

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 29 September 2026 20:18

To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: EXTERNAL RE: 6007402 - Patshull Road, Albrighton, Shropshire, WV7 3BH - Conditions

Dear Aimee,

We write on behalf of the Rule 6 Party in relation to the disputed condition proposed by the Appellant concerning the timely delivery of the local centre (Condition 32 - as per the latest conditions submitted by the Council to PINS today).

The Appellant has proposed the following wording:

"No more than 200 dwellings in the development hereby permitted may be occupied until the local centre, excluding the safeguarded land for the medical centre, has been substantially completed in accordance with a Local Centre Strategy, including monitoring arrangements, that shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority."

The Rule 6 Party's position is that the local centre should be constructed, marketed and be available for occupation by final occupation of Phase 1, being the 140th dwelling (as identified on CD6.7 Phasing Strategy Plan which would be an approved plan), to help assist in the timely delivery of the facilities and taking into account the ATE's consultation response (CD17.2).

Additionally, the Appellant's proposed wording expressly excludes the safeguarded medical centre land, which would allow that element to be treated separately from the local centre, notwithstanding its role as part of the overall community infrastructure serving the development. This reinforces the Rule 6 Party's case presented at the Inquiry about the uncertainty as to what facilities will actually form part of the local centre scheme, other than the local shop and when these elements will come forward.

Further and in any event, the Rule 6 Party's view is that the build out of the Local Centre should be dealt with via the s106 agreement rather than conditions. This is because the wording of the condition lacks sufficient precision and certainty regarding matters including the definition of delivery, the content and implementation of the local centre strategy, the extent of the local centre scheme, marketing requirements, availability for occupation and the associated monitoring arrangements.

These matters require a more detailed and enforceable mechanism than can appropriately be secured through the condition as presently drafted. The Rule 6 Party therefore considers that, if the build out of the Local Centre is to be secured sufficiently, the obligations relating to the timing, delivery, marketing and availability for occupation of the local centre, including the GP/medical centre land, should instead be secured through the Section 106 Agreement. This would enable the necessary definitions, triggers, obligations and monitoring provisions to be set out with sufficient clarity and enforceability.

Notwithstanding the above and for the avoidance of doubt, the Rule 6 Party's concerns relating to the lack of evidence and clarity as to the future operation of the Local Centre remain.

Kind Regards,

Tom Ryan BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Principal Planner | ET Planning



Planning | Enforcement | Land Promotion | Sequential Tests | CIL

200 Dukes Ride, Crowthorne, RG45 6DS | 01344 508048

@etplanning.co.uk | DD: 01344 985118

www.etplanning.co.uk

ET Planning is the trading name of ET Planning Ltd. Registered in England and Wales Company No. 10646740

This email and any attachment is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee only.

If you are not the intended recipient you should not use the contents nor disclose them to any other person.

If you have received this message in error please notify the sender immediately.