
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 18 July 2017

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G2435/W/17/3168722

Land to the north east of Normanton Road, Packington, Ashby De La Zouch, Leicestershire LE65 1WU

- 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 and Mrs B T Moseley against the decision of North West Leicestershire District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/01051/OUT, dated 30 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of eight dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is made in outline with access, layout and landscaping. Appearance and scale are details reserved for a subsequent application. Whilst appearance and scale are matters reserved for a subsequent application, at the hearing the appellant confirmed that it was proposed that the dwellings would each be two storeys. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon (i) the distribution of housing development within the River Mease catchment; (ii) the character and appearance of the area and (iii) whether or not the proposal would deliver a sustainable form of development.

Reasons

Site and proposal

4. The appeal site comprises pasture land and is located at the junction of Spring Lane and Normanton Road. It is roughly triangular in shape and falls within the countryside. It is positioned on the eastern edge of the village of Packington. There are existing residential properties on the northern side of Spring Lane and there are 30 dwellings under construction immediately to the south (on the other side of Normanton Road) which have the benefit of planning permission. The site is enclosed by hedgerows and trees and can be accessed from a field gate off Spring Lane.
-

5. It is proposed to erect eight dwellings on the site with garages. Four of the dwellings would front onto Normanton Road and four would be positioned to the rear of the site with their rear elevations facing onto Spring Lane. There would be three accesses onto Normanton Road resulting in the loss of some hedgerow, although all other hedgerows would be retained. A new footway would be provided along the northern side of Normanton Road and the existing access onto Spring Lane would be closed. An Ash tree which fronts Normanton Road would be removed.

Planning policy context

6. The development plan for the area comprises the saved policies of the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan 2002 (LP). In the first reason for refusal, the Council makes reference to saved Policies S2 and S3 of the LP. Policy S2 seeks to permit development on allocated sites and other land within the "Limits to Development" identified on the Proposals Map. The appeal site does not fall within the limits to development for Packington: it is shown on the proposals map as falling outside of this area and in land defined as Countryside. Policy S3 of the LP states that development will be permitted on land outside the Limits to Development for specified types of development. The proposal would not represent a development type that would be allowed by virtue of Policy S3.
7. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would not accord with Policies S2 and S3 of the LP. However, these policies were drawn up to reflect the land use planning requirements for the District up to 2006. The plan is now time expired and hence the policies have limited weight.
8. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that *"due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework"*. The Council contend that Policy S3 should be afforded more weight as it would not be entirely inconsistent with the one of the 12 core planning principles of the Framework which is that planning should recognise *"the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside"*. Policy S3 of the LP states that *"land outside the limits of development is identified as countryside which will be protected for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty"*. However, I share the views expressed by the Inspector who recently determined appeal Ref APP/G2435/W/17/3166865 (17 July 2017) for 36 dwellings at Land at Swepstone Road, Heather, Leicestershire LE67 2RE. The Inspector commented that Policy S3 of the LP takes a very restricted approach to housing in the countryside when compared to the Framework. Consequently, and notwithstanding the views of the Council, I do not afford Policy S3 of the LP anything more than limited weight.
9. I have carefully considered the evidence presented by both parties including the most recent housing land supply information submitted as part of the examination into the emerging North West Leicestershire Local Plan (ELP). This has taken into account the Council's Housing and Economic Needs Assessment published in January 2017 (HEDNA), although this needs to be fully tested as part of the examination into the ELP and hence cannot be afforded significant weight at this moment in time. However, this does not mean that the HEDNA should be ignored or disregarded in planning terms.

10. At the hearing, there was some discussion about housing land supply. Reference has been made to appeal decision Ref APP/G2435/W/16/3150237 dated 5 May 2017 where the Inspector concluded that there was a *"supply of 5.33 years"* and that *"even with a reduced supply from small sites in accordance with the appellant's estimate, there would still be a supply in excess of 5 years (5.23 years)"*. In respect of the ELP, the HEDNA indicates that fewer dwellings need to be built per annum (i.e. 481 dwellings). In considering whether the local planning authority can demonstrate a deliverable five year supply of housing land, the Inspector, who considered appeal Ref APP/G2435/W/16/3150237, took into account a higher annual dwelling requirement (i.e. 520 dwellings). Overall, and on the evidence that is before me, I am satisfied that the local planning authority can demonstrate at least a deliverable five year supply of housing sites.
11. The ELP was submitted for examination in October 2016. Hearings were held in January 2017 and March 2017. Since this time, the Council has published two Position Statements (February 2017 and March 2017) which include responses to questions identified by the ELP Inspector. The examining Inspector has requested that the Council undertake consultation on a number of main modifications. The main modifications six week public consultation period ends on 24 July 2017. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the main (and minor/additional) modifications version the ELP for the purposes of determining this appeal.
12. Paragraph 216 of the Framework states that decision-takers may give weight to the relevant policies in emerging plans according to *"the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight may be given); the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater weight that may be given); and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)"*.
13. I have considered comments made so far by the examining ELP Inspector. The ELP is now at a very advanced stage, but it has not been adopted. I cannot afford the ELP full weight in decision making terms, but given its current stage in the examination process, and in view of some unresolved objections, I afford it moderate weight. The policies have been the subject of significant public consultation and have been modified since the ELP examination. I acknowledge that the Inspector who considered appeal Ref APP/G2435/W/17/3166865 on 17 July 2017 gave limited weight to these policies, but the ELP was at a different stage. It is now at main modifications stage and the public consultation period is about to end.
14. The adopted LP is now time expired. Furthermore, the housing requirement and Policy H4 of the LP is out of date and hence has very limited weight. In these respects, and as the ELP has not yet been adopted, it is also necessary for me to consider the proposal against paragraph 14 of the Framework including the tilted balance. I deal with this issue later in this decision.

River Mease SAC/SSSI

15. The appeal site lies within the catchment area of the River Mease Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the River Mease is a designated SSSI. According to the River Mease Standing Advice (2017), produced by Natural England, the River Mease suffers from the effects of point source and diffuse water pollutions and levels of phosphates far exceed the recognised conservation limits as agreed with the Environment Agency. Development within the catchment of the River Mease SAC has the potential to contribute to the poor quality environment including from foul water entering the River Mease and its tributaries from sewage treatment works.
16. Sewage from the eight dwellings would be treated at Packington Treatment Works (PTW). The Council has confirmed that there is capacity available at the PTW for the foul drainage from the proposed development. However, in order to mitigate the impact of discharge into the River Mease, the Council adopted the River Mease Developer Contribution Scheme Second Development Window (DCS2) on 20 September 2016. This requires a financial payment to be made, based on bedroom numbers, from new developments within the SAC catchment to mitigate the impacts of such development upon the River Mease. The DCS2 replaces DCS1 (2012) and this development window allocates 1826 dwellings within the River Mease catchment.
17. At my request, the Council has confirmed that DCS2 is not a supplementary planning document in the sense that it is not linked to an adopted development plan policy. However, it has been the subject of public consultation and has been approved by the Council's Cabinet. Whilst the document may not have development plan status in planning decision terms, I nonetheless consider that it has been prepared for sound environmental/planning purposes and hence I afford it considerable weight as a material planning consideration.
18. In the Council's appeal statement, it states that when all approved planning applications and planning applications with a resolution to approve subject to the completion of a planning obligation are taken into account, there is a remaining capacity of 282 dwellings. The Council considers that this is a limited capacity and that any further development should therefore be targeted towards more sustainable locations than the appeal site. At the hearing, there was discussion about a number of the housing sites which had been listed by the Council. It was agreed between the main parties that there was in fact at least a remaining capacity of 346 dwellings. However, this figure may actually be higher as the planning permission for 450 dwellings at land to the west of High Street/Land at Measham Waterside, Burton Road now includes part of the agreed position of High Speed Two Phase 2b. Hence, there is some uncertainty about whether the planning permission would actually be implemented.
19. Policy S2 of the ELP sets out the settlement hierarchy for the District. It states that *"any development provided for within this policy which discharges wastewater into the Mease catchment will be subject to the provisions of Policy En2. Any such development which does not meet these provisions will not be permitted"*. I have considered Policy En2 of the ELP and this states that development within the catchment of the River Mease SAC will be allowed where there is headroom at the relevant sewage treatment works and the proposed development accords with the River Mease Special Area of Conservation Water Quality (Phosphate) Management Plan (WQMP).

20. In this case, there is no dispute that there is headroom at the relevant sewage treatment works. I have not been provided with any evidence that the proposal would not comply with the WQMP and the appellant has agreed to mitigate impacts upon phosphate levels by means of the completion of a planning obligation. The Council confirmed at the hearing that the completed planning obligation was acceptable in terms of mitigating impacts upon phosphate levels.
21. There is no actual reference in Policy S2 or En2 of the ELP to directing development to more sustainable sites where available development capacity within the River Mease catchment is limited. I acknowledge that there is a spatial strategy in the ELP and that this is based on a hierarchy of settlements as detailed in Policy S2 of the ELP. I am also cognisant of the fact that Policy S3 of the ELP includes controls within the countryside and that the proposals map defines the limits to development. However, these are matters which I have already addressed above and in planning policy terms fall to be considered separately from issues relating to the River Mease SAC. The latter relates to matters of conservation whereas the former relates to matters of land-use principle. I do not consider that there are any adopted or emerging policies which link the two together.
22. At the hearing, the Council indicated that the concept of limited capacity and directing development towards more sustainable settlements was a general principle/approach that had been applied in the District. However, the Council conceded that the planning policies (and DCS2) relating to development within the River Mease catchment did not specifically refer to directing development to more sustainable settlements where capacity was limited.
23. Given my findings above, and in particular that there is common ground that there is at least available capacity for the erection of eight dwellings, it is not necessary for me to reach an absolute conclusion relating to the total capacity available relative to the DCS2 allocation of 1826 dwellings. However, there is no dispute between the parties that there is at least an available capacity of 346 dwellings. I do not consider that this would constitute a "limited capacity".
24. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that subject to the completed planning obligation, the proposal would not cause significant harm to the River Mease SAC/SSSI. In this regard, the proposal would not conflict with the conservation aims of Policy S2 and En2 of the ELP and the Framework.

Character and appearance

25. The site falls within land defined as Countryside in both the adopted LP and the ELP. The site is open and undeveloped. It includes mature hedgerows and some trees along its boundaries and provides a soft and green edge to the otherwise more built up development that partly surrounds it. There is no doubt that the erection of eight dwellings on the site, coupled with the formation of new accesses, a pavement and the loss of some hedgerow/landscaping, would change the essentially open and rural character of the site and hence that there would be some adverse impact on the distinctive character and appearance of the locality.
26. Planning permission (Ref 13/01002/OUTM) has been approved for thirty dwellings immediately to the south of Normanton Road (i.e. the other side of the road). This site falls within the defined Limits to Development in the ELP

but is within Countryside in the LP. I do not know the exact circumstances which led to these dwellings being approved, but at the hearing I was told that the site had included an agricultural building close to its frontage with Normanton Road. In this sense, the characteristics of such a site were not previously and directly comparable with the appeal site. Nevertheless, the houses are in the process of being constructed and this has created a more urban environment when travelling along Normanton Road. Indeed, this development, coupled with the approval of a new footpath on the road, has introduced a more built up and urban environment in this part of Normanton Road.

27. In essence, and in view of the thirty dwellings being constructed on the other side of Normanton Road, the appeal development would be sandwiched between housing development to the south west and existing residential development upon Spring Lane. Therefore, whilst the proposed dwellings would certainly be noticeable when seen between open breaks in the form of proposed accesses, and also between the trees/hedgerows in the winter months when without leaf, they would nonetheless relate reasonably well to the existing pattern of development which surrounds them. However, and notwithstanding other recently approved housing development in the locality, the appeal site does provide a very soft edge to the built up development on Spring Lane which, in relative terms, has a semi-rural appearance. Therefore, the proposal would have some urbanising effects when viewed from this area.
28. Some of the adverse impacts identified above could be mitigated to some extent by the fact that it is proposed to both retain most of the hedgerow/vegetation on the site and to introduce new/enhanced planting along the boundaries. Furthermore, some of the dwellings would be set well back behind planting. However, the house and the garage to Plot No 2 would be positioned very close to the boundary with Spring Lane and I am not persuaded that any additional landscaping in this area would suitably soften the urbanising effects of such development. I accept that the impact of the development upon longer distance views would be less severe given the existence of intervening landscaping, but there would no doubt be harm to the essentially rural and open character of the countryside when viewed from more localised viewpoints on Spring Lane.
29. I am satisfied that the overall density of the appeal the site would suitably reflect that of the surrounding area and, whilst appearance and scale are reserved matters, I am confident that it would be possible to ensure that the dwellings were designed to be in-keeping with the existing surrounding development. However, acceptable density would not overcome the aforementioned harm that would be caused to the essentially open and rural character and appearance of the countryside when viewed from Spring Lane. I acknowledge that houses are being built on the other side of Normanton Road, but these are not conspicuous in the landscape when viewed from the junction of Heather Lane with Normanton Road. When viewed from this area, the appeal site is conspicuous and currently provides a soft, rural and verdant edge to Spring Lane. Its appearance emphasises a clear division between the built up area and the countryside setting. I therefore consider that, in respect of more localised views, the proposal would cause harm to the countryside.
30. The site is located outside of the limits to development and within land defined as Countryside in the LP and ELP. In conclusion, and for the reasons outlined

above, I consider that the proposal would cause some adverse harm to the essentially open and rural character and appearance of the countryside. In this regard, there would be conflict with the countryside protection aims of Policy S3 of the ELP; Policy S3 of the LP and paragraph 17 of the Framework which states that planning should recognise the "*intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside*".

Sustainable development and planning balance

31. In my reasoning above, I have afforded weight to the relevant policies in the LP and the ELP. However, as the LP is time expired and the ELP has not been adopted, it is necessary for me to also consider the proposal against the planning policies in the Framework including the tilted balance in paragraph 14.
32. Paragraph 7 of the Framework states that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. There is no doubt that the erection of eight dwellings would result in construction employment, although such a benefit would be relatively short lived. The occupiers of the proposed dwellings would likely support local facilities and services and hence contribute economically to the vitality of Packington and other settlements. In addition, the proposal would result in the Council receiving additional Homes Bonus. However, the overall economic contribution from a limited number of dwellings (i.e. 8) would not be very significant.
33. In the context of paragraph 55 of the Framework, I do not consider that the proposal would result in the erection of isolated dwellings in the countryside. This is because the dwellings would be positioned in close proximity to existing development on Spring Lane and houses under construction on Normanton Road. It is proposed to form a new footpath along Normanton Road thereby enabling the occupiers of the proposed dwellings to easily and conveniently reach very close-by local facilities and services in Packington. I am satisfied that the site would not be isolated in terms of access to a reasonable range of day to day local facilities and services, and based on the public transport information submitted by the appellant, the occupiers of the proposed properties would not be solely reliant on use of the private motor vehicle. These are environmental matters in favour of the proposal. There is no dispute between the main parties about these matters.
34. I have found that the proposal would result in some localised harm to the character and appearance of the countryside and hence that there would be conflict with the countryside aims of the adopted and emerging development plan policies and the Framework. This is an environmental matter which weighs against the proposal.
35. The proposal includes an off-site contribution of £200,000 to be spent on affordable housing. The provision of additional affordable housing in the District is a positive social factor which should be weighed in the balance. However, the number of affordable homes to be provided as a result of the financial payment would be relatively limited.
36. I acknowledge that the erection of eight dwellings on the site would seek to boost the supply of houses in the District. However, on the evidence that is before me, the local planning authority can demonstrate at least a deliverable five year supply of housing sites for the District. Therefore, I do not consider

that there is currently a pressing housing land supply need to release the site for housing. Furthermore, the provision of eight dwellings would not be very significant in housing numbers terms.

37. At the hearing, the Council confirmed that there was currently an unmet housing need for Leicester City and that was why the modification version of Policy S1 of the ELP now states that the Council will continue to work collaboratively with the Leicester & Leicestershire Housing Market Area (HMA) authorities to establish the scale and distribution of any additional provision that may be necessary in North West Leicestershire and elsewhere in the HMA as a result of the inability of one or more authority to accommodate its own needs as identified in the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment. Indeed, Policy S1 of the ELP states that *"the District Council will commence a review of this Local Plan (defined as being publication of an invitation to make representations in accordance with Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012) by the end of January 2018 or within 3 months of the adoption of this Local Plan (whichever is the later). The Plan Review will be submitted for examination within two years from the commencement of the review. In the event that the reviewed plan is not submitted within two years then this Local Plan will be deemed to be out of date"*.
38. At the hearing, the appellant was of the view that the need for an early review of the ELP meant that it was very likely that there would be a need to release further land for housing purposes in North West Leicestershire District. This does not necessarily follow and, in any event, this would be a matter to be considered as part of a development plan review involving public consultation and collaboration with all authorities in the HMA area.
39. Whilst I acknowledge that the appellant has objected to policies in the ELP, and in particular has requested an extension to the boundary for Packington to include the appeal site, I have not been provided with any compelling evidence to demonstrate that the site is required to meet the overall housing requirements of the ELP. Indeed, the Council has referred me to the examining Inspector's preliminary note to the Council dated October 2016, and also the Guidance Note dated November 2015, which indicate that the Inspector would not consider omission sites and that if there were a need for additional sites it would be a matter for the Council to consider. The Council confirmed at the hearing that there were no main modification proposals to include any additional housing sites, including the appeal site, outside of the defined settlement boundary for Packington. On the evidence that is before me, I do not consider that there is a current or pressing need for the Council to review the Limits to Development boundary for Packington.
40. In addition to the above, I conclude that as the site is in Countryside the proposal would fundamentally conflict with the housing aims of Policy S2 of the ELP where a *"limited amount of growth will take place within the defined Limits to Development"* within sustainable villages such as Packington. Furthermore, as the site is greenfield there would be further conflict with Policy S2 which states that *"the re-use of previously developed land (as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework) will be supported where it is compatible with the settlement hierarchy set out above"*.

41. I acknowledge that the ELP is not yet adopted. However, it has now reached a very advanced stage. Whilst the Council confirmed at the hearing that there were still some objections to Policies S1, S2 and S3 of the ELP, such policies have been modified as part of the examination and are currently the subject of public consultation. I accept that the policies are not yet adopted, and so therefore afford them moderate weight in decision making terms.
42. The proposal would be fundamentally at odds with the settlement hierarchy and strategic housing aims of Policy S2 of the ELP. In addition, as some harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the Countryside, the proposal would not accord with countryside aims of Policy S3 of the ELP; Policy S3 of the adopted LP and the Framework. Collectively, these are strategic housing and environmental matters which significantly and demonstrably outweigh the aforementioned benefits of the proposal. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not deliver sustainable development.

Other Matters

43. The appellant has submitted a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act signed and dated 12 April 2017. This includes, inter alia, a contribution of £200,000 for off-site affordable housing, the provision of a landscaping and management plan (including maintenance arrangements) and financial contributions per dwelling type for the River Mease Special Area of Conservation and a financial contribution towards the National Forest. I have no reason to depart from the Council's acceptance of an off-site affordable housing financial contribution. Such a contribution would be a positive factor to weigh in the balance, although the financial sum equates to an equivalent of 2.4 dwellings on site and so is a relatively limited benefit.
44. I am satisfied that the planning obligation would be acceptable in terms of affordable housing provision and in respect of mitigating the effects of the development upon the River Mease. I note that the Council raises no concerns about the detailed wording or content of the planning obligation including measures relating to the maintenance and enhancement of landscaped areas and the financial contribution towards the National Forest. However, whilst the completed planning obligation is acceptable in planning terms, and satisfies the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the Framework and Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations, this would not outweigh or overcome my overall conclusion on the main issues.
45. I have taken into account representations made by other interested parties including supportive comments. In respect of the latter representations, I have already addressed five year housing land supply issues.
46. I note the comments made that additional houses would seek to maintain and enhance local amenities/services in Packington and that in recent times the village has lost its post office and Chapel. However, this issue needs to be balanced against the emerging development plan strategy for the District as well as the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the countryside. It is not a matter which would alter or outweigh my overall conclusion on the main issues.
47. I acknowledge the comments made by objectors relating to traffic generation and highway safety matters. However, I have no reason to disagree with the conclusion reached by the Highway Authority about these matters. Subject to

the imposition of planning conditions, I do not consider that the proposal would have a detrimental impact upon matters of highway safety or the free movement of traffic.

48. I have considered the location of Packington House which is a Grade II listed building and the nearby Packington Conservation Area (CA). Given the distance of the listed building and the CA from the appeal development, I do not consider that harm would be caused to the setting of the listed building or that the development would cause harm in respect of views into or out of the CA. In effect, the development would have a neutral impact in terms of these heritage matters.
49. Comments have been made in respect of localised flooding issues. Had the proposal been acceptable, it would have been possible to have imposed a planning condition relating to surface water drainage.
50. As part of the hearing, I was able to view the appeal site from No 1 Spring Lane and to consider the effects of the proposed development upon the occupiers of this dwelling. In my reasoning above, I have concluded that this part of the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area owing to its very close proximity to Spring Lane. I consider that the development within proposed Plot No 1 would also have some adverse harm upon the outlook afforded to the occupiers of No 1 Spring Lane, particularly when viewed from ground and first floor front windows. Such an impact would be more profound in the months when the appeal site's boundary landscaping was without leaf. Whilst this harm would be relatively limited, it nonetheless adds to the harm identified in respect of my overall conclusion on the main issues.
51. In respect of all other proposed dwellings and garages, I am satisfied that it would be possible for such development to be erected on the site without material harm being caused to the occupiers of surrounding residential development in terms of light, privacy and outlook.
52. I accept that appeal Ref APP/G2435/W/17/3166865 (17 July 2017) for 36 dwellings was recently allowed. However, the proposal was for significantly more dwellings than this appeal and in applying the tilted balance in paragraph 14 of the Framework the Inspector afforded different weight to various planning considerations. I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits and in balancing all planning matters have concluded that it should be dismissed.
53. I acknowledge that the Council did approve residential development on the site in the past, but such a decision was quashed following a legal challenge. I have not been provided with the full facts of the legal challenge, but at the hearing it was suggested that there were a number of issues. Nonetheless, Members of the Planning Committee were entitled to reach a different decision in respect of residential development on the appeal site. I do not consider that I am bound by decisions that have been made on the site previously. I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits taking into account the current planning policy position and balancing all other material planning considerations.
54. There are no other issues raised which outweigh or overcome my overall conclusion on the main issues.

Conclusion

55. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Steedman, Steedman Planning

John Imber, JMI Planning

Brian Moseley

FOR THE COUNCIL:

Jenny Davies, Senior Planning Officer, North West Leicestershire District Council

Chris Elston, Planning and Development Team Manager, North West Leicestershire District Council

Emma Trilk, Senior Planning Officer, North West Leicestershire District Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Robert Martin

Paul Taylor

Sam Brassington

Philip Harley

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

Doc 1: Appeal decision Ref APP/G2435/W/17/3166865 dated 17 July 2017

Doc 2: Map No SG-02-207 dated July 2017 - High Speed Two Phase 2b: West Midlands to Leeds Safeguarding Directions