

---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 5 - 8 April 2016

Site visit made on 8 April 2016

**by David M H Rose BA (Hons) MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 27 June 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H1033/W/15/3136353**

**Land off Long Lane, South of Chapel-en-le-Frith High School,  
Chapel-en-le-Frith, Derbyshire, SK23 0TQ**

- 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 Mr S Robinson (Trading as Bank Hall Drive Developments) against the decision of High Peak Borough Council.
  - The application Reference HPK/2015/0058, dated 29 January 2015 (and registered on 11 February 2015), was refused by notice dated 24 September 2015.
  - The proposal is an outline planning application for residential development.<sup>1</sup>
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

#### Drawings

2. The application was made in outline with all matters reserved for subsequent approval. The original Concept Plan, with four potential access points, was replaced by Drawing 14-111-CP01 Rev C, with two potential access points via Bank Hall Drive and/or third party land and, thereafter, through the grounds of Chapel-en-le-Frith High School. This formed the basis of the Council's consideration and the decision to refuse planning permission.
3. A second planning application followed, supported by Drawing 14-111-NP (Revised Proposals Post Neighbourhood Plan),<sup>2</sup> which was withdrawn prior to its determination.
4. It was agreed, in response to the appellant's request, that Drawing 14-111-NP would form the basis for the consideration of this appeal as no other party would be disadvantaged because the plan was already in the public domain and had been consulted on; it was illustrative; there was no specific identification of potential means of access; the reservation of part of the site for the adjoining school was notional; and the drawing, like its predecessor, did not set any formal parameters.

---

<sup>1</sup> The application form refers to a total of 250 residential units – this was subsequently amended to approximately 210 dwellings

<sup>2</sup> Proposing approximately 200 dwellings – variously referred to as 208 dwellings

---

5. Whilst the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, the substitution of Drawing 14-111-NP would not change the substance of the appeal, insofar as the points in dispute are matters of principle rather than detail, and its adoption for the purposes of this appeal would not cause prejudice to anyone with an interest in the proposal.

#### **Access**

6. A further matter arose in relation to access in that the appeal site does not have road frontage, or a definitive means of access, to an adoptable highway; and the provision of access would involve land within the ownership of one or more third parties. Article 5(3) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015 requires:- *'where access is a reserved matter, the outline planning permission must state the area or areas where access points to the development proposed will be situated'*.
7. In this case it is acknowledged that details of the access to the development would form the subject of a further application for planning permission, rather than submission as a reserved matter. It was confirmed that the local planning authority had accepted the application as valid, on the basis of Queen's Counsel's opinion, and continued to do so.

#### **High Peak Local Plan**

8. Shortly before the commencement of the Inquiry, the Inspector's Final Report on the examination into the High Peak Local Plan (the Local Plan) was published. It was common ground that the Local Plan should be treated as if it were adopted for the purposes of the Inquiry and the determination of the appeal. The Local Plan was subsequently adopted on 14 April 2016.

#### **Planning Agreement**

9. On the final day of the Inquiry a completed agreement, pursuant to section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, was submitted to secure a number of measures including those referred to in reason 2 of the Council's decision to refuse planning permission. The concluded agreement effectively overcomes this reason for refusal.
10. The obligation would secure the provision of affordable housing within the site; a financial contribution towards the improvement of named open spaces; a sum to improve pedestrian links from the site to the railway station; safeguarding funds for possible traffic management measures; the provision of a Travel Plan, and a related financial contribution for monitoring; contributions for additional school places generated by the development; and water quality monitoring and mitigation measures in relation to Combs Reservoir Site of Special Scientific Interest.
11. All of the above are underpinned by policies in the Local Plan. The contents of the obligation would fulfil the policy tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the statutory tests in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. None of the financial contributions would, in combination with other development contributions, exceed the five limit threshold of regulation 123(3).

## Main Issues

12. I have re-cast the main issues from those announced at the opening of the Inquiry to reflect the adoption of the Local Plan and the evidence heard. The main issues are:-
- (i) would the proposal be in conflict with the housing policies in the High Peak Local Plan and the Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan;
  - (ii) the effect of the proposal on the setting of heritage assets;
  - (iii) the likelihood of securing a suitable access to the site; and
  - (iv) the balance to be struck between any identified harm and the benefits arising from the scheme.

## Reasons

### The development plan

13. Policy H1 of the Local Plan confirms:-

*'The Council will ensure provision is made for housing, taking into account all other policies in this Local Plan, by:-<sup>3</sup>*

- a) supporting the development of specific sites through new site allocations in the Local Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan;*
- b) promoting the effective reuse of land .....;*
- c) supporting housing development on unallocated sites within the defined built up area boundaries .....;*
- d) encouraging the inclusion of housing in mixed use schemes .....;*
- e) supporting development identified through a Community Right to Build Order;*
- f) supporting self build housing schemes'.*

The proposal would not fulfil any of these criteria.

14. A second strand of the policy explains:-

*'The Council will give consideration to approving sustainable sites outside the defined built up area boundaries, taking into account other policies in this Local Plan, provided that:-*

- g) the development would adjoin the built up area boundary and be well related with the existing pattern of development and surrounding land uses and of an appropriate scale for the settlement; and*
- h) the development would not lead to prominent intrusion into the countryside or have a significant adverse impact on the character of the countryside; and*
- i) it would have reasonable access by foot, cycle or public transport to schools, medical services, shops and other community facilities; and*
- j) the local strategic infrastructure can meet the additional requirements arising from the development'.*

---

<sup>3</sup> I have 'numbered' the bullets for ease of reference

15. In turn, Policy EQ3 confirms that *'outside the settlement boundaries and sites allocated for development as defined on the Policies Map ..... the Council will seek to ensure that new development is strictly controlled in order to protect the landscape's intrinsic character and distinctiveness .....'*
16. Additionally, Policy S3 makes provision for:- *'at least 7,000 dwellings over the period 2011 - 2031 at an overall average annual development rate of 350 dwellings. In order to meet this requirement sufficient land will be identified to accommodate up to 3,549 additional dwellings on new sites'*. This is to be distributed across the Borough by sub-area.
17. Policy S3 also requires that *'..... Neighbourhood Plans should maximise opportunities for housing growth in sustainable locations and, where appropriate, make allocations in their plan to provide at least the same amount of housing land as identified in the Local Plan for the relevant parish or Neighbourhood Area'*.
18. The Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Neighbourhood Plan) was made in August 2015. It evolved alongside, and with express recognition of and alignment with, the emerging Local Plan. Its allocations and commitments have the potential to deliver some 969 units against a target of a minimum of 850 units set in the Local Plan and to make the required additional provision for 100 units from unallocated small sites.
19. Policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan allocates land for a minimum of 454 new homes on five sites; and Policy H2 confirms that planning permission will be granted for small residential developments of fewer than six units on infill and redevelopment sites within the Parish (outside the Peak District National Park), subject to guiding criteria.
20. The appeal site is not allocated for housing development by Policy H1; and the proposal would conflict with the overarching identification of principal housing sites. It would also be at odds with the strategy of allowing development on smaller sites within the ambit of Policy H2 as the number of dwellings proposed would be far in excess of those admitted by the policy.
21. Whilst it is argued that Policy H2 is not engaged, as its purpose is to guide the consideration of schemes on smaller sites, Policies H1 and H2 clearly provide, in tandem, the defining strategy of the Neighbourhood Plan namely, that residential development should take place on either the allocated sites or on smaller windfall sites subject to a defined upper limit.
22. The Neighbourhood Plan is, however, silent on the manner in which development sites falling outside the scope of Policies H1 and H2 are to be considered. The expectation is that unallocated sites of six or more units will be refused as the Neighbourhood Plan provides in excess of the minimum number of new homes required by the Local Plan. However, there is no express policy to this effect.
23. Planning Practice Guidance: Neighbourhood Planning confirms that *'Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes ..... Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area'*.

24. In this case, the Neighbourhood Plan has taken account of the wider area's development needs and the strategic distribution of housing, and translated the required minimum level of housing provision into sites favoured for development by the community as set out in Policy H1; whilst allowing for the development of further smaller sites in accordance with Policy H2.
25. As to the consideration of large windfall proposals, the guiding policy is set out in the second strand of Local Plan Policy H1. This sits within a recently adopted Local Plan; there is a confirmed five year housing land supply; the basic premise is that development should, in particular, take place on allocated sites or within defined built up area boundaries; and that Neighbourhood Plans should play a complementary and reinforcing role. It is also relevant to note that Policy H1 sets out a monitoring role with the aim of identifying a continuing five year supply of deliverable housing sites and, if necessary, reviewing the plan to bring forward additional sites for housing.
26. Taking up the policy, the extent to which the appeal site would '*adjoin the built up area boundary*' (in the sense of directly coinciding with it) would, at best, be limited to an almost inconsequential part of the northern boundary of the site where it runs close to the long rear gardens of a small number of dwellings in Downlee Close. Even then, the length of the gardens, their scrub woodland enclosure and an intervening narrow stream would, in perceptual terms, effectively remove any tangible association between the site and the built up area boundary.
27. The need, or otherwise, to take a wider definition of '*adjoin*' (in the sense of being close to) can be embraced by the consideration of whether the site would be '*well related with the existing pattern of development and surrounding land uses*' and whether the development would '*..... lead to prominent intrusion into the countryside or have a significant adverse impact on the character of the countryside*'.
28. A significant portion of the north-eastern boundary of the site adjoins a school/community sports field and all-weather sports pitches marked by fencing and floodlights. Unlike the school building and its associated playing fields and car park alongside Long Lane, these are excluded from the built up area boundary. Nonetheless, they serve to extend the influence of development beyond the well-defined limits of Long Lane, Elmfield and Frith View and the school in its grounds has a markedly stronger relationship with the settlement than the open countryside.
29. The remainder of the north-eastern boundary adjoins a small field which is itself masked from the continuation of the built up area along Long Lane by a railway embankment. The field to the east is similarly physically separated from the built up area; the south-western boundary of the site leads into a wider panoramic countryside landscape which includes Marsh Hall farmhouse and barn; and the short northern boundary has strong backdrop screening from Downlee Close.
30. In overall terms, the appeal site has limited affinity with the pattern of development on the south-western edge of Chapel-en-le-Frith insofar as it is only the school and its extensive open grounds which would provide any semblance of connection between the site and the built up area.

31. It follows, as the site itself forms an integral part of the open countryside which embraces this part of the town, and, taking account of topography and the ethereal nature of its boundaries, that new development would undoubtedly intrude into the rural landscape.
32. Although there were no marked landscape objections to the development of the site, insofar as the Landscape Impact Assessment, prepared on behalf of the Council for the Local Plan, records a '*low visual impact and low effect on the setting of the National Park*', the study acknowledged that '*if development is proposed it will be necessary to create an appropriate landscape framework*'.
33. However, the appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment found that the overall significance of landscape effects on the Settled Valley Pastures Landscape Character Type would be '*moderate adverse*'. In terms of visual effects, the residual effects (after 15 years and with appropriate landscaping) would be '*high to moderate adverse*' for nearby private residential dwellings and for users of the near or adjacent public rights of way encircling the site.
34. '*Moderate adverse*' effects relate to the substantial permanent loss or alteration to one or more key elements of the landscape and visual intrusion with an adverse effect on the landscape. '*High adverse*' effects include the permanent loss or major alteration to key elements and features of the landscape and that the development would be visually intrusive and would disrupt fine and valued views both into and across the area.
35. My own observations, from Eccles Pike, the vicinity of the railway station, Downlee Farm and Castle Naze, find that the development of the appeal site would have a moderate association with the existing built up area of the town. However, from the nearer public rights of way around the site, new housing would be perceived clearly as a prominent extension of the settlement and a damaging visual intrusion into the countryside. Whilst the effect on the Landscape Character Type as a whole would not be particularly marked, the loss of open fields would, nonetheless, have a locally significant impact on the character of the countryside. Overall, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy H1 g) and h); and the loss of intrinsic character and distinctiveness would be in direct conflict with Policy EQ3.
36. A further aspect of Policy H1 g) is whether the proposal would be of an appropriate scale for the settlement. Although it is said by the appellant that '*this has to be judged by reference to the scale of the settlement (because that is what the policy says) .....*' the policy has to be read in its entirety and by reference to all other policies in the Local Plan. In this regard, the plan has allocated substantial new housing to Chapel-en-le-Frith in order to meet the objectively assessed need for additional housing within the plan period. Increasing that by a further 20% or so would be at odds with the distribution of housing land intended by Policy S3. On this basis, the erection of some 200 unplanned homes would not be of an appropriate scale for the town.
37. In terms of Policy H1 i), reasonable accessibility on foot to local services and facilities could be secured if a means of access were to be provided through the school grounds; but this would become more questionable if access were to be taken solely from Bank Hall Drive. As means of access does not form part of the project, I am unable to reach a definitive conclusion on this aspect of Policy H1. No point is made in relation to Policy H1 j).

38. Against this background I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Policies H1, S3 and EQ3 of the Local Plan and also with Policies H1 and H2 of the Neighbourhood Plan. It follows that the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan when read as a whole. Even if Policy H2 were to be interpreted as nothing more than a policy for the detailed consideration of smaller site proposals, this would not change my conclusion on the identified conflict with the development plan.

#### **Heritage assets**

39. Marsh Hall farmhouse and barn (Listed Grade II) are located immediately to the west of the site. The proposed development would not result in any direct harm to the heritage asset. However, it is acknowledged that the farmstead may historically have had a functional relationship with the appeal site and that the development of these fields and consequential urbanisation would affect how the asset is experienced in part of its wider landscape setting. The harm is agreed to be less than substantial.
40. A second heritage asset, the scheduled promontory fort at Castle Naze, occupies a high point in the landscape some 1.3 kilometres to the south of the appeal site. It provides a broad and distant panoramic outlook over the valley landscape containing Chapel-en-le-Frith and its defining hills. Although the proposal would extend the built up area of the town, the development would have the backdrop of the town itself and, in this regard, it would not have any perceptible impact on the manner in which the asset is experienced. As such no material harm would arise.

#### **Access**

41. The proposal is unusual insofar as it is promoted without an identified means of access. Potential options have been narrowed down to an access through the school grounds and thereafter with intended passage through adjoining third party land to the north-east of the site. However, in the face of expressed opposition from the landowner, a revised route, wholly within the school site, was deemed to be technically feasible.
42. Nonetheless, this would require remodelling of the southern wing of the school (demolition and relocation of four classrooms) and adjustment to the all-weather pitches. It has not been formally designed, consulted upon and no agreement has been concluded; and the initial reaction on behalf of the governing body has been one of objection.
43. A second route has been identified along Bank Hall Drive. It would entail traffic light controlled single running under the railway bridge (with a separate pedestrian phase); it would be subject to a height restriction even with a lowering of the carriageway; and it is opposed by Network Rail. Beyond the railway bridge, third party land would be required and each of the potentially involved parties opposes the inclusion of their land.
44. Moreover, the widening of the existing road to the east of the railway bridge, to the point where it joins Long Lane, would require land (and the felling of trees) designated as Local Green Space. Local Plan Policy CF4 confirms that *'development that would harm the openness and/or special character of a Local Green Space or its significance and value to the local community will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances which outweigh the harm to the Local Green Space'*.

45. With all this in mind, it is evident that the appellant's thinking on the access arrangements is not well advanced either in terms of design or negotiation. The obstacles in reaching an acceptable solution appear to be very substantial. However, it would be a step too far to conclude that there is no prospect of access being secured, through commercial negotiation, within the lifetime of any planning permission and it would be inappropriate to dismiss the appeal on this ground.

#### **The planning balance**

46. The National Planning Policy Framework seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and confirms that housing applications should be considered in the context of sustainable development.
47. It also confirms:- *'The planning system is plan-led; planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise; and where a planning application conflicts with a neighbourhood plan that has been brought into force, planning permission should not normally be granted'*.
48. In this case, the proposal would conflict with Policies H1 and H2 of the Neighbourhood Plan which identify meeting new dwelling needs through a combination of chosen sites and unallocated smaller sites to reflect the strategic aims of the Local Plan.
49. Reference was made to a decision of the High Court<sup>4</sup> (*Crane*) relating to the Broughton Astley Neighbourhood Plan which, in common with the Neighbourhood Plan for Chapel-en-le-Frith, set out specific site allocations but remained silent on 'large' windfall sites.
50. In that case, Mr Justice Lindblom (as he then was) said:- *'..... It follows from my understanding of the relevant provisions of the neighbourhood plan that a proposal for housing on a site other than those allocated in policy H1 will only accord with the plan if it finds support in policy H3 as a windfall proposal, and is consistent with other relevant policies. Larger proposals for housing on unallocated sites will not accord with the plan. They will be contrary to its strategy for housing development in policies H1 and H3 .....*'.
51. Although the appellant before me accepts the interpretation in *Crane*, it reserves its position on whether the case was correctly decided should it be necessary to pursue further the outcome of this appeal. In this regard, the appellant seeks to draw distinction between the circumstances of the two Neighbourhood Plans and also other components of the development plan.
52. The evolution of the two Neighbourhood Plans, in very broad terms, can be seen to have had much in common in allocating land for housing following a process of consultation and a sustainability appraisal of potential sites. The tone of Broughton Astley in seeking to *'control development to avoid excessive expansion into the countryside'* differs only by degree to that of Chapel-en-le-Frith in its aim to *'preserve the character of Chapel-en-le-Frith as a small market town .....*' and nothing appears to turn on that nuance.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ivan Crane v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Harborough District Council [2015] EWHC 425 (Admin)



53. Moreover, whilst the Chapel-en-le-Frith Neighbourhood Plan does not contain a 'windfall' policy, this is merely a matter of nomenclature in that Policy H2 (Smaller Sites) has much in common with the expressly labelled Policy H3 at Broughton Astley. In terms of allocations, the identification of a small reserve site (a site of 28 units to supplement two allocated sites with a total of 500 units) at Broughton Astley appears to be expressly related to securing phased delivery rather than any reappraisal of overall housing numbers. Both plans have in common the provision of housing land in excess of the identified requirement.
54. The nub of the distinction between *Crane* and the present case is said to be the very different relationship between the Neighbourhood Plans and their respective Local Plans in that, unlike its counterpart, the High Peak Borough Local Plan contains a policy (H1) on how applications on non-allocated sites should be assessed.
55. Accordingly, I have considered the proposal against the criteria set out in the second strand of Local Plan Policy H1 with a finding of material conflict with the policy when read as a whole. Moreover, that is reinforced by reference to related Local Plan Policies EQ3 and S3.
56. Overall, the proposal would conflict with the defined housing strategy in both the Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan and the development plan when read as a whole.
57. The material considerations supporting the development are limited to the provision of an increased supply of market housing, the consequential provision of affordable housing and the related social and economic benefits arising. However, it is to be noted that in the Final Report on the examination into the Local Plan the appointed Inspector confirmed that there was no overriding need for the Local Plan housing provision in the parish of Chapel-en-le-Frith to be changed; and that he was not convinced that a further uplift of the objectively assessed need, and the allocation of more sites, would be an effective way of addressing affordable needs.
58. With this in mind and with up-to-date plans in place, a five year supply of housing land and measures for monitoring and review as necessary, the purported benefits would fall well-short of outweighing the conflict with the development plan. This conflict therefore forms a compelling, stand-alone, basis on which to dismiss the appeal.
59. In terms of heritage assets, Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a Listed Building or its setting, special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting.
60. The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that when considering the harm to an asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation; and, the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Where it is found that a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

61. With reference to my conclusions above, notably that the benefits of additional housing wane in light of their conflict with the development plan, the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, without a convincing public benefit, would represent a further ground on which to dismiss the appeal.

**Conclusion**

62. From my consideration of these and all other matters raised I find nothing of sufficient materiality to change my conclusion to dismiss the appeal.

*David MH Rose*

Inspector

## **APPEARANCES**

### **FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:**

Nathalie Lieven QC	Instructed by: The Solicitor to High Peak Borough Council
--------------------	--

#### **She called<sup>5</sup>**

Robert White BSc (Hons), MRTPI, MIEMA, CEnv	Director White Peak Planning Limited
--	---

### **FOR THE APPELLANT:**

Satnam Choongh (of Counsel)	Instructed by: Knights Professional Services Limited
-----------------------------	---

#### **He called**

William Booker BSc (Hons)	Director SCP, Transportation Planners & Infrastructure Designers
------------------------------	--

Clare Brockhurst BSc (Hons), Dip LA, FLI	Founding Partner Tyler Grange LLP
---	--------------------------------------

Carl Copestake BA (Hons), Dip. UPI, MRTPI	Partner Knights Professional Services Limited
--	--

### **FOR CHAPEL-EN-LE-FRITH PARISH COUNCIL (RULE 6 PARTY):**

Andrew Parkinson (of Counsel)	Instructed by: Erimax – Land, Planning and Communities
-------------------------------	---

#### **He called**

Nigel McGurk BSc (Hons), MCD, MBA, MRTPI	Director Erimax – Land, Planning and Communities
---	---

### **INTERESTED PERSONS:**

John Coxon BSc (Hons), MRTPI	Associate Director Emery Planning (on behalf of Bloor Homes NW Limited)
---------------------------------	---

Elizabeth McCormick	Local resident
---------------------	----------------

Victoria Needham	Local resident
------------------	----------------

---

<sup>5</sup> Nicola de Bruin (Solicitor to the Council) contributed to the discussions on the Planning Agreement

David Benning	Local resident and contributor to Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan
Peter Soden	Local resident and contributor to Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan
Ruth George	Local resident and Chair of Steering Group: Chapel Vision

## **DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY<sup>6</sup>**

LPA 1	Letter from Network Rail (1 April 2016)
LPA 2	High Peak Borough Council's Local Plan: Final Report (24 March 2016)
LPA 3	Extract from Derbyshire Local Wildlife Sites Register: Down Lee Lodge and Barlow's Field
LPA 4	Opening Statement of Local Planning Authority
LPA 5	Extract from High Peak Local Plan: Built-up Area Boundary Changes
LPA 6	Email correspondence re paragraph 4.18 of Mr Booker's proof
LPA 7	High Peak Borough Council Development Control Committee Report (HPK/2015/0651)
LPA 8	Email correspondence between Borough Council's Solicitor and Head of Development (Children's Services), Derbyshire County Council
LPA 9	Email correspondence re public open space contributions
LPA 10	Table of S106 contributions
LPA 11	S106 - Policy and Statutory Tests document
LPA 12	List of suggested planning conditions
LPA 13	Suggested route for Inspector's accompanied site visit
LPA 14	Closing Submissions on behalf of the Local Planning Authority
LPA 15	High Peak Local Plan Adoption Statement
APP 1	Supplementary Plan: Designations, Rights of Way and Other Features
APP 2	Opening Submissions on behalf of the Appellant
APP 3	Written Statement: Rachel Hacking Ecology – Designation of Local Wildlife Site
APP 4	Closing Submissions on behalf of the Appellant
APP 5	Planning Agreement dated 8 April 2016
APP 6	Response to letter from the governing body – Chapel-en-le-Frith High School (20 April 2016)
PC 1	Opening Points on behalf of Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council
PC 2	Letter from the owners of Downlee Farm
PC 3	Planning Practice Guidance: Housing and economic land availability assessment
PC 4	Historic England consultation response (HPK/2015/0651 – 5 January 2016)
PC 5	Email on behalf of Chapel-en-le-Frith High School Governors requesting permission to submit a written statement following the close of the Inquiry
PC 6	Closing Points on behalf of Chapel-en-le-Frith Parish Council
IP 1	Written Statement: David Benning:
IP 2	Written Statement: Peter Soden
IP 3	Written Statement: Elizabeth McCormick
IP 4	Letter from the governing body – Chapel-en-le-Frith High School (13 April 2016)

---

<sup>6</sup> Documents LPA 15, IP 4 and APP 6 were submitted after the close of the Inquiry by agreement