

---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 26 - 29 January and 10 March 2016

Site visit made on 10 March 2016

**by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 26 May 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W0910/W/15/3009061**

**Land at Manor Road/Rating Lane, Barrow-in-Furness, Cumbria**

- 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 Story Homes Ltd against the decision of Barrow-In-Furness Borough Council.
  - The application Ref B07/2014/0536, dated 1 August 2014, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2014.
  - The development proposed is the erection of 38 no. dwellings including the provision of open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure.
- 

### Procedural matters

1. At the opening of the Inquiry, the appellant requested that revised drawings<sup>1</sup> ref. 474-STO-10 Revision J, 474-STO-11 Revision H, 474-STO-12 Revision C, 474-STO-13 Revision C, JN0819-DWG-0005 TG1 v1 – EPS1, ARU-PLP1 Rev A and ARU-PL1.7 Rev A, be substituted for the relevant plans<sup>2</sup> originally submitted. The substantive changes introduced by the revised drawings relate to the site layout, elevations and boundary treatment. The Council and the highway authority were consulted on the revisions and did not object to this submission. I am satisfied that dealing with the appeal on the basis of the revised drawings would not prejudice the interests of any party.
2. On the basis of the revisions the highway authority withdrew its objections to the proposal and the Council confirmed that it was no longer pursuing refusal reasons 3, 4 and 5. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. It was confirmed at the Inquiry that there is no requirement within the Borough of Barrow-in-Furness for proposals for residential developments to incorporate an element of affordable housing. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
4. The Council's witness, Dr M Bullock, who was going to give evidence on the objectively assessed housing need and housing requirement, was not called.

### Decision

5. I dismiss the appeal.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 10.3 Statement of Common Ground

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 10.1 Statement of Common Ground

---

## **Main Issues**

6. The effect of the proposal on:
  - 1) the surrounding area in terms of landscape character and visual impact;
  - 2) the setting of nearby heritage assets;
  - 3) whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Furness Abbey Conservation Area, and
  - 4) whether this would be a sustainable form of development having regard to national and development plan policies in respect of the delivery of new housing and whether or not the Council can demonstrate a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land.

## **Reasons**

### *Background*

7. The appeal site is situated to the north east of Barrow-in-Furness, within the Furness Abbey Conservation Area and opposite the Grade II listed Manor Farmhouse. It consists of 2 fields of grazed pasture separated by a post and wire fence. It extends to around 2.72ha (of which around 1.8ha would be developed) and is bounded to the west by Rating Lane, to the north by Manor Road which leads to Furness Abbey (a Grade I listed building and a scheduled ancient monument (SAM)), to the east by the wall to Furness Abbey (a Grade 1 listed building and a SAM) and to the south by the Barrow-in-Furness 6<sup>th</sup> Form College.
8. Proposed is the erection of 38no. dwellings comprising 21no. 3 bed dwellings made up of a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached houses, 12 no. detached 4 bed dwellings and 5no. 5 bed detached dwellings. Vehicular access would be taken from Rating Lane.

### *Landscape character and visual impact*

9. The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) includes representative views of the proposal and distinguishes between its effect on landscape character and its visual impacts on views experienced by visual receptors. It also sets out the impact of the development at 1 and 10 year intervals following completion, and the proposed mitigation measures.
10. The appeal site lies within an area classified by Natural England as the "West Cumbria Coastal Plain" National Landscape Character Area. This is described as having a strong industrial history. In local landscape terms the Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit locates the appeal site within character type 5c "Rolling Lowland". This recognises the area's open, undulating and rolling topography which is dominated by pasture, with hedges and hedgerow trees common on lower ground.
11. The appeal site stands on the edge of the built-up area of Barrow-in-Furness which is apparent from the urban characteristics of Rating Lane and the residential developments that have taken place to the west of this road. In addition, the 6th Form College to the south of the proposal was recently granted planning permission to extend its campus to provide a car park with flood lighting. I also observed that overhead electricity lines traverse the

appeal site. In this regard, I note that the Council's *Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment* (SHLAA) described the appeal site as infill between the 6<sup>th</sup> Form College and Manor Farm with the *Issues and Options Consultation Draft* of the emerging Barrow Borough Local Plan describing the majority of the appeal site as being greenfield within the urban boundaries.

12. Nevertheless, in my judgement, given its pastoral appearance, the appeal site shares its affinity with the open landscape character of the Furness Abbey precinct and the countryside beyond to the north and east. Moreover, in the vicinity of the appeal site Rating Lane has a more verdant character than its more urban appearance further to the south. Although an undesignated landscape, I observed that the appeal site possesses an attractive and tranquil quality that provides an open setting for the nearby heritage assets and contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area – matters to which I return below. I did not find it to be characterised by man-made features but rather forms part of a rural, pastoral landscape, albeit one that fringes the urban edge of Barrow-in-Furness. As such, I consider it would have a moderate sensitivity to change.
13. As to the magnitude of change that would be wrought by the proposal, I consider that the density of development would be moderate and the anticipated landscape improvements and enhancements, allied with the buffer strip of land that would be left undeveloped, would serve to mitigate some of the effects of introducing built form into this undeveloped pastoral environment. Within this context, I consider that the proposal would not have a harmful effect in respect of landscape character and visual impact over longer distance views.
14. Nevertheless, as may be seen from the LVIA<sup>3</sup>, the development would be prominently seen from closer range views, both initially and at the submitted 1 and 10 year post completion views. The proposed housing scheme would appear as a prominent feature that would stand on rising ground with the highest part of the development seen against the skyline. The introduction of built form with the attendant urbanising elements such as roads, driveways, gardens and street-lighting would be visually jarring in this tranquil, pastoral landscape.
15. One of the core principles of the NPPF is that the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised. Building 38 new houses with associated infrastructure on the appeal site would lead to an erosion of that natural quality, and as a result, the proposal would cause landscape harm. This magnitude of change (and thus of harm) from an open, tranquil pastoral landscape to a housing development would, given the proposed mitigation and the presence nearby of the urban fringe, be moderate.
16. In terms of its visual impact, when seen from surrounding roads such as Manor Road (LVIA viewpoint 15), Abbey Road (LVIA viewpoint 16) and Rating Lane (LVIA viewpoint 14), and the footpaths which pass nearby such as the public footpath running southeast wards from Abbey Road to Rating Lane (LVIA viewpoint 9), public footpath 601076 (LVIA viewpoint 11), the Cistercian Way (LVIA viewpoints 12 and 13) and the Haematite Way, the development would have a pronounced presence. It would increase the quantity of development in the area, introducing built form to pastoral fields that are currently seen as part

---

<sup>3</sup> Verified view 1 of viewpoint 2 and verified view 2 of viewpoint 15

of the edge of the countryside as it sweeps up to the urban fringe. This effect would be localised but given the proximity of the roads and footpaths, I consider that the effect would be one of moderate harm in visual impact terms.

17. The Council argued that in this regard the proposal would be contrary to saved Policy B3 (i) of the Barrow Borough Local Plan Review 1996-2006 (LP). However, B3 relates to a sequential test set out in the now revoked Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan 2001-2016 and is not fully consistent with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As a more recent expression of national policy on the countryside, the NPPF is a material consideration that outweighs Policy B3.

#### *The setting of the heritage assets*

18. The NPPF defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which it is experienced. The extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset; may affect the ability to appreciate that significance; or, may be neutral. The NPPF makes clear that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight attaches to the asset's conservation; the more important the asset, the greater that weight should be. Significance can be harmed through development within an asset's setting.
19. Historic England guidance; *The Setting of Heritage Assets*, indicates that setting embraces all of the surroundings from which an asset can be experienced or that can be experienced from or within the asset. Setting does not have a fixed boundary and cannot be defined, in perpetuity, as a spatially bounded area or as lying within a set distance of a heritage asset.
20. The significance of a heritage asset is defined in the NPPF as its value to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. That interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting. Significance may be harmed by a development and it is necessary to determine the degree of harm that may be caused.
21. In my judgement, the heritage assets that would be affected by the proposal as a development within their settings would be the Abbey Wall (Grade I listed and a SAM), the Remains of the West Gate to Furness Abbey (Grade I listed and a SAM), Manor Farmhouse, West Gate Cottage, the Lodge to Crosslands and Our Lady's School Crosslands Convent (all Grade II listed). The parties have described the significance of each heritage asset, including the contribution made by their settings and have also assessed the effect on significance that would arise as a result of the impact on setting. This approach is in line with the advice in NPPF paragraphs 128-9.
22. The fabric of the heritage assets would remain untouched by the proposal. From what I observed that is where the majority of their significance as designated heritage assets lies. However, in each case I consider that setting does to some degree contribute to the significance of each asset. In the case of the Abbey Wall and the West Gate, these were built to exert a presence over the surrounding area (West Gate Cottage is located close to the West Gate remains and in my judgement is seen in that context). The appeal site forms part of that area and therefore part of their settings. Similarly Manor Farm was

built with its aspect across the appeal site which formed part of its agricultural setting. However, the effect on setting is lessened by the retention of an undeveloped strip of land which keeps the proposal back from Manor Farm, West Gate Cottage and the West Gate, and keeps development from being directly in front of the Abbey Wall. In this regard, I note the consultation response of Historic England, who in raising no objections to the grant of planning permission, nevertheless concluded that there would be harm arising to significance albeit it "very much less than substantial".

23. In the case of the Lodge to Crosslands and Our Lady's School Crosslands Convent, I consider that there is very limited inter-visibility between the appeal site and the Convent given the screening provided by mature vegetation. In which case, there would be no effect on the setting of this heritage asset. As for the Lodge, it stands opposite the appeal site affording a high degree of inter-visibility. I consider that the Lodge was an architectural statement that was meant to be seen to announce the entrance to the Convent. As such, the northern part of the appeal site falls within its setting and contributes to the heritage asset's significance. However, given it stands opposite that part of the proposal that would remain undeveloped, I consider that would temper the degree of harm arising.
24. Consequently, with the exception of the Convent, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the significance of these heritage assets as a development within their settings. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that substantial harm is a high test and goes on to note that in terms of assessing proposals affecting listed buildings, the key question is whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of their special architectural and historic interest. Elements of the significance of each of these historic assets encompass their historic, architectural and archaeological values. Furthermore, as designated SAMs the Abbey Wall and West Gate are clearly of national importance. However, given the majority of the significance of the heritage assets derives from their historic fabric which would be unaffected, I consider the harm arising in each case would be less than substantial.
25. In which case, under NPPF paragraph 134 this harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal, including securing the asset's optimum viable use. This is a matter to which I return below.

#### *Conservation Area*

26. The Furness Abbey Conservation Area was designated in 1968. There is no adopted appraisal for the area but I observed that its character is centred on the Abbey precinct with incursions beyond into surrounding pasture which give the precinct a green buffer and define its setting. The appeal site is one such buffer which provides a rural context for the Abbey Wall and under NPPF paragraph 138, I consider, is an element that contributes to the Conservation Area as a whole. The essence then is one of a medieval monastic complex with later additions within the precinct dating up to the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.
27. Residential developments do not form part of this character and in that sense the proposal would be an alien feature within the Conservation Area as a whole, at odds with its evidential, historical, aesthetic and communal values. Having said that, the proposal would sit within a peripheral area of the asset without impinging on the Abbey ruins themselves which are the main focus of the character of the Conservation Area. In that sense, I agree with the

appellant that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to this designated heritage asset. As such the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

28. In which case, under NPPF paragraph 134 this harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal, including securing the asset's optimum viable use. This is a matter to which I return below.

#### *Housing land supply*

29. The parties disputed whether or not the Council could demonstrate an up to date 5 year supply of housing land. An annual requirement figure of 151 dwellings per annum was agreed by the parties. The Council estimated its supply, accepting a 20% buffer for past under-delivery to be around 916 units, giving a 6.1 years supply. The Council was satisfied in the light of the review carried out under the January 2015 SHLAA, and taking comfort from recent correspondence from developers relating to larger sites, that this was a reasonable estimate of housing land supply.
30. The appellant disagreed arguing that the correspondence with developers, produced by the Council, could not be taken as demonstrating the claimed level and timing of housing development. It was argued, in terms of sites without planning permission owned by the Council, sites with planning permission awaiting a section 106 agreement, sites under 0.1ha with planning permission, sites over 0.1ha with planning permission and future windfalls, that the Council has greatly over-estimated the supply of deliverable sites within 5 years and in the case of demolitions, has under-estimated. In which case, the appellant's estimated supply was 425 units giving a housing land supply of 2.8 years.
31. A lack of a 5 year supply would engage NPPF paragraphs 49 and 14. However, in this case I have found that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to heritage assets. I heard that a recent high court judgement considered the relationship between the balancing exercises under NPPF paragraphs 14 and 134. That judgement<sup>4</sup> makes it clear that for the purposes of the 2nd bullet point of paragraph 14 which addresses the circumstances where relevant policies of the development plan are out of date whether due their lack of consistency with the NPPF and/or due to a failure to demonstrate a deliverable supply of housing land, paragraph 134 may be a specific policy which indicates that development should be restricted. The balancing exercise under paragraph 134 therefore requires to be carried out to determine if the harm is outweighed by any public benefits.

#### *NPPF paragraph 134 balance*

32. The appellant claimed that the proposal would boost the supply and choice of high quality dwellings in the Borough in an area with good transport links, bring economic benefits through direct and indirect employment, attract high earners to the area delivering economic output and bring additional spending power to the area from residents of the proposal. The appellant also claimed that the proposal will help reveal the Abbey Wall by channelling views towards it. However, in my judgement views are already available of the wall without the need of a housing development to channel these views. In which case I give this consideration limited weight.

---

<sup>4</sup> Forest of Dean v SoS & Galdman [2016] EWHC 421

33. Furthermore, employment and economic activity during the construction phase would be temporary benefits, and in general the benefits would not be enjoyed by the wider public but by those resident at the development and the businesses patronised by those residents. However, it is the case that the NPPF seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and widen the choice of high quality homes, as well as secure economic growth. Against this background, I attach significant weight to these benefits.
34. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) states that special regard should be paid to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings, where those settings would be affected by proposed development. Furthermore, section 72 of the Act requires that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Applying sections 66(1) and 72 of the Act in the manner required by the recent judgements<sup>5</sup> that were drawn to my attention, is a matter to which I give considerable importance and weight.
35. Giving considerable weight to the special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of these heritage assets and giving considerable weight to paying special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area means that despite finding the harm in each case to be less than substantial, the presumption against granting planning permission remains strong. It can be outweighed by material considerations if powerful enough to do so and while I give significant weight to the public benefits identified in this instance, I do not consider them to be sufficiently powerful to outweigh the aggregated less than substantial harm that I have identified. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with NPPF paragraph 134 and saved LP Policy D15 which reflects the approach of section 72 of the Act.
36. Having applied the balance under NPPF paragraph 134 in respect of the setting of the heritage assets and the Conservation Area, I have found that the public benefits would not outweigh the less than substantial harm arising. This means that under limb 2 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet of NPPF paragraph 14, NPPF paragraph 134 is a specific policy in the Framework that indicates that development should be restricted. Therefore, whether or not a 5 year housing land supply can be demonstrated is not determinative in this appeal.

#### *Other matters*

37. I note from the officer report to Committee that the proposal would be acceptable, subject to conditions, in respect of ecology, living conditions and drainage. Furthermore, I note that the highway authority, subject to conditions, does not object to the proposal on the grounds of highway safety. From my assessment, I have no reason to disagree.

#### **Conclusion**

38. I have identified aggregated less than substantial harm to identified designated historic assets and moderate harm to landscape character and in terms of visual impact. Although the proposal would not be harmful in terms of *other*

---

<sup>5</sup> Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council and Others [2014] EWCA Civ 137; Jones v Mordue & SoS & South Northamptonshire Council [2015] C1/2015/1067 and Forest of Dean v SoS & Gladman [2016] EWHC 421

*matters* and would bring benefits of significant weight, I consider that these matters would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm, giving considerable weight to paying both special regard to the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, as reflected in paragraph 132 of the NPPF.

39. Therefore for the reasons set out above, I consider that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard McCoy*

INSPECTOR

## **APPEARANCES**

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms R Stockley of Counsel	Instructed by the Council Retained Solicitor
She called	
Mr C Wilton MCD, MRTPI	Principal Planning Officer
Mr E Booth BA, DipUD, MRTPI, IHBC, FSA	Director, The Conservation Studio

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr R Lancaster of Counsel	Instructed by Barton Willmore
He called	
Mr J Turner BA DipLA, MLI, MIEMA	Partner, AJT Environmental Consultants
Mr J Clemons BA, MA, MSc, MRTPI, IHBC	Director & Head of Historic Buildings, CgMs
Mr V Ryan BA(Hons), DipTP, MRTPI	Planning Associate, Barton Willmore LLP

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr P Littlewood	Stop Manor Road Housing
-----------------	-------------------------

## **DOCUMENTS**

- 1 Council's letters of notification of the appeal
- 2 Evidence of Mr Littlewood
- 3 Housing land supply - summary position of each party
- 4 Schedule of disputed housing sites – comments of each party
- 5 Table appendices – disputed housing sites
- 6 Council's evidence on deliverability of disputed housing sites
- 7 Rebuttal Proof of Mr Ryan in response to Council's additional housing land supply evidence
- 8 Draft planning conditions list
- 9 High Court Judgement *Forest of Dean v SSCLG [2016] EWHC 421 (Admin)*
- 10 List of Core Documents
- 11 List of those wishing to attend the site visit



## **PLANS**

- 1 Suggested route for site visit

## **CORE DOCUMENTS LIST**

- 1 Officer's Committee Report, dated 2nd December 2014
- 2 Barrow-in-Furness Borough Council Local Plan Review 1996 – 2006, Housing Chapter Alterations (2006) and Direction Letter
- 3 Barrow Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA, May 2014)
- 4 Barrow Strategic Housing Land Availability Review (SHLAA, December 2013)
- 5 Barrow Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Interim Housing Land Statement (SHLAA, 2014)
- 6 Barrow Annual Monitoring Report 2013/14 (AMR, 2014) Published January 2015
- 7 North West of England Regional Spatial Strategy 2003 - 2022 (NWRS) (Revoked 20/05/2013)
- 8 Barrow Borough Local Plan: Issues and Options Consultation Draft (September, 2014)
- 9 Barrow Borough Local Plan: Preferred Options Draft (June, 2015)
- 10 English Heritage Response in relation to Issues and Options Consultation Draft (dated 23rd October 2014)
- 11 Barrow Borough Council Housing Land Supply Statement (June, 2015)
- 12 Barrow Draft Green Infrastructure Strategy (June, 2015)
- 13 DCLG Household Projections up to and including 2012 (February, 2015)
- 14 Objectively Assessed Need and Housing Target Technical Advice Note, Planning Advisory Service (July, 2015)
- 15 Ten Key Principles for Owning Your Own Housing Number – Finding Your Objectively Assessed Needs, Planning Advisory Service (2013)
- 16 The Historic Environment Good Practice in Planning Note 3 – Setting of Heritage Assets (English Heritage, 2015)
- 17 Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for Sustainable Management for the Historic Environment (English Heritage, April 2008)
- 18 The British Standard Guide for the Conservation of Historic Buildings (BS7913:2013)
- 19 National Heritage Listings A – W (see page 7)
- 20 Furness Abbey Conservation Area Plan and Designations (1968)
- 21 Furness Abbey Conservation Area Appraisal (due August 2015)
- 22 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, March 2012)
- 23 National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG, March 2014) (see page 8/9)
- 24 Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire DC [2014] EWCA Civ 137
- 25 R (on the application of Forge Field Society and others) v Sevenoaks DC [2014] EWHC 1895
- 26 R (on the application of Hughes) v South Lakeland DC [2014] EWHC 3979
- 27 Bedford BC v Secretary of State for CLG, Nuon UK Ltd [2013] EWCHC 2847
- 28 Hunston Properties Ltd and Secretary of State for CLG, St Albans City and DC [2013] EWCA
- 29 Gallagher Homes Limited and Lion Court Homes Ltd v Solihull MBC [2014] EWHC 1283
- 30 Appeal Decision at Whymondham, Norfolk (August, 2014) Ref: APP/L2630/A/13/2196884
- 31 Appeal Decision at Boltongate, Wigton (April, 2014) Ref: APP/G0908/A/13/2191503

- 32 Appeal Decision at Burton Agnes, East Riding (May, 2014) Ref: APP/E2001/A/13/2190363
- 33 Appeal Decision at Hawton, Newark on Trent (September, 2014) Ref: APP/B3030/A/12/2183042
- 34 Appeal Decision at Chineham, Basingstoke (September, 2014) Ref: APP/H1705/A/13/2250929
- 35 Appeal Decision at Molesworth, Cambridgeshire (December, 2014) Ref: APP/H0520/A/13/2197548
- 36 Appeal Decision at Bolsover, Derbyshire (March, 2015) Ref: APP/R1010/A/14/2212093
- 37 Appeal Decision at Barby, Northamptonshire (June, 2015) Ref: APP/Y2810/A/13/2200749
- 38 Cumbria Landscape Character Guidance and Toolkit (Cumbria County Council, 2011)
- 39 Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition, Landscape Institution
- 40 Photograph of Appeal Site taken from where Park Wall meets Abbey Road, adjacent to West Lodge, Abbey Road (13th August 2014)
- 41 Aerial photograph showing application site (date required)
- 42 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- 43 Town and Country Planning Act 1990
- 44 Inspectors Interim Report for the draft County Durham Plan (18th February 2015)
- 45 Appeal Decision at Alsager, Stoke-on-Trent (October, 2013) Ref: APP/R0660/A/13/2195201
- 46 Appeal Decision at Pit Lane, Lindal (November, 2015) Ref: PP/W0910/W/15/3035787
- 47 Appeal Decision Parade Street, Barrow-in-Furness (June, 2015) Ref: APP/W0910/E/14/2225075
- 48 Appeal Decision Newton Road, Dalton-in-Furness (September, 2013) Ref: APP/W0910/A/13/2196172
- 49 Appeal Decision at Razor's Farm, Chineham, Basingstoke Ref: APP/H1705/A/13/2205929)
- 50 Appeal Decision Cirencester Road, Fairford Ref: APP/F1610/A/14/2213318
- 51 Appeal Decision Henfield, West Sussex Ref: APP/Z3825/A/13/2205204
- 52 Appeal Decision Javelin Park, Haresfield, Glos Ref: APP/T1600/A/13/2200210
- 53 Appeal Decision Ross Road, Newent Forest of Dean Ref: APP/P1615/A/14/2228822
- 54 Jones v Mordue & Ors [2015] EWCA Civ 1243
- 55 Understanding Place: Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management (English Heritage, 2011)
- 56 Cumbria and Lake District Joint Structure Plan 2001-2016 (2006) (now revoked)
- 57 Barrow Cycleway Network (September, 2007)
- 58 Minutes of Executive Committee Wednesday 14th November 2012