



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 6-9 June 2017

Site visit made on 6 June 2017

by H Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI

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

Decision date: 30 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/16/3162166

Land south of Wellington Road, Muxton, Telford

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Seabridge Developments Limited against Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2016/0568, is dated 23 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is outline application for residential development of up to 150 dwellings and associated access, with all other matters reserved.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is in outline with access to be considered at this stage. However, an indicative masterplan is included within the application documents, which shows how the site might be developed and I have also therefore had regard to this in my determination of the appeal.
3. The description of development has changed to that given on the application form. I have reflected this in the heading above.
4. The Inquiry opened on 6 June and sat for four days. At the Inquiry, during the discussion on planning obligations a request for a financial contribution along with a substantial amount of previously unseen evidence was provided on behalf of West Mercia Police. In the interests of fairness and natural justice, I adjourned the Inquiry on the final day of sitting in order for the main parties to respond to this evidence. The Inquiry was subsequently closed in writing. However, it transpires that the evidence provided by West Mercia Police was in fact received by PINS but a technical issue resulted in it not being put before me prior to the Inquiry. Nevertheless, I have had the opportunity to read these submissions and have taken them into account in reaching my decision.
5. I made an accompanied site visit on the first day of the Inquiry to view the site and walk the local footpaths including the Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) through a site off Muxton Lane which was the subject to a previous appeal. I also walked to Muxton Primary school and to the monument on Lilleshall Hill. Following my adjournment on the final day of the Inquiry, I also made an unaccompanied site visit to view the site from Shropshire Golf Course.

6. Whilst the appeal resulted from the Council's failure to determine the application within the prescribed period, the Council has clearly set out within its case the reasons upon which it would have refused the application and the development plan policies it would have applied.
7. Included in those reasons are issues to do with highway safety. However, these were subsequently considered to have been addressed based on amendments to the access arrangements by the appellant and the Council confirmed that it would not be pursuing this matter at the Inquiry. The amendments are detailed on drawing no. T0129-02 Rev. H-1. Accordingly, I have not referred to this matter in the main issues. Moreover, in view of the fact that I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, any outstanding concerns relating to highway safety need not be considered any further because the development is not being granted planning permission.
8. I wrote to the main parties before the Inquiry to seek their views on the judgement of the Supreme Court of 10 May 2017¹ (the SC judgement). Both parties submitted responses before the Inquiry.
9. After the Inquiry was closed, the Council published the Proposed Main Modifications to the Telford and Wrekin Local Plan Submission Version (June 2016) (emerging Local Plan (eLP)). This was brought to my attention by the appellant. I therefore wrote to the main parties seeking their views on any bearing this updated position might have on the appeal and have reflected the responses received in my decision.
10. I have framed the first main issue differently to that within my opening remarks to more accurately reflect the evidence given at the Inquiry.

Application for costs

11. At the Inquiry an application for costs was made by Seabridge Developments Limited against West Mercia Police. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

12. In light of all the submissions before me, the main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would accord with the development plan strategy for the location of housing including having regard to (i) its effects on the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) whether it would provide satisfactory access to shops and services
 - whether it would make satisfactory provision for affordable housing

Reasons

Location of housing

13. The appeal site covers about 6.95 ha of agricultural land that is outside but contiguous with the built up area boundary on the north eastern part of the borough as defined on the Proposals Map contained within the Wrekin Local Plan (2000) (the WLP).

¹ Suffolk Coastal District Council v Hopkins Homes Ltd and SSCLG; Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and SSCLG v Cheshire East Borough Council [2017] UKSC 37

14. The development plan comprises the saved policies of the WLP and the Telford and Wrekin Core Strategy (2007) (the CS). CS policy CS1 concerns itself with the number of new homes to be delivered over the plan period to 2016. Policy CS7 states that development within rural areas will be focussed in three rural settlements. The Policy says that outside of these, development will be limited and in the open countryside, strictly controlled.
15. The decisions of the Inspectors in a number of recent appeals² have found CS policies CS1 and CS7 to be out of date because of being time-expired and that they variously carry limited or no weight. The Council has conceded that the tilted balance in paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is engaged.
16. However, that does not mean policies CS1 and CS7 should be automatically discounted as they remain part of the statutory development plan and may be apportioned weight according to their consistency with the Framework. I am also able to give weight where relevant, to emerging policies based on their consistency with the Framework and where there are no unresolved objections within the examination process.
17. Policies CS1 and CS7 do broadly seek to create sustainable communities and provide a sequential approach by focussing new housing in the existing urban areas. Although policy CS7 applies a blanket restriction on development in the countryside which may not accord with the Framework's less restrictive approach, the Framework also seeks to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, which is an issue I shall explore in more detail below. In these respects, the policies are in general conformity with the broad sustainable development objectives of the Framework.
18. I acknowledge that the housing figures set out in policy CS1 are derived from the now revoked Regional Spatial Strategy for the West Midlands so they are not based on any objective assessment of housing need (OAN) as required by the Framework. In this context, I note all of the concerns raised about where the eLP will seek to address future housing demand, such as in the form of urban extensions because the current development boundaries may not allow enough land to come forward.
19. However, in my view such matters generally fall outside the ambit of a Section 78 appeal, particularly bearing in mind that the Council can currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing land as required by the Framework. The Development Plan therefore, despite its age, is not constraining the supply of housing or failing to deliver the Government aim of boosting significantly the supply of housing. Therefore, although even more housing could be considered a benefit, it is not one that needs to occur now or would justify overriding the aims of the relevant planning policies.
20. Against all of this background, I consider that policies CS1 and CS7 may be accorded at least moderate weight in the overall planning balance. The appeal site is located immediately next to the settlement boundary but nonetheless falls outside it and is therefore within the open countryside as defined in the WLP. Accordingly, the proposal runs counter to the housing strategy and countryside protection aims of policies CS1 and CS7.

² APP/C3240/W/15/3025042; APP/C3240/W/16/3143217; APP/C3240/W/16/3144445; and APP/C3240/W/16/3149398 (Core Documents 14.1; 15; 16; and 26.1)

21. Paragraph 14 of the Framework says that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or where specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.
22. In light of all the above, the Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development is a significant material consideration in this appeal. I am therefore pointed towards granting permission in the event that I do not find the benefits of the scheme to be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by adverse effects. It is to these matters that I now turn.

Character and appearance

23. At my site visit, I observed that the surrounding landscape is of rolling character with some pronounced higher points such as Lilleshall Hill. There are wooded ridges, pockets of woodland on valley sides and well vegetated hollows, particularly along watercourses. This creates the impression that the landscape is relatively wooded, particularly to the south, as layers of vegetation stretch out along the contours of rising land.
24. The appeal site comprises a number of variously sized and shaped fields separated by mature hedgerows. A small part of the easternmost and largest of these would contain the site access from Wellington Road and the indicative masterplan also shows six dwellings next to it.
25. The majority of the proposed development would be located to the west of a well-vegetated brook. This is a strong feature of the local landscape and provides an element of containment of the site. The vegetation along the brook continues to the south east towards the nearby Shropshire Golf Course. It creates a distinctive boundary between the small to medium-scale fields next to the edge of the settlement and the much larger fields within the more open landscape to the east. From within the site there are views towards the surrounding wooded areas and the more open areas beyond including towards the prominent monument on Lilleshall Hill.
26. Although from within the site the urban edge has some visual influence, vegetation within residential gardens lessens the presence of the buildings and provides a reasonably well-defined edge to the settlement. Furthermore, whilst the vegetation along the brook provides a notional strong boundary, it is located away from the actual urban edge and in my view is a distinctive component of the rural landscape.
27. For the above reasons, I consider the site to be a distinctive part of the open countryside thus leading me to conclude that it shares a greater affinity with the rural landscape than it does with the urban area. Whilst I note the containment provided by the vegetation along the brook course, as I have found it to be a component of that rural area, it does not provide strong justification for a development between it and the urban boundary.
28. The submitted plans show the part retention of hedgerows within the development. Whilst I recognise the indicative nature of the layout, it seems clear to me that it represents the likely form of development given the number

of dwellings that would be built and their associated infrastructure. Accordingly, the existing hedgerows would be fragmented, which in combination with the spread of built development would result in the erosion of a substantial proportion of the distinctive pattern of smaller scale fields around the settlement edge.

29. I acknowledge that a recent development has taken place on two small-scale fields outside the defined urban boundary. However this does not in itself justify the further expansion of development into an area that provides an attractive setting to Muxton.
30. At the Inquiry I heard evidence that the site forms part of a landscape pattern considered to *reorganised piecemeal enclosure*. A comparison was made by the appellant with the nearby land to the south which was considered by the Inspector in the *Muxton Lane* appeal³ to be *piecemeal enclosure* and thus of local rarity. The appellant sought to argue that the appeal site is therefore of less value than the area forming the Muxton Lane site.
31. Whilst I see the logic of that argument, the appeal site comprises smaller-scale fields in much the same way as the land to the south in comparison to the much more open landscape to the east. Taking the appeal site and the Muxton Lane site together, on the ground there is no clear difference between their respective characters and they function together to create a different, more intimate landscape than the area to the east of the brook.
32. Although a forensic analysis can therefore be made between the characteristics of various areas of land, in reality I am not persuaded that there is any significant material difference in character within the overall smaller-scale landscape to the east of Muxton. I therefore share the Council's view that it maintains a sense of time depth and some semblance of a historic field pattern and consider that it makes a valuable contribution to the setting to of this part of the urban area.
33. In assessing the residual landscape effects of the proposal, I have taken account of Landscape Sensitivity Study (LSS) commissioned by the Council, the final report of which is dated February 2014. The LSS assessed a number of land parcels including the south western part of the site (ref TWMu4 – 64) and the larger area to the east of the brook course (ref TWMu3 – 74). It assessed the former as being of medium sensitivity although the value of the small-scale field pattern was recognised. In the case of the latter, an assessment of high/medium sensitivity was based on its ecological value, openness and its role as part of the green buffer between Telford and Lilleshall.
34. Whilst these conclusions are noted, the LSS was undertaken to assess the capacity of the landscape to accommodate housing development as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. A substantial proportion of the site has not been included in the LSS and as such, I consider it provides inconclusive evidence of the sensitivity of the appeal site as a whole. In any case, this does not alter my findings set out above.
35. I have also noted the deletion of the Lilleshall Village Strategic Landscape from the eLP following the Inspector's Main Modifications. Whilst the area between Muxton and Lilleshall will not therefore have such policy protection going

³ APP/C3240/W/16/3149398

forward, this does not diminish my findings that the proposal would cause harm to the landscape character of the area because of its effects on the smaller scale field pattern next to the settlement edge.

36. I pause here to consider the effects of the proposal on the appreciation of views from Lilleshall Hill. There are no other significant views from public vantage points and none were put forward at the Inquiry. At my site visit, I was able to look towards the site from a vantage point near to the monument on Lilleshall Hill. Whilst this is a prominent hilltop feature in many views from within and around Muxton, when looking towards the settlement the lower lying parts of the site are substantially screened by the existing vegetation along the brook. In addition, the part of the site that would contain the access and a small number of dwellings is situated on the other side of land that rises away from the settlement edge. The indicative plans include a substantial belt of new planting to the east of the proposed access. I am satisfied that the development would not be obtrusive in views from Lilleshall Hill and that it would not appear as an unacceptable visual encroachment into the countryside.
37. I have considered this matter in the context of the Inspector's conclusions in relation to the Muxton Lane site. That site is crossed by PROWs, one of which leads towards Lilleshall Hill. Thus, it is clear that the Muxton Lane proposal would have had a direct effect on the experience of those using the PROWs and would have been more visually obtrusive from public vantage points than the proposed development subject to this appeal. In this regard, I do not therefore consider that any direct comparisons can be drawn between the visual effects of the appeal scheme and the Muxton Lane site.
38. I turn now to the effects of the proposed access on the character and appearance of Wellington Road. Whilst I accept it functions as a distributor road and that it is marked and lit near to the settlement edge, there remains a distinct sense of a sudden change in character from the built-up confines of the settlement to the rural area.
39. The hedgerows along both sides of Wellington Road are substantial and contribute significantly to the sense that the area is distinctly rural immediately beyond the built-up area. Around 80m of hedgerow on the southern side of the road would be removed in order to facilitate the site access. A substantial proportion of hedgerow sits on top of a relatively high and steep bank. Therefore, the regrading that would be necessary to construct the access in combination with the introduction of additional white lining, other road markings and urbanising structures would create a heavily engineered and thus alien appearance to this part of Wellington Road. The proposed access would therefore appear as an urban intrusion into the rural area.
40. In forming this view, I have taken into account that the hedgerows are comprised of few species and thus, they are unlikely to be classed as 'important' for the purposes of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. However, that belies their contribution to the area's character and appearance and thus, their significant landscape value.
41. The harm I have described above would be added to by the effects of the proposed dwellings next to the access although I accept that they could be omitted from the development as part of a reserved matters application. However, this does not alter my overall findings of unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of Wellington Road.

42. To conclude on this main issue, although the site is not open to significant public views and I agree with the appellant that the landscape does not meet the high hurdle of a 'valued landscape' for the purposes of Framework paragraph 109, the proposal would nonetheless result in serious harm to character and appearance of the area.
43. Overall, I consider the effects of these environmental harms to be significant and demonstrable, thus bringing the proposal into conflict with WLP policy UD2 that requires development to accord with a number of design principles and with the broad design objectives of CS policy CS 15. These policies are in general alignment with the Framework requirement for good design and I afford them significant weight. The proposal would also conflict with the similar objectives of eLP policy BE1. After the Inquiry closed, the Schedule Main Modifications to the eLP was published and I took submissions from the main parties on this. Given that no changes are proposed to the wording of policy BE1, taking into account the advanced stage of the eLP and having regard to paragraph 216 of the Framework, I also give this policy significant weight.

Access to shops and services

44. CS policy CS9 requires development to promote sustainable forms of transport through providing improved accessibility by public transport, cycling and walking and minimising travel distances.
45. The distances from the site are agreed by the main parties. There are bus stops on Wellington Road within reasonable walking distance of all parts of the site. These would provide occupants with the option of regular public transport to higher order services in Telford centre, Stafford and Newport. As such, I am satisfied that the major centres would be accessible by a practical alternative to the car.
46. Moreover, access to the bus stops would be enhanced further by the creation of an access from the development to Wellington Road via the existing field track. Although currently the practicality of this link is affected by the lack of a footpath on the southern side of Wellington Road, at the Inquiry the appellant provided a letter⁴ from a neighbouring property owner confirming a willingness to allow the construction of a footpath on part of his land. I am therefore satisfied that this matter could be addressed by means of a negatively worded planning condition prohibiting development taking place until this specified action had been taken i.e. a *Grampian condition*.
47. Having said that, some of the other significant day-to-day services and facilities would be a substantial walking distance away. From the site access, Muxton Primary School would be almost 2km away and the walking route would be a very convoluted one. This would also be the case even with the secured use of the neighbour's land to create a satisfactory field track access. In my view, this would be likely to discourage walking in favour of the car, particularly during inclement weather.
48. In reality, I am not convinced that the occupants of the proposed development would opt to use public transport to access the shops and restaurants in the vicinity of the clocktower which are likely to be attractive to them and to which they would be likely to make relatively regular visits.

⁴ Inquiry Document AP2

49. Although in certain respects the proposal would perform better than the Muxton Lane site in terms of access to shops and services, the ways in which it would not are significant. Added to this is the fact that the proposed number of dwellings would be almost twice that proposed for the Muxton Lane site. Thus, it could reasonably be concluded that the number of trips generated would be significantly higher from the appeal site.
50. It was nevertheless put to me that a Grampian condition could be used to secure access from the development along either Nelson Way or Merrington Road or both. Planning Practice Guidance says that such conditions should not be used where there are no prospects at all of the action in question being performed within the time-limit imposed by the permission. I explored the possibility of this and the Council provided no prima facie case that there are 'no prospects' but neither has the appellant provided any substantive evidence to indicate otherwise. Given that I must make a judgement on all of the evidence – or indeed lack of it, I cannot reasonably conclude that the Nelson Way/Merrington Road accesses would be achievable in accordance with a Grampian condition.
51. Without either of these accesses, the degree of permeability between the proposed development and the existing urban area would be unacceptable and to my mind would lead to a level of car use at odds with policy CS9. I do not find this policy to be out of step with the Framework and therefore give it significant weight. I also give significant weight to the sustainable transport objectives contained within eLP policy C4, given that there is no evidence to indicate the existence of any unresolved objections to this policy within the Main Modifications process.

Affordable housing

52. CS policy CS7 requires 40% affordable housing in the rural area. However, this requirement has been superseded by the evidence base to the eLP and policy HO 5 seeks to apply a 35% figure in rural locations and 25% in within urban areas. The parties are in dispute over whether the development should attract the 35% rural or 25% urban affordable housing requirement although there is general agreement that the eLP figures are the ones that should be used.
53. It is clear that the Council's internal consultee accepted the provision of 25% affordable housing at application stage and it is this requirement the appellant seeks to apply. However, the Council made clear in its substantive evidence to me at the Inquiry that it seeks to apply the higher figure.
54. I have already acknowledged that on a policy definition, the site lies outside the urban area boundary and is thus within the rural area. I nonetheless note the appellant's arguments that the site is located immediately next to the boundary and the provision of affordable housing would therefore have a clear, direct relationship with urban Telford. However, for the reasons that follow, I am not convinced that the urban affordable housing requirement of 25% is the one that should be applied in this case.
55. The eLP distinguishes between only urban and rural areas. It does not apply different criterion to sites adjoining the urban edge. Whilst the eLP is not currently part of an adopted development plan, there is nothing before me to indicate that the Examining Inspector has concerns in respect of the emerging

affordable housing policies. Moreover, these policies align with the third bullet point of Framework paragraph 50. I therefore give them substantial weight.

56. The appellant drew my attention to the Priorslee Sustainable Urban Extension, which was approved with a 20% requirement. However, it is clear from the evidence⁵ that there were particular circumstances that led the Council to accept this level of provision, not least the additional off-site affordable housing contribution of c.£2m. In addition, the developer put forward a convincing case that the scheme would be unviable with the full level of on-site provision. I do not have any such viability evidence before me in this appeal.
57. For the above reasons, I consider it appropriate to apply the 35% requirement and the proposal would therefore run counter to eLP policy HO 5.

Planning Obligations

58. The appellant has submitted executed planning obligations by way of two separate Unilateral Undertakings (UUs). In addition to making provision for affordable housing, the first of these provides for contributions towards off-site recreation, primary and secondary education, traffic calming, highways and a Travel Plan. A second UU makes provision for a contribution towards policing equipment and premises.
59. However, these contributions would have only mitigated the effects of the development and thus, they are neutral factors that could not be weighed in favour of the development in the planning balance. As I am dismissing the appeal for other substantive reasons, I do not consider these obligations further. I have already considered the matter of affordable housing and found the level of provision set out in the UU would not accord with eLP policy HO 5.

Other Matters

Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land

60. The proposal would result in the loss of agricultural land of grades 2 and 3b. Grade 2 falls within the BMV category and paragraph 112 of the Framework says that local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of such land. Much of the land around Telford is good grade agricultural land and the Council has accepted some loss with in relation to the H1 and H2 sites along with an area of land around Newport. Although the Council does not consider the loss of BMV land to be determinative in this appeal, it considers it to be a further indicator of the proposal's general unsuitability. However, whilst I agree with the Council, the loss of BMV agricultural land would be modest and localised.

Planning Balance and conclusion

61. For the proposal to be acceptable for the purposes of Framework paragraph 14, it must accord with the principles of sustainable development set out therein. There would be some benefits from the economic uplift associated with the construction of the development and the residual support for local businesses following its occupation and this attracts considerable weight.
62. In terms of a social role, whilst I accept that the existence of a 5 Year HLS does not place a ceiling on development, I have not found that relevant

⁵ Core Document 17.1

development plan policies for the supply of housing are currently failing to achieve the objectives of Framework paragraph 47 which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. I have had regard to the findings of the Inspector in the *Kestrel Close* appeal⁶ who in calculating the HLS figure considered that even though it is on the cusp of the 5 year threshold, it is very much a worst case position. Thus, the existence of a 5 year HLS greatly limits the weight that I give to the proposal's social benefit in terms of increasing the supply of housing. Moreover, the proposal would fall short of providing the appropriate level of affordable housing. Thus, there is no benefit from this aspect of the scheme that might otherwise weigh in its favour.

63. In terms of harm lying with the environmental side, the limited links to the adjoining urban area and the reliance in some respects on private motorised transport points to an overall unsustainable access to shops and services thereby weighing heavily against the scheme. Also weighing heavily against the scheme is the significant and demonstrable environmental harm to the area's character and appearance.
64. In terms of BMV agricultural land, I am satisfied that the economic benefits of the development are sufficient to outweigh any harm. Therefore on balance, the proposal would not run counter to the Framework in respect of BMV agricultural land.
65. Taking all of the above into account, whilst the proposal would have some economic benefits, the weight this attracts would in my view be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse impacts, when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. As such, the Framework does not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the Development Plan.
66. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, including those by interested parties, the appeal does not succeed.

Hayden Baugh-Jones

Inspector

APPEARANCES

⁶ APP/C3240/W/16/3144445

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Miss Sarah Clover, of Counsel

Kings Chambers
Instructed by Mrs Eileen Griffin,
Solicitor, Telford and Wrekin Council

She called:

Ms Katherine Stephens
BSc(Hons), MA Town
Planning, PGDip Urban
Design, MRTPI

Team Leader, Development
Management, Telford and Wrekin
Council

Mr Douglas Harman
MLPM, CMLI

Douglas Harman Landscape
Planning

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr David Manley, of Queens Counsel

Kings Chambers
Instructed by Grant Anderson

He called:

Mr Clive Self
DipLA, CMLI, MA (Urban
Des)

CSA Environmental

Mr Allan Mendelsohn
MSc(Hons), MIHT, MCIT

ADL Transportation

Mr Andrew Williams
DipTP, MRTPI

Advance Land and Planning

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Miss Jenny Urey

Local resident

Mr Phillip Loughlin

Representing Muxton residents

Mr Stephen Devereux

Local resident

Mr Kevin Brace

Representing Campaign Against the
Overdevelopment of Muxton

Mr Dick Raynsford

Donnington and Muxton Parish
Council

Mr Ken Oldfield

Local resident

Mrs Maureen Leavey

Local resident

Mrs Jean Taylor	Local resident
Mrs Judith Nelson	Local resident
Brian Taylor	Local resident
Miss Nina Pindham	No5 Chambers Instructed by Ms Caroline Gutteridge, Solicitor, Warwickshire County Council Representing West Mercia Police
Mr Andrew Morgan	Place Partnership Representing West Mercia Police

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

Documents submitted by the appellant

- AP1 Appellant's opening notes
- AP2 Letter from Mr DelManso in relation to land purchase
- AP3 Landscape Advice from Mr Harman to Telford and Wrekin Council in relation to the H1 site including plans annotated by appellant
- AP4 Letter from David Wilson Homes in relation to Land off Fieldhouse Drive
- AP6 Proposed Right Turn Access Arrangements Drawing No T0129-02 rev H-1
- AP6 Signed, dated Planning Obligation (7 June 2017)
- AP7 Appellant's closing submissions
- AP8 Signed, dated Planning Obligation (12 July 2017)

Documents submitted by the local planning authority

- LPA1 Opening on Behalf of Telford and Wrekin Council
- LPA2 Plan showing appeal site and suggested walking routes for site visit
- LPA3 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 Compliance Statement
- LPA4 Email from Telford and Wrekin Council in relation to cost breakdown of highways works
- LPA5 Closing on Behalf of Telford and Wrekin Council

Documents submitted by interested parties

- IP1 Appeal Statement from Miss Urey
- IP2 Letter from Mr and Mrs Taylor, residents of 20 Nelson Way
- IP3 News item in relation to residents' views on homes plan
- IP4 Appeal Statement from Mr Loughlin
- IP5 Appeal Statement from Mr Devereux
- IP6 Appeal Statement from Mr Brian Taylor
- IP7a Web page information relating to Lilleshall Neighbourhood Plan consultation
- IP7b Web page information relating to Donnington and Muxton Neighbourhood Plan consultation

Other documents (submitted jointly by the main parties)

- ID1 Agreed list of planning conditions
- ID2 Additional Grampian planning condition relating to accesses via Nelson Way and Merrington Road