



# Appeal Decisions

Hearing held on 22 September 2010  
Site visits made on 16 August and 22 September 2010

by **D L Burrows** DipTP MRTPI

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

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:**  
**28 October 2010**

---

## **Appeal A Ref: APP/R0660/A/10/2123053** **Land at Coppice Way, Handforth, Cheshire**

- 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 Greystone (UK) Ltd against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref 09/0695M, dated 27 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2009.
- The development proposed is the development of a care village comprising 58 bedroom care home (use Class C2); 47 close care cottages (Use Class C3); 15 shared ownership affordable dwellings (Use Class C3); and associated access roads, public open space, landscaping, car parking and ancillary development.

---

## **Appeal B Ref: APP/R0660/A/10/2123054** **Land at Coppice Way, Handforth, Cheshire**

- 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 Greystone (UK) Ltd against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref 09/0708M, dated 27 March 2009, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2009.
- The development proposed is the formation of new vehicular access from Coppice Way and engineering works.

---

## **Appeal C Ref: APP/R0660/A/10/2123055** **Land south of Coppice Way, Handforth, Cheshire**

- 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 Greystone (UK) Ltd against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
- The application Ref 09/3023M, dated 17 September 2009, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2010.
- The development proposed is an outline planning application with means of access, layout, scale and appearance for consideration and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval for the development of a care village comprising 55 bedroom care home, 36 close care cottages, 6 shared ownership affordable dwellings – all for the over 55's; and associated access roads, public open space, landscaping, car parking and ancillary development.

---

## **Appeal D Ref: APP/R0660/A/10/2123056** **Land south of Coppice Way, Handforth, Cheshire**

- 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 Greystone (UK) Ltd against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
  - The application Ref 09/3050M, dated 17 September 2009, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2010.
  - The development proposed is the formation of new vehicular access from Coppice Way and engineering works.
- 

### **Preliminary Matters**

1. The hearing was originally scheduled for the 17 August 2010. However, due to numbers of people attending, the venue was not large enough to accommodate all those present. Consequently the rescheduled hearing took place on the 22 September 2010 at The Festival Hall, Alderley Edge.
2. Appeals A and C relate to 2 alternative schemes for a care village. Appeal A is a full application, whilst Appeal C is in outline, although it is accompanied by all detailed matters apart from landscaping. Appeals B and D are identical. They seek to provide a vehicular access to the care village from Coppice Way.
3. It was agreed between the main parties at the hearing that the reasons for refusal do not rely on the revoked policies of the Regional Spatial Strategy referred to in the decision notices. As a consequence only the *Macclesfield Borough Local Plan* (LP) policies are referred to below.

### **Decision**

4. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main issues**

5. In respect of the care village proposals (appeals A and C) the appellant recognises that the developments would be contrary to development plan policy. Consequently, the main issue for both appeals is whether the material considerations are sufficient to outweigh the provisions of policies in the *Macclesfield Borough Local Plan*, in particular GC7 and RT6 (appeal A only).
6. With regard to the 2 appeals for access into the site, the issue turns on whether the care village proposals are acceptable. And if those developments are rejected would the access be premature and contrary to LP policy RT6.

### **Reasons**

#### ***Appeals A & C***

7. Policy GC7 designates safeguarded land between the urban limits and the inner boundary of the green belt. In such locations it is intended that countryside policies will apply, with the proviso that should development be allowed it would not prejudice later comprehensive development. Countryside policy GC5 is generally restrictive of development unless it is essential for agriculture, forestry and the like.
8. The reasoned justification for policy GC7 recognises that the land may be required to meet development needs in the longer term (ie well beyond the

plan period) and that it should only be allocated within the strategic planning context and following assessment of development sites along the lines set out in *PPG3: Housing*<sup>1</sup>.

9. Appeals' sites – The sites are virtually the same. They form the northern part of the safeguarded land at Handforth Hall, Handforth. However, site C is somewhat smaller than A. It excludes land to the west of footpath 91. The sites are both rectangular in area and open in nature, if somewhat overgrown, particularly the land to the west of footpath 91, which at the time of the site visits was impenetrable because of the thick/inhospitable vegetation. Beyond this open land to the west lies Handforth Hall and its gardens. To the north of the appeals' sites is a landscape bund which separates the undeveloped land from the Handforth Dean shopping area and its access to Coppice Way. To the east, the sites do not quite extend as far as the busy A34 trunk road. The A34 is one of the primary routes into Manchester from the south and marks the beginning of the open countryside which is protected by green belt designation. To the south is the remaining (and larger) portion of GC7 safeguarded land. It is in agricultural use.
10. Need for development – In the national context it is generally recognised that there is a need to provide suitable accommodation to enable an aging population to live full independent lives for as long as possible. This strategy is also recognised at a more local level in the *Cheshire Sub-Regional Housing Strategy 2009-2012*<sup>2</sup>. Older housing strategies produced by the former Macclesfield Council point to a higher than average over 55 population and an increasing elderly population with insufficient facilities to meet demand for care services.
11. A care village as proposed is one way a choice of and/or improvement in care facilities could be brought about. The appeals' schemes would provide a choice of market price and affordable accommodation including bungalows, houses and apartments with varying levels of assistance for the over 55's, together with a community centre which would enable the provision of a range of services and social activities. This would be complemented by a care home on the same site capable of catering for residents as dependency needs increase. Such a proposal would offer the opportunity for *aging-in-place*, thus negating the necessity for couples to be split up and/or move areas. It is said there is no similar provision on a single site within 10km of the appeals' sites.
12. The proposals were supported in 2008 by the former Head of Housing at Macclesfield Borough Council. A Manchester based housing group expressed interest in the affordable units and Age Concern was in favour of the care village concept in 2009. Some local residents consider a secure village environment with only an elderly population would not be in the best interests of an aging population, but people's aspirations and needs are varied and a scheme such as that proposed would offer choice.
13. The appellant has undertaken a sequential approach to site selection (September 2009 report). That report says that the catchment area for a care village is generally within a 10km radius of a site and the conclusions below are

---

<sup>1</sup>now replaced by *PPS3: Housing*

<sup>2</sup> The sub region is defined as Cheshire West & Chester and Cheshire East Council areas.

based on that area. The appeals' sites are very close to the Council boundary and a significant part of the 10km catchment lies to the north within south Manchester Districts. Furthermore, the *Macclesfield Borough Strategic Housing Assessment 2008* points to the strong links between the Wilmslow Housing Market Area (HMA) and south Manchester. Although care needs are assessed by the Council on an authority-wide basis, in reality it is likely that a care facility in this part of Cheshire East would cater for people from south Manchester and vice versa. The cascading criteria set out in the appellant's documents would not prevent this. Moreover, the situation could develop where there would be a prevalence of one type of care facility in south Manchester complemented by another type in Cheshire East.

14. So far as I am aware, although the report examines the availability of various sites within the Macclesfield Borough and its housing HMAs, there is no such analysis of proposals/available sites within the south Manchester area which could potentially cater for the needs of the elderly from Wilmslow/Handforth. A significant part of the northern area of the district could fall within the 10km radius of sites within southern Manchester. The possibility of similar developments could have an impact on the potential demand for elderly peoples' requirements in this northerly part of the Council's area. Furthermore, a care village is only one of the ways the needs of the elderly could be met and such developments would not be required to satisfy total demand.
15. Given the lack of information on these matters the evidence in terms of need does not demonstrate sufficiently that the appeals' sites are the most appropriate for a care village to cater for the elderly in this northern part of Cheshire East. The assessment of need is not robust enough to justify a departure from policy GC7. It does not demonstrate satisfactorily that in the strategic planning context there is a compelling need for development of the site.
16. Sustainability – The sites are greenfield. Therefore they cannot be the first priority for development. In terms of location they lie generally to the east and south of the built up area of Handforth. That being said to the north is the Handforth Dean retail park and commercial/industrial areas, whilst to the west and south west are housing areas extending as far as Manchester Road/ Wilmslow Road which is straddled by the local district centre and its varied facilities. At the hearing and in the representations there was some dispute about walking distances to the centre and its facilities. However even when accepting the longer distances quoted the relative proximity of the centre means that whilst the sites may not be considered to be the most accessible, they are nevertheless reasonably proximate to the centre and its transport links.
17. The topography of Hall Road/Station Road means that there is an incline when travelling west. No doubt this would dissuade some people from walking to the district centre, as would the condition of the pavement. However, at my visits I saw that the path was used by local people including the elderly. As a consequence, it seems unlikely that the more mobile residents or those with mobility scooters would be deterred from walking/riding to the local facilities along Hall Road/Station Road.

18. With regard to concerns about the strain on local resources, particularly medical facilities, there is no substantive evidence from the providers of health care which confirms these fears. The email from a local medical practice goes no further than express the desire to talk about the proposals.
19. The conclusions on this matter are therefore that whilst the appeals' sites are not a first priority for development, they are nevertheless reasonably accessible to a range of local services and facilities. I note in policy LP GC7 and the Council's land availability survey that there is recognition that the land is capable of development for housing.
20. Handforth Hall is a charming grade II\* listed building which lies to the north of Hall Road and shares its eastern boundary with appeal A's western boundary. The siting of the hall within its grounds is such that there are gardens to the front and eastern side of the house, whilst to the west the building itself extends virtually up to the boundary. Its western elevation is open to view and has a stark and somewhat cramped appearance from Hall Road. It is therefore its attractive gardens to the side and front that are important to the setting of the listed building, providing it with a context within the street scene.
21. To the east of the gardens the swathe of open land with trees and vegetation that would largely disappear in the Appeal A scheme. However, the setting of the hall is such that it is read in the context of its gardens and not the open land surrounding it. The proposals would leave a gap of 15m or so (at the narrowest point) between the hall grounds and the new building. Such a distance with its existing and proposed vegetation would ensure that the eastern side of the property would not be seen as shoehorned between developments. Consequently, proposal A would meet the objectives of LP policies, in particular BE2 and BE16 insofar as they seek to protect listed buildings and their setting.
22. Appeal C would confine building to the east of footpath 91, leaving a gap of over 50m between the hall boundary and new building. It follows from the above conclusion in respect of Appeal A, that in these circumstances neither would there be harm to the listed building nor its setting as a result of Appeal C proposals.
23. Nature conservation – the undeveloped nature of the appeals' sites means that they house and provide habitat for a variety of wildlife including a number of protected species. This is borne out by both written and verbal representations. Whilst the land itself is not subject to any nature conservation protection at national, regional or local levels there are a number of recorded protected species on the sites. Natural England has concerns about the need for additional surveys and mitigation measures, but it does not object to the proposals in principle.
24. The appellant has provided reports in respect of great crested newts. The findings of those reports generally reflect those in the Handforth Hall report. There is no doubt that development would affect the greater crested newt habitat. However, appropriate mitigation measures and habitat enhancement could be incorporated into a scheme. The appellant has produced a mitigation

- strategy which seeks to provide enhanced habitat by the creation of new breeding ponds/habitat on and off site (on land owned by the Council).
25. A management plan could ensure the maintenance and management of the created habitats on the site. Similarly, appropriate planning conditions could ensure the satisfactory provision and management of the mitigation works. In addition, prior to the start of any works a Natural England licence would be required. All great crested newts would have to be cleared from the working areas and amphibian exclusion fencing erected to ensure the newts were not killed or injured during the works. The combination of these measures would be likely to adequately protect the species on and adjacent to the appeals' sites.
26. Bat surveys were carried out on the sites in July 2009. Although a number of trees had potential for bat roosts none were recorded. However, the woodland, hedgerows and ponds provide a foraging and commuting habitat for bats. An activity survey identified both common and soprano pipistrelle bats. That being said the proposals indicate that the general types of habitat would be retained as part of the developments. Where trees with potential for roosts are scheduled for felling or pruning, if the work were to be done in accord with the Bat Conservation Trust Guidelines, potential harm to bats would be minimised. Similarly careful design of lighting of the new developments would reduce the impacts on foraging bats. These are matters that can be addressed by appropriate planning conditions.
27. A bird survey carried out by the appellant identified UK BAP Priority Species/Species of Conservation Concern and this is borne out by other written and oral evidence from interested persons. It is evident that the woodland, scrub, hedgerows and grassland provide both nesting and foraging opportunities for both resident and migratory bird species. There would no doubt be a loss of some habitat and disturbance would be caused by construction works. However, the appeals' sites are surrounded by similar habitat and the schemes would introduce alternative hedgerow, tree and scrub habitats. Furthermore, the removal of potential nesting habitat such as scrub and trees could be undertaken outside the bird nesting season. Together these measures would minimise any adverse impacts on the bird population. The provision of adequate landscaping and timing of works could be adequately controlled by appropriate planning conditions.
28. Development of the sites would inevitably have similar impacts on other wildlife such as butterflies, foxes and the like. However given the location of the sites adjacent to similar habitat and the potential to incorporate new habitats within the developments, the impacts would not be so significant as to justify refusal of the proposals on these grounds. The proposals are therefore in line with the objectives of LP policy NE11 and NE17
29. By their undeveloped nature on the fringe of the urban area the appeals' sites contribute to the break between the retail area to the north and the housing area to the south. That being said their appearance is not particularly attractive as it consists of overgrown scrubby and wooded areas together with uncultivated farmland. The landscape of the sites is not recognised or protected at national or local level as being of any particular ecological or visual

amenity value. The *Baseline Ecological Assessment* produced by the appellant company reinforces this view.

30. None of the trees on the sites are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. There is however a hedgerow to the south of the sites which provides an attractive edging to the footpath to the south. There are fears that development would affect this feature, but the hedgerow would not be directly affected by the proposals. And given the nature of the development proposed together with the separation of buildings from it, neither should there be any indirect effects through use of the gardens and the like. A suitable planning condition would protect the hedgerow during both the construction phase and the period beyond.
31. A landscaped mound to the north between the sites and Coppice Way would also remain largely<sup>3</sup> unaffected by the proposals, thus ensuring a continuity in north and south boundary landscape features. Moreover, the first application includes details of landscaping of the site which indicate that although the nature of the land would change within it there would remain significant amenity/open areas, particularly to the east of the (diverted) footpath. A landscape implementation scheme and a satisfactory arboricultural method statement would ensure protection of the landscape features to be retained. In these circumstances the proposals would be largely in accord with the aims of policy NE17.
32. In respect of Appeal A the land between the footpath and Handforth Hall is subject to recreational/open space LP policy RT6(10) which also covers the landscaped bund. RT6 allocates the land for amenity open space. Neither the policy, its explanation or the glossary in the LP define amenity open space. The land is privately owned and the representations do not indicate that public access onto the land is proposed in the future. Its value as open space is visual, derived from its open nature. Whilst part of this open land would be lost as a result of the proposed development a section of it would be retained providing a green gap between the (relocated) footpath Handforth Hall, thus retaining continuous open land from Coppice Way to Hall Lane. The proposal would therefore reduce, slightly the extent of open land but would not compromise its purpose.
33. It is evident that until recently there has been public access to the 2 appeals' sites to the east of the footpath and also to land behind Handforth Hall to the west of the path. It has been used for dog walking, informal recreation and the like. However, there is no legal right of access to it. It is in private ownership. Moreover, the land which falls within LP policy GC7 area has been identified as having the potential for future development. Furthermore the footpath to the south and its links to the open countryside to the east and south of the sites would be retained. In these circumstances the conflict with policies RT6(10) and NE18 and the loss of informal open space is not on its own sufficient to justify refusal of the proposal on these grounds.
34. The layout in Appeal A involves the diversion of footpath 91. The proposed route would be longer and have a bend in it. However, because the footpath

---

<sup>3</sup> The access road to the sites would go through the bund.

would have increased natural surveillance from dwellings within the proposed development, personal safety should not be compromised by the change in direction. At the request of the Council the new path would be both a foot and cycle way. The evidence indicates that such mixed routes can cause particular problems for the visually impaired. However, a suitable design for the path and its surfacing/access would minimise potential conflict.

35. The Council's highways officers have not objected to the proposals. Parking within the developments would meet the Council's standards and there would be no vehicular access onto Hall Road. Traffic on Hall Road should not therefore increase significantly. It may be that, on occasions, if there is no parking within the sites people visiting occupants of the developments would be inclined to park on Hall Road in much the same way as some people visiting the retail park appear to do. However, this is likely to be only those people calling at properties in the western parts of the developments. Because of the distances of the nursing home/units at the east of the sites from Hall Road, it is more likely that people visiting these properties would find it more convenient to park in the retail park which is closer to their destination.
36. To the west of Handforth Hall is St Benedicts RC School. In its vicinity, at the beginning and end of the school day parking and traffic is excessive. For short periods the school no doubt causes congestion, competition for spaces and potentially dangerous highway conditions. However, this is an existing problem which is short lived and similar conditions are to be found at a multitude of school locations throughout the country.
37. Hall Road beyond Handforth Hall provides vehicular access for only 2 short culs-de-sac. Residents in these streets have ample off road parking. It is unlikely therefore that any additional demand for on street parking from the developments would be so great as to create serious congestion or competition for spaces. It is evident that the condition of the footpath to the west of the school can at times be problematical and cause people to walk on the road. This creates the potential for pedestrian and vehicular conflict which would be exacerbated by additional traffic. But in the light of the conclusions above, the increased risk from the amount of traffic likely to be generated by the development would not significantly change existing highway conditions.
38. There are objections based on potential localised flooding from increased surface water run off from the site because of the extent of buildings and hard surfaced areas. There is also anecdotal evidence of flooding backed up by photographs produced at the hearing.
39. The Environment Agency's (EA) flood maps indicate the site is in Flood Zone 1 where there is a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river flooding in any year. In Zone 1 *PPS25: Development and Flood Risk* says that all uses of land are appropriate. However, in line with national policy guidance in PPS25 the applications were accompanied by a flood risk assessment (FRA). This indicates that the drainage from the site will employ Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) techniques to reduce the rate of storm water flow off the site.

40. As a result of the FRA the EA has indicated that it has no objection, that is, provided a condition is imposed limiting the surface water run off generated by the 1 in 1 average annual flow so that it would not exceed the run off from the undeveloped site and would not increase the risk of flooding off site. A suitably worded condition would achieve this end. In these circumstances the developments would not exacerbate present conditions. The proposals are therefore generally in accord with policies DC17 and DC18.
41. In the light of the distance between the proposed dwellings and existing properties there would be no serious harm to neighbours' living conditions as a result of the development. The views from houses and gardens may change but the separation between buildings would be such that the new properties would not appear overbearing when seen from existing houses. Similarly, as the developments are essentially residential in nature there would be no excessive noise generated by the care village. There would be no conflict with LP policies H13 and DC3 insofar as it seeks to protect the amenities of the occupiers of nearby houses.
42. Turning to the impact of noise on proposed residents, the care home would be closest to the by-pass and traffic on it is a major source of noise in the locality. The particulars of the sites/developments are such that the distance from the by-pass, the embankment along side it and the vegetation between it and the proposed home would have some mitigating effects. The Council's environmental health officers are satisfied that subject to conditions requiring appropriate insulation of the home, noise levels would be within acceptable standards. There is no substantive evidence to indicate otherwise. The proposals would therefore be in accord with LP policy DC4.
43. Whilst many of the above conclusions find no objection to the proposals on technical grounds, the lack of harm in this respect is not sufficient to overcome the fundamental objection to the lack of proven need for the development in a strategic planning context.

### **Appeals B & D**

44. It follows from the conclusions above that there is no need for an access to the sites because there would be no development for it to serve. As a consequence the proposal would be contrary to LP policy RT6 in that it would, without need, result in the loss, albeit a limited area, of land allocated for amenity open space purposes. However for completeness considered below are other matters raised in the representations.
45. Concerns were raised about the safety of the access and the capacity of Coppice Way in relation to anticipated traffic flows to and from the site. The *Transport Statement* accompanying the applications concluded, amongst other things, that the traffic generated by the schemes could be accommodated by the local road network. The sight lines and configuration of the access meet normal Council and road safety standards. In response to consultations the Council's highways officers were satisfied that the access in design and capacity was acceptable, whilst the Highways Agency raised no objections and were content that the traffic generated by the scheme would have a negligible

impact on the trunk road network<sup>4</sup>. There is no substantive evidence to outweigh these views.

46. Whilst the developments would cater for the 55+, there is no reason to suppose that the use of the access onto Coppice Way and the trunk road network would be problematical for residents of the development. The numbers of people living on the development would be relatively few compared to the numbers using Coppice Way as a whole. At present road users of all ages visit the adjacent shopping development and the evidence does not suggest that there is a greater propensity for older drivers to be involved in accidents. For similar reasons, without evidence to the contrary, it cannot be assumed that residents of the development would have difficulty crossing Coppice Way to reach the retail outlets.
47. The development would result in the loss of some landscaping which no doubt provides a habitat for wildlife, but the part of the open area affected would be relatively small and the scheme would provide its own replacement landscaping. As a consequence the impact on wildlife would be no more than negligible. The submitted details on plan 42737/02P make provision for a footpath along one side of the access, thus reducing any potential conflict when pedestrians enter or leave the sites.
48. The purposes of the existing mound appear to include noise attenuation and residents believe that a breach in the bund would significantly increase noise levels at properties in the Hall Road area. However, given the distances between the road, the bund and the dwellings, this is unlikely to raise sound levels significantly at these properties.
49. Consequently, these further matters in relation to Appeals B and D do not add weight to the harm identified in para 44 above.

#### **Other material considerations**

50. The appellant has produced 2 unilateral undertakings in the event that the appeals are allowed. It is noted that the Council has reservations about the undertakings with regard to the powers of attorney as they are not certified copies and also the lack of a date on the power of attorney from A K Carmichael to G R Atkinson as there is no date in the body of the document. Because the appeals are to be dismissed these concerns are not pivotal to the overall decisions.
51. The undertakings deal with a variety of measures including the care home placements. Whilst this makes provision for the cascading criteria to come into play if only one bedroom is available in the care home, this is only for a period of 1 week. This means that for the majority of the time the care home accommodation would be available to meet need from outside the former Macclesfield District area. In these circumstances it supports the view that assessment of need must enshrine a wider area than the district boundary.
52. As written paras 2 and 5 of schedule 2 of the undertakings set out lump sum payments for contributions to, firstly meet the costs of making an unspecified

---

<sup>4</sup> The A34

Traffic Regulation Order and secondly of providing a sum of £10000 as compensation for the loss of policy RT6 land. It maybe that these are reasonable amounts and that they are necessary to make the developments acceptable in planning terms. However, there is no information available to assess whether they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the developments proposed.

53. Insofar as the operational plan is concerned, whilst it would provide sufficient detail there is no mechanism for its implementation within the undertakings. It could not therefore be assured that the plan would be implemented should there be a different developer and/or operator. In the light of these factors it is doubtful whether the undertakings meet all the tests set out in *Circular 05/2005:Planning Obligations*.
54. A number of objectors wish to see the appeals' sites and adjacent GC7 land protected by green belt policies. However, such a change in allocation does not fall within the remit of a s78 planning application. It is the subject of the development plan process. The emerging core strategy is at a very early stage. Its potential provisions cannot therefore carry weight in terms of these appeals and s38(6) of the Act.
55. All other factors have been taken into account in reaching a determination including the provision of affordable units, but they do not either collectively or individually affect the balance of the decisions. There is a fundamental objection to the proposals because the evidence does not demonstrate adequately that the sites are the most appropriate to cater for the needs of the elderly in this part of Cheshire East. The proposals would be contrary to LP policy GC7. As a result of this there is no justification for the loss of RT6 land to provide access to the sites. The appeals should therefore be dismissed.

*D L Burrows*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mrs K Ventham	Director of Barton Willmore Regent House, Prince's Gate 4 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3QQ
Mr P G Nicosia	Greystone (UK) Ltd

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mrs S Glover	C/o Cheshire East Council
--------------	---------------------------

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Cllr P Whiteley	Wilmslow North Ward Councillor
Col G Sparrow	CPRE
Mr D Fehily	
Ms J Fehily	
Mr N King	
Mr R Acton	
Mrs A Acton	
Dr R Small DSc FRPharms	
Mr B Burkhill	
Ms R Thomason	
Miss J Watson	
Mr G Stow	

## DOCUMENTS

- 1 Emails apologies for non attendance
- 2 Emails re:medical facilities (Mr Burkhill)
- 3 Great Crested Newt Survey Handforth Hall May 2009 (Mr Fehily)
- 4 Conditions as modified at hearing
- 5 Drawing numbers of plans relating to various conditions
- 6 Signed unilateral undertakings
- 7 Appellant's comments on Doc 3
- 8 Council's comments on Doc 6
- 9 Appellant's comment's on Doc 8

## PHOTOGRAPHS

- 1 2 x flooding in locality (Mr Acton)