

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

Site Location & JVH ref.	JVH Delivery	JVH Comment	Council Delivery	Council comment
1 Land at Lightmoor Village	0	Delays regarding site disposal to the market Will result in non-delivery in 5 years.	100	Site is considered deliverable, given willing landowner intends to bring forward the site for development. Insufficient to demonstrate the site is undeliverable.
2 Land at Lawley Village	266	Reserved matters application indicates 266 Dwellings	267	Reserved matters consent has been granted for 267 dwellings.
4 Red Hill Clay Pit	0	No developer for this site and no known interest ; will require a new application before it can proceed.	120	Insufficient evidence submitted by appellant to demonstrate the site is undeliverable.
5 Alexandra Road Wellington	0	No developer interest despite marketing since 2013.	18	Insufficient evidence submitted to demonstrate that the site is undeliverable, given the 'in principle' acceptance of development. Still time for a planning application to be submitted for relatively modest development up to April 2021.
6 Off Peregrine Way	76	Realistic Delivery rates indicate delivery after 2018.	100	Conversation with Kier (18 <sup>th</sup> November 2016), who intend to purchase the site from HCA, confirmed intention to start on site during summer 2017, subject to RM approval, with a two-year build out period.
7 North and East of Aston Road Newport	102	Realistic Delivery rates indicate delivery after 2018.	136	No reason to suggest the site is not deliverable in full by April 2021
9 Beech Road Iron bridge	0	The existing user confirms that the project is not proceeding in the next 5 years	90	No evidence to confirm that no development is to take place by end of March 2021.
10 Stafford Road Oaken gates	0	No developer interest , no reserved matters	14	Whilst activity may be slow at this time, still sufficient time for the site to be acquired and brought forward by 2021 given permission in outline (all matters reserved) has already been issued, confirming 'in principle' support for development.

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

				The outline will expire in more than a years time (13 <sup>th</sup> December 2017). Landowner seeking to progress the site.
12 Land at Arleston	20	The existing reserved matters will deliver only 20 Dwellings. No new permission likely for a scheme with no-extra care.	95	A subsequent full application has now been submitted by Redrow Homes in November 2016 (not validated at time of writing) which includes a mix of homes and extra care provision. This would appear to contradict the previous application (TWC/2015/0840) which did not include any extra care housing (ECH). Clearly, the applicant wishes to progress the site. There now appears to be some of the uncertainty regarding the triggers relating to construction of the extra care facility. Consequently, the 20 dwellings planned to be built out by April 2021 under TWC/2015/0836, prior to construction of the ECH element, may not now be implemented.
13 Priorslee East	18	Only Parcel D is subject to a Reserved matters application, remainder is delayed due to uncertain site disposal.	160	HCA is close to appointing a preferred developer for plots E and F (c.8 hectares). The plots are being progressed through the Telford Land Deal. It is anticipated that the plots will be built out at a total of 220 dwellings (c.27.5 dph). Given that some site preparation has already taken place, including the provision for access between and onto the various plots, it is also anticipated that a reserved matters planning application will be submitted by April 2017. A target date of September 2017 has been set for consent to be secured. The total housing to be delivered on plots D3, E and F will be 245 dwellings. This includes provision for 25 dwellings on plot D3, confirmed by TWC Property Service on 22 <sup>nd</sup> November 2016. The remaining plots (J1 and J2) will

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

				be brought forward via 'Direct Commissioning', a central government initiative established to accelerate housing delivery. Therefore, no reason to suspect the site could not come forward by 2021 as envisaged.
14 Doseley Works	35	Site will not deliver under last year due to vacation of the existing uses and demolition and remediation.	100	Accept that a sitting tenant may influence the timing of any start on this phase of the larger site. However, not aware that any arrangements have been agreed and confirmed between the relevant parties. The view expressed by the appellant is therefore speculative and cannot be relied upon until such details are known.
15 Camping Centre	0	No developer interest no reserved matters	14	A conversation with the agent for the current outline application (Mr M Cheadle) on 14 <sup>th</sup> November 2016, confirmed that the applicant will be pursuing a resubmission that will supersede the original outline consent. This provides clear evidence of a firm intention to progress the site for development.
16 Hinkshay Road Dawley	0	Highly contaminated battery site , not being marketed, no developer owners confirm unlikely to deliver in 5 years	80	Following a conversation with new site owners (Countrywide Properties) on 16 <sup>th</sup> November 2016 it is their intention to submit a reserved matters application before Christmas 2016. Countrywide Properties expect to accelerate delivery to c.70 dpa. Even if an allowance of up to 12 months is made for registration and approval of the RM application before a start on site, there is clearly sufficient time to deliver 80 units by 2021.
17 Castle way Priorslee	0	Site not being marketed ,no developer, no Reserved matters, no delivery in 5 years.	80	The agent (Harris Lamb) confirmed on 14 <sup>th</sup> November 2016 that the client has instructed them to progress a reserved matters application, to be submitted prior to the expiry of the outline in March 2017. Even if an allowance of up to 12 months is

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

				made to allow for registration and approval of the RM application before a start on site, there is sufficient time to deliver 80 units by 2021.
18 Moorfield Way Church Aston	4	Current approval not being implemented and new scheme for 4 dwellings only.	4	Agreed
20 Grange Park Primary School	0	No reserved matters, no marketing no developer.	37	For information, I am aware that the site has been sold subject to contract (SSC). The fact that no developer exists does not automatically mean the site is not deliverable. Insufficient evidence submitted by appellant to demonstrate the site undeliverable by 2021.
21 Gower Street	0	No willing developer after marketing of the site	10	The application is still extant, and will expire in April 2017. Insufficient evidence submitted by appellant to demonstrate the site undeliverable by 2021.
22 Wellington Road Horsehay	0	No willing developer, after marketing of the site	23	The application is still extant, and will expire in April 2017. Insufficient evidence submitted by appellant to demonstrate the site undeliverable by 2021.
26 Cheshire Cheese Pub.	0	There are unresolved title issues which cannot be resolved.	13	TWC aware that there are legal measures that can be taken to resolve matters as 'Title defects' such as described in appellant's evidence. This is known as 'Title Indemnity Insurance'.
27 Maxwell Site Shawbirch	0	PP allows 7 years for the submission of reserved matters. Buildings on the site currently occupied by owners . No marketing ; no developer.	160	There has been strong interest in bringing forward this site for development. There are no constraints that prevent the site from being progressed should a developer come forward. Planning permission remains extant.

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

28 Mill Lane Tibberton	20	Deliver based on delivery and build out rates.	22	NEW SITE - Insufficient evidence submitted by appellant to demonstrate the site is undeliverable by 2021.
29 Dairy Crest Crudington	58	Site marketed but no developer, no reserved matters. Delivery after 2019.	111	TWC aware that there is currently interest from a national house builder in taking forward the site. Even if an allowance of 6 months is made for the sale of the site and a further 12 months between registration of a reserved matters application and start on site, there would still be approx. 3 years to allow for full build out at 36 dpa. No evidence that only 58 dwellings could be delivered by 2021.
30 Garfield Road	0	Agent confirms non delivery in five years	45	No evidence that 45 dwellings could not be delivered by 2021, even if a new planning application was submitted, given the existing 'in principle' support for residential development.
31 Audley Avenue Newport	58	Site to be marketed after PP issued. Deliver timetable and delivery rate indicates delivery after 2019.	120	TWC expectation is that s106 will be signed before end of November 2016. No other impediments preventing development within next five years. Once the site is sold the new owner (most likely to be a national builder) can progress the site to reserved matters stage. Assumed that site will start in 2018 and deliver at 40 dpa.
32 Former Swan Centre.	0	Highway constraint on development No developer No reserved matters	28	Landowner (TWC) anticipates site will be released onto the market in summer of 2017 following rebuilding of Grange Park School on adjacent land. Insufficient evidence submitted by appellant to demonstrate the site undeliverable by 2021

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

34 British Sugar	0	PP allows 5 years for the submission of reserved matters. Complex permission , no developer Long delivery period.	50	Appellant has not presented any evidence that the site is not deliverable up to 2021. Landowner is actively seeking to market the site for the intended use.
35 Priorslee East	102	No PP issued, anticipated long lead in time, Delivery based on lead in times and delivery rates.	150	<p>The appellant assumes a lower build out rate (35dpa) than TWC and suggests dwellings would be delivered at the start of May 2018. For information, the s106 has now been signed and consent issued (26<sup>th</sup> October 2016) and a house builder is progressing the site. TWC assumption is 50 dpa with completions coming forward over three of the five year period.</p> <p>Conversation with Julie Morgan (23<sup>rd</sup> November 2016) from the developer (Miller Homes) confirmed they would be assuming a build out rate of 50dpa based on 'national standards' from one outlet. However, MH also confirmed that they were considering having two outlets on site. This could result in overall delivery being in the range of 75 to 100 dpa. Ms Morgan also stated that MH were assuming that RM application would be submitted within 12 months. Assuming 3-6 months to secure the RM consent, this would suggest delivery would begin in 2018, and potentially on site within the 2017/18 period.</p>
36 Former Sutherland School	58	No developer interest , not being marketed, Delivery based on lead in time and delivery rates.	123	The landowner (TWC) will be actively seeking to market the site for the intended use. Sufficient time exists to allow for a reserved matters application to be submitted and determined and for start on site in 2018. Appellant has not presented any credible evidence that the site is not deliverable up to 2021.

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

37 Station Road Newport	58	Site to be marketed after PP issued. Delivery timetable and delivery rate indicates delivery after 2019.	120	Insufficient evidence submitted by the appellant to demonstrate the site is undeliverable by 2021, given landowners intention to sell the site for the intended use.
38 New Trench Road Donnington	58	Outstanding objections to the sites in the emerging LP. Delivery based on delivery timetable and delivery rates	120	It is accepted that the timescale necessary to put in place the necessary consents mean that start on site may turn out to be slower than envisaged. Assumed start on site in 2018 given the landowners intention to pursue residential development, subject to outline consent being granted.
40 Former Beeches Hospital Ironbridge.	58	Delivery based on delivery timetable and delivery rates.	89	The site is owned by the developer who will build out the site (Shropshire Homes) and a full planning application has been submitted (TWC/2016/0562).
42 Holyhead Road	0	Delays regarding site disposal to the market Will result in non-delivery in 5 years.	40	TWC is promoting the site through the local plan and consider that it can come forward in the next five years. Site previously allocated in the Central Telford Area Action Plan following adoption in March 2011. Site will be progressed as part of Telford Land Deal.
43 North of Priorslee Roundabout.	0	Delays regarding site disposal to the market Will result in non-delivery in 5 years.	70	TWC is promoting the site through the local plan and consider that it can come forward in the next five years. Site previously allocated in the Central Telford Area Action Plan following adoption in March 2011. Site will be progressed as part of Telford Land Deal.
44 Orleton Lane Wellington	58	Delivery based on delivery timetable and delivery rates.	144	The appellant presents no evidence that the site is likely to start in 2019 given the landowner's (Lovell) firm intention to bring the site forward subject to

**Table 1: Sites where there is a disagreement regarding delivery in the five year period**

				securing full planning consent, which is likely to be in 2017.
	JVH Total Delivery		Council Total delivery	
	1049		2853	