



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 10, 11, 12 and 13 October and 28 November 2017

Site visits made on 28 November 2017

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/16/3166025

Land adjacent to 51 Main Road, Goostrey, Crewe CW4 8LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Henderson Homes Ltd against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 16/4306C, dated 1 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of 6 no. dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary and Procedural matters

2. In July 2017, after the planning application had been refused, Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (CELP) was adopted. In addition, in August 2017 Goostrey Parish Neighbourhood Local Plan (NP) was made. Consequently, the development plan consists of the saved policies within the Congleton Local Plan First Review 2005 (LP) and those of the two recently adopted development plans.
3. A Statement of Common Ground between the Council and appellant confirmed that there is no dispute between the two main parties relating to matters of landscape, trees, ecology, flood risk and drainage, design, highway safety, access or amenity. However, the Parish Council, who had been granted status to be represented at the Inquiry, was not a signatory to this document and its position was that the proposed development raised substantive matters of conflict with the NP. A Position Statement between Henderson Homes and Goostrey Parish Council was provided to me before the resumption of the Inquiry in November (ID25). This document set out, in principle, subject to my consideration, where the Parish Council's detailed concerns relating to matters of design (other than that relating to the density of the development), and parking provision could be overcome by the use of appropriately worded conditions.
4. As part of this position statement a detailed plan was provided, setting out the elevations and floor plans of the double garage, which had not been submitted as part of the original application. No party raised any objection to this and I am satisfied that taking this into account would not prejudice the position of any party. I have added it to the plans being considered as part of the appeal.

5. At my request, whilst the Inquiry was not sitting, I was provided with details of a S106 agreement relating to a nearby residential development but which is located within Chester West and Chester Borough planning authority (ID20 and ID21) and information relating to a proposed housing site within Holmes Chapel which is currently in use for employment purposes (ID22).
6. In addition, I was provided by the appellant with a decision letter relating to a development for up to 400 dwellings in Crewe (APP/R0660/W/17/3166469) (ID30). I consider this below.
7. At the end of the Inquiry it was left that I would be provided with a signed, dated and certified copy of a S106 planning obligation relating to the provision of two affordable dwellings on the site. This has been received and I have taken this into account and have dealt with it below.
8. During the Inquiry, Jodrell Bank Observatory was selected to go forward to UNESCO as the United Kingdom's nomination for World Heritage Site status (ID15).

Main Issues

9. From what I have read and heard the main issues are a) the effect of the proposed development on the operation of the Jodrell Bank Observatory; b) whether the appeal proposal would accord with the development strategy of the development plan; and c) whether there are any material considerations, sufficient to outweigh any harm or conflict with policy in relation to the above matters.

Reasons

Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope

10. The proposed development lies within the Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope (JBRT) Consultation Zone which is defined on the proposals map of the LP. As such, saved Policy PS10 of the LP, and Policy SE 14 of the CELP require, that where an impairment of the efficient operation of the radio telescope is shown, the development '*will not be permitted*'. Policy SC2 of the Goostrey NP has a similar provision. I consider Policy HOU1 of the NP separately below.
11. In common with the Inspector who provided a recommendation to the Secretary of State, for his determination of an appeal for a substantively larger number of houses on an adjacent site, I consider that I must address this issue by taking a simple reading of the respective policies¹.
12. I note that Policy SE 14 of the CELP refers to the use of conditions to mitigate identified impacts, and that Policy SE 8 of the CELP requires weight to be given to the benefits arising from renewable and low carbon energy schemes whilst considering, amongst others, the adverse impact on the operation of JBRT and requires the use of appropriate mitigation. However, from what I have read and heard, there is no reference within development plan policy that sets out specific thresholds of impairment above which development should not be permitted.
13. No technical evidence has been proffered to dispute that provided by Professor Garrington and it is agreed between both main parties that the proposed

¹ Paragraph 250 Report APP/R0660/W/15/3129954, CD6 known as Gladman appeal.

development of 6 dwellings on the appeal site would result in additional interference² to the operation of the JBRT. This would be the case even with mitigation measures. Such interference, which is increasingly commonplace and therefore more significant, derives from transmissions from electrical equipment, motors and switches. As these are unintentional and less predictable, unlike radio broadcasts which are controlled by the licensing regimes, they are more difficult to make allowances for, recognise, and manage when undertaking radio astronomy observations. This can lead to the loss, or contamination, of data.

14. In considering the relative impact of the proposed development I have been referred to the levels of interference from other sources within the Consultation Zone (CZ). These could include, for example, visitors to Goostrey carrying mobile phones; existing older buildings which have not been built to modern construction standards to include the mitigation provisions required by Jodrell Bank; the electrified railway lines; visitors and workers at Jodrell Bank itself, including the intensification of its use and an increase in numbers of those working there, as a result of its hosting of the Square Kilometre Array Headquarters, as well as the other developments which have been approved, including allocated sites north of Congleton.
15. Clearly, no study can be perfect, and inputs used will, to some extent, be based on assumptions which may not always in every case, completely reflect reality on the ground. However, I am aware, as part of this appeal, no alternative technical methodology has been suggested, other than that which the Inspector into the Gladman appeal concluded, *'to be based on reasonable assumptions applied to a rational methodology in respect to calculating both the absolute and relative increase in interference resulting from the development'*³. Therefore, on the evidence before me, I consider that there is nothing which substantively undermines the basis on which Professor Garrington has undertaken his study into the technical implications of the proposed development.
16. His study concludes that the appeal proposal would result in an exceedance of the International Telecommunications Union Recommendation ITU- RA.769-2 by a factor of 20. This threshold is an internationally recognised measurement of the level at which radio interference is considered harmful to radio astronomy measurements. This rises to an exceedance of the ITU thresholds by a factor of 100 on the basis of detailed analysis of the position of the proposed development. This takes into account, amongst other variables, the intervening terrain, its location to the south west of the JBRT in the direction of the celestial horizon, which is a very significant area of sky for pulsar observations⁴⁵, and important for shared data from telescopes in the northern and southern hemispheres, as well as the site's proximity to the radio telescopes. I note that pulsar observations remain Jodrell Bank's most significant contribution to primary radio astronomy research, and that it holds the longest database of pulsar timings in the world.
17. I have been referred to the significant correlation between distance and impact. As a consequence of this correlation, the work of the JBRTs is particularly

² Paragraph 6.6 Statement of Common Ground.

³ Paragraph 264 Report APP/R0660/W/15/3129954, CD 6 known as Gladman appeal

⁴ Professor Garrington's Proof of Evidence Paragraph 11.11.3

⁵ Professor Garrington's Proof of Evidence Paragraph 11.13

sensitive to nearby developments around Goostrey. For example, Professor Garrington set out that the impact of the appeal before me for 6 dwellings at Goostrey is twice as great as that for the previously proposed development of 27 dwellings at Marton, which is further away and which had been dismissed by the Secretary of State⁶. The Secretary of State accorded moderate weight to the impact of this development on the work of the Jodrell Bank Observatory, who had described the development's impact as, '*relatively minor*'.

18. I am aware that the objection to the proposed development had been couched in terms of a '*relatively minor adverse impact*' upon the efficiency of the JBRT. The term had been coined to describe the scale of impact, relative to other potential scales of development, rather than addressing the direct impact of the proposed development. However, I am aware that this yardstick of impact is being reappraised by Professor Garrington and his colleagues at Jodrell Bank, as it does not accurately communicate the significance of the impact to the efficiency of the JBRTs, which in the case of the development before me, is described as a '*significant threat to the research of Jodrell Bank Observatory*'⁷.
19. The proposed development would impair the efficiency of the JBRT. A figure of a 0.86% increase in interference, when the telescope is pointed in the direction of Goostrey, does not seem, on the face of it, to be particularly key. However, when taken in the context of an increase, over and above all existing emissions from properties within the whole of the Jodrell Bank Consultation Zone it appears more significant⁸. Moreover, this should be considered in the backdrop of continued substantial investment in the technology of the JBRT to retain its global position as one of the world's foremost radio telescopes, which is in use almost 24 hours a day.
20. In the 1990s, the Observatory had to stop observing new pulsars due to the levels of interference. This happened, notwithstanding, that radio astronomers continuously try to recognise and take account of manmade interference, as a means of ensuring that as little data as possible is lost. It has not been disputed that pulsar observations, which make up the most important element of the work at Jodrell Bank, are considered to be, '*still just feasible in the current environment of interference*'⁹. Consequently, given this background, I accord the impact of the proposed development on the efficiency of the JBRT significant weight.
21. Further interference from unintentional transmissions, as calculated by Professor Garrington, would adversely degrade the data received by the radio telescopes and the operational efficiency of the JBRT, contrary to the explicit policy considerations set out in the three development plans. Moreover, a reliance on a comparative approach is perverse as when absolute levels of interference increase, additional further interference, expressed as a percentage figure of the whole, reduces.
22. Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope is the third largest steerable radio telescope in the world. I am aware that the letters from academics within the Radio Telescope field, appended to Professor Garrington's evidence, were originally garnered in response to the appeal into the adjacent, larger proposed housing

⁶ Report APP/R0660/W/15/3138078, CD17 known as Marton appeal.

⁷ Professor Garrington's Proof of Evidence Paragraph 0.8

⁸ Professor Garrington's Proof of Evidence Paragraph 12.22.1

⁹ Professor Garrington's Proof of Evidence Paragraph 0.8

development. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that they are no longer of relevance in setting out the recognised global significance of, and sensitive nature of the radio astronomy work which takes place at Jodrell Bank, including its integral role as part of the national and international e Merlin, and Very Long Baseline Interferometry network of radio telescopes. Such work is directly relevant to pure and applied physical sciences and continues to be supported by substantial public investment to ensure that the radio telescopes remain capable of undertaking leading edge research¹⁰.

23. I am also aware that whilst the JBRTs do not play a direct role in the Square Kilometre Array (SKA) project, whose headquarters is being built at Jodrell Bank, the fact that Jodrell Bank remains an operational observatory was an important element in its selection as the host institution for the SKA project's global headquarters. Consequently, I accord significant weight to the global significance of the JBRT and to the breach of the policies for its protection set out within the adopted development plan for Cheshire East, namely Policy SE 14 of the CELP, saved Policy PS10 of the LP and Policy SC2 of the NP.
24. In coming to this conclusion, I am aware of the perceived lack of consistency in relation to impact on the JBRT, in how Cheshire East has determined planning applications within the Consultation Zone (CZ), including where sites have been allocated within the development plan. I am also aware of the difference in weight accorded to the impairment of the efficiency of JBRT, by both my colleagues and the Secretary of State in determining related appeals¹¹. I note scientists at the Jodrell Bank Observatory have recently taken a more robust approach to responding to proposed developments within the CZ. I have also been referred to a number of sites within the CZ where developments have been refused on the basis of impacts on the JBRT, including where they were considered to be of a '*relatively minor impact*'.
25. These refusals demonstrate the development pressures within the wider area and the particular challenges of the proximity of the Jodrell Bank Observatory to those who wish to develop housing, including those who spoke in support of the development. Nonetheless, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the evidence, and the particular circumstances of the case before me. As such, and in common with previous Inspectors and the Secretary of State, my conclusions should not be deemed as setting a precedent, as each proposed individual development will have impacts which are particular to it, and which will require consideration with reference to the relevant policies of the development plan and other relevant material considerations.

Development Strategy

26. From what I observed, Goostrey appears to be a small linear settlement which was substantially extended in the 60's and 70's, set within a relatively flat agrarian landscape. It is formed of two distinct parcels of built development separated by an area of land identified as open countryside, referred to as a '*bow tie*' within the NP. The appeal site lies within this area of open countryside, behind two recently constructed detached houses, immediately adjacent to the Settlement Zone Line which defines the boundary of villages identified within saved Policy PS5 of the LP.

¹⁰ Professor Garrington's Proof of Evidence Section 5 of

¹¹ Reports (APP/R0660/W/15/3138078) (APP/R0660/W/15/3138078) CD6 and CD17

27. These settlement boundaries remain part of the Policies Map. Any alterations are to be made through the Site Allocations and Development Policies Development Plan and/or Neighbourhood Plans.
28. Policy PG 1, of the recently adopted CELP, sets out the housing requirement for the whole of Cheshire East. Policy PG 2 of the CELP sets out a settlement strategy for the distribution of housing predicated on the principles of sustainable communities. Goostrey is identified, in common with 12 other smaller settlements, to take the role of a Local Service Centre. The expectation is that these will provide, in order of, 3,500 new homes towards Cheshire East's housing requirements. However, the supporting text of Policy PG 2 of the CELP envisages and specifically identifies that Goostrey's development needs would, *'largely be provided for in Holmes Chapel'¹²*.
29. Nonetheless, the recently adopted Goostrey NP takes a positive approach to housing development within or adjacent to the settlement boundary. However, due to the complexities of identifying housing sites, which would not individually or cumulatively harm the operation of the JBRTs, the NP does not allocate any housing sites, relying on two policies, HOU1 and HOU8 of the NP.
30. I have been referred in great detail to the genesis of Policy HOU1 of the NP, including reference to the levels of housing need identified within the plan. I am content, indeed, I am not in a position to suggest otherwise, that the Examiner has already taken into account the particular characteristics of housing need within Goostrey and the rural hinterland, including the significant benefits to be derived from its provision, as far as it relates to Goostrey NP in his consideration of the wording of the policy text of HOU1 of the NP that *'the construction of around 50 new homes will be supported'*.
31. Importantly, I do note there is no reference to this figure being expressed as a minimum within the policy text of the adopted plan. Similarly, the Examiner will have been aware of the particular issues in identifying suitable sites for housing given the proximity of Jodrell Bank Observatory to the settlement.
32. Reference has been made to the numbers of houses which have been constructed and are committed within Holmes Chapel. However, these clearly contribute to the overall housing supply, as do the 38 houses to which I have been referred which have a functional link to Goostrey, as evidenced by the amended S106 planning obligation, which I was provided with during the recess of the Inquiry (ID20 and ID21). Nonetheless I do not consider that these have a direct link to the appeal before me, as Policy HOU1 positively supports the construction of 50 new homes. This figure is independent of any development proposed or developed within Holmes Chapel or nearby on the eastern fringes of Chester and Chester West Council.
33. It is clear, that were impact to the JBRT not to be an issue, the appeal proposal would be in accordance with the development strategy for Cheshire East. This would be irrespective of the site's location within the open countryside as defined by saved Policy PS5 of the LP and subsequent conflict with saved Policy PS8 of the LP which is considerably more restrictive than Policy PG 6 of the CELP in relation to infill. Consequently, I give little weight to the argument that, as saved Policy PS8 of the LP is out of date, the presumption in favour of sustainable development should apply.

¹² Paragraph 8.35 Cheshire East Local Plan, CD4

34. The proposed development would derive, in principle, policy support as it would be small scale development of under 12 properties, immediately adjacent to the defined Settlement Zone Line, and consistent with its role as a Local Service Centre as identified by Policy PG 7 of the CELP and in line with Policies HOU1 and HOU8 of the NP. As such, whilst I am aware that concerns were raised in relation to the levels and quality of infrastructure within the village, such small scale development would, in principle, be acceptable.
35. To my mind, it is evident from both the body of the NP and the evidence provided by Dr Morris, on behalf of the Parish Council, that Policy HOU1 has been carefully worded to ensure that any housing permitted within the area covered by Goostrey NP, would not, individually or cumulatively, harm the operation of the JBRTs. Also, I am clear that it is implicit within the policy text that this may necessitate that not all the 50 new homes be constructed over the plan period. Indeed, this is referred to within the supporting text of Policy HOU1 where the relationship between Policy SC2 of the NP and HOU1 is explained. As such, there is no support for the premise that some form of harm to JBRT is accepted as an unavoidable consequence of Policy HOU1 of the NP.
36. Conversely, whilst I note that there have already been 23 dwellings which are committed or built within the NP area, I am also aware that the plan period runs to 2030. Consequently, even were I to accept that there was an unassailable imperative to construct the 50 new homes, whilst it is not easy to find suitable sites for new housing given the sensitive nature of the equipment at the Observatory, it is not impossible that the levels of housing proposed could be constructed at a different location within the NP area, within the plan period.
37. Therefore, from a simple reading of Policy HOU1, as I have already concluded that the proposed development of 6 dwellings would result in harm to the operation of the JBRT, the development would be contrary to Policy HOU1 of the NP. This I consider to be the local manifestation of the wider development strategy. Therefore, it is not inconsistent with the reference set out in the introduction to the CELP that, *'the Jodrell Bank radio telescope does not pose a significant restriction on new development'*.

Other material considerations

38. I have been referred to the support set out within the Housing White Paper - Fixing Our Broken Housing Market to small builders such as the appellants, and the important role which small scale builders play within the local economy through the direct employment of local employees and, indirectly, through the construction process. This is a clear benefit to which I give moderate weight.
39. As set out a signed, dated and certified S106 obligation was provided to enable the provision of two affordable housing units. The Council has accepted that this would secure the affordable housing and I see no reason to disagree. This accords with Policy HOU4 of the NP, which encourages the provision of at least 30% affordable dwellings for all sites. However, CELP Policy SC 5, sets out that affordable housing is to be sought in such areas from development of 11 or more dwellings, and this must temper the weight I can give to the proposed affordable units. Therefore, whilst I conclude that the affordable housing would be directly related to the proposed development it could not be considered to be necessary. Therefore, I am only able to accord limited weight

to the benefit derived from the proposed affordable housing in these circumstances.

40. I am aware that the appeal site is in a location which is considered to be accessible and capable of being made environmentally acceptable. I accord the benefit of the provision of general needs housing adjacent to a generally sustainable settlement which includes a railway station, general store, Post Office, two churches, a primary school and a village hall moderate weight, whilst noting the fundamental conflict I have found with Policy HOU1 of the NP.

Other matters

41. I am aware of the lengthy and complicated planning history of the site including its identification within the Cheshire East Council SHLAA of 2012. However, it is clear to me that no part of the appeal site benefits from any kind of live consent which would give weight to the proposed residential development. I also appreciate that the appellant is unhappy with the way in which his applications have been progressed by the Council. However, this is not a matter of direct relevance to my consideration of the appeal before me.
42. I note that the Council has raised no objection to the design of the proposed development. I am content, were I to have concluded that the appeal should be allowed, that subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions, the substantive objections from the Parish Council relating to car parking and matters of design could have been overcome. In the context of this appeal, the density of the proposed development would not be determinative.

Planning balance and conclusion

43. The appeal proposal would provide 6 new homes on a site which I consider, subject to the imposition of conditions, to be acceptable in design terms and would be appropriately located in relation to transport links and proximity to the village and its services. As such, I have accorded this moderate weight in favour of the development. I have also attached moderate weight to the benefits to be derived from the construction of modest developments by local builders through the provision of small sites, and limited weight to affordable housing provision. However, I have found, on the basis of the uncontested evidence of Professor Garrington, that the proposed development would breach saved Policy PS10 of the LP, Policy SE 14 of the CELP and Policy SC2 of the NP which require that where the efficiency of the telescopes are impaired that development will not be permitted. From the evidence before me, including consideration of the global significance of Jodrell Bank as a scientific research resource, I accord this breach of policy significant weight.
44. Moreover, the proposed development would also be contrary to Policy HOU1 of the NP. This supports new housing in principle within and adjacent to the settlement boundary of Goostrey, where it does not individually or cumulatively harm the operation of the JBRTs. Similarly, from the evidence before me I accord this breach significant weight. I must also take into account paragraph 198 of the Framework which states where a planning application conflicts with a neighbourhood plan that has been brought into force, planning permissions should not normally be granted.
45. When the Council refused the application it considered that it did not have a five year housing land supply. However, by the time that the Inquiry

commenced the Council was of the view that, following the adoption of the CELP, it was able to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing. The appellant has consistently stated that the Council was unable to demonstrate a five year supply, but at my Inquiry no substantive evidence was provided to me to support this proposition. The issue which divided the main parties was the extent to which the alleged harm to JBRT should be determinative in the particular circumstances of the development, irrespective of the five year housing land supply position. In this context, there is conflict with DP as a whole, and the identified benefits would not outweigh this.

46. Notwithstanding this, before I resumed the Inquiry at the end of November, I was provided with an appeal decision (ID30)¹³ relating to a site in Cheshire East. The Inspector in this case stated, on the basis of the evidence before him, that the 5 year supply should be considered to be marginal and, potentially, in doubt. He therefore regarded the policies for the supply of housing to be considered not up-to-date, thereby engaging the *tilted balance* of paragraph 14 of the Framework.
47. However, whilst I have been made aware of this decision, I note that the housing supply position was considered marginal in the circumstances of that particular appeal and I have not undertaken a similar forensic examination of the housing supply position such as to be able to come to a definitive conclusion. Moreover, even if the housing supply position was such as to engage the tilted balance, this would not alter my conclusion on the significant weight which I would attribute to the individual harm from the proposed development to the operational efficiency of JBRT. These adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits I have identified, such as to require the dismissal of the appeal proposal.
48. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR

¹³ APP/R0660/W/17/3166469, White Moss, Crewe ID30

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Scott Lyness of Counsel	Instructed by: Head of Legal Services
He called Mr Nick Hulland BSc, MSc, MRTPI Professor Simon Garrington, BSc, Phd.	Senior Planning Officer, Cheshire East Council Associate Director, Jodrell Bank Centre for Astrophysics

FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Hunter of Counsel	Instructed by: Direct Professional Access Emery Planning
He called Mr Stephen Harris BSc (Hons.) MRTPI	Director Emery Planning

FOR GOOSTREY PARISH COUNCIL:

Dr Ken Morris	Goostrey Parish Council
---------------	-------------------------

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Catherine Morris	Local Resident
John Roger Dyke	Local Resident
David Johnson	Local Resident
Rob Stubbs	Local Resident
Councillor Andrew Kolker	Cheshire East Ward Councillor
Adrian Rose	Local Resident
Sally Darbyshire	Local Resident

CORE DOCUMENTS

- 1 Officer Report and site plan for Appeal Application 16/4306C
- 2 Decision Notice for Appeal Application 16/4306C
- 3 Congleton Borough Local Plan 2005
- 4 Cheshire East Local Plan July 2017
- 5 Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan August 2017
- 6 Appeal APP/R0660/W/15/3129954 by Gladman Developments, including site plan
- 7 JBO consultation response to 16/4306C
- 8 Cheshire East Local Plan – Inspectors Final Report June 2017
- 9 Goostrey Neighbourhood Plan Examiners Report
- 10 National Planning Policy Framework
- 11 12/4318C – Decision Notice, Officer Report, plan & JBO consultation (appeal site history)
- 12 13/4266C – Decision Notice, Officer Report, plan & JBO consultation (appeal site history)
- 13 15/3131C – Decision Notice, Officer Report, plans & JBO consultation (appeal site history)
- 14 15/5517C - Decision Notice, Officer Report, plans & JBO consultation (appeal site history)
- 15 16/4558C - Decision Notice, Officer Report, plans & JBO consultation (Redrow Homes, Congleton)
- 16 16/1345M - Decision Notice, Officer Report, plans & JBO consultation (Church Farm, Marton)
- 17 Marton SoS Decision – 27 dwellings (APP/R0660/W/15/3138078)
- 18 Richbrough Supreme Court Decision
- 19 Cheshire East Council 'Housing Monitoring Update' 1st September 2017

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- 1 Professor Garrington Email Questions
- 2 Draft Conditions
- 3 Copy of Advice from DE Manley and John Hunter re land adjacent to Main Road Goostrey
- 4 Stringer vs Minister of Housing and Local Government and Another
- 5 Opening Statement by John Hunter on behalf of appellants
- 6 Opening Statement by Scott Lyness on behalf of Cheshire East
- 7 Opening Statement by Dr Morris on behalf of Goostrey Parish Council
- 8 Statement by Mr David Johnson
- 9 Statement by Mr Rob Stubbs
- 10 Statement by Mrs Catherine Morris
- 11 Statement by Cllr Andrew Kolker Cheshire East Ward Councillor and member of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
- 12 Statement by Roger John Dyke
- 13 Housing Advice Note Goostrey Parish Council February 2016 Draft
- 14 Excerpt Holmes Chapel Neighbourhood Plan Final Version (2016-2030)
- 15 Press release Jodrell Bank Nomination for World Heritage Status
- 16 Statement by Dr Morris on behalf of Goostrey Parish Council
- 17 Consultation response on behalf of Goostrey Parish Council 16/4306C

- 18 Jodrell Bank's comments on planning application 16/0732C
- 19 Delegated report 16/0515C
- 20 Copy of Planning Obligation relating to land off Harrison Drive and New Platt Lane Goostrey Cheshire 1 May 2014
- 21 Draft Agreement and Planning Obligation relating to land off Harrison Drive and New Platt Lane Goostrey Cheshire
- 22 Email dated 15 November 2017 Conor Vallely to Jeremy Owens re Victoria Mills Site, Holmes Chapel
- 23 Extract housing completions and losses from 01/04/2010-31/03/17
- 24 Supplementary Note of Nick Hullah BSc, MSc, MRTPI
- 25 Position Statement between Henderson Homes and Goostrey Parish Council 20 November 2017
- 26 Draft S106 agreement re appeal site
- 27 Closing submissions of Mr Lyness on behalf of Cheshire East Council
- 28 Closing submissions of Dr Morris on behalf of Goostrey Parish Council
- 29 Closing submissions of Mr Hunter on behalf of the appellants
- 30 Appeal decision AAP/R0660/W/17/3166469 White Moss, Barthomley, Crewe
- 31 Signed and certified of completed S106 obligation relating to the appeal site.