



Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened on 3 August 2010

Site visit made on 4 August 2010

by **Isobel McCretton BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

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

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Decision date:
5 April 2011**

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/A/10/2124491

Land off East Lane, Stainforth DN7 5TZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by conditions of a planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Waystone Ltd/AvVail (UK) Ltd against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref.09/1658/REMM, dated 8 July 2009, sought approval of details pursuant to conditions Nos. 4, 37 and 38 of planning permission Ref. 02/1402/FULA, granted on 18 July 2003 and extended by permission 06/00641/WCC dated 8 June 2006.
- The application was refused by notice dated 25 November 2009.
- The development proposed is a mixed use development of Hatfield Colliery Power Park, including environmental improvement and a business cluster of clean coal technology power generation industrial uses and coal mining operations.
- The details for which approval is sought are: access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, and details pursuant to condition 37 (final layout including road layout, parking areas, building locations and internal landscaping) and condition 38 (traffic position statement).

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and approve details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, details pursuant to condition 37 (final layout including road layout, parking areas, building locations and internal landscaping) and condition 38 (traffic position statement), submitted pursuant to planning permission Ref. 02/1402/FULA, granted on 18 July 2003 and extended by permission 06/00641/WCC dated 8 June 2006 in accordance with the application Ref.09/1658/REMM, dated 8 July 2009, subject to the conditions set out in Annex A to this decision.

Procedural Matters

2. Following additional information received from the appellants' noise consultants in April 2010, the Council reassessed its position and decided that it was satisfied with the submitted noise assessment in relation to BS4142¹. As a result the Council withdrew its opposition to the proposal and did not offer further evidence at the Inquiry other than with regard to conditions.

¹ British Standard BS4142: Method for Rating Industrial Noise Affecting Mixed Residential and Industrial Areas (1997)

3. The 2003 permission was renewed in 2006 (ref. 06/00641/WCC) and an extension of the period of time for the submission of reserved matters to July 2009 was given in relation to the mixed use B1/B2 element.
4. The appeal application is for Phase I of the Power Park and is for a waste reception and materials recycling facility (MRF) comprising a waste receiving hall, processing hall, recycling hall, associated plant (including sprinkler tanks and thermal oxidisers with associated discharge stack), 2 gatehouses, vehicle repair workshop, store and yard offices and parking and manoeuvring areas. The Council accepts that such a use falls within the scope of the outline permission which included B1 and B2 industrial uses. This appeal concerns reserved matters and the discharge of conditions. Despite the continued objection of local residents, the principle of the development has been established and my ability to impose further conditions is limited.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance, and the effect on the local road network and highway safety.

Reasons

6. The appeal site, lying approximately 1.5km north of the residential area of Hatfield and adjacent to the residential area of Stainforth, comprises an area of reclaimed land which was formerly part of the Hatfield Colliery. It is a level platform which has been engineered from tipped colliery spoil to enable development for industrial use. To the southeast a working colliery remains, and consent has been granted² for a 900MW coal fired power station. To the east of the site is Junction 5 of the M18.
7. The MRF is designed to process up to 400,000 tonnes/annum of municipal solid waste, together with commercial and industrial waste and demolition and construction waste. The material, not comprising hazardous waste, would be delivered to the facility by lorry and deposited in the main building. After initial sorting to remove oversized items, it would be loaded into autoclaves to be steam treated to produce sanitised recyclates and a solid recovered fuel (SRF). Segregation would then take place to retrieve over 90% of the recyclates (e.g. glass, plastic and metals) which would be removed from the site for reprocessing. The remaining SRF would be transferred to a proposed neighbouring sustainable energy generation plant for use as fuel in the boilers but, until such time as a separate planning application has been submitted and approved for such a plant, the material would be transported off-site to other end users. Although of concern to local residents, this energy plant forms no part of the reserved matters for consideration in this appeal.

Noise and Disturbance

8. The dwellings whose occupiers would be most likely to be affected by noise from the proposed development are those in Beech Crescent, around 114 metres to the north of the site, and Bootham Crescent, about 203 metres to the west. A large bund, up to 15 metres higher than the surrounding land, has

² Granted 5/2/09 under s36 of the Electricity Act 1989.

already been constructed around the site to shield the residential area. The access road to the MRF would run around the western and northern edges of the site at the foot of this bund giving access to the staff/visitors car park and to the manoeuvring yard where the waste would be received into the building. The vehicle access doors would be on the opposite side of the building from the residential properties, with the nearest vehicle access door some 202 metres from the nearest house.

9. As far as the building is concerned, Kingspan panels would be used with additional acoustic lining where necessary. The building would be under negative pressure, with air being extracted to external thermal oxidisers on the north-western elevation. Air intake louvres would be on the south-western and north-eastern elevations, and there would also be external air handling units, coolers and boiler flues. The potential impact of the use of the building and mechanical services plant has been assessed against measured background noise levels as advised in BS4142, the methodology first having been agreed with the Council. Three locations were used: adjoining properties on Beech Crescent, the car park off Beech Crescent at the rear of properties in Coronation Road and next to properties on Bootham Crescent. The main source of background noise was found to be traffic on local roads and the lowest ambient and background noise levels recorded at each location were then used as the basis for the assessment.
10. It was agreed with the Council that in order for the development to be acceptable, the sum of noise breakout from the building and noise from all external plant (L_{Aeq})³ should not exceed the marginal significance level given in BS4142 i.e. that the 'rating level' should be no higher than +5dB above the background noise level (L_{A90})⁴. If the rating level were to exceed the L_{A90} background noise level by 10dB or more, then complaints would be likely.
11. The evidence here suggests that, with suitable attenuation measures in place, noise from the fixed plant, within and outside the building, would be of marginal significance (measured as +1dB at Bootham Crescent and +3dB at Beech Crescent) based on the lowest night time background levels (02.00 – 04.00 hours) of 32dB and 30dB respectively. Such attenuation is a matter which could be secured by a suitably worded condition.
12. The appellants did not object in principle to the imposition of noise controls. Rather, the main dispute at the Inquiry was whether or not the noise from HGVs, addressed separately by the appellants, should be included in the BS4142 noise calculation or whether other assessments were more appropriate.
13. Calculations for the predicted noise from the access road were based on 'sound exposure level' (SEL) measurements made of similar vehicle movements taken at other sites. The overall noise level was calculated with a formula based on the number of lorries and the SEL during various time periods to give the equivalent continuous noise level, the L_{Aeq} figure. It was calculated that the

³ L_{Aeq} is the A-weighted equivalent continuous sound level which is an average of the total sound energy measured over a specified time period i.e. the level of continuous noise which has the same total A-weighted energy as the real fluctuating noise measured over the same time period. (A-weighting is achieved by an electronic filter on sound level meters that replicates the frequency response of the human ear)

⁴ L_{A90} is the A-weighted sound level exceeded for 90% of the time period – used as a measure of background noise

noise from the access road would result in no more than a 2.6dBA increase in the ambient noise levels during the evening noise survey period (this period being taken as the quietest period during daytime⁵ working hours) and an increase in the ambient noise level of up to 3dBA in the 06.00 – 07.00 hours and 23.00 – 06.00 hours periods. A 3dBA increase is only just perceptible.

14. However such measurements average out the figures and it is the spikes in noise which are likely to be disturbing to residents, especially at night. The appellants maintained that the guideline noise levels set out in PPG24⁶, BS8233⁷ and guidelines from the World Health Organisation (WHO) are the correct standards to use with regard to noise from HGVs on the proposed access road. The commonly used criteria are non-exceedence of daytime noise levels of 50-55 dBL_{Aeq(16hours)} outside residential properties and internal noise levels of between 30 dBL_{Aeq(8hours)} and 45dBL_{Amax}⁸ in bedrooms at night. It is accepted that an open window gives attenuation of 10-15 dBA, corresponding to external noise levels of around 40-45 dBL_{Aeq} and 55-60dBL_{Amax}.
15. The appellants calculate that the maximum noise levels from the HGVs on the access road could be expected to be up to 79dBL_{Amax}, at a distance of 10m, which equates to 48dBL_{Amax} at the nearest noise sensitive locations. The existing maximum noise levels recorded at these locations during the survey were 47-78dBL_{Amax} during the daytime, 46-71dBL_{Amax} between 06.00-07.00 hours and 41-68dBL_{Amax} in the 23.00-0600 hours period. This suggests that the maximum levels from the HGVs would be at the lower end of the range of existing maximum noise levels during the night time. It is claimed that, as these types of maxima are already experienced in this area, the development would not result in a material change in the noise climate, and that the extra HGV movements on the access road would not cause any significant disturbance.
16. Similarly, it is argued that, as the manoeuvring yard would be shielded by the proposed building, and no unloading/unloading would take place outside, the noise from vehicles in the yard, including reversing alarms, would also be below the lowest ambient noise levels.
17. This approach was challenged on behalf of the residents. It was argued that the noise on the access road would be part of the overall industrial noise emanating from the site and, as such, should be part of the BS4142 assessment, added to noise from the building and plant. The appellants contended that this was not logical as the noise from the lorries did not change in any way once the boundary of the application site was crossed, and therefore it should still be regarded as 'traffic' rather than 'industrial' noise. Previous appeal decisions were cited where Inspectors had taken differing views on this approach, the balance of the cases put forward favouring the appellants' view. However it seems to me that the detailed site circumstances and the nature of the proposed use are the determining factors. In this case I have some sympathy for the view that the HGV noise should be included in the industrial noise assessment; the reasons for this are as follows.

⁵ Based on the advice in PPG24 it is customary to consider 'daytime' as 07.00 -23.00 hours and night time as 23.00 – 07.00 hours

⁶ Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise (PPG24)

⁷ British Standard BS8233:1999 - Code of practice for sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings (BS8233)

⁸ L_{Amax} is the maximum A-weighted sound level that was recorded during the monitoring period

18. For the most part there would only be lorries travelling along the northern perimeter and into the yard, not mixed traffic. At this point drivers would be changing gear and braking before entering the yard or accelerating away so that the noise at that point would not be from a steady flow of traffic. While most deliveries and collections would be made during the daytime, the appellants are allowing for night time lorry movements with a distinct rise in the number of movements in the 06.00 – 07.00 hours period which, in terms of PPG24, is still night time. Moreover, the noise levels advised in BS8233 are partly based on the fact that, in general, traffic noise is an anonymous noise source and it is recognised that people are likely to tolerate higher levels of anonymous noise. Here, however, the HGV noise on the haul road would be perceived as being as specific as the noise from plant and machinery at the site. I therefore believe that it should be included in the BS4142 evaluation.
19. During the Inquiry the appellants calculated the effect of a cantilevered noise barrier along the access road as part of a BS4142 assessment which included HGV noise. I note that this also included a revised barrier and distance correction for the yard which, it seems, had been previously overestimated. The result is that, at the nearest residential property (Beech Crescent) the noise from the site would be less than +5dBA above background (i.e. of marginal significance). The only exception to this would be during the 23.00 – 06.00 period when the noise would be +6dBA above background. However this could be reduced to +5dBA by a small amount of additional attenuation to fixed plant; again this is a matter which could be controlled by condition.
20. Although concern was expressed that calculations have not been included for noise when the yard doors are open, I am not convinced that this would be a significant problem. The doors are completely screened from the nearby residential properties by the building which, in any event, would be kept under negative pressure, and the lorries themselves would fill much of the opening.
21. Overall, with the additional barrier in place along the haul road, I consider that there would not be an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the nearby residents in terms of noise and disturbance and the proposal would not conflict with UDP policy EMP17 in this regard.

Lorry Movements and the Road Network

22. In addition to the issue of noise from lorries within the site, concern was expressed about the impact of lorries on the local road network, both in terms of highway capacity and safety and on the living conditions of residents in the wider area.
23. As part of Phase II of the Power Park, it is proposed to construct a new link road to Junction 5 of the M18. This link would provide access to the MRF for all lorries except those carrying material from the local Hatfield/Stainforth area. It is expected that the proposed MRF would take around 2 years to build and that the link road would be delivered in 3-4 years. The link is not being funded solely by the appellants and the exact timescale for delivery is open to question, but it was stated at the Inquiry that the development of the MRF would provide the funding to commence the design and procurement of this link road.

24. As envisaged when the outline permission was granted, until the construction of the M18 link, traffic to and from the site would use the local road network. There is no substantiated evidence that there are capacity issues. The local roads which would be included in the Traffic Routing Agreement (TRA) are classed by The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) as either Urban All Purpose 3 (a variable standard road carrying mixed traffic with frontage access, side roads, bus stops and at-grade pedestrian crossings) or UAP4 (busy high street carrying predominantly local traffic with frontage activity including loading and unloading). A survey showed that the current traffic flows on the local roads are comfortably within the ranges identified in the DMRB. Taking a worst case of the busiest hour, and also assuming a shift changeover within this hour, at most the flows would be just over 70% of the road capacity for even the narrowest of the local roads identified in a proposed lorry routing plan.
25. Analysis of road accidents along the routes to and from the site shows that there are no specific road safety issues: there have been relatively few accidents, there is a downward trend in incidents and those which have taken place have not involved HGVs. Moreover, despite the concerns of local residents, the identified routes for HGVs would not pass Hatfield Travis Nursery and Infants School or schools on Kirton Lane.
26. Although residents consider the use of the local network unsuitable, as I have already indicated, the use of the local road network by HGV traffic is a matter that was considered when outline planning permission was granted for the mixed use development. The original planning application, supported by a Transport Assessment, was granted permission subject to a S106 Agreement. That Agreement, with which the appellants must comply, included a requirement for the prior approval of a Heavy Goods Vehicle Management Plan (HGVM) which, among other things, would restrict the hours during which material could be exported from the site. However, the permission placed no other limit on operating hours. Thus the principle of allowing the existing road network to be used for night-time deliveries to the site has already been established.
27. The appellants have submitted a Unilateral Undertaking to seek approval for a TRA from the Council substantially in line with that shown in the Transport Statement submitted with the appeal. The Undertaking also provides for an updated Travel Plan which would aim to reduce the use of the private car for journeys to work by staff. I consider that the submitted Undertaking is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development and is fairly and related in scale and kind. As such it accords with the tests for planning obligations set out in Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
28. The plant would operate using 3 shifts/day, 7 days/week, though deliveries of waste and exports of recyclates would, for the most part, occur within an 8-hour daytime period, and generally be between 06.00 and 23.00, with only occasional movements during the 23.00 – 06.00 period. When compared with the unspecified B1/B2 uses which were considered at outline stage the proposed MRF would result in a slight increase in HGV traffic (from 266 vehicles/day to 296/day or from 34 to 38/hour), but there would be an overall decrease in predicted traffic movements to and from the site during the critical

morning and evening peak periods. On this basis, the Highway Authority agreed that there would be a lesser impact on the local highway network than that envisaged by the outline permission. The traffic generated would include slightly more HGVs, but the proposal would have the benefit over general employment use in that most staff trips and HGV movements would not be concentrated at peak periods and there would be more certainty over future trip generation, given the limit on the amount of waste to be processed.

29. Thus in terms of a Traffic Position Statement as required by condition 38, I consider that the proposal before me would not have a materially greater impact on the local road network in terms of traffic generation and safety, and thus noise and disturbance to residents in the wider area, than that which has already been established through granting outline planning permission for the development.

Other Matters

30. The MRF building would be around 24 metres high to the ridge of a wave-form roof and 16 metres to the eaves. It would have a steel frame structure and be covered with a mixture of flat panel and profiled cladding to break up the building's outline, the colours being grey tones to matching the prevailing sky colour and so minimise its visual impact. The Council has raised no objection to the design and external appearance of the building and I have no reason to disagree. Although a large structure, which would have 2 exhaust stacks of 40 and 50 metres in height, views of it from the adjoining residential area would be partly obscured by the surrounding bund, and the 'wave form' design of the roof and the colour of the materials would soften the impact on the skyline. Tree planting and landscaping would provide an overall environmental enhancement, though more detailed planting plans should be submitted for approval. I therefore find that the design, external appearance and landscaping of the proposed development are acceptable and would not conflict with UDP⁹ policy 52.
31. Amongst the various measures which would be taken to minimise odour emissions, all waste would be delivered in sealed and covered vehicles and acceptance would be within the building which would be kept under negative pressure with fast acting roller shutter doors. On that basis I am satisfied that the living conditions of local residents would not be harmed unduly.
32. Concern was expressed by local residents about the fire hazard represented by the proposal because of the range of waste material which would be accepted at the site and the processes for dealing with it. Examples were cited of major incidents at other MRFs in recent times. While it could not be guaranteed that a fire would not occur, this would be a modern plant with up to date fire prevention systems. Neither the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service nor the Health and Safety Executive have raised concerns in this regard, and the stringent requirements of both fire prevention and health and safety legislation would have to be met before the plant could operate. There is no substantiated evidence that the proposed plant would represent an unacceptable risk to the local population as a fire hazard.

⁹ Doncaster Unitary Development Plan (1998) (UDP). The policies cited have been saved under the terms of a Direction pursuant to paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

33. Similarly PPS23¹⁰ states that the planning and pollution control systems are separate but complementary, and that planning authorities should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. Thus matters relating to emissions would be for consideration and regulation through the necessary Environmental Permit. Again, there is no substantiated evidence to suggest that likely emissions from the plant would be a reason to withhold planning permission.
34. At the Inquiry residents argued that this facility would result in job losses in local authority waste collection services. There is no conclusive evidence before me on this matter. However it is clear that, overall, the project would result in increased job opportunities in the area and represent a major regeneration scheme.

Conditions

35. I have considered the need for conditions in the light of the advice in Circular 11/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions* and those discussed at the Inquiry. As stated above the appeal concerns reserved matters and discharge of conditions and so any conditions imposed must stem directly from those matters.
36. Otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
37. In the interest of the appearance of the development it is necessary to require that further details of the proposed landscaping and ecological enhancement are submitted and approved before development begins.
38. As accepted at the Inquiry, to accord with the Council's requirement for sustainable construction it is reasonable to request a report detailing how the predicted carbon emissions from the site will be reduced by 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy equipment. (This will include further details of the proposal for photovoltaic cells).
39. To protect the living conditions of nearby residents it is necessary to require a Construction Management Plan. It is also necessary to require further details of sound insulation and mitigation. In view of the fact that I have found that noise from HGVs on the haul road should be included in the BS4142 assessment I shall impose a condition to restrict the level of noise emissions from the site so that it is not more than +5dB above existing background noise levels at the nearest residential properties in Bootham Crescent and Beech Crescent i.e. a maximum of 37dB and 35dB.
40. A condition regarding lighting is unnecessary because, as the Council pointed out at the Inquiry, it is already imposed through the outline permission.
41. I do not consider that it would be reasonable to impose a condition regarding hours for deliveries etc. prior to the construction of the M18 link road as this would go to the heart of matters already established by the granting of permission for the mixed use development.

¹⁰ Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (2004) (PPS23)

Conclusion

42. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Isobel McCretton

INSPECTOR

ANNEX A – Schedule of Conditions.

- 1) Otherwise than as required by other conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: R57-08-P1, R57-08-P2D, R57-08-P3B, R57-08-P4, R57-08-P5B, R57-08-P6, R57-08-P7A, R57-08-P8B, R57-08-P9B, R57-08-P10B.
- 2) Prior to the commencement of development further details of landscaping, planting and ecological enhancement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The particulars shall include details of species (including species rich grassland), planting distances and bird and bat boxes, together with a programme of planting. Planting is to be carried out in the first available planting season after the commencement of development and shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the local planning authority's document '*Landscape Specification in Relation to Development Sites*'. Any tree or shrub planted as part of the scheme which is removed or severely damaged or is found to be dying or seriously diseased within five years of planting, shall be replaced within the next available planting season with a tree or shrub of a similar size and species.
- 3) Prior to the commencement of works on site a report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority identifying how the predicted CO₂ emissions from the development will be reduced by at least 10% through the use of on-site renewable energy equipment. The carbon savings which result from this shall be above and beyond what is required to comply with Part L of the Building Regulations. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved report and the equipment shall be put in place before the building is first brought into use and shall thereafter be retained.
- 4) No development shall take place until a Construction Impact Management Plan, indicating measures to be taken to mitigate the effects of construction activity and associated vehicle movements upon the living conditions of the neighbouring residents and upon highway safety, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan.
- 5) Prior to the use of the Materials Recycling Facility, details of a scheme of noise insulation and mitigation, which shall include provision of an additional noise barrier alongside the access road, shall be submitted to and approved

in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 6) The rating level of noise emitted from vehicles and operations on the site shall not exceed 37dB at the nearest property in Bootham Crescent or 35dB at the nearest property in Beech Crescent when assessed according to the BS4142 Method of Rating Industrial Noise Affecting Mixed Residential and Industrial Areas (1997).
- 7) During operations at the Materials Recycling Facility, all windows in the building shall remain closed and an alternative means of ventilation shall be provided.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Peter Taylor He called:	Solicitor, partner DLA Piper
Ian Prosser DipTP, MRTPI	Planning Consultant
Daniel Godfrey MSc, MA, MCIHT, MILT, TPP	Senior Transport Planner, Scott Wilson Transport Consultancy
Peter Hepworth BSc FIOA	Managing Director, Hepworth Acoustics
Paul Leonard MCIAT, MAPS	Director, HB Architects Ltd

FOR RESIDENTS AGAINST INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPEMENT (RAID)

Martin Wraith	Chair, RAID
Chris Skelton They called:	Secretary, RAID
Richard Watson BSc, CEng, MIA, MAES, MIEEE	Partner, Blue Tree Acoustics

INTERESTED PERSONS:

David Owen	BNP Town Councillor for Stainforth
Mr Larner	Local Resident
Mrs Rowan	Local Resident
Mr Naggs	Local Resident
Nic Burne	Local Resident
Sylvie Davies	Local Resident
Mr McCloughlin	Managing Director, Waystone

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY:

Documents Submitted by the Appellants

Document 1 RW Plant and Hampshire CC [2009] PAD

- Document 2 Cherwell DC and Stagecoach Oxford [2009] PAD
- Document 3 Blue Tree Acoustics: Noise Assessments Report for Proposed Use of Units 65-67 St Thomas' Road Huddersfield by VTL Holdings Ltd
- Document 4 24Acoustics Noise: Impact Assessment for Proposed Retail Units, Worting Road, Basingstoke
- Document 5 Revised Hatfield Noise Predictions
- Document 6 Unilateral Undertaking dated 4/8/10
- Document 7 List of Conditions
- Document 8 Letter from NatWest to Waystone Ltd dated 29/07/10
- Document 9 Letter from Franklins Solicitors LLP to DMBC dated 30/7/10

Documents Submitted by RAID

- Document 10 Noise Report for Immingham Distribution Facility
- Document 11 Noise Assessment for Proposed Renewable Energy Plant Selby
- Document 12 Appeal decision APP/Q2500/C/07/2039818

Documents Submitted by Other Parties

- Document 13 Extracts from Mailonline and Parliament Early Day Motions submitted by Mr Owen
- Document 14 S106 Agreement dated 18/7/03 accompanying original planning application submitted by the Council

DRAWINGS:

- A1-10 Drawings submitted with the planning application (R57-08-P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10) (included at Tab 5 of appellants' supporting documents)
- B1-7 Amended drawings (R57:08:P2D, P3B, P5B, P7A, P8B, P9B, P10B) (included at Tab 10 of appellants' supporting documents)