The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 22 – 24 January 2019
Site visit made on 5 February 2019

by Helen Heward BSc Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th April 2019

Appeal Reference: APP/N4205/W/18 /3207361
Land at Bowlands Hey / The Fairways, Westhoughton, Bolton

- 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 Bellway Homes (Manchester Division) against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref: 02781/18 dated 26 January 2018 was refused by notice dated 4 July 2018.
- The development proposed is described as the erection of 174 dwellings, the laying out of roads and footways, hard and soft landscaping, walls and fences and drainage, together with the laying out of public open space including ecological mitigation; and other associated works.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary and Procedural Matters

2. Prior to the inquiry the Council formally withdrew reasons 2 and 3 given on the Decision Notice (DN). Both main parties prepared their Proofs of Evidence based on reasons 1 and 4 only.

3. Shortly before the inquiry the Council submitted a Rebuttal Proof of Evidence regarding housing land supply, extracts from the Greater Manchester Strategic Framework Revised Draft January 2019 (GMSF), an Addendum Proof summarising visual impacts and a Community Infrastructure Levy Compliance Statement. Although submitted late, the information did not raise any significant new issues, was of assistance to the inquiry, and the appellant raised no objections to me accepting it.

4. After the inquiry the appellant submitted an executed Section 106 Agreement. It includes obligations that would come into effect if planning permission were granted. They would secure on-site affordable housing, public open space and financial contributions towards education facilities and highway works.

5. At the time that the Council made its decision the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) 2012 was in place. By the time the inquiry was held the revised 2018 Framework had been published and was addressed by the parties. On 19 February 2019, after the close of the inquiry, the Government published several documents. These include the updated Framework, February 2019, the Housing Delivery Test 2018 measurement results and technical note, the Government response to the technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance including the standard method for calculating

housing need, and updated Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Housing and economic needs assessment.

6. On 28 March 2019, the Office for National Statistics published updated annual affordability ratios. The main parties were consulted on these and their responses have been taken into consideration in this decision. Where I refer to the Framework it is to the 2019 version, unless stated otherwise.

Background

7. Applications should be determined in accordance with the development plan (DP) unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The appeal is for a proposal to build housing on a greenfield site located on the edge of Westhoughton. The DP for this area comprises the Bolton Core Strategy 2011 (CS) and the Bolton Allocations Plan 2014 (AP). In the DP the site is identified as being within Other Protected Open Land (OPOL).

8. CS Policy OA3 relates to Westhoughton. Criterion 3 (OA3.3) aims to concentrate new housing in the town centre and other sites within the existing urban area. Criterion 6 (OA3.6) seeks to ensure OPOL around Westhoughton remains undeveloped. The proposal runs contrary to these requirements. Nor does it fall within any of the specified categories of development that AP Policy CG6AP permits within OPOL. These policies flow from CS Strategic Objective 15 and Policy SC1 which amongst other things seek to focus new housing in the existing urban area, especially Bolton town centre, council owned housing areas and in mixed use developments on previously developed land.

9. The first reason for refusal in the Council's Decision Notice advises that Policy CG6AP is not "up to date" and refers to advice at paragraphs 14 and 49 of the [2012] Framework. The Framework is a material consideration.

10. Paragraph 11[1] advises that decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Subsection 11.d) ii states that where the most relevant policies for determining the application are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

11. For applications involving the provision of housing, out of date includes situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable sites (HLS) (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73), or where the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below (less than 75% of) the housing requirement over the previous three years.

12. The housing requirement in the CS is more than 5 years old. A revised draft of the GMSF is at an early stage. At the inquiry the main parties agreed broadly that the Council has a HLS of approximately 3.5 years. Therefore the weight I attach to these policy provisions is limited and paragraph 11.d) ii of the Framework applies in this case.

Main Issue

13. The first reason for refusal informs that the adverse impacts which the Council consider would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits are

[1] Paragraph 11of the 2019 Framework replaces paragraph 14 of the 2012 version

described within reasons 2, 3 and 4. Having withdrawn reasons 2 and 3 this leaves those adverse impacts specified in reason 4. This states that "*the proposed development would have significant local landscape and visual impacts which would not maintain or respect the landscape character of the area or the landscape setting to the west of the Westhoughton Town Centre Conservation Area [CA]...*" The Council clarified that the reference to the CA was not an assertion of harm to the setting of the CA.

14. Therefore the main issue is whether likely landscape and visual impacts of the development would satisfactorily safeguard the character and appearance of the site and locality with particular regard to landscape character.

15. I shall then go onto consider if any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh any benefits of the proposed development.

Reasons

Landscape value and sensitivity

16. The undeveloped land on the western edge of Westhoughton falls within Natural England's National Landscape Character Area 56: Lancashire Coal Measures (NCA). In the Landscape Character Appraisal for Bolton, 2001, (LCA) the site sits within an area of Agricultural Coal Measures Landscape Character Type (LCT). This is a settled, urbanised landscape with a scattered settlement pattern. The LCA recognises that the landscape is of variable quality. The proposal would result in little change to the key characteristics, and the magnitude of change and effect would be low-negligible across the NCC and LCT as a whole. These are large areas and broad scale assessments, and this limits the weight I attach to these effects.

17. Locally, there are significant areas of suburban expansion around Westhoughton and housing estates make up a large part of the outer extent. Major roads and rail lines dissect the surrounding landscape. These detract from the quality of the urban fringe on the west side of the town. Within this area the site forms part of a broadly triangular area of OPOL bounded by predominantly modern housing and by the route of railway lines.

18. In the locality of the appeal site I noted that trees and vegetation substantially screen the CA. Trees and vegetation alongside Pennington Brook limit visibility of the edge of built development east of the site. Elsewhere hedgerows and trees limit views of industrial development, scattered built form at Dobb Brow, and housing under construction beyond Old Lane. The main parties agree that impacts would be contained within a relatively small Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) around the site, and I agree.

19. Within the ZTV there is some semi-natural habitat, mainly along the Pennington Brook corridor. The appeal site is mainly characterised by small irregular fields typical of Enclosed Land and Piecemeal Enclosure historic landscape types[2]. A Historic Desk Based Environment Assessment[3] notes that the enclosure of the fields is likely to date from the late C18th and that many boundaries have remained the same since. From a copy of an 1849 Ordnance Survey map and my site visit observations it appears to me that the

[2] The Greater Manchester Urban Historic Landscape Characterisation (September 2008)
[3] CD4.20 paragraph 4.30

relationship of these small fields to Old Lane and Dobb Brow Road has changed little. At the inquiry the appellant's heritage witness agreed.

20. The agricultural land is low grade. There are no designations covering the site. Undulating small fields are abundant in the locality. The appeal site has only a few fragmented poorly managed hedgerows that are not identified as requiring protection. Planning conditions could be attached to secure the investigation of the archaeological potential. The Council did not identify any other features. Other areas of this LCT are more remote, diverse and intact. Nonetheless, the small fields on the site have scenic qualities that contribute positively to landscape character in the ZTV.

21. Old Lane and Dobb Brow Road form part of a well-used footpath network offering a circular route, close to, and accessible from, the built-up area. Whilst only crossing part of the site this network affords access around the site and views across the small fields on the appeal site. In these ways the site contributes positively to the recreational value of the landscape within the ZTV.

22. The low, narrow channel of Pennington Brook is set in a much wider corridor extending on both sides. It is well vegetated with scrub and trees, including several native species such as willow, oak, hawthorn and ash, often several metres tall. Even in winter the naturalised vegetation affords significant screening. Consequently, even though the houses are on higher ground, most views are partially restricted. This residential edge is mainly seen in views across fields and mostly at some distance, where it often appears as little more than a narrow strip in the panorama.

23. The introduction to the LCA explains that the relationship between urban areas and surrounding countryside is a key aspect of Bolton's visual character. It goes on to state that estate-based housing development, commonly on green field sites on the edges of the urban areas have had significant impact on the landscape, and that it is important that this relationship between the landscape and the built edge of Bolton is protected and enhanced. These aims are broadly consistent with Natural England's aims for NCA56. These include to enhance the sense of place, assist with assimilating new development into the landscape and to provide recreational opportunities by including green infrastructure and biodiversity habitat (suited to the landscape type and site characteristics) within any new sustainable residential and commercial development.

24. The LCA is not a capacity assessment and is almost 20 years old. But whilst it seeks to restrict the extension of the urban edge the main parties agree that the LCA recognises that there is potential for change in this LCA. A Review of Protected Open Land, 2018, (the LUC report) assessed the sensitivity of the landscape of the larger triangle of urban fringe in this area as "low/medium". The area of low sensitivity is mainly to the south. Overall, I find that within the ZTV the landscape value, susceptibility to change, and sensitivity are all medium.

Effects at the edges of development

25. Presently the Pennington Brook corridor creates a strong physical and visual feature in the landscape and gives strength to the settlement boundary in this area. In the proposal a new outer edge to the settlement would be formed alongside the northern section of Dobb Brow Road. Although the dwellings

would be slightly set back, the space between would be almost fully occupied with drives, front gardens and parking. Often there would be little more than a narrow grass verge separating development from Dobb Brow Road.

26. The LCA places a strong emphasis on the planting of locally native species. There are some existing native trees on the outer edge of Dobb Brow Road, but the site boundary only includes a narrow strip. The appellant's landscape witness advised the inquiry that the individual trees proposed would be mainly ornamental and fruit trees, and that proximity to buildings would limit planting possibilities.

27. Where housing would come close to Dobb Brow Road there would be insufficient margin on either side to enable block or woodland planting to create natural strong defensible boundaries as recommended in the LCA. Reference was made to the planting of new hedgerows, but the plans indicate that this would primarily be in the form of laurel garden boundary hedges.

28. The limited vegetation and tree cover would be occasional. It would not form a robust landscaped edge and would not safeguard the relationship between the settlement and the surrounding landscape. At the inquiry the appellant's landscape witness conceded that the proposal would not have met his landscape strategy recommendations for this edge.

29. Post-construction an area of habitat for biodiversity with native tree planting would be created straddling a length of the southern section of Dobb Brow Road. It would protect the character along this section and limit effects of development in longer views. Nonetheless, in other relatively unmitigated views, houses and parking would be seen at very close quarters and in succession, occupying and dominating large parts of the view over a relatively long section of Dobb Brow Road.

30. At the southern end of the development a residential enclave would have two short frontages facing out in an "L" shaped cul-de-sac. In some views, particularly from footpath WES093, dwellings would appear 'forward' of the main body of development. The cul-de-sac road would be constructed to adoptable standards and extend hard up to the boundary. Save for some specimen trees and hedging to gardens there would be little room for planting around this edge either.

31. The habitat area around Dobb Brow Road and reinforced native vegetation along Pennington Brook would limit and mitigate some views. But in other views from WES093 and WES094 this section of development would present two unmitigated, incongruous, prominent and hard edges to the countryside.

32. A 'Grampian' planning condition could require planting outside of the site. Although the appellant has an option on this land, I have insufficient evidence to be certain that it would meet advice on the PPG regarding such conditions, and in any event even if it did, it would only mitigate effects in this area.

33. There was confusion about detailed landscaping proposals. The main parties agreed that in the event of permission being granted, a planning condition should be imposed requiring new landscaping proposals due to the inconsistencies. Even so, the layout of development would not change.

34. I conclude that the development at these edges would introduce uncharacteristic elements and have a major adverse effect upon the

relationship between the settlement and surrounding urban fringe. It would run contrary to stated aims to provide an appropriate strategy to assimilate development within the landscape.

35. The major adverse effects upon landscape character would be particularly noticeable in, and harmful to, views from well-used rights of way around and through the site. These receptors would have a high sensitivity. I am not persuaded that an awareness of surrounding development would lessen the perceived magnitude of change in the available views. The effects would be major adverse.

Effects around Old Lane

36. Old Lane runs through the northern part of the site. Dwellings would generally face onto Old Lane and be set back. Five adoptable turning heads would abut this lane, all appearing larger and more engineered than the rural scale and character of Old Lane. On the south side, the area between the front of dwellings and Old Lane would be dominated by parking and drives. To the north four properties would have private rear gardens along Old Lane. Finished levels of some of the development close to Pennington Brook would appear relatively high from Old Lane.

37. Where present, trees and hedgerows could be kept. The footpath along Old Lane would remain. Post and wire fencing would prevent access. A view of the Church would be retained. Revised landscape drawings could reinforce planting. Nonetheless, the intimate rural character of Old Lane would be overwhelmed between two residential street scenes heavily dominated by access and parking.

38. These aspects of the development would be uncharacteristic and incongruous. Development would fail to safeguard positive landscape characteristics which enhance the sense of place and would not safeguard the relationship between the settlement and surrounding urban fringe. The effects upon landscape character would be major adverse. In views from Old Lane the magnitude of change would be high, and the effects would be major adverse.

Other landscape and visual matters

39. Housing is seen in views in this urban fringe area and is not uncharacteristic. North of Old Lane development is under construction. Although within the same broad urban fringe triangle, that site appears set back more from Old Lane and more contained by the settlement and industrial development.

40. The development would result in a loss of an open space and fields, but the appeal site is not designated as open or green space and is not within the Green Belt. Residential development on open fields will inevitably have high impacts upon the site itself but there is a need to be careful not to 'over inflate' such effects. I attach limited weight to arguments about loss of open fields.

41. Pennington Brook could become a positive wildlife and habitat corridor within development and provide screening between existing and new housing. The open space would far exceed the Council's requirements. But the benefits of the creation and long-term management of this, and other green infrastructure, would not mitigate or compensate for the adverse effects.

42. The Council did not present ecological evidence against the proposal. Whilst I heard concerns about active open space provision in relation to play and kick

about areas, I find no harm in this regard. Nor did the Council advance a reason for refusal regarding the urban design of the proposed development, and, I am satisfied that the residential layout in itself would be satisfactory.

43. The Council conceded it had not undertaken a full Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) but paragraph 1.20 of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments, third edition, advises that the guidance concentrates on principles and is not intended to be prescriptive. In any event the conclusions in both LVIAs presented are ultimately based upon a series of judgements and I have made my own, having regard to the evidence before me.

Conclusions on main issue

44. The development would not provide an appropriate strategy to assimilate development within the landscape and would not form a robust settlement edge. The development would fail to safeguard positive landscape characteristics which enhance the sense of place and would not safeguard the relationship between the settlement and surrounding urban fringe. The adverse effects upon landscape character would be particularly noticeable in, and harmful to, views from well-used rights of way around and through the site. The effects would be permanent. Development would fail to assimilate into the landscape. Domestic paraphernalia would be likely to increase adverse effects upon the quality and character of the landscape over time.

45. Although impacts would be constrained within a relatively small ZTV, where the landscape value is medium with a medium sensitivity to change, the harms to the character and appearance of the site and locality would be substantial.

46. The proposal would be contrary to requirements of CS Policy CG3.2 and CG3.7 which seek to ensure that development has regard to the overall built character and landscape quality of the area, maintains and respects the landscape character of the surrounding countryside, and that landscaping should be compatible with nearby landscape types identified by the LCA.

47. These policies are broadly consistent with advice at paragraph 127 of the Framework. This includes that decisions should ensure that development will add to the overall character of the area, should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.

48. Effects would be relatively localised, and I find no conflict with Policy OA3.8 regarding effects upon the 'wider open landscape'. Development would be well screened from, and have a neutral effect upon, the CA. I find no conflict with requirements of Policies CG3.4 and OA3.7 to conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings and the character of the existing physical environment.

Other Matters

49. Bolton Unitary Development Plan December 1995 Policy PG10 Bowlands Hey allocated the site for housing. That Policy sought to ensure that planning permission would not be granted until more than one of four criteria relating to the regeneration of the urban areas were met and is long out of date. In the current DP the explanatory text to Policy CG6AP recognises that some OPOL land could be appropriate for development in the future, but not during the

plan period up to 2026 and not without a further review of the CS. Nor does it specifically identify this site.

50. A consultation of the GMSF, October 2016, included the site within Policy M61C3 "West of Westhoughton" for up to 1100 houses. In the GMSF consultation, January 2019, the site is not identified for development. However, both iterations are drafts. In all these situations the much larger triangular urban fringe area was considered where the railway routes could be used to form new settlement boundaries.

51. At the inquiry and having regard to advice at paragraph 73 and footnote 37, the parties agreed that the Local Housing Need (LHN) 'standard method' set out in the PPG with 2014 based on ONS household projections should be used. The parties also agreed that the supply of specific deliverable sites should include a 20% buffer for significant under delivery of housing over the last three years. At the inquiry the parties were in broad agreement that Bolton had a HLS of approximately 3.5 years, and I find no reason to disagree.

52. The recently published 2018 HDT measurement results indicate that Bolton achieved 60% of delivery target in the last 3 years. Application of a 20% buffer remains appropriate.

53. Evidence was presented to the inquiry about the deliverability of sites that the Council had included in the supply and the appellant contends that changes to the definition of deliverability could impact upon the assessment of some sites relied upon by the Council. Nonetheless, the appellant still agreed that including the contended sites does not have a significant effect upon the overall supply figure; perhaps increasing it by up to 0.3 years.

54. On the 28th March 2019, the ONS published the 2018-based results for the ratio of median house price to median gross annual workplace-based earnings for England and Wales. For Bolton there is an increase in the mean affordability ratio from 5.23 to 5.36 between 2017 and 2018. In their post inquiry submissions the parties disagree whether the effect of this slight change has an adverse or positive effect upon the HLS of approximately 3.5 years agreed at the inquiry. The appellant argues that the effect is to increase the annual requirement by 6 dwellings. The Council argue it will reduce by 4. The effects are marginal. The data neither indicates that the gap between need and supply is materially improving or moving further apart.

55. To my mind this further examination with the most up to date advice and data confirms that the position agreed at the inquiry of a HLS of approximately 3.5 years was, and remains reasonable, and that there is no material change.

56. HLS at the inquiry was calculated using a different methodology to that used at inquiry APP/N4205/W/17/3167848 in July 2017, when the parties agreed the supply was 3.1 years. This inevitably limits comparability. In any event the improvement is not significant. Nor do I attach much weight to proposed housing land requirements in the GMSF January 2019 draft.

57. Bolton has failed to meet its housing requirements successively. The parties agree that the Council is working to improve delivery and has produced a broad scope for an Action Plan, but it is no more than that. I do not doubt that since the inquiry the Council has continued to deal with other housing applications and granted some more consents. But from the evidence before me at the

inquiry I am not persuaded that the steps that the authority are taking to remedy the shortfall are likely to materially reduce the deficit soon, or that a significant deficit is unlikely to persist.

58. The Council argue that the proposal would adversely impact upon the regeneration strategy of the DP as reflected in CS Strategic Objective 15 and CS Policy OA3.3. Such aims are broadly consistent with advice in the Framework for making efficient use of land and regeneration.

59. At the inquiry the Council agreed that sections 10 and 11 of Bolton's Authority Monitoring Report 2017/18 indicate that Bolton's aims for the distribution of development, and development on previously developed land are broadly on target, and that some of the possible actions listed in the scope for the Action Plan could include OPOL land. I am not convinced that there is evidence before me to demonstrate that the proposal would materially harm regeneration aims.

60. The Council has granted permission for developments on OPOL land and the 3.5 year HLS includes OPOL land. Housing has been allowed on OPOL land on appeal and several decisions are drawn to my attention. At inquiry the Council's witness conceded that other OPOL land would be likely to be required to maintain a 5 year HLS. Other areas of undeveloped land around Westhoughton might have a higher landscape value. The LUC report ranks Bowlands Hey as having the lowest landscape sensitivity of the sites around Westhoughton. But it is not the purpose of a S78 appeal to undertake an assessment of alternative sites such as would occur through a development plan review, and I have assessed this appeal on its own merits.

61. The site I am considering is not in the Green Belt. I attach little weight to arguments about safeguarded land in the context of paragraph 139 of the Framework and comparisons with retention of openness in the Green Belt.

Benefits

62. The Framework seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing land and the proposal would deliver 174 houses. The appellant agreed at the inquiry to a condition requiring commencement within 2 years and advises that the housing would be delivered within 5 years at a rate of approximately 30 houses per annum. Jobs would be created during construction, and indirectly in the supply chain, and there would be support for local businesses.

63. The appellant draws attention to the failure of other schemes to deliver affordable housing. The appeal scheme would deliver 46 discount market and 15 intermediate affordable dwellings.

64. The scheme includes a mix of unit types and sizes and children's play space to create a mixed inclusive sustainable community. The proposal would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the amenity of surrounding residential properties or their occupants. The site is sustainably located, accessible to the town centre, shops, services and the train station. The Council does not take issue with the internal urban design of the scheme or the sustainability credentials. But all these matters are integral to good planning, necessary to satisfy planning requirements, and neutral in effect.

65. The quantum of open space would exceed the Council's requirements, habitat creation and landscaping in this area could be enhancing, but a lack of clarity in this regard limits the weight I attach to this.

66. The proposal does not make provision for improving visibility for drivers along Old Lane. Use as a footpath could increase with the new development. Westhoughton Golf Club is concerned about visibility, but there is little evidence from a highway expert regarding this.

Overall Balance and Conclusion

67. Aspects of the development would result in major adverse landscape and visual impacts and fail to safeguard positive characteristics of the local landscape which enhance the sense of place, the character and appearance of the site and locality and the relationship between the landscape and the built edge of the settlement. The total harms to the character and appearance of the site and locality would be very substantial, permanent and long lasting and run contrary to aims to protect the urban fringe.

68. The proposal would conflict with DP Policies CS Policy CG3.2 and CG3.7, which are relevant to the proposal but not related to the supply of housing. It would also be contrary to advice in the Framework for the creation of well-designed places that add to the overall quality of an area, not just for the short term, but also over the lifetime of a development. These conflicts add to the very substantial weight against the proposal.

69. The Council has a HLS of approximately 3.5 years. The shortfall is significant and there is a compelling need for housing. The relevant policies for the supply of housing are out of date and I attach little weight to conflict with Policies SC1, OA3.3, OA3.6 and AP Policy CG6AP.

70. The delivery of 174 dwellings, including 61 affordable units, within 5 years would make a significant, meaningful and continuous contribution toward the delivery of housing. This attracts considerable weight in favour. I also attach weight in favour of the socio-economic benefits that construction and subsequent occupation of the dwellings would bring, and to the provision of substantial open space.

71. However, even if I were to conclude that problems with the deliverability of sites and the effects of the recent changes to the mean affordability ratio were to mean that the supply of deliverable housing land was considerably less than 3.5 years, the adverse impacts of granting permission, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

72. Therefore, and having regard to all other matters raised, including by third parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Heward

PLANNING INSPECTOR

PARTICIPANTS AT THE INQUIRY

FOR THE APPELLANT

David Manley, Queens Counsel, Kings Chambers, instructed by Mike Stone, for Bellway Homes. He called:

Simon M Pemberton MRTPI AIEMA, Lichfields

Jonathan Berry CMLI AIEMA M.Arbor.A, Partner, Tyler Grange LLP

Graeme Ives MRTPI, Director, Graeme Ives Heritage Planning Ltd

FOR THE COUNCIL

Stephanie Hall, Counsel, Kings Chambers, instructed by Nicola Raby, Solicitor for Bolton Council. She called:

Jodie Turton Principal Development Officer, Development Management, Bolton Council

Peter Coe BA Dip LA CMLI, Urban Vision

INTERESTED PERSONS

Mrs D Roscoe, Local Resident

Mr D Fearnley, Local Resident

Mr Riley, Local Resident

Mr Heaton, Westhoughton Golf Club Trustee

Mr Wilkinson, Ward Councillor, Bolton Council and Parish Councillor

Documents received at the inquiry

1 Opening submission on behalf of the Council
2 Extracts from Bolton Core Strategy Spatial portrait and issues
3 Tyler Grange Agreed Visual Comparison Table 22.01.19
4 DWG BHM005 PL01 Rev G
5 Extracts from the Statement Accompanying the Definitive Map for Bolton metropolitan Borough Council
6 Statement to the Inquiry by Mrs Roscoe and attachment bundle
7 Statement to the Inquiry by Mr Fearnley and attachment bundle
8 Revised list of proposed planning conditions agreed by the main parties
9 Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government Ministerial Statement HCWS488, 25 March 2015
10 Mr Fearnley's notes for points for me to observe on my site visit
11 Bolton Council email dated 24 January 2019: 12:27 confirming highway costings for the S106
12 Extract from the Bolton Unitary Development Plan December 1995; Policy PG10 Bowlands Hey
13 Mr Fearnley's photographic story boards and finds (digital images recorded and submitted by the appellant for the inquiry)
14 Closing submissions on behalf of the Council
15 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant