a document being issued in December 2011⁹ following a draft version in September of that year.

The Status of Policy 9

21. Before proceeding further it is necessary to establish whether the application of Policy 9 is outweighed by material considerations, and in particular the provisions of the NPPF. Para 14 indicates that, where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, then permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Para 215 requires that weight should be given to relevant policies according to their consistency with the NPPF.
22. Policy 9 is neither absent nor silent, which is a matter confirmed in the Bloor Homes judgement¹⁰ on the previous appeal, and there is no indication that circumstances have changed so as to lead to a different conclusion on this point. However, where previously it was determined that the Council could demonstrate a five year housing supply, for the reasons set out above, that is no longer the case. In these circumstances, NPPF para 49 requires that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date.
23. In this respect, it is the appellants' contention that Policy 9 falls within the scope of para 49 by being relevant to the supply of housing. Reference is made to the determination in appeals in Honeybourne and Winchcombe¹¹, for example, albeit with some variation in circumstances, and to the judgement in Cotswold¹², which found that a policy restricting housing development outside development boundaries was relevant to the supply of housing. On the other hand, a policy concerning a Green Wedge in the William Davis case¹³ was considered not to relate to the supply of housing. If these judgements are to be distinguished, the policy in Cotswold related to all areas outside development boundaries, whereas William Davis referred to a specifically defined area of Green Wedge. This distinction is also made in the South Northamptonshire case¹⁴, where a policy which prevented development in the open countryside was deemed to be relevant to the supply of housing, but, as a very general policy, it could be contrasted with policies to protect specific areas or features, such as gaps between settlements. This decision goes on to note that whether a particular policy falls within the scope of para 49 is a matter of planning judgement.

⁹ Hinckley and Bosworth Green Wedge Review, December 2011

¹⁰ Bloor Homes Ltd v SOS for CLG, [2014] EWHC 754 (Admin)

¹¹ APP/H1840/A/12/2171339, issued 24 August 2012, and APP/G1630/A/12/2183317, issued 14 May 2013

¹² Cotswold District Council v SOS for CLG, [2013] EWHC 3719 (Admin)

¹³ William Davis Ltd v SOS for CLG, [2013] EWHC 3058 (Admin)

¹⁴ South Northamptonshire Council v SOS for CLG, [2014] EWHC 573 (Admin)

24. In this instance, Policy 9 appears closer to the circumstances of William Davis than to those in Cotswold. This part of the Green Wedge, whilst of some extent and crossing several local authority boundaries, has a relatively narrow and lineal form, passing between Leicester and the villages on its north western side. It covers a limited proportion of each of the constituent authorities and neither this, nor the other area of Green Wedge in this Borough, amounts to a blanket restriction on development outside settlements. In this respect, it cannot be construed as subject to a "counterpart" policy, as described in para 47 of the South Northamptonshire judgement. Its purposes, set out as assessment criteria in the Green Wedge Review, are to prevent the merger of settlements; to guide development form; to provide a green lung into urban areas; and, to act as a recreational resource. The intention of the policy is to protect a tract of land from development which might undermine these purposes. Overall, there are grounds to conclude that Policy 9 is not a policy relevant to the supply of housing in the terms set out in NPPF para 49, and should not therefore be considered out of date for that reason.
25. Nor are there grounds to consider that the Green Wedge Policy has fallen out of date because of the passage of time or changes in circumstances. It is a long standing policy, which, as the appellants point out, was not intended to restrict development but to ensure that open space was incorporated into the urban areas on the edge of Leicester. This is a continuing objective.
26. Turning to the implications of NPPF para 215, any weight given to Policy 9 would be diminished by a lack of consistency with the policies of the NPPF. However, whilst the NPPF does not specifically refer to Green Wedges, there is no reason to consider that the objectives that Policy 9 is intended to serve, including the separation of settlements to retain their identity, and promotion of the recreational aspects of countryside, are inconsistent with either the policies or underlying principles of the NPPF.
27. It is also alleged that Policy 9 is inconsistent because it does not incorporate the cost-benefit approach which was identified in the Colman judgement¹⁵. However, the policy considered in that case, which applied to all of the countryside, was clearly prohibitive of development, whereas, by the appellants' own acknowledgement, Policy 9 is a permissive policy. By implication, uses which fall outside those specified will not be acceptable because they would damage the function of the Green Wedge, but it is open to a developer to show that an alternative use would not cause such damage. It is certainly true that the policy does not explicitly state that its objectives could be overcome by the delivery of benefits, but its omission would have little practical effect on the operation of Policy 9, because it is always open to an applicant to argue that material considerations outweigh the development plan¹⁶.
28. There are adequate grounds to decide that Policy 9 is not out of date in terms of NPPF para 14, and is consistent with the NPPF, so as to retain weight in the consideration of this appeal. The question arises, therefore, as to whether, and to what degree, the proposal would be in conflict with that policy by causing harm to the function of the Green Wedge. In this respect, the purposes derived from the Green Wedge Review, referred to above, were adopted by both main parties as a means of assessing the impact, and there is no reason

¹⁵ Anita Colman v SOS for CLG, [2013] EWHC 1138 (Admin)

¹⁶ Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

to seek alternative criteria. Of these, the appellants point out that guiding development form is not engaged because it refers to amendments to the Green Wedge to shape the development of new communities, and it is accepted this has limited relevance to the present situation. The other purposes are considered below.

The Impact of the Development on the Green Wedge

29. It is contended that the Green Wedge plays a limited role in separating Groby and Ratby because of the lack of inter-visibility, and because of the dividing effect of the M1 Motorway. On this latter point, it is certainly true that the motorway is a physical barrier. However, its location in a cutting means that it is an audible, rather than visual presence, so that, to the observer, there is continuity of landscape to the edge of Ratby. Nor is it accepted that the settlements would remain effectively concealed from one another. At the time when the site visit took place, the upper parts of buildings in Ratby were clearly visible to the west of the site. For at least a portion of the year, it would be apparent on the ground that the countryside between the settlements was significantly decreased, diminishing the perception of their identity as separate villages. Similarly, travellers using the road between Ratby and Groby would become aware of the closer proximity of these settlements, which would take on the character of being divided by a narrow neck of open land, rather than the current impression of being set within countryside. The area retains a largely rural character, despite the open, non-agricultural uses on adjoining land, and the appeal site contributes to this impression.
30. Part of the function of the Green Wedge as a green lung is to provide a connection between urban areas and the open countryside. The lineal form of the wedge, passing between settlements, gives close accessibility to rural land, as well as a link to the wider countryside beyond. At a more local level, this part of the Green Wedge is adjacent to Cowpen Spinney, an area of green space which protrudes into the built-up part of Groby, to the east of the former tramway. Development of the site would largely surround the spinney with urban development, and remove its connection with the countryside, so diminishing accessibility through it to the rural area.
31. There is no indication of a right of public access to the appeal site, and the Green Wedge Review does not suggest a recreational function of the land. Notwithstanding this, the existing field gives an open, rural aspect to its surroundings, including the footpaths bordering the site. The character of those paths would change with development of the land, and, to the extent that they are used by walkers, and by those enjoying the wider countryside, there would be a reduction in the overall recreational value.
32. Although the assessment of these criteria would indicate damage to the function of the Green Wedge, it is suggested by the appellants that the nature of the site and its surroundings are such as to minimise any harm, and account is taken of their landscape analysis in this respect. It is certainly the case that there is existing vegetation on the boundaries of the site, which would be reinforced as part of the development, and the housing would be set in from the surrounding roads. Nonetheless, whilst in its present condition the site is not especially prominent in the area, tending to blend into the general landscape, new housing would be sufficiently visible, both through and between boundary planting, as to have a decisive effect on the character of the site and

its surroundings. It is the case that the road system around the triangle of land is an urbanising influence, but there is no substantial reason to conclude that the outer edges of the appeal site would provide a preferable or more logical boundary to this part of the settlement than the former tramway, which, by being raised on an embankment and surrounded by mature trees, creates a clear demarcation of the nearest part of the village.

33. There was a distinct change of approach to the assessment of this part of the Green Wedge between the draft Green Wedge Review of September 2011 and the final version in December. Where the earlier report noted that the appeal site did not achieve the objectives of the Green Wedge, and had a more limited impact on its overall functioning than other more sensitive areas, the later version found that it did perform the separation of settlements and helped to guide development form. The appellants question whether this change of view was justified by the altered circumstances identified in the report, and this point is noted. Nonetheless, limited weight can be attributed to the superseded draft Review. Similarly, the site was identified as one of 28 'preferred sites' in Groby in the Draft Preferred Options Report of 2009¹⁷, but excluded in the Pre-Submission Report of 2014¹⁸, and, again, limited weight can be given to the earlier draft document. The 2013 SHLAA¹⁹ does not wholly exclude consideration of the site for housing, but acknowledges that its Green Wedge status may be a severe limitation.
34. Regard is also had to a number of other sites, some of which are in adjoining Boroughs, where planning permission has been granted for development in the Green Wedge, including the substantial housing and commercial scheme in Glenfield²⁰. By their nature, each case has different characteristics, and, even if it is necessary to develop part of the Green Wedge to meet the requirement for housing land, each case is assessed on its merits, and no general principle may be derived to indicate that circumstances will invariably overcome the need to retain Green Wedge land.

Conclusions on the Green Wedge

35. For the reasons given, Policy 9 is not outweighed by the provisions of the NPPF, and the development would be contrary this policy by having a harmful effect on the function of the Green Wedge.

Prematurity

36. Part of the Council's grounds of refusal state that the development would be premature to the plan making process by allocating a site and amending the Green Wedge boundary ahead of consideration and consultation of the Site Allocations and Generic Development Policies DPD. In response, the previous Inspector²¹ noted that para 17 of the NPPF indicates that planning should be genuinely plan led, and that permission now would undermine the role of the Council and local communities in this process. At that time, it was anticipated that the Site Allocations Plan would be subject to examination at the beginning of 2014.

¹⁷ Site Allocations and Generic Development Control Policies: Consultation Draft Preferred Options Report 2009

¹⁸ Site Allocations and Development Management Policies: Pre-Submission Report, Discounted Site Paper, 2014

¹⁹ Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, 2013 Review

²⁰ APP/T2405/A/10/2138666, October 2011

²¹ Quashed decision APP/K2420/A/12/2181080, 22 January 2013

37. In the event the programme has slipped, with the Plan still to complete its consultation period at the time of writing, and the examination expected no earlier than the summer of 2015. This follows a series of slippages which have occurred since adoption of the Core Strategy in 2009. In addition, the previous Inspector found a five year housing supply, whereas its absence in this case creates an increased need to allocate sites in advance of the Plan. The Planning Practice Guidance notes that refusal of planning permission on the grounds of prematurity will seldom be justified where a Local Plan has yet to be submitted for examination, and, unless the effect would be so significant as to undermine matters central to the emerging plan.
38. The Site Allocations Plan has not reached the stage of examination, and there is no indication that the grant of planning permission would have a determining effect on it. Whilst there is a need to support a plan led system, the delivery of that plan has become protracted, and there is a requirement for land in advance of its adoption. In the circumstances, it is not accepted that the proposal is premature so as to undermine the preparation of the Site Allocations Plan.

Sustainability and Overall Conclusions

39. The presumption in favour of development in the NPPF applies to sustainable development, which is defined in para 7 as having economic, social and environmental components. The provision of market and affordable housing would satisfy both economic and social aspects of sustainability. In circumstances where there is an identified shortfall in the supply of housing, and a clear need for affordable dwellings in the area, the scheme would help to meet the NPPF objective of boosting the supply of housing in order to contribute to a wide choice of homes. Similarly, there would be the environmental benefit of public access to the open space on the estate, albeit this would be of limited extent and closely related to the new housing.
40. Core Strategy Policy 8 seeks to support local services in Groby and ensure local people have access to a range of housing by the provision of a minimum of 110 new homes. Whilst the draft Site Allocations Plan aims to meet these needs on alternative sites, the plan has not yet been to examination, which diminishes the weight that may be applied to it, and, in any event, there is little evidence that exceeding this minimum level would be unduly harmful to the village, especially as any additional pressure on infrastructure could be met by planning obligations. The site is in an accessible location, with facilities available without the need to rely on private vehicles, and there is no reason to consider that the increased population could not be successfully absorbed into the community of Groby.
41. Set against these positive attributes is the objective of Policy 9 to secure a Green Wedge to contribute to the life of urban residents. The site is within the area of open land separating Groby and Ratby and, on a wider scale, forms part of a linked network of open spaces to provide a green lung and connection with the surrounding countryside. Its development would undermine the identified purposes of the Green Wedge, for the reasons set out above. In these respects it would not meet those aspects of the social and environmental components of sustainability which concern the need to protect the natural environment and the well being of local residents.

42. In forming a judgement between these competing objectives, the location of the site within a relatively narrow portion of the Green Gap is of particular importance. The projection of the urban area of Groby towards Ratby would diminish the width of the gap to the degree that its role in separating these settlements would be seriously undermined. This, combined with the loss of part of the green lung, and the harmful effect on the recreational value of adjoining land, is of sufficient importance to outweigh the positive aspects of the scheme, so as to render it an unsustainable form of development overall, for which there is no presumption in favour. Despite the conclusions that the Council are not able demonstrate a five year housing supply, and that the proposal would not be premature to the emerging site allocations plan, the conflict with Policy 9 renders the proposal contrary to the development plan, and the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

John Chase

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr T Leader	Of Counsel
He called	
Mr A Thompson BSc, MPhil, MRTPI	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Mr R Crosthwaite BA, DipTP, MRTPI	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Dr D Hickie BSc, MA, PhD, CMLI, CEnv, MIEMA, IHBC, MISP	David Hickie Associates

FOR THE APPELLANTS:

Mr J Cahill QC	
He called	
Mr J Peachey BSc, M.LD, CMLI	Pegasus Group
Mr A Bateman BA TP, MRICS, MRTPI, MCMi, MIoD, FRSA	Pegasus Group

FOR THE GROBY AND RATBY PARISH COUNCILS:

Mr S Stanion	Solicitor, Marrons Shakespeares
He called	
Mr J Coley	Chairman, Groby Parish Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr M Lambert Dip T, MRTPI	On behalf of Leicestershire Police
Mr A Tyrer BA, MRTPI	On behalf of Leicestershire County Council

DOCUMENTS

FROM THE APPELLANTS

- A1 List of representatives at the appeal
- A2 Completed Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking
- A3 Response to LPA Housing Land Availability Evidence
- A4 Letter from Bloor Homes to A Bateman dated 16 January 2015
- A5 Opening Statement on behalf of the Appellants
- A6 Updated tables to show housing land supply position
- A7 Closing statement on behalf of the Local Planning Authority at Land East of Groby Village Cemetery Inquiry of December 2012
- A8 R (on application of Perret) v SOS for CLG, [2009] EWCA Civ 1365
- A9 Court of Appeal; Solihull MBC v Gallagher Estates and Lioncourt Homes, [2014] EWCA Civ 1610
- A10 Examples of recent appeal decisions where Sedgefield methodology endorsed by the Inspector and Secretary of State
- A11 Report of the Deputy Chief Executive re: Green Wedge Review, 20 December 2011
- A12 Email from M Whitehead dated 22 October 2014 enclosing notes of meeting concerning Hinckley West on 17 September 2014
- A13 Email from M Whitehead dated 21 January 2015 with enclosures concerning Section 106 Undertaking
- A14 Consultee comments concerning impact on GP Practices of 14 May 2012
- A15 Email from County Council dated 31 July 2012 concerning archaeological work
- A16 Appellants' closing statement

FROM THE RULE 6 PARTIES

- B1 Opening statement on behalf of Groby and Ratby Parish Councils
- B2 Parish Councils' closing statement
- B3 Supplementary proof by Leicestershire County Council
- B4 Consultation response from Leicestershire County Council Highway Authority

FROM THE BOROUGH COUNCIL

- C1 Email from A Sykes of 1 September 2014 concerning rate of delivery on land west of Normandy Way, Hinckley
- C2 Feedback Analysis for Land off Normandy Way, Hinckley on behalf of Bloor Homes dated December 2014
- C3 Minutes of HBBC Pre-application Meeting of 17 September 2014, concerning Hinckley West
- C4 Email from R Crowthwaite to A Thompson of 16 January 2015, concerning Residual Housing Requirements
- C5 Letter from Signet Planning and Charnwood BC dated 31 March 2014 concerning impact of Planning Practice Guidance
- C6 Site Suggestion Form re: Laurel Farm, Leicester Road, Groby; Emails re: Land off Bluebell Drive and Grey Close Groby
- C7 Housing supply table 2014 to 2026
- C8 Summary proof of Dr Hickie
- C9 Open Statement by the Local Planning Authority
- C10 Borough Council Meeting Minutes 20 December 2011
- C11 Appeal Decision Ref APP/R0660/A/13/2209335, Land bounded by Gresty Lane, Rope Lane, Crewe Road and A500, Crewe
- C12 Play and Open Space Guide SPD, September 2008
- C13 North Wiltshire District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment
- C14 Council's closing statement

Richborough Estates