



## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 11-15 January & 9-11 February 2016

Site visit made on 12 February 2016

**by Lesley Coffey BA Hons BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 06 April 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/W/15/3010715**

**Land South of Tom Benson Way, Preston, Lancashire**

- 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 Rowland Homes Limited against the decision of Preston City Council.
  - The application Ref 06/2014/0572, dated 18 July 2014, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2014.
  - The development proposed is the erection of up to 164 dwellings with vehicular access off Tanterton Hall Road together with associated footpaths, cycleway, public open space, landscaping and biodiversity works.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The proposal is an outline application with all matters except the access reserved for subsequent approval. The appellant submitted a plan showing how the development might be accommodated. The plan is for illustrative purposes only and there could be alternative layouts for the site. It nevertheless provides a useful guide when considering the proposal before me.
3. The government published an amendment to Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on 11 February 2016. This included revisions to the section in relation to Green Infrastructure. The parties were provided with an opportunity to comment on these revisions and I have taken these comments into account in reaching my decision.
4. The appellant submitted a Unilateral Undertaking, this covenants to provide 30% of the dwellings as affordable housing, submit a Travel Plan to promote sustainable patterns of travel and to provide and maintain the open space and play area in accordance with a submitted scheme. I am satisfied that the Unilateral Undertaking meets the statutory tests and I have taken it into account in reaching my decision.
5. The application was recommended for approval by Officers, but was refused by Members. At the time of the decision the development plan included the *Preston Local Plan* (adopted 2004). The Council subsequently adopted the *Preston Local Plan 2012-2026 Site Allocations And Development Management*

*Policies* (PLP) in July 2015. As a consequence, Local Plan policy G6 referred to in the decision letter has been superseded by Policies EN5 and EN1 of the PLP.

6. In addition, at the time at which the application was determined the Council stated that it did not have a 5 year housing land supply. Following the adoption of the PLP it now submits that it has in excess of a five year housing land supply. For this reason, and the changes to the development plan, the Council contends that the comments made by officers at the time of the application do not fully reflect the Council's position in respect of this appeal.

### **Main Issues**

7. I consider the main issues to be:
  - The effect of the proposal on the visual amenity, landscape character and landscape amenity of the Area of Major Open Space (AMOS) and the distinctive character of the Ingol Golf Communities;
  - Whether the proposal would compromise the long term retention of an 18 hole golf course within the AMOS;
  - Whether the loss of open space is acceptable; and
  - Whether in the light of the development plan, national guidance and other material considerations, including the housing land supply position, the appeal proposal would be a sustainable form of development.

### **Reasons**

8. Following the closure of the former Ingol Golf Club in January 2010, the entire golf course, including the current appeal site, was the subject of an outline planning application for up to 550 dwellings, together with associated open space and community facilities. The application was refused and an appeal against this decision was dismissed by the Secretary of State in 2011<sup>2</sup>. He concluded that whilst the lack of 5 year housing supply, the sustainable location of the site, and the wide mix of housing (including affordable housing) all weighed in favour of the proposal, the proposal conflicted with the Development Plan and national policy, and on balance these positive material considerations were not sufficient to outweigh this conflict.
9. Whilst this previous decision is a material consideration in relation to the present appeal, there are significant differences between the two. The previous scheme covered an area extending to 70 hectares, proposed 550 dwellings and resulted in the loss of the entire 18 hole golf course. The current proposal would occupy 13.6 hectares of land. It proposes 164 dwellings and would retain a reduced size, reconfigured 18 hole golf course. Accordingly, these differences, together with the changes in national and local planning policy since the time of the previous appeal decision, means that the weight to be accorded to the previous decision is limited.
10. The appeal site comprises the 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> holes of the former Ingol Golf Club. The current proposal is for up to 164 dwellings and associated infrastructure, including public open space, footpaths, cycleways, landscaping

---

<sup>2</sup> Appeal reference: APP/N2345/A/11/2145837

and biodiversity works. Access would be by way of a new road served via a priority-controlled access off Tanterton Hall Road with an emergency access through the woodland to the north linking the site with Tom Benson Way. The illustrative site layout and the associated Parameters Plan indicate that the dwellings would vary from 2 to 5 bedrooms in size. The dwellings would be predominantly detached and semi-detached, but with some terraced dwellings and linked mews. They would mostly be two storeys high and 30% of the dwellings would be provided as affordable housing.

11. The proposal would incorporate public open space in the form of a public park along the eastern edge of the appeal site between the proposed housing areas and the adjacent golf course. It is intended that this will include public footpaths, cycle routes and children's play areas. In addition, there will be a series of green corridors of landscaped public open space with footpaths and cycleways; the creation of two new ponds and damp grassland habitats; improvements to the four existing ponds and ditch located within and adjacent to the appeal site; the creation of wildflower meadows and the planting of native shrubs. The proposals would also enhance and formalise the existing Definitive Map Modification Orders (DMMOs) which do not have public right of way status.

### ***Effect of the Proposal on the AMOS***

12. Policy 19 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the identity, local distinctiveness and green infrastructure of certain settlements and neighbourhoods by the designation of Areas of Separation and Major Open Space. The appeal site and existing golf course lie within the AMOS between Ingol/Tanterton and Greyfriars/Cadley. Policy 19 also seeks to ensure that those places at greatest risk of merging are protected. Paragraph 10.16 of the explanatory text makes clear that these areas 'are valued as part of the local Green Infrastructure'; that the (open) spaces 'help to maintain the distinctiveness of the adjoining neighbourhoods'.
13. The detailed boundaries of these areas are defined by policy EN5 of the PLP. Whilst policy EN5 does not preclude development within these areas, development proposed within the AMOS is required to satisfy the specified criteria. These include that proposals should not detrimentally affect the visual amenity, landscape amenity, landscape character or nature conservation value of the AMOS and should maintain the identity of the neighbourhoods/urban communities. The PDP inspector gave specific consideration to the inclusion of the appeal site within the AMOS and concluded that it fulfilled the function of an AMOS as envisaged by the Core Strategy.
14. The provision of the golf course was closely associated with the development of the surrounding housing in the late 1970's and early 1980's. The original golf course winds through the surrounding area of Ingol/Tanterton and contributes to the distinctive character of these neighbourhoods. I consider the relationship between the surrounding dwellings and the golf course to be integral to the character of the local area.
15. Although the layout shown on the indicative plan is for illustrative purposes only, it is apparent that in order to accommodate the number of dwellings proposed, with the exception of a small park adjacent to Walker Lane, the

- majority of the land occupied by former holes 6 & 7 will be occupied by housing.
16. Both parties sought to assess the effect of the proposal on the landscape character and visual amenity of the AMOS on the basis of Landscape and Visual Assessments (LVIAs). Both LVIAs state that they have used the methodology within the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment (3rd Edition)*. Whilst both clearly set out their methodology, and use similar terminology, they differ in respect of the definitions attributed to the terminology. For this reason the two LVIAs are not directly comparable.
  17. In many instances the parties reached similar conclusions in terms of the impact of the proposal on the AMOS. The most significant differences relate to the visual impact on Walker Lane and The Avenue, and the character of the appeal site.
  18. Walker Lane is a narrow unmade road that runs along the north eastern boundary of the appeal site separating it from the 5<sup>th</sup> hole and the residential properties of Gleneagles Drive beyond. It is lined on both sides by remnants of overgrown hedgerow with mature trees. In many places there are gaps in the vegetation which provide clear views across the appeal site. The route is popular with walkers and dog owners and the Council advise that it provides a link with the local cycle routes in Preston. There is no vehicular access from it onto Tom Benson Way and no dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Therefore few vehicles use this part of Walker Lane.
  19. The PDP inspector noted the importance of Walker Lane as a pedestrian route between Tom Benson Way and residential areas to the south. He also observed that it is likely to be used increasingly as a link to the residential development due to take place in NW Preston during the plan period and observed that in this context it provides 'room to breathe'.
  20. The proposed development would be clearly visible through the trees and the gaps in the hedgerow. Whilst the foreground of these views would be occupied by the proposed park, the dwellings, infrastructure and activity associated with a residential development of the scale proposed would be clearly noticeable in views from Walker Lane. As such the proposal would detract from the tranquillity of Walker Lane, as well as the open character of the landscape which policy EN5 seeks to protect.
  21. The appellant suggests that in views from Walker Lane the proposal would have a minor adverse effect on visual amenity. The appellant's LVIA indicates that this would represent harm to a small number of receptors that would be capable of mitigation. However, at the time of my visit, during the winter time, Walker Lane was well used by pedestrians, including dog walkers, and I consider that the number of receptors would be significant. The appellant suggested that the hedgerow could be supplemented with additional planting to limit the extent of any views, however, this would merely filter views of the development. In my opinion, even allowing for post-construction mitigation the proposal would have an adverse effect on views from Walker Lane, where the change in the character of the area would be readily apparent. Furthermore, the visual prominence of the proposal would be increased due to the loss of trees within the appeal site. Whilst these may be of limited merit individually, together they filter views of the existing dwellings.

22. Whilst the proposal would reduce the distance between the properties in Gleneagles Drive and The Avenue to a limited extent, due to the scale of the residential development proposed it would significantly reduce the visual separation between Ingol/Tanterton and Cadney/GreyFriars.
23. The Avenue estate, which includes West Avenue and New Links Avenue, adjoins the appeal site. It comprises a series of short cul-de-sacs lined with predominantly detached residential properties, including several bungalows. Many of these dwellings overlook the open land of the appeal site. Both parties identified the proposal as having a 'moderate adverse' effect of the visual amenities of this area. The appellant's LVIA suggests that this would entail 'some change in view to receptors, may be capable of mitigation', whereas the Council describe a moderate adverse effect as 'a distinct deterioration in the existing view'. The appellant also submits that any harm should be considered in the context of the proposed use which would be similar in nature and grain to the existing residential development within the area.
24. The proposal would have a significant effect on the views from these dwellings and would fundamentally alter the character of the area. The importance of the open nature of the appeal site to the distinctive character of the area was noted by the PLP inspector. He stated that '*Whatever the access rights might be, the land abuts and wraps around the residential 'inlier' of The Avenue, Tanterton and thus helps to protect the 'local distinctiveness' of that area.*' The open nature of the landscape is evident from numerous public and private viewpoints within the vicinity and is intrinsic to the distinctive character and setting of these dwellings.
25. The Appellant considers that the golf course is not fundamental to the character of The Avenue since in many cases it is the rear boundaries of the properties that face onto the golf course. However this arrangement allows occupants of the dwellings to overlook the golf course from the rear rooms of their dwellings and affords them an open outlook from their back garden. Moreover, the golf course is visible from many public viewpoints within this residential inlier. As a consequence of the appeal proposal, rather than being a residential inlier as at present, this area would form part of a continuous block of residential development.
26. Views over the open land from New Rough Hey Estate would be replaced with views of the proposed dwellings. Whilst the existing trees would provide some screening there would nevertheless be a significant change in character.
27. Despite their proximity to each other New Rough Hey and The Avenue are discrete neighbourhoods. Due to the separation provided by the open land of the golf course and former golf course they each have their own distinctive character. The infilling of much of the area that separates them from each other would significantly undermine the distinctive character of these neighbourhoods.
28. The appellant identifies the site as urban fringe due to the 'strong visual influence from the adjacent dwellings'. Unlike in areas of urban fringe which provide a transition between urban areas and the countryside, the golf course is a distinctive feature of the locality. The arrangement of the housing around it seeks to maximise the interface between the housing and the golf course. The open nature of the land provides a visual and physical break from the

surrounding built-up area and acts as a unifying element to the surrounding community. It also provides separation between the individual neighbourhoods.

29. Overall I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the visual amenity, landscape character and landscape amenity of the AMOS and the distinctive character of the Ingol Golf Communities and would conflict with policy 19 of the Core Strategy and PLP policy EN5.

### ***Golf Course***

30. The former Ingol Golf Club closed in January 2010. In September 2013 the landowners granted a 15 year lease to John and Timothy Wright on part of the former golf club. This land excluded former holes 6, 7 and 8 which comprise the appeal site. The new operators reconfigured and redesigned the course to provide an 18 hole golf course, it is now known as Ingol Village Golf Club. The reconfigured golf course does not form part of the appeal proposal.
31. Amongst other matters PLP Policy EN5 requires that any development within the AMOS complements and does not compromise the retention of a full size 18 hole golf course unless it can be demonstrated that a need no longer exists. The appellant does not dispute the need for an 18 hole golf course in this location, but considers that this need is met by the reconfigured golf course. The Council believes that the reconfigured course is not safe to play or of adequate quality, as such it could jeopardise the long-term retention and viability of a golf course within the AMOS, contrary to the aim of policy EN5(b).

### ***Safety***

32. A number of layout plans were submitted to the inquiry. I have assessed the Council's concerns against the actual layout of the golf course as shown on plan no:5 within Mr Gaunt's proof of evidence.
33. The Council's safety concerns relate to holes 6 & 7 and holes 11-14 on the reconfigured course. On behalf of the Council, Jonathon Gaunt, a Golf Course Architect, explained that safety margins on golf courses had increased in recent years due to the performance of modern equipment which permits significantly increased distances/trajectories to be achieved by comparison with the 1980's when the original golf course was designed.
34. Mr Gaunt's assessment relied on the criteria used by the European Institute of Golf Course Architects. He advised that these criteria encompass best practice in relation to the design of new golf courses and/or amendments to an existing golf course and provide for safety margins to properties and public rights of way. Amongst other matters the criteria require that holes should not share fairways and fairways should not cross. However, these guidelines are not published and are unavailable within the public domain, accordingly, the weight to be afforded to them is limited.
35. Mr Gaunt assessed the safety of the course using a safety cone to show the spread of 90% and 95% of golf balls respectively. Whilst the safety cone does not represent formal guidance, in the absence of any other guidance it provides a useful starting point against which to assess the likely safety of a particular hole.
36. Hole 6 is designed as a dog-leg and the centre line crosses the centre line of

hole 7. The Council considers that due to the crossing fairways, golfers using these holes are at risk of being injured by golf balls coming in two different directions. In addition, it considers that due to the inadequate safety margins there is a greater risk of wayward golf balls coming to rest on neighbouring land or injuring walkers using the footpath which crosses the fairway.

37. The appellant submits that the position of the cone as shown by Mr Gaunt in respect of hole 6 is incorrect. Mr Wright (the golf course operator) explained that he has installed signs on these fairways to remind golfers of their safety responsibilities. As well as marking posts
38. I consider that even allowing for the adjustments shown on the appellant's plan, there is some risk to golfers due to the centre lines of both holes crossing as illustrated by the safety cones. However, hole 6 is designed to be played as two shots due to the dog-leg, and measures implemented by Mr Wright following advice from the Lancashire Golf Union (LGU) would help to mitigate the risk. Therefore whilst the arrangement may not be ideal, taking account of the openness of this part of the course and the measures put in place by the golf club, I do not consider it to be so unsafe as to pose a serious risk to players or walkers using the footpath.
39. Holes 11,12, 13 & 14 are located on part of the course previously occupied by holes 13 and 14. Holes 11 and 13 cross, whilst holes 12 and 13 share a fairway. The Council considers these holes to be very confusing, dangerous and unplayable in safety terms. The appellant submits that it is not uncommon for golf courses to have holes which share the same fairway or even the same greens, or for fairways to be close together. Mr Wright explained that lines of sight have been established for the holes and signs erected advising players of the need to play safely. In addition, trenches were introduced to limit the penalise players who over-hit the ball. These measures were considered acceptable by the LGU. Mr Wright advises that since the holes were opened in 2013 several thousand rounds have been played without incident.
40. I do not doubt the appellant's view, that many courses throughout the country would fail to meet the safety standards put forward by Mr Gaunt. For this reason, the safety margins depicted by the safety cones need to be applied with a degree of flexibility, and take account of other mitigating factors. Whilst individually these holes may be acceptable, when considered together, they could give rise to considerable confusion, or require players to wait an unduly long time particularly when the course is busy. I am conscious that Mr Wright has taken steps to limit the risk of harm to players and others. However, if the number of rounds played continues to increase in line with the expectations of the club, this part of the course could become extremely busy during peak periods. For this reason, even in the light of the mitigation measures introduced by Mr Wright, I consider that these holes pose a potential safety risk.
41. The Lancashire Golf Union (LGU) initially rejected affiliation in 2013 and required implementation of various safety measures. The appellant suggests that this implies that the LGU is satisfied that the course is safe. However, the LGU confirmed in writing that affiliation does not involve any accreditation of the golf course design or layout in terms of safety and

quality.

42. I appreciate that it may not be unusual for courses to have blind shots, shared greens and to be crossed by public footpaths. Moreover, many sports entail potential safety risks. I have also had regard to the table submitted by the appellant. This shows that when the safety cones are applied to the original layout, 32 fewer dwellings would come within the safety cone. However, these considerations do not outweigh my concerns in relation to holes 11-14.

### *Viability*

43. The Council considers that on the basis of the available information, the existing club may not be viable in the long term. Should the club fail and the appeal site be used for housing, it believes that the reduced size course would be unattractive to alternative operators. In these circumstances it considers that it may be difficult to resist the pressure to use the land occupied by the existing golf course for housing.
44. A 15 year lease was granted to John and Timothy Wright in September 2013. This was on the basis of a rent of £60,000 pa, payable from September 2014 onwards. The club house reopened in February 2013 and the golf course reopened in April 2013, with the full 18 holes being playable from September 2013.
45. Mr Wright and his brother have invested significant capital into the club and course. He explained that the cost of bringing the course back into use has been considerably reduced because they have carried out much of the work themselves. Notwithstanding this, the level of investment required was greater than anticipated. As a consequence, a further rent free period was sought in 2014/15 and again in 2015/16, and the rent that would have been due was invested into the course. The total investment amounts to about £400,000 come from the directors, landlord and profit invested back into course.
46. Mr Wright explained that the rent holidays were to allow additional investment in the course and were not a reflection on the profitability of the club. He confirmed that contrary to his expectations the club was profitable in the first year and continues to be so.
47. The club focuses on the affordable, open to all golf market. It aims to provide a more gender equal and less formal club than what was available in the local area. The target market is lapsed players, new players, family players, casual players and juniors, including a junior academy. The Council agree that this is an appropriate strategy.
48. The club currently has about 300 members. Mr Wright stated that there had been significant growth in the past year with over 4,000 day player rounds over the last 12 months. During the next season it is anticipated that the number of rounds will increase to 17,200, and that the club aspires to achieve the 25,000 - 35,000 rounds pa, which is the benchmark for clubs of this type. In order to achieve this number of rounds there would need to be a substantial uplift in the current levels of participation. The current operators are actively trying to promote the club and this may accelerate participation rates. However, on the basis of the present



trajectory this level is unlikely to be achieved until 2017/18, at which time only about 10 years of the lease would remain.

49. The Council suggest that taking account of green-keeper fees, maintenance costs and machinery the annual running costs of the course would be between £150,000-£200,000, excluding the rent of £60,000 pa. Based on the figures put forward by the appellant it believed the income generated by membership and green fees fell significantly short of the lower end of this range. For this reason the Council was doubtful that John & Timothy Wright will recoup their investment by the time the lease expires.
50. No financial information was submitted in relation to the running costs or income of the golf club. The running costs put forward by Mr Smith were not disputed, however, Mr Wright explained that the club house was very profitable, and that the business as a whole was also profitable.
51. Based on the limited financial information available, it would seem that the overall profitability of the club relies on the profits from the club house, and the personal efforts of Mr Wright and his brother to keep overheads low by undertaking much of the work to the golf course themselves.
52. The club re-opened following a prolonged period of closure and is seeking to establish itself as a new club. It is evident that Messrs Wright faced considerable challenges in bringing it back into use. In these circumstances it is likely to take some time for membership numbers and the number of rounds played by non-members to reach optimal levels. However, based on the limited information submitted to the inquiry, it would seem that even with 400 members (Mr Wright's membership target) the viability of the club would be reliant on the profitability of the club house.
53. I do not doubt that it is Mr Wright's intention to establish a successful golf course. However, the lease expires in 2028 and there is no right of renewal. Mr Wright explained that it was his desire that the length of lease be limited to 15 years and that Northern Trust, the landlords, did not object to a longer lease.
54. It is debatable whether at the time at which the lease expires the golf course would be an attractive business proposition, particularly if a future operator did not wish to adopt such a 'hands on' approach as Messrs Wright. For the reasons given above, I find that holes 11 -14 pose a potential safety risk. They also give the impression of a cramped course. It seems to me that the reconfiguration of the course, particularly holes 11-14 could mean that it is less attractive to future operators. In the absence of any substantive evidence as to the profitability of the course, I am unable to conclude that the reduced size course would not compromise the long term viability of an 18 hole golf course in within the AMOS. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to comply with PLP policy EN5.
55. The Council suggests that some of the changes to the existing golf course are likely to have required planning permission, and could potentially be subject to enforcement action. However, this is a separate matter outside of the scope of this appeal.

### **Loss of Open Space**

56. The AMOS is valued as part of the local green infrastructure. Its purposes include the maintenance of the visual amenity and landscape character, to safeguard the environmental and open space resources and help protect Central Lancashire as a place with room to breathe whilst helping to maintain the distinctiveness of the adjoining neighbourhoods.
57. Whilst policy EN5 does not preclude development within the AMOS, it requires any proposals to comply with the specified criteria. I have found above that the proposal would significantly harm the character and visual amenity of the AMOS and the character of the surrounding neighbourhoods. It would also compromise the retention of the golf course in the long term. As such the proposal would fail to comply with policy EN5 of the PLP.
58. In addition, policy EN5 requires proposals to comply with policy EN2. This seeks to protect Green Infrastructure from development. It states that the loss of green infrastructure is only permitted where it is surplus to requirements; or the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision; or the development is for an alternative green infrastructure provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.
59. Whilst the site may be surplus to the needs of the golf club at the present time, it is clearly not surplus to the function of the AMOS. This matter was specifically addressed by the PLP inspector. He was of the opinion that although the land did not benefit from public access it had *'...continued amenity value as an undeveloped area within the interstices of an urban area'*. He concluded that the land fulfilled the function of the AMOS as envisaged by the Core Strategy. I share this view, and on the basis of the evidence submitted to the inquiry, have no reason to reach a different conclusion.
60. The appellant submits that the overall reduction in green infrastructure would be limited in that 57 % of the site would comprise a public park and green corridors. Moreover, the recent revision to the PPG<sup>3</sup> includes private gardens as part of green infrastructure. When these areas are included about 75% of the appeal site would represent Green Infrastructure. At the present time there is no public right of access to the appeal site. The provision of a public park, cycle routes and footpaths would therefore provide recreational opportunities that do not exist at present, together with arrangements for the long term management and maintenance of these areas.
61. At the present time the site comprises areas of woodland, smaller groups of trees, hedgerows and open grassland and is identified as semi-natural open space. Some of the grassland would be replaced with the proposed park by publicly accessible open space and other green infrastructure. The areas that are currently biodiversity rich, including the trees and ponds would remain. The proposal would also include measures that would be likely to be beneficial to biodiversity such as improvements to the existing ponds and ditch within and adjacent to the appeal site, the creation of wildflower meadows and the planting of native shrubs.

---

<sup>3</sup> 11 February 2016

62. Much of the existing open landscape would be replaced by residential development. Whilst this would include small areas of open space to the front of, or between, some of the dwellings it would not fulfil the same function as the AMOS. The public park, and to a lesser extent the landscaped area to the south east of the site, would continue to contribute to the role of the AMOS, and would provide benefits in terms of public access. Nevertheless, the areas of open space would be fragmented, and whilst the private gardens may potentially provide some benefits to biodiversity they would not contribute to the open space resource which Core Strategy policy 19 and policy EN5 seek to protect. Whilst the proposal may result in the loss of a relatively small proportion of the overall AMOS it would undoubtedly harm its overall character and function which is derived from the open nature of this landscape.
63. The Council's *Open Space, Indoor and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Study* (2007) identified a surplus of natural /semi natural green space within this part of Preston. However, this was based on the population levels at that time and therefore when existing and planned increases in the population in this part of Preston are taken into account the extent of any over provision may be significantly reduced. Moreover, although the proposal would replace some of this semi-natural green space with an alternative form, there would be an overall loss of green infrastructure. This loss would not be replaced by equivalent or better provision.
64. Overall I conclude that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of open space and would fail to comply with Core Strategy policy 19 and PLP policies EN2 and EN5.

### ***Housing Land Supply***

65. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites against their requirements.
66. Amongst other matters, the NPPF encourages local planning authorities to ensure that their local plan meets the need for market and affordable housing and to identify a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of housing against their requirements. To ensure choice and competition in the market an additional buffer of 5% is required or, where there has been a record of persistent under-delivery, a buffer of 20% is required.
67. The assessment as to whether a Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land needs to take account of the housing requirement, any previous shortfall in delivery, whether any shortfall should be spread across the remainder of the plan period or made good in the first five years, the appropriate buffer, and the available housing land supply.
68. Core Strategy Policy 4 sets a minimum requirement of 534 dpa for Preston for the period 2010-2026 including an allowance for previous under delivery. The PLP seeks to identify and allocate sites to meet the housing requirements of the Core Strategy, and does not re-assess the need for housing identified within the Core Strategy.

69. The extent of the shortfall increased between the adoption of the Core Strategy and the PLP. Taking account of this additional shortfall the PLP Inspector found a housing requirement to be 608 dpa including a 5% buffer. He concluded that on the basis of an updated position statement in September 2014, there were sufficient sites allocated to provide a comfortable margin to ensure the delivery of at least 608 dwellings a year between 2014-19, and that this would also provide the potential to make up the prior under-supply in the first five year period should market conditions allow.

#### *Empty Homes*

70. The Council's most recent *Housing Land Position Statement* (March 2015) confirms that during the period April 2010-March 2015 there were 1251 completions. Over the same period 596 long term empty homes were brought back into use. If these are added to the supply, when assessed against the Core Strategy housing requirement there is a shortfall of 823 dwellings.
71. The appellant considers that the inclusion of empty homes as part of the housing land supply effectively reduces the Core Strategy requirement which was a minimum requirement net of demolitions. Concern was also expressed that not all of the 596 properties within the Empty Homes Strategy were originally dwellings and therefore there is a risk of double counting.
72. Paragraph 51 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings in line with local housing and empty homes strategies. PPG (ID 3-039-20140306) explains that any empty homes brought back into use and counted against the housing need must be supported by robust evidence by the local planning authority at the independent examination of the draft Local Plan. It specifically refers to the need to test the deliverability of the strategy and to avoid double counting.
73. The PLP inspector assessed the empty homes as counting against the housing need, and not as an alteration to the housing requirement. It is evident from his report that he took a cautious approach to the inclusion of empty homes with the guidance within the PPG in mind. He was clear that if empty homes brought back into use were to be counted against housing need, as if they were new dwellings, there should be robust evidence that such dwellings were not counted as part of the existing stock when the overall need for dwellings was calculated.
74. He observed that there had been a steady decline in the number of long-term empty homes since 2009 matched by a noticeable increase in the numbers of homes brought back in to use. Furthermore, a report by NLP for the then NW Regional Assembly clarified that household projections took no account of supply side factors. In addition, DCLG tables in respect of the total housing stock and empty housing stock showed that the vacancy level, which had previously been consistently above 4%, had declined to 3.62% in 2013/14.
75. Taking all of the relevant information into account, he concluded that the Council's evidence was as robust as might reasonably be expected and that the 498 dwellings brought back into use since 2006 could be counted as additions to the housing stock thereby reducing the extent of the under-supply. He also agreed that there should be an allowance of 375 dwellings for the period 2014-19 for bringing back into use long-term empty homes within the existing urban

area. These conclusions are reflected in the PLP which was adopted in July 2015<sup>4</sup>.

76. The evidence in relation to the 498 dwellings was considered in detail by the PLP inspector at the time of the EIP. The fact that some of the evidence was dealt with by way of written submissions does not detract from the robustness of the EIP process. To adopt an alternative approach to the inclusion of these empty homes would alter the overall housing requirement, and in the absence of any substantive new evidence would undermine the housing strategy within the PLP which seeks to meet the housing requirement of the Core Strategy based on the inclusion of long term empty homes.
77. The appellant suggests that some of the 98 dwellings added since the EIP could be subject to double counting. Reference was made to the Council's Empty Homes Strategy, this cites the Windsor Castle Public House as an example. The appellant suggests that this would have required planning permission and therefore could have been counted both as a long term empty homes as well as homes delivered by way of planning permission. On behalf of the Council, Mr Molyneux confirmed that this was not the case and the empty homes included in the Council's housing supply did not include properties with planning permission. Therefore the inclusion of these dwellings accords with the advice within the PPG and the provisions of the PLP.
78. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Therefore since the PLP inspector clearly gave detailed consideration to the issue of empty homes in the absence of any compelling new evidence an allowance for empty homes should be included in the housing land supply in accordance with the PLP Inspector's report and paragraph 5.12 of the PLP. On this basis I consider that the shortfall should be reduced by 596 dwellings.

### *Shortfall*

79. The Council propose that the shortfall should be spread over the remainder of the plan period, whereas the appellant believes that the shortfall should be added to the five year requirement. PPG<sup>5</sup> advises that any shortfall should be dealt with within the first five years of the plan period where possible. This approach (Sedgefield) would be consistent with the aim of the NPPF objective to significantly boost the supply of housing. It is also favoured by the Secretary of State in most appeal decisions because it deals with the issue of past delivery failures promptly over the short-term. However, PPG does not preclude spreading the shortfall over the remainder of the plan period.
80. The PLP inspector considered both approaches. Core Strategy policy 4 states that prior under-provision should be made up over the remainder of the plan period, namely 2010-2026, which covers the entire period of the PLP. The PLP inspector considered that it would not be logical to apply a different approach to the under-supply that had arisen since 2011 to that which occurred earlier. He noted that the constraints to the delivery of housing were primarily due to market considerations rather than the result of there being insufficient land either with planning permission, or allocated sites within the local plan. On this

---

<sup>4</sup> PLP para 5.3

<sup>5</sup> Paragraph ID 3-035-20140306

basis he concluded that the shortfall should be spread over the entire plan period.

81. Notwithstanding the views of the PLP inspector, the appellant considers this approach to be inconsistent with the aim of the Core Strategy to meet the shortfall as soon as possible. Clause b) of policy 4 states that if, over the latest 3 year review period, any targets relating to housing completions or the use of brownfield land are missed by more than minus 20%, the phasing of uncommitted sites will be adjusted as appropriate to achieve a better match and/or other appropriate management actions taken; provided this would not adversely impact on existing housing or markets within or outside the Plan area.
82. The Council consider that the PLP provides for the adjustment required by clause b). As set out at policy HS1, the PLP allocates sufficient land for 8,637 houses in addition to housing commitments established through planning permissions on unallocated sites. Of these 5,800 are expected to be completed in the plan period, but there is also capacity within the North West Preston Strategic Allocation for the construction of 2,837 dwellings as and when required. Evidence submitted to the inquiry indicates that the necessary infrastructure for the delivery of these dwellings is progressing. Whilst the Council's timetable for the delivery of this infrastructure would seem to be somewhat optimistic, the submitted evidence suggests that the necessary infrastructure is likely to be in place to enable the delivery of these dwellings during the plan period. I therefore consider that the Council has taken steps to fulfil the requirements of Core Strategy policy 4b), and therefore policy 4b) does not in itself justify the Sedgefield approach.
83. The Council's housing strategy relies on a number of strategic sites. In some cases these require significant infrastructure such as the East-West link road and the Preston Western Distributor. The Council stated that some development could be accommodated within these areas in advance of the provision of this infrastructure, nevertheless the delivery of such infrastructure provides further justification for spreading the shortfall over the remainder of the plan period.
84. It would be preferable to make good past deficiencies as soon as possible. Nevertheless, having regard to the particular circumstances within Preston, including market conditions, the reliance on strategic sites and the reduction in the extent of the shortfall since the time of the EIP<sup>6</sup> I have no reason to reach a different to the PLP inspector. On the basis of the evidence submitted to the inquiry, I conclude that spreading the shortfall over the remainder of the plan period to be an acceptable approach towards housing delivery and entirely consistent with the Core Strategy and PLP.

#### *Buffer*

85. The Council submits that it does not have a persistent record of under-delivery and therefore the additional buffer required by paragraph 47 of the NPPF should be 5% rather than 20% as advocated by the Appellant.
86. PPG advises that when assessing whether there has been a persistent record of under delivery it is preferable to look at a complete economic cycle. In the

---

<sup>6</sup> The shortfall declined from 1,251 in April 2014 to 1,111 by April 2015

context of this advice, the Council suggest that a 10 year period is appropriate. This is the period used by the PLP inspector, and I consider it to be an appropriate time scale.

87. The PLP inspector found that there had only been 4 years since 2003 (2004/5 - 2007/8) in which the completion rate had been above the RSS requirement. He concluded that this did not represent persistent under-delivery by the strict (dictionary) definition of the term. He concluded that in these circumstances a 5% buffer would be sufficient to meet Government policy objectives on land supply.
88. Since the EIP there has been an additional year of completions. The latest Housing Land Position Paper indicates that 613 dwellings were added to the supply during 2014-15. This comprised 515 new build and 98 long term empty properties brought back into use. Thus the number of completions exceeded both the Core Strategy requirement of 534 and the PLP figure of 608.
89. The Council further advise that recent monitoring indicates that the trajectory for the current monitoring year is broadly in line with expectations. Therefore if long term empty homes are taken into account, the annual housing requirement was met 4 times during the 10 year period up to April 2015. In my view this does not represent a pattern of persistent under-delivery and a 5% buffer should apply.
90. I am aware that at an appeal in Grimsargh<sup>7</sup> in April 2014 the Council accepted that a 20% buffer should apply and that any shortfall should be made good in the next five years. Moreover, the Council expressed a similar view at the time at which the application in relation to this appeal was determined in October 2014. Nevertheless, these views pre-date the adoption of the PDP. On the basis of the evidence submitted to this inquiry I conclude that a 5% buffer is appropriate.

#### *Housing Land Supply*

91. The housing land supply includes sites with planning permission or a resolution to grant permission, sites allocated within the PLP, an allowance for student accommodation and an allowance for empty homes brought back into use. On this basis the Council submits that it has a housing land supply of 3467 dwellings. The appellant suggests that the deliverable supply is 2634 dwellings. The differences relate to the deliverability of individual sites (556 dwellings), and the inclusion of an allowance for empty homes. For the reasons given above, I consider an allowance for empty homes in accordance with the PLP is appropriate.
92. Footnote 11 of the NPPF states that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. The parties generally agree that 30 dpa is a reasonable development rate for Preston. On the basis of the evidence submitted to the PLP examination, this is due to market conditions rather than the supply of housing land.

---

<sup>7</sup> Appeal Ref:APP/N2345/A/13/2208445

93. *Argyll Road* This is an allocated site within the PLP. Part of the site is owned by the Council and is used by the Neighbourhood Services department. This use includes the use of the site by vehicles and plant associated with refuse collection and street cleaning. The remainder of the site is used by Preston Bus. The Council anticipate that 60 dwellings will be delivered in the next five years on the part of the site occupied by the Council. The appellant submits that no dwellings will be delivered due to the need to relocate the existing use and perhaps address any on-site contamination.
94. The site comes within the Housing Zone agreed in March 2015 where simplified planning arrangements apply. The Housing Zone bid required the Council to demonstrate the viability and deliverability of dwellings within it, and the funding arrangements require the dwellings to be delivered by 2020. The Council acknowledge that there is some slippage in the programme and accept that the first dwellings are now likely to be delivered in 2018/19.
95. The Council is working with a development partner and a feasibility study is currently being commissioned. It explained that it had agreed a timetable for delivery with the HCA. Moreover, it stated that it is the only suitable major Council owned site, and as such is a priority for members who are keen to deliver affordable housing on it. Although the site is not immediately available in that it is currently occupied, taking account of the incentive for the Council to deliver dwellings within the Housing Zone in the next five years, the agreed timetable for delivery and its commitment to providing affordable housing on this site, I consider that Council's trajectory is realistic.
96. *St Joseph's Orphanage* This is a grade II listed building situated within the Housing Zone. The Council anticipate 81 dwellings will be delivered on this site in the next five years, whilst the appellant considers that no dwellings will be delivered.
97. Planning permission for this site was granted in 2004. I understand that some minor works were commenced and that the permission remains extant. The appellant suggests that there may be viability issues with the scheme. The Council explain that it is in discussions with the owner and the HCA. There has also been interest from other potential investors. The Council has commissioned a development appraisal of the approved scheme to inform these discussions.
98. The site is available and benefits from planning permission and there is no clear evidence to suggest that the site is no longer viable. NPPF Footnote 11 states that sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. The Council is currently taking steps to bring the scheme forward. Moreover, due to its location within the Housing Zone there is an expectation that it will be delivered in the next five years. Therefore having regard to footnote 11 of the NPPF I am satisfied that there is a reasonable prospect that the site will be delivered in the next five years.
99. *Sharoe Green Hospital* The Council anticipates 55 dwellings will be delivered on this site within the next five years and the appellant believes that no dwellings will be delivered. Reserved matters were approved in 2006, but no dwellings have been completed since 2009-2010. The original development company has been dissolved. At the PLP examination the Council stated that



the site had been purchased and there was a commitment to progress matters. However, to date there has been no further progress. The Council's housing trajectory indicates that the first dwellings will be delivered in 2018/19. In the light of the extant planning permission, and the fact that there are no outstanding conditions to be discharged, I see no reason why, despite the lack of progress to date, this could not be achieved.

100. *Former Tulketh Community Sports College* This is an allocated site within the PLP and comes within the Housing Zone. It is currently vacant and is owned by the County Council. The Council expects the site to deliver 44 dwellings whilst the appellant anticipates a maximum of 30 dwellings. It was previously anticipated that the development of the site would commence in 2016, however, the Council explained that due to the need to relocate a phone mast the programme has slipped. There is no dispute that the site is available or suitable, and given the number of dwellings proposed, should there be further slippage in the Council's trajectory and the first dwellings not be completed until 2018/19, I consider that it would still be possible to provide the 44 dwellings proposed within the next five years.
101. *Winckley Square* The Council expects 153 dwellings to be delivered in the next five years, the appellant believes that no dwellings will be delivered. This site comprises four buildings. Planning permission was granted for the conversion of one of the buildings, Lancashire House, in 2008 but has since expired. The appellant advises that the site is currently being marketed for either residential or office purposes. Two of the other buildings are owned and/or occupied by Lancashire County Council. The site forms part of the Housing Zone, and planning permission may not be required, or alternatively could be subject to simplified planning procedures. The Council advise that it is currently agreeing the viability of the site, but that the costs to date appear to be realistic.
102. The Council needed to submit robust information as part of the Housing Zone bid to demonstrate that it amongst other matters it had the capacity to deliver the dwellings within the Housing Zone. I consider that the inclusion of this site within the Housing Zone means that there is a realistic prospect that it will come forward for housing purposes. However, given that some of the buildings are still occupied and in the absence of a clear timetable for delivery, I consider that the first dwellings are unlikely to be delivered before 2017/18. Therefore on the basis of the evidence submitted to the inquiry the number of dwellings delivered by this site should be reduced by 30.
103. *Cottam Hall* Outline planning permission for 1,094 dwellings was granted in March 2013. It is a phased development and full planning permission for Phase 1, comprising 104 dwellings was granted in August 2013. In the 2014/15 period 24 dwellings were completed, and the appellant acknowledges that the remaining 80 dwellings within this phase should be built out by 2017/18. Phase 2 is due to commence this year, whilst phase 4 is due to be marketed in 2016/17.
104. The Council anticipate 344 dwellings will be delivered across the entire site within the next five years, whilst the appellant suggests that 300 dwellings is more realistic. The difference between the parties relates to the inclusion of affordable housing within the housing trajectory. This adds between 5 and 12 dpa, with the higher number toward the end of the five year period when all

three phases are operational. As explained above, the usual delivery rate of 30dpa is a function of market conditions. The proposed affordable housing is unlikely to be subject to the same market constraints, and therefore I do not consider its inclusion to be unreasonable. I therefore consider the Council's trajectory to be achievable.

105. *Land North of Eastway* The Council expect the delivery of 90 dwellings, the appellant believes only 83 will be delivered. The difference between the parties relates to year three, where the appellant considers only 23 houses will be delivered, but the Council assumes 30. The difference relates to 7 dwellings, and there is no compelling evidence to indicate that a total of 30 dwellings could not be achieved in year 3.
106. *Whittingham Hospital* This is a phased development. At the time of the inquiry a reserved matters application in relation to Phase 2 had not been submitted, and the Council accepted that there was likely to be a 6 month slippage in the HCA timetable. For this reason the appellant suggests that only 15 dwellings will be delivered on phase 2 in 2017/18, whilst the Council has assumed 32. In addition, as with Land North of Eastway and Cottam Hall the Council's trajectory includes the delivery of affordable housing. For the same reasons given in relation to those sites I consider that this allowance is justified.
107. In the absence of a reserved matters application for Phase 2 I consider that it is unrealistic to anticipate a full year of completions in 2017/18. Therefore the delivery for this period should be reduced by 16 dwellings.
108. *Inglewhite Road and the Former Riding Depot* The Council assumes that each of these sites will deliver 90 dwellings within the next five years, whereas the appellant assumes that 83 dwellings will be delivered. Both sites benefit from outline planning permission, but in neither case has a reserved matters application been submitted. The difference between the parties is fairly small amounting to 7 dwellings over the period up to 2019/20. Given that these are both sites with planning permission, I do not consider that there is clear evidence that the Council's trajectory will not be achieved in respect of these sites.
109. *Victoria House* This is a former office block. The Council confirmed in October 2013 that Prior Notification was not required for the conversion of the building to residential use. The Council consider that 69 dwellings will be delivered on this site over the next five years, with the first dwellings delivered in 2016/17. Evidence submitted by the appellant indicates that the property is currently being marketed for office purposes<sup>8</sup>. In the absence of any clear evidence to the contrary, I am not convinced that the site is available for housing at the present time and therefore it should be excluded from the housing land supply.
110. Overall, I conclude that the Council's housing land supply should be reduced by 115 dwellings<sup>9</sup>, providing a housing land supply of 3,352.

---

<sup>8</sup> Doc 15

<sup>9</sup> Whittingham Hospital, Winckley Square & Victoria House

### *Overall Conclusion on Housing Land Supply*

111. If the previous under-delivery is spread over the remainder of the plan period the five year housing requirement is for 3,045 dwellings. When a 5% buffer is added a five year housing land supply sufficient for 3,197 dwellings is required (639dpa). I therefore conclude that the Council has demonstrated that it currently has a housing land supply sufficient to deliver 5.24 years of housing.

### **Other Matters**

112. The Core Strategy aims to significantly increase the supply of affordable housing across the area. The submitted Unilateral Obligation proposes to provide 30% of the proposed dwellings as affordable houses in accordance with Core Strategy policy 7. Since the adoption of the Core Strategy the number of affordable homes completed represents 12% of total completions which is significantly below the target of 30%. Although there a number of affordable homes coming forward on allocated sites and sites with planning permission, the contribution of the appeal site towards meeting the need for affordable housing weighs in favour of the proposal.

### *Sustainability*

113. The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 6 explains that regard must be had to the Framework as a whole in determining what the concept of sustainability means in practice.

114. Economically, the development would bring short-term advantages in respect of jobs. In the longer term it would increase household spending in the area, and would support economic growth through the provision of housing and the creation of jobs in local services to meet the additional demands arising from the development. Whilst the proposal would also generate a financial contribution through Council Tax income, New Homes Bonus payments and CIL contributions, the Council Tax income would be used to fund services required by future residents and the CIL contributions would be used to mitigate the effect of the proposal on infrastructure.

115. The proposal would contribute to the social role of sustainability through the provision of housing, including affordable housing. The provision of a public park and rights of way within the site would also bring social benefits to future residents and the local community.

116. The site is situated within a sustainable location, and would be accessible to public transport, schools, community facilities and shops. Therefore occupants would not be unduly reliant on the use of cars for their journeys.

117. It is accepted by the Council that, subject to the proposed mitigation measures the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on protected species on the site. Based on the evidence submitted to the inquiry I have no reason to reach a different conclusion. Moreover, some of the biodiversity measures proposed, including improvements to the four existing ponds and ditch located within and adjacent to the appeal site; the creation of wildflower meadows and the planting of native shrubs, would be beneficial to flora and fauna.

118. However, balanced against these benefits the proposal would give rise to substantial harm to the AMOS and the distinctive character of the surrounding neighbourhoods. The proposal also fails to demonstrate that it would ensure the long term retention of the golf course, and there would be a loss of open space within the AMOS. Looked at in the round the proposal would not be environmentally sustainable and therefore looked at in the round would not represent sustainable development.

### **Conclusion**

119. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that proposal for housing should be considered in the presumption in favour of sustainable development. For the reasons given above, I have found that the proposal would not represent sustainable development and therefore this presumption does not apply. Moreover, the Council is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply and therefore the development plan policies, including those within the recently adopted PLP can be considered up to date.

120. The proposal would provide a number of benefits, including the provision of market and affordable housing, public access to part of the site, and improved pedestrian and cycle links. However, it would significantly harm the distinctive character of the surrounding neighbourhoods, and the landscape character and visual amenities of the AMOS. In addition it would result in the loss of part of the AMOS contrary to PLP policy EN5. Overall the proposal would fail to comply with the policies and aims Core Strategy and the PLP.

121. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Lesley Coffey*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Giles Cannock	Of Counsel Instructed by Alison Rowland, Solicitor for Preston City Council
He called	
Jonathon Gaunt	Golf Course Architect
Mark Smith	Smith Leisure
Cathy Edy	Landscape Consultant
Michael Molyneux	Planning Officer Preston City Council
Jane Healy Brown	Planning Consultant

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Roger Lancaster	Of Counsel Instructed by De Pol Associates
He called	
John Wright	Ingol Village Golf Club
David Appleton	Landscape Consultant
Colin Crosthwaite	Crosthwaite Leisure Property Specialts
Neil Allen	Neil Allen Associates
Alexis De Pol	Planning Consultant

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Ellison	Ingol Golf Village Residents Association
Mr Brookes	Local resident
Mr Brown	Local Resident

### DOCUMENTS

- 1 Council letter dated 7 December 2015 notifying interested parties of arrangements for the inquiry
- 2 Mark Smith Rebuttal Proof
- 3 Michael Molyneux Rebuttal Proof
- 4 Safety Cone diagrams – Holes 6,7 & 8 and 14 & 15 submitted by the Council
- 5 Landscape Officer Comments submitted by the Appellant
- 6 CIL Compliance Note submitted by the Council
- 7 Alan Brookes Submission
- 8 Bruce Ellison Submission

- 9 Tim Brown Submission
- 10 Assessment of disputed five year housing land supply sites (ID1)<sup>10</sup>
- 11 Plan showing location of North West Preston sites with planning permission submitted by the Council (ID2)
- 12 Planning Permission Ref: 06/2013/0349 Land North of Eastway and South of Durton Lane (ID3)
- 13 Details of reserved matter application – Land North of Eastway and South of Durton Lane (ID4)
- 14 Reserved Matter Application Ref: 06/2015/0769 (ID5)
- 15 Marketing details Victoria House(ID6) submitted by the Appellant
- 16 Sport England comment on application(ID7) submitted by the Council
- 17 Extract from Assessing needs and opportunities guide for indoor and outdoor sports facilities submitted by the Council (ID8)
- 18 Golf Course projects from Gaunt Golf Design website (ID9)
- 19 Safety Cone diagrams (original Holes ) Holes 1 & 18, hole 4, hole 5, holes 6 & 7, holes 8 & 9, hole 10, hole 11, hole 12, hole 16, hole 17 submitted by the Appellant (ID10)
- 20 Schedule of dwellings and footpaths within safety cones submitted by the Appellant (ID11)
- 21 Safety Cones in respect of new holes 6, 7, and 11,12,13 &14<sup>11</sup> submitted by the Appellant (ID12)
- 22 Safety Cone holes 6 & 7<sup>12</sup> submitted by the Appellant (ID13)
- 23 Ingol Village Golf Club Membership detail's ( extracted from website) submitted by the Council (ID14)
- 24 Draft Planning Conditions submitted by the Council
- 25 Unilateral Undertaking
- 26 CIL compliance note dated 8 February submitted by the Council
- 27 Additional note on 5 year housing land supply submitted by the Appellant

---

<sup>10</sup> Enlarged version of previously submitted document

<sup>11</sup> Holes 11,12,13,& 14 is an enlargement of Jonathon Gaunt's Plan 5

<sup>12</sup> Enlargement of Jonathon Gaunt's Appendix

---

- 28 Council's updated housing land supply
- 29 Note regarding implementation and management of Green Infrastructure Measures submitted by the Appellant
- 30 Council's note in relation to Unilateral Undertaking
- 31 Appellant's comment in relation to proposed condition 17