



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 18 - 21 and 25 - 28 June 2019

Site visits made on 17, 21 and 27 June 2019

by H Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/W/19/3225741

Great Heys, 74 Bankhall Lane, Hale Barns WA15 0LW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Octopus Healthcare against Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 96465/FUL/18, is dated 12 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing dwelling and redevelopment of the site to provide a new 64 bed care home (Use Class C2) together with associated access, car parking and landscaping.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Whilst the Council did not determine the application within the prescribed period it confirmed, in advance of the Inquiry, that it would have been refused for three reasons related to heritage assets, character and appearance and protected species¹.
3. Prior to the Inquiry, and following an updated site survey, the presence of Great Crested Newts (GCNs) was confirmed on the site. Consequently, amended plans were prepared to provide two new ponds in the south western part of the site. The Council suggested that this necessitated a change to the description of development and the layout plan, whilst the appellant took an opposing view. In my view, the inclusion of the ponds does not alter the substance of the proposed development. Whilst it would result in a reduction in the amount of usable space on the site for residents (the ponds would not be physically accessible), that reduction would be very modest. I do not consider the amendments to the proposal to be material such that they would prejudice anyone's case. Moreover, the details shown on the plans would form part of a grant of permission. Thus, the inclusion of the ponds in the substituted plans would be covered by the permission. For these reasons, I accepted the amended plans as substitutions.
4. A completed planning obligation by way of a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act (S106) has been provided. The obligation provides for a contribution towards green infrastructure.

¹ See Core Document CD-OR2

5. My site visit on 17 June took place at Abney Court Care Home in Cheadle. This is operated by Care UK who are also intended to be the operator of the development subject to this appeal.
6. One of the witnesses to appear for the Council was unable to attend the Inquiry. With the agreement of the parties, I accepted her Proof of Evidence as a written representation that I have taken into account in determining the appeal.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:
 - The effects on the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Whether it would provide satisfactory access to shops and services;
 - Whether it would provide acceptable living environment having regard to amenity space and the model of care;
 - Whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of designated heritage assets including the South Hale Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Bank Hall; and
 - the effects on protected species.

Reasons

Character and appearance

8. The appeal site lies immediately to the south of Bankhall Lane and is surrounded by fields on three sides and the wooded River Bollin corridor to the south. It is accepted by the Council and the Appellant that the site lies at a transitional point between the residential area to the north and the river valley.
9. When walking along the Public Right of Way (PRoW) from Bankhall Lane, there is some sense of the site's domestic character. However, the vegetation along the PRoW creates a tunnel effect which channels the view towards the wooded river valley and away from the site. The adjoining field to the west also provides the clear presence of an agricultural landscape. In my view, these rural elements are more definitive to the character of the local landscape around the site than the existing dwelling and its more domesticated plot. The overriding impression is that the site occupies a predominantly rural location.
10. The site is influenced by both the Wooded Claylands Landscape Character Type (LCT) and the Wooded River Valley LCT, the characteristics of which are set out in The Landscape Strategy Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) (SPG). Therefore, there is a clear interrelationship between the site and these two LCTs.
11. The proportions of the site and its general ratio of built form to outdoor space are broadly reflective of many other residential plots along Bankhall Lane and in the surrounding streets. The proposed building would extend across the site and its edges would be close to the boundaries. The proposed amount of built form on the plot would disrupt the rural character of the local area and significantly diminish the transitional role of the site.
12. I accept that the proposed development would not be experienced in 'plan view'. Nevertheless, that does not justify a scheme that would be at odds with

the prevailing form of surrounding development and the landscape.

Furthermore, the proposed building would extend to the south, well beyond the rearmost elevation of the existing dwelling. Whilst I acknowledge that the site is a residential plot of domestic character, given its relationship with the surrounding fields and proximity to the river corridor, the proposed development would result in a very substantial amount of built form projecting further towards the open countryside.

13. I accept that the site could be brought back into a residential use if the proposed development does not go ahead and that it could result in the springing-up of further domestic trappings such as sheds, trampolines, garden furniture and garden ornaments etc. However, the effects of these would not be so pronounced as those resulting from a very substantial building extending across much of the site and close to the plot boundaries. Whilst I acknowledge that the effects would be localised, the proposal would nonetheless result in significant residual harm to the character of the area.
14. I turn now to visual matters. Whilst the building would not be widely seen, given how far it would extend to the south on the plot, it would be clearly visible from the gaps in the hedgerow where there are field gates to the east and west of the site. There would be a substantial amount of built form occupying part of those views where currently on a more modest development can be seen. Even though the main blocks of the building would, to an extent, be separated by the glazed links, I nonetheless consider that it would be incongruous and obtrusive. At my site visit, it seemed clear to me that it is not necessary to stop and look over the field gates to understand that the proposal would be unacceptably eye catching in the view through the gaps.
15. In addition, even though the site is bounded by mature vegetation, there are gaps within it alongside the PRow, to which the building would be very close, particularly at one point. Even with additional planting, the sense of a very large development close to the PRow would remain. The viewer would have the perception of a large building and the views of the building would be sequential meaning that the experience would be one of there being a single large building stretching across much of the site and ending close to its boundaries.
16. A development has been proposed on the adjoining field to the east of the site. Whilst there is no certainty that it will go ahead, on the evidence put to the Inquiry, it nonetheless signifies an acceptance by the Council that this other site could be developed to provide a modestly sized housing scheme. Were this to happen, it would result in the blocking of views of the appeal scheme from the gap formed in the hedgerow by the eastern field gate. I therefore give limited weight to the effects arising from the proposal in views from the east along Bankhall Lane. Nevertheless, there would still be a harmful visual effect from the west and from along the PRow.
17. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with CS policy R2 which includes a requirement for proposals to protect and enhance landscape character. It would also conflict with policy L7 which amongst other things broadly seeks to improve an area's character and quality.

Access to shops and services

18. The evidence indicates that residents of the proposed care home would be those approaching the last two years or so of their lives and/or living with

dementia. At the Inquiry, the Residents' Group put it to me that having a care need does not equate to immobility and that such people are not a uniform group. That, to me seems to be a reasonable proposition and accordingly, I agree that residents would have very different individual needs.

19. It was accepted that the nearest shops and services to the site are located about a mile away in Hale which is well-beyond walking distance or that which could be covered by someone in a wheelchair. Whilst there are bus stops within what would be acceptable walking distance for able bodied people, those who are less ambulant would not be able to access public transport to get to Hale or elsewhere to go shopping or visit a café for example. Thus, residents of the care home would be reliant on motorised transport for shopping trips and the like.
20. I acknowledge that many visits to shops etc would be undertaken by means of a Care UK-operated minibus or by family and friends in a car. However, I have no clear details of how the minibus service would be operated to accord with individual needs or how it would be shared with other Care UK homes. I cannot therefore be certain that it would provide an acceptable service to ensure residents were able to get out to a local centre.
21. Notwithstanding this, residents of the care home might wish to take a short, gentle stroll 'around the block'. At my site visits, I noted that the pavements along Bankhall Lane are narrow, which would make it difficult for a resident to walk alongside a carer or to provide for wheelchair access. The PRoW next to the site is also of constrained width and does not have an even surface which, at times, may also be very muddy. Thus, there are practical issues that cast doubt over its suitability as a walking route for future residents of the care home.
22. Planning Practice Guidance says that inclusive design can help older and disabled people live more independently and reduce health and social care costs. This includes considerations around transport infrastructure and the ease and comfort of movement on foot and with mobility aids between homes, services and town centres. This supports the Framework requirement for developments to address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport.
23. I accept that the nature of residents would make it extremely unlikely that many would be able to leave the care home unaccompanied, irrespective of the prohibitive distances to shops etc. However, that does not mean that those who could should not be able to and for the above reasons, they would be prohibited from doing so. For some residents, even though they would be able to walk around the building, the sense would be one of being unable to leave the site.
24. Moreover, such a situation appears to be at odds with Care UK's own standards in relation to those living with dementia which are set out in its publication *Good to go – A guide to dementia-friendly days out*². This actively encourages simple trips out including walks around the block. At my site visit to the Abney Court home, I observed that it is situated within a parkland that residents can access for an accompanied walk. This aligns with the dementia-friendly set-up promoted by Care UK and is a very different scenario to the one before me.

² See Appendix 1 to Appendix 3 of Mr Hinds' Rebuttal Proof of Evidence

25. Whilst residents of the home could be visited by school and community groups from outside, that does not replace the need for people to feel as though they are a valued part of local society by getting out into the local community. It seems to me that the importance of simple pleasures such as a short walk around the local area are extremely valuable to those in the very latter stages of their lives and/or living with dementia. In this regard, the proposal would fail to meet the needs of its residents. I turn now to travel considerations in relation to care home staff and visitors.
26. There are two bus services (nos. 283 and 284) that run between Warburton Green and Altrincham Interchange, stopping at Hale Barns, Well Green and Hale and there are stops within an acceptable walking distance of the site. I have been provided with the timetable for these routes and consider the services to be reasonably frequent on Mondays to Saturdays although there would be a much more limited service on Sundays and public holidays.
27. I acknowledge that as both routes are circular, the journey in one direction would be of greater duration. However, those durations would still be relatively short and in my view would not put staff and visitors from using the bus services. Furthermore, staff shift times are not yet set and could be tailored to accord with the availability of public transport as part of a Travel Plan. This is a matter that could be addressed by condition.
28. Overall, I am satisfied that the availability of public transport would be sufficient to provide an alternative to the use of the car to get to and from the site for staff and visitors. Whilst it might not completely replace it, it would be acceptable in meeting the Framework requirement to ensure that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be - or have been - taken up, given the type of development and its location.
29. To conclude on this final main issue, whilst I have not found harm in relation to the accessibility of the site for staff and visitors, I have identified significant shortcomings in the ability of residents to lead as independent a life as possible. Thus, the proposal conflicts with the Framework.

Living environment and the model of care

30. Part of the Appellant's and Residents' Group's evidence focused on the design of the scheme relative to its proposed external environment and whether it would provide an acceptable place to live. The Resident's Group suggested that the feel of the care home would be "institutional".
31. At the Inquiry, I heard evidence from the Residents' Group³ that the model of care for those in the latter stages of their lives and/or living with dementia is changing. It was put to me that the ethos of care in the community extends to residential care homes and that the independence of residents should be maintained as far as possible within a dignified care package. I share the Residents' Group's view (which is also supported by the Council), that achieving this goes beyond operational management and in my view, design and the consequent living environment should be at the heart of such an ethos and relates directly to the model of care.
32. I have no reason to doubt the Resident's Group's evidence that there is a move away from larger homes to smaller ones. However, at my visit to the Abney

³ The evidence of Prof Woodcock

Court home, I was able to view the various parts of the building and its immediately surrounding outdoor spaces. Inside, the home had a pleasant feel and was light and airy. It had a good range of facilities such as a hair salon and a cinema in addition to various lounges, dining rooms and games rooms. Outside, the gardens were well laid out to provide areas for sitting out and for gardening in raised planting beds for those willing and able to do so. Moreover, residents of Abney Court have direct access to the surrounding parkland for recreation. I did not leave with the impression that the home did not provide an acceptable living environment or model of care for its residents.

33. However, as already set out, the proposed building would occupy a large proportion of the site. Consequently, the grounds around it would be constrained and limit the opportunities for enjoying the external environment. Whilst residents would be able to see beyond the site to the pleasant rural landscape, to my mind this would only serve to reinforce their sense of containment.
34. Whilst the proposed courtyard garden would be of acceptable size and there would be a reasonable amount of space next to the western part of the building, the proximity of the site boundaries to the other parts of the building would not provide comfortable outdoor spaces. The Appellant has pointed out that the ratio of outdoor space to the building compares very favourably with other care homes in the local area. However, that is not a valid reason to provide a facility with what I consider to be very constricted areas of outdoor space, particularly between the eastern and southern façades of the building and the site boundaries. Given that the proposal would provide 64 bedrooms, the overall amount of outdoor space would be insufficient.
35. There are clear differences in the living environment at Abney Court and those that would be provided by the appeal scheme. In combination with the poor access to the local area around the site, the proposal would not provide an external environment of acceptable usability thereby having a detrimental effect on its residents' quality of life. The design of the appeal scheme would not provide an acceptable living environment or model of care thereby running counter to the Framework and PPG.

Designated heritage assets

36. The appeal site sits outside but next to the South Hale Conservation Area (CA). Notably, within the South Hale CA – Supplementary Planning Document SPD5.21 Conservation Area Appraisal – March 2017 (CA SPD) site was excluded from the CA. The appraisal concluded that a section of the CA between Bankhall Lane and Rappax Road to the east contains numerous pockets of mid to late 20th century development of insufficient quality or historical architectural character to warrant inclusion in the CA. The appeal site is referred to specifically.
37. The CA covers an extensive area, mainly to the north of the appeal site. It comprises a verdant and spacious residential area and there is commonality in the style of many dwellings. Having said that, overall, there is a mix of dwelling styles and periods of design. The character and appearance of the dwelling on the appeal site is not unique to the area. My observations chime with the 2017 CA Appraisal, which identifies that the design of many of the newer houses is not representative of the Victorian and Edwardian buildings elsewhere within

- the CA. The site's predominantly rural surroundings place it within a distinctly different context to the mainly built-up CA.
38. At the Inquiry, the Council accepted that the effects of the proposal on the setting of the CA would affect only a small part of it but nonetheless argued that the significance of the CA as a whole would be diminished.
 39. The proposed building would consist of four brick-built main blocks joined by glazed links. Each of the main blocks would have pitched roofs of varying heights and forward-facing gables with fenestration of domestic appearance and scale. The glazed links would be of simple form and their height would be about level with the eaves of the main blocks. Thus, they would appear subservient to them and each block would have the general appearance of a detached house, albeit that they would be joined by the glazed links.
 40. Notwithstanding that there would be a significant amount of activity within the glazed links, because of their subservient scale to the main blocks and contrasting materials, the overall impression of there being separate main buildings would remain.
 41. I consider that the design of the proposal would be of a good standard and would not be at odds with the overall mix of dwelling styles in the CA. Moreover, set against the character and appearance of the existing dwelling including its sprawling single-storey elements, purely in design terms, the proposal would have at worst, a neutral effect and would not therefore appear discordant with the character or appearance of the CA.
 42. The proposed new access would allow for a greater extent of views into the site than is currently the case, and this would enable the viewer to see a substantial parking area and the resulting increased amount of vehicular parking and activity. However, views into the site would be transient. Moreover, because of the existing vegetation within the site, the parking area would not be seen in its entirety. Accordingly, the proposed changes to the site's frontage would not have a material effect on the appreciation of the historic significance of the CA in views from along Bankhall Lane.
 43. It was put to me that the glazing between the main blocks would result in reflection towards the CA when struck by direct sunlight and that this would be at odds with the residential surroundings and thereby harmful to the CA.
 44. The appellant provided a drawing⁴ showing the path of the sun during February, June and October. I have no reason to consider this evidence to be inaccurate and indeed its' accuracy was not challenged by the Council or the Residents' Group. The drawing shows that the northern elevation of the building would receive direct sunlight for only a short period at around 1600 in June and even then, it would reach only a small part of the glazed link in that elevation. The effects of the sun reflecting off the glazing would also be mitigated by the trees and hedges fronting the site. The level of possible glare would not detract from the appreciation of the CA's historic significance.
 45. The site contains a pond and it was suggested by the Council that its location accorded with that shown on historic maps and that its loss would have a detrimental effect on the heritage value of the area. However, even if that is the case, the pond is of domestic appearance – being edged by walling and

⁴ ID09

- paving, and it occupies what is now a domestic garden. Any contribution it makes to the historic environment is in my view, negligible.
46. Pulling all of this together, I do not find there to be compelling reasons to conclude that there would be harm to the significance of the CA as a whole.
 47. In addition to the CA, nearby Bank Hall is a grade II listed building. The parties agree that because of the separation distance between the site and Bank Hall along with the intervening vegetation and green field, no harm would be caused to the significance of the listed building. I have no reason to take an alternative view.
 48. The proposal therefore accords with policy R1 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) (the CS), which amongst other things, requires proposals to demonstrate how they will preserve or enhance the CA and its wider setting. The proposal also accords with the CA SPD. However, it is agreed that policy R1 does not reflect the expression of national policy in the Framework. I have no reason to take an alternative view and agree with the parties that the policy is not up-to-date and should not be given full weight. However, insofar as the policy seeks to protect the historic environment, it can be given some, albeit limited, weight.
 49. My above conclusions on the absence of harm to the significance of the CA and to Bank Hall mean that the proposal does not conflict with the objective to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out in the Framework.

Protected species

50. In this appeal, the relevant species are bats and Great Crested Newts (GCNs). Both are European Protected Species.
51. At the Inquiry, it was agreed between the Council and Appellant that the harm to bats could be avoided through appropriate mitigation measures secured by the imposition of suitably worded planning conditions. From all that I have read and heard, I am satisfied that mitigation could be achieved through that mechanism and that there would be no material adverse harm to bats arising from the proposed development. I turn now to GCNs.
52. The appeal site is host to a disused swimming pool and a pond. The Appellant's GCN survey has identified that both are being used by a medium population of GCNs (i.e. where peak count is 11-100). The swimming pool is being used by them for breeding. In addition to these water bodies, the existing garden areas within the site provide terrestrial habitat of moderate foraging value and there are numerous areas that provide shelter and hibernation sites.
53. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the Regulations) transposed into UK law, the European Union Directive 92/43/EEC (the Habitats Directive). The Habitats Regulations include a strict system of protection for European sites and European Protected Species. Amongst other things, they place a duty on decision-makers to have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive in the exercise of their functions. In addition to the relevant provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1990, this role is also supported by the Framework.
54. Framework paragraph 170.d) indicates that planning decisions should minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing

- coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. Paragraph 175.a) indicates that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating it on a site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. This is referred to in PPG as the 'mitigation hierarchy'⁵.
55. The implication of this approach is that the proposed development should ideally be designed and constructed in a way which avoids effects altogether; if this is not possible then mitigation measures should only be employed where it is not possible to avoid effects altogether, and compensation should only be used where mitigation is not possible. Proposals should ensure that there would be no net loss of biodiversity and preferably a net gain.
56. The proposed removal of the swimming pool and pond would result in the loss of a breeding site and another water body used by the GCNs. The Council calculates that the proposed development would result in almost a 45% reduction in the amount of terrestrial habitat currently on the site.
57. The proposal includes the creation of two new ponds in the south-western corner of the site. They would be shaded by existing trees and other boundary vegetation. The shading effects would be compounded by the proposed tree planting along the southern site boundary. However, whilst such a situation may not be an ideal one, I am satisfied that the effects of shading would not be so severe to prohibit the establishment of suitable aquatic vegetation in the new ponds and that technical measures are available to ensure it. Furthermore, the pond habitat could be managed to ensure long-term favourable breeding conditions for the site's GCN population. This is a matter that could be addressed by means of a suitably worded condition.
58. Moreover, the ponds would be located close to the boundary hedgerows which would provide good foraging, refuge and hibernation opportunities for GCNs. Whilst there would be an overall reduction in terrestrial habitat on the site, it is currently of poor quality, being mostly made up of amenity grass and areas of hardstanding. I acknowledge that the new GCN habitat would occupy a more constrained area within the site, but it would nonetheless be tailored to the requirements of the GCNs' terrestrial needs. In addition, the newly created habitat would be geographically well-located to other areas of suitable foraging habitat beyond the site's boundaries.
59. In the event of planning permission being granted, NE would need to be satisfied that suitable measures were in place before a licence was granted. Without such a licence, the development could not proceed. Thus, there are adequate safeguards in place to ensure the long-term viability of the site's GCN population.
60. In reaching my conclusions on this third main issue, I have had regard to the findings of the Inspector in the Shepshed appeal⁶. In the case before me, the situation is very different in that there are clear proposals for GCN mitigation including new ponds, terrestrial foraging habitat, and features to provide for hibernation and refuge. Therefore, I do not consider that a meaningful comparison can be drawn with that other case and the one before me.

⁵ Paragraph 018 Reference ID: 8-018-20140306

⁶ APP/X2410/W/18/3213386

61. Pulling all of this together, I do not consider that the proposal would result in harm to GCNs. Accordingly, the proposals do not conflict with CS policy R2 which amongst other things, includes a requirement to protect biodiversity. Neither is there conflict with the Framework.

Planning Balance

62. It is agreed that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites (the 5-year HLS) and that paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is engaged. The accepted position is that the Council can demonstrate a 2.5 years HLS. Thus, there is a pressing need for housing in the borough.
63. It is also agreed that the proposal would equate to the provision of 35 homes through the release of housing stock back to the market as people enter the care home. In an area where there is a clear need, the provision of 35 homes would make a useful contribution to the availability of housing in the Borough in support of the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. This attracts considerable weight in favour of the scheme.
64. Whilst the Council and Appellant have used different assessment models, both indicate a growing numerical year-on-year demand for care home places in the borough between 2019-2035. The importance of planning for the housing needs of older people is advocated in PPG.
65. The parties' views diverge on whether the calculations of existing bed spaces should include those with a rating lower than 'good' as ascribed by the Care Quality Commission (CQC). The Appellant seeks to discount them from the supply. The CQC ratings are something of a moveable feast as a care home with a below-standard rating may improve prior to its next CQC inspection and it would be logical to conclude that the operator would have an interest in ensuring such improvements.
66. Notwithstanding this, even if below standard, those bed spaces still exist, and people have a choice of which home they go into. Such decisions may be based on its geographical location as much as they might have to do with the home's CQC rating. Moreover, there is no evidence before me to indicate that homes falling below the standard are set to close, so those beds should be counted as part of the supply. In any case, a home assessed as 'requires improvement' may have been rated as such for non-care reasons so the standard of care itself might be perfectly acceptable. For these reasons, I do not agree with the Appellant's approach.
67. In addition to all of this are considerations related to the geographical location of the site when looked at in terms of localised areas of need. The Residents' Group highlighted that areas with higher levels of deprivation are those most in need of care home provision as there is a correlation between diseases such as dementia and social deprivation. I find this argument to be compelling. The proposed development would not be in a location that would address the needs of people with conditions linked to social deprivation.
68. Whilst the provision of care home places may also constitute a benefit of the appeal scheme, for the reasons I have just given, those benefits are substantially tempered.

69. Set against the benefits of the appeal scheme are the conflicts with development plan and Framework policies relating to the character and appearance of the area, the design and care model of the scheme and the unacceptable access to the local area for the care home's future residents. I give significant weight to each of these conflicts.

Planning Obligation

70. The UU provides for a financial contribution towards green infrastructure, the provision of which is required by CS policy R3. A Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL) Compliance Statement sets out the specific sites where the contribution would be used. On the basis of the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the contribution would meet the relevant tests. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other substantive reasons, I do not consider this matter further.

Conclusion

71. I have found that the appeal scheme would result in some benefits, but they are significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the clear identified harms. Consequently, there is no reason to take a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal does not succeed.

Hayden Baugh-Jones

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ruth A Stockley of Counsel

Kings Chambers. Instructed by
Trafford Borough Council

She called

Nicholas Folland BA(Hons) DipLA CMLI

Barnes Walker Ltd

Elisabeth Lewis BA(Hons) DIP TP
(Conservation) MRTPI

Trafford Borough Council

Teresa Hughes MSc CIEEM

Greater Manchester Ecology
Unit

Dr Karen Ahmed BSc PGDip(Dist.)
MA SW MA CPM(Dist.) HCPC

Trafford Borough Council

Bethany Brown BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Trafford Borough Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Paul G Tucker of Queens Counsel

Kings Chambers. Instructed by
Jeremy Hinds, Savills

He called

Mark Flatman BA(Hons) DipLA (Hons)
CMLI

Liz Lake Associates

Jen Kedgley BA (Hons) MSc

Heritage Collective

Dr Katy Read CEcol MCIEEM CEnv
MCIWEM C.WEM DipSM

Middlemarch Environmental

John Thompson BEng MIHT CMILT

SK Transport Planning Ltd

Howard Clayton BA(Hons) Dip.Arch RIBA

C Squared Architects

Jeremy Hinds BA(Hons) MSc

Savills

FOR THE HALE AND BOLLIN RESIDENTS' GROUP:

Freddie Humphreys of Counsel

Kings Chambers. Instructed by the Hale and Bollin Residents' Group

He called

Prof Ashley Woodcock OBE MD BSc
MBChB FERS FFPM FMedSci FRCP

Consultant Physician

Jane Simpson RIBA NRAC

Jane Simpson Access

Ruth Jackson BA MRUP MRTPI

Ruth Jackson Planning

INTERESTED PARTIES:

John Gower Jones

Local resident

Daniel Laffly

Local resident

Andrew Brady

Local resident

Tim Heatley

Local resident

Dave Fricker

Local resident

Jeremy Williams

Local resident

Dave Richardson

Local resident

Michael Jefferies

Local resident

Stephen Hodder MBE PPRIBA

Local resident

Fiona Woodcock

Local resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- ID01 Dr Karen Ahmed's Rebuttal Proof of Evidence Summary
- ID02 Teresa Hughes' Supplementary Evidence and Rebuttal Proof of Evidence Summary
- ID03 Arboricultural Impact Assessment Update
- ID04 Opening Submissions on behalf of the Appellant
- ID05 Opening Submissions on behalf of the Council
- ID06 Opening Submissions on behalf of the Hale and Bollin Residents' Group
- ID07 Copy of suite of plans
- ID08 Un-signed planning obligation
- ID09 Sun path drawing
- ID10 Draft Statement of Common Ground on need
- ID11 Revised Layout Plan
- ID12 Revised Boundary Treatment Plan
- ID13 283/284 bus timetables
- ID14 Site Sections Plan
- ID15 Draft planning conditions
- ID16 Planning and Development management Committee Minutes, 9 May 2019
- ID17 Email correspondence in relation to pre-application
- ID18 Table index on need
- ID19 Errata list to Mr Hinds' Proof of Evidence (email)
- ID20 Update to ID18
- ID21 Updated PPG on Housing for Older People
- ID22 Update to ID15
- ID23 Update on Greater Manchester Spatial Framework
- ID24 Engrossed planning obligation
- ID25 CIL Compliance Statement
- ID26 Bundle of representations from local residents
- ID27 Statement of Common Ground on need figures
- ID28 Signed planning obligation
- ID29 Closing submissions on behalf of the Council
- ID30 Closing submissions on behalf of the Hale and Bollin Residents' Group

ID31 Closing submissions on behalf of the Appellant