



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2016

by Brendan Lyons BArch MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 21 April 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M0933/W/15/3130714

Land at Jack Hill, Allithwaite, Grange over Sands, Cumbria LA11 7QB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Applethwaite Homes against the decision of South Lakeland District Council.
 - The application Ref SL/2014/0800, dated 8 August 2014, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2015.
 - The development proposed is described as 18 dwellings (6 affordable), alterations to road junction and creation of pedestrian crossing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 18 dwellings (6 affordable), alterations to road junction and creation of pedestrian crossing at Land at Jack Hill, Allithwaite, Grange over Sands, Cumbria LA11 7QB in accordance with the terms of the application Ref SL/2014/0800 dated 8 August 2014, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule annexed to this decision.

Preliminary matters

2. An application for costs has been made by the appellants against the Council. That application is the subject of a separate Decision.
3. In response to the Council's refusal of the planning application, the appellants have made amendments to the proposal in respect of highway works. The layout of the proposed development would otherwise remain the same. The appellants ask that the appeal be determined on the basis of the amended plans¹.
4. The appellants have carried out their own consultation exercise on the amended plans, involving direct notification of interested parties as well as public advertisement. The Council later conducted a separate consultation, which would have helped to remedy any uncertainty over the source of the notifications and the treatment of responses. The Council has addressed the amended scheme in its appeal submissions, as have interested parties. I am satisfied that the proposal remains substantially as that refused permission, and that all parties have had sufficient opportunity to express their views on the amendments. I consider that no party's interests would be prejudiced by

¹ Plan Nos. 2015/1408/005 Revision B (Highway Scheme) and 13021.01 Revision M (Site Layout)

acceptance of the amended plans, and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

5. The appeal was accompanied by a draft planning obligation under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, in the form of a unilateral undertaking ('UU') by the landowners and appellants. A copy of the properly executed UU has subsequently been provided. The UU contains covenants in respect of the provision and management of affordable housing on the site, and a financial contribution towards off-site play area provision. The merits of the obligation are considered later in this decision.
6. The appeal is accompanied by the information required to trigger payment of a Community Infrastructure Levy charge, in accordance with the charging schedule adopted by the Council since the refusal of the planning application.

Main Issues

7. The main issue in the appeal is whether the proposal would provide a sustainable form of development, having particular regard to:
 - the provision of safe and convenient access for pedestrians and cyclists;
 - the creation of an inclusive mixed community by the integration of affordable and market housing.

Reasons

8. The appeal site mainly comprises 0.77ha of grazing land located in an elevated position above the village of Allithwaite. The site has a short frontage to the busy B5277 road, here named Holme Lane, which slopes down to the village centre. The longer southern frontage is to Jack Hill, which is a narrow road that serves a number of houses, and which beyond the site twists and slopes steeply down to the village level. The site is bounded to the west by a short private road, Ridgeway, which is at a lower level, and to the north by the adjoining field and a detached bungalow, The Homestead. The appeal site has been drawn to include a length of the Jack Hill roadway, together with its junction with Holme Lane and the adjoining Kirkhead Road.
9. Permission is sought to erect 18 houses served by a shared surface cul-de-sac opening off Jack Hill. Six houses, forming two terraces of 3 to one side of the access road, would be reserved for affordable occupation (3 for rent and 3 for low cost ownership). The other units, including 2 bungalows adjoining Jack Hill, would be detached.

Access

10. Allithwaite is designated as a Local Service Centre by the South Lakeland Local Plan Core Strategy ('LPCS'), adopted in October 2010. The appeal site lies just within the settlement boundary of the village defined by the Local Plan Land Allocations DPD, ('LPLA') adopted in December 2013. The appeal site and a smaller plot on the opposite side of Holme Lane are identified as 'Land North of Jack Hill' and are allocated by LPLA Policy LA1.3 for housing development, with about 27 dwellings envisaged. Outline planning permission has already been granted for 4 dwellings on the smaller plot.

11. The LPLA explanatory text for Allithwaite² identifies key issues for the development of the allocation, including access arrangements and local traffic management to facilitate safe active travel within the village and to ensure improved traffic and pedestrian safety, particularly on and around Holme Lane. The need for a single access point to each of the two plots is identified, but no actual location is specified.
12. The Council's relatively recent allocation of the site confirms that it is seen as a sustainable location for development. The facilities of the village centre, including a shop, church and primary school, are within walking and cycling distance but at a lower level. The absence of a dedicated footway for a short length of Holme Lane is a negative factor, which could tend to discourage journeys on foot. However, the Traffic and Highway Advice prepared by consultants DPM to supplement the Council's appeal statement accepts that this is not untypical for villages in the area. Within the village, away from the main road, gaps in footway provision should be of lesser concern. In my assessment, neither the gradient nor concern about safe use of the route would be sufficient to discount walking and cycling as sustainable access choices for future residents of the site.
13. The site is close to bus stops, with daytime services to larger centres and to secondary school. There are also regular train services to local and regional centres that would allow for travel to work. The station can be reached on foot or by bicycle. While the distance is slightly greater than the 800m recommended by the CIHT guidance for journeys on foot³, rail must be regarded as an attractive travel option in this instance. I agree with the appellants that the site is reasonably well placed to avail of sustainable modes of transport and to reduce the need to travel.
14. Although the first reason refers to 'safe and convenient access for all users', this is qualified to specify particular concern about access for pedestrians and cyclists. The Council raises no issue about vehicular access, but some interested parties have done so.
15. The Council's concern centres on the location of the site access on Jack Hill and the absence of a direct pedestrian route from the site across Holme Lane, which it considers would promote better access on foot to facilities in the village centre. However, the application was supported by a supplementary highways statement that sought to demonstrate why a direct crossing of Holme Lane could not be safely or practically achieved. This conclusion has been endorsed by the highway authority and was borne out by the evidence of my own site inspection for the appeal.
16. In brief, a location to the south of The Homestead would require the removal of a long length of hedgerow on both sides of the road to achieve visibility to the south-east, but would still encounter traffic rounding the bend without yet slowing to the 30mph limit. Without a build-out, for which the carriageway is not wide enough, the location would still have very poor visibility to the north-west. The land to the north of The Homestead, which is outside the application site and the LPLA allocation, is not in the appellants' control. But even if it were

² LPLA paragraph 4.25

³ Chartered Institution for Highways and Transportation: Planning for Public Transport in Developments, quoted in the DPM Advice Note. Other CIHT guidance, also quoted, suggests an acceptable range of 1000m, and a maximum of 2000m, for commuting journeys on foot.

possible to create a route adjoining The Homestead, there would be similar issues of screening by the bungalow's garden unless a build-out could be formed, for which there is inadequate width. In both cases, there would also be conflict with use of existing field and domestic accesses. I agree with the appellants that the potential serious risk to pedestrian safety and the adverse effects on character and appearance weigh heavily against the possibility of a direct crossing of Holme Lane.

17. In the light of that, it is difficult to see under what circumstances the 3m wide buffer strip to the south of The Homestead shown on the appellants' latest revised plans would ultimately allow the possibility of future access. But even if never used for access, the buffer would have some benefit in protecting living conditions at The Homestead, by separating its rear garden from the proposed shared parking area. There would be inadequate justification to form a buffer to the west of The Homestead in the hope of future connection with a crossing further north on Holme Lane.
18. As proposed, pedestrians and cyclists would exit the site onto Jack Hill and travel some 85m along it to the junction with Holme Lane. The additional length of journey over an alternative access onto Holme Lane would be negligible for a cyclist, and the Council does not in fact offer any clear evidence to substantiate a concern over discouragement of cycling. For pedestrians, the need to walk along Jack Hill and then cross Kirkhead Road and Allithwaite Road (B5277) would add some 200m to a journey to the village centre compared to a direct crossing of Holme Lane.
19. There is little reason to conclude that this in itself would make journeys on foot unattractive to future residents. The trip would be the same length as, or shorter than, that currently made by residents of Jack Hill and the side roads off it. The Council acknowledges that the village centre would be within recommended distances, but refers to the distance to the train station. However, the proposed use of Jack Hill would provide an easier route to the station, without the need to cross and re-cross the B5277. In any event, the key test should not be a comparison with a notional alternative access, but whether the arrangement currently proposed would facilitate safe sustainable travel and links with the wider local area. Seen in its own terms, pedestrian access would not be particularly circuitous, but would lead directly towards the train station and nearest bus stop, crossing Allithwaite Road at the nearest available point, where the northern footway is not set at a lower level than the road and behind a hedgerow.
20. The Council and others raise concern about the safety of use of Jack Hill by pedestrians. Because of its narrowness and enclosure by field hedgerows on one side, the road has the character of a quiet lane, with through traffic prohibited by order. The proposal to retain the hedge rather than widen the road to create a footway, as earlier proposed, would help to sustain this character and to calm vehicular traffic. The proposed alterations to the junction alignment should also have the effect of slowing vehicles entering from Holme Lane.
21. The road has also been designated as part of the Cumbria Coastal Way long distance footpath and the Morecambe Bay Cycle Way, which suggests that it is seen as a safe space for pedestrians and cyclists. Despite some residents' concern about flouting of the traffic restriction, traffic volume on the road is

- relatively low, as evidenced by the appellants' traffic count. The Council's DPM Advice Note accepts that the increase in vehicular traffic from the addition of the appeal development would be minimal. Similarly, the increased number of pedestrian movements should also be low.
22. The Advice Note sees no obstacle to the shared use of the roadway by pedestrians and does not support the proposed demarcation of a notional footway by a white line. Given the nature of the road and the numbers involved, I agree that the benefit of the demarcated area may be marginal and that the road could function safely without it. However, the proposed arrangement is accepted by the highway authority, who raise no objection on safety grounds. I find no reason to take a different view.
23. The proposed alterations at the junction with Kirkhead Road, with increased spacing between junctions, should slightly improve safety for pedestrians and vehicles alike. The alterations to the east of Kirkhead Road would enhance crossing of Allithwaite Road for both existing and new users. I note the concerns raised about the proposed traffic island, but again I find no reason to dissent from the view of the highway authority and of an independent safety audit that the proposal would be acceptable in safety terms. Other provision, such as the need for changes to speed limits, could be subject to further consideration by the highway authority but would not be necessary to allow approval of the appeal proposal as submitted.
24. Although not part of the Council's case, other parties have argued that the site should be served by a road access from Holme Lane, with some seeking to claim support for this option by the Inspector during the examination of the LPLA. However, there appears to be no documentary evidence of this. The Inspector would have had regard to the Council's Allithwaite Fact File prepared in support of the proposed allocation, which is clear that access would need to be taken from Jack Hill. The later Further Highway Evidence prepared by AECOM acknowledges the potential for access from Jack Hill, noting the support of the highway authority, but favours access direct from the B5277. The Inspector's Report is not explicit, but the reference to access and junction arrangements being resolved with those to the land to the rear of Bankfield suggests that access was seen to involve use of the junction of Jack Hill and Holme Lane, and not therefore direct from Holme Lane onto the appeal site.
25. The DPM Advice Note acknowledges that formation of a new access direct from Holme Lane would be close to the existing junction with Jack Hill and would require a relaxation of the highway authority's standards on junction spacing. In my view, the introduction of a third junction along this busy bend would be a potential risk. It would also require removal of most of the hedges along both sides of Holme Lane to allow adequate visibility at the junction, which would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
26. The appeal proposal must be assessed on its own merits. For the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that the proposal would be sustainable in terms of the safety and convenience of all users, particularly cyclists and pedestrians. It would comply in this respect with LPCS Policies CS10.1 and 10.2, which respectively seek improved accessibility within the plan area and to maximise the use of sustainable forms of transport appropriate to the location. It would also address the issues set out in the LPLA policy text for Allithwaite.

Mixed community

27. National policy set out in paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') seeks the delivery of a wide choice of homes and the creation of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, reflecting local need and demand. Affordable housing needs should be accommodated on the site where possible. NPPF paragraph 61 advises that high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations to include the connection between people and places. Reflecting this approach, LPCS Policy CS6.3 seeks to meet local need on appropriate sites, and requires affordable housing to be 'mixed within the development'.
28. The Council does not dispute that the six units proposed as affordable housing would meet the requirements of LPCS Policy CS6.3 with regard to the amount of provision and the mix of tenure between rented and discounted ownership. The Council's concern, as set out in the second reason for refusal of the application, is that the location of the six houses in a group to the east of the access road would not result in an inclusive mixed development.
29. It must be recognised that the delivery of affordable housing on the site, as opposed to direct or indirect off-site provision, is the most significant element in the site's contribution to a mixed community in the area. The concern about layout of the site is, in my view, of a lower order of significance.
30. The Council has not referred to any detailed guidance that would clarify the policy requirement. The notion of mixing within the development appears to me to be a broad concept, capable of differing degrees of implementation. I recognise that on a large development, the formation of enclaves of housing of a recognisably different specification would have a harmful effect, but on a site of this scale, with a small number of units in a relatively confined space, such concern should be less likely to arise.
31. The evidence of the evolution of the proposed design shows that it has been changed considerably to remove barriers between tenures. Originally the six affordable units were to be served by a separate access road and facing away from the market houses towards Holme Lane, thus effectively splitting the development into two discrete parts. The later version of the scheme, which triggered the concern of the Council's committee, showed a single access road, but with the affordable units still facing away and separated by a 1.8m high wall. As now proposed, all units would address the access road as common public space. The affordable units would directly face a market bungalow and adjoin a market detached house.
32. I agree with the appellants that the achievement of 'tenure-blind' development is very much a function of design. In this case, there would be a range of house types across the site, but all would recognisably belong to a consistent design language, albeit that the affordable units, as might be expected, would be slightly less elaborate in treatment.
33. The Council has not objected to the size of the units, for which a terraced form would be logical and economical. Detached units of this size would tend to look incongruous and out of character with the locality. In any event, the Council clearly has no objection in principle to terraces, which are a feature of the affordable provision in both of the schemes referred to as examples of successful integration.

34. While the two terraces would sit well together visually, as a consequence of their placement their shared parking areas would become a prominent feature at the entry to the scheme that would draw attention to the different nature and scale of these houses. The option of separating the two terraces could have mitigated the impact of the parking, and lessened the contrast with the detached houses' on-plot parking. The preference of the housing provider for easier maintenance does not provide a compelling reason for the need to group the units as proposed.
35. However, the effect of the different character of the parking arrangement and the scale of the houses would not be sufficient to create a harmful lack of integration with the character of the remainder of the scheme. When viewed overall the adverse effect of this aspect of the layout would not be sufficiently harmful to outweigh the generally positive outcomes of the proposed provision. On balance, the proposal would not conflict with CS Policy CS6.3 or the objectives of national policy.

Other matters

36. A number of objections have been raised by interested parties on grounds that are not supported by the Council.
37. The application was accompanied by a Flooding and Drainage Assessment ('FDA'), which has subsequently been updated following further testing of site conditions and the drainage design progressed. Following consultation with Cumbria County Council as lead local flood authority it appears that the outstanding concerns have either been addressed or are matters of detail that would be capable of resolution under the terms of a planning condition requiring full approval of the design and maintenance arrangements of sustainable drainage for the site. The FDA gives assurance that the risk of surface water run-off from the site, including onto Jack Hill, and the potential implications of the limestone bedrock have been adequately considered. Subject to the final approval of details, the proposal should not contribute to the risk of flooding.
38. The application was supported by Ecological Appraisal and by an Arboricultural Impact Assessment. The hedgerow surrounding the site has been independently assessed by the Council's arboricultural specialist and found not to be of 'important' status. I give greater weight to this assessment than to the survey submitted by interested parties. The proposal has been designed to retain as much of the existing hedgerow as possible, with the possibility that sections to be removed could be successfully transplanted, subject to approval of a method statement. The evidence suggests that the proposal would not have significant harmful effects on local ecology and wildlife.
39. The retention of most of the hedge boundary would reinforce the character of Jack Hill as an historic country lane. The site has now been subject to archaeological investigation and a number of significant finds have been discovered. Completion of the post-excavation analysis and its publication, together with a watching brief during the construction phase, could be the subject of a condition.
40. The two-storey houses along the western boundary of the site would be at a higher level than the northernmost pair of existing houses along Ridgeway. Because of the distance between the houses and the intervening hedge

boundary, the effect on outlook from the Ridgeway houses would not be overbearing. Any overlooking would be from bedrooms of the proposed houses and would be directed towards the 'public' face of the existing houses. The effect on residents' living conditions would not be unacceptably harmful.

Conditions

41. The Council has put forward outline suggestions for conditions to be applied. Subject to certain justified reservations, the appellants accept the substance of the conditions proposed. I agree that with those omissions the outlines provided would form the basis of conditions that would be reasonable and necessary, and I have drafted detailed conditions in those terms.
42. In addition to standard conditions on the commencement of development and the confirmation of the approved plans, and to those already outlined above, further conditions are necessary on the approval and implementation of materials for buildings, surfaces and boundaries, and of a scheme of landscaping, all in order to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
43. The Council's proposed condition on the implementation and retention of the internal road layout, turning areas and parking areas is necessary in the interests of highway safety. The same reason would apply to the four additional conditions proposed by the highway authority, and which the appellants are willing to accept. I agree that the conditions covering the implementation of visibility splays at the site access, the implementation of the proposed junction and crossing alterations and the provision of parking during the construction period would be justified, but not that on the specification of the internal road, which could better be addressed by the highway adoption process.

Unilateral undertaking

44. The UU as completed by the landowners and appellants allows for 35% of the dwellings on the site (6 houses) to be provided as affordable housing, for the timing of their provision, and for definition of the numbers, type, tenure and location of the affordable units and the control of their future occupation. The Council has confirmed that these provisions would accord with its requirements, based on LPCS and NPPF policy and the level of unmet need in the district. I am satisfied that this obligation would comply with the requirements of the Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL') Regulations 2010 and with the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the NPPF and with the advice of the PPG. The obligation can be fully taken into account in support of the appeal proposal.
45. The UU also obliges the parties to pay the Council a contribution of £7400 to be used for maintaining, improving or providing play facilities in the area. The appellants have made clear that this covenant was inserted to meet the Council's expectation but that the precise need for such provision or the basis of calculation of the requested sum had not been explained. Accordingly, the UU is worded to say that the obligation will not have effect if this decision finds that the obligation would not meet the tests of the CIL Regulations.
46. Although these concerns were outlined in the appellants' grounds of appeal, the Council has not taken the opportunity to explain the justification for the requested contribution. In the absence of such evidence, I consider that the

obligation has not been shown to be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms or to be fairly and reasonably related to the development in scale and kind. The obligation would not meet the tests of the Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations or of the NPPF and I have not taken it into account as support for my decision on the appeal.

Conclusion

47. I consider that the appeal proposal would enable the development of an allocated site in accordance with LPLA and LPCS policy. It would allow safe access arrangements and would facilitate safe active travel within the village of Allithwaite and the choice of sustainable transport modes. The layout of the housing would not conflict with the creation of an integrated community. The proposal would provide a sustainable form of development in accordance with the development plan, to which the presumption in favour set by the NPPF would apply.
48. While recognising the distinctive character of Jack Hill, and having taken careful account of all representations made, for the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to conditions.

Brendan Lyons

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

Annex

Appeal Ref: APP/M0933/W/15/3130714

Land at Jack Hill, Allithwaite, Grange over Sands, Cumbria LA11 7QB

Schedule of conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan Ref 13021.00, Site layout plan Ref 13021.01 Rev M, Site section Ref 13021.06 Rev A, Site section Ref 13021.07, House Type A Ref HT01, House Type B Ref HT02, House Type C Ref HT03, House Type D Ref HT04, House Type E Ref HT05, House Type F Ref HT06, House Type G Ref HT07, Garage details Ref 13021.04, Boundary treatment details Ref 13021.05, Highway scheme Ref 2015/1408/005 Rev B.
3. No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of the arrangements for maintenance over the life of the development. The scheme shall be implemented and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.
4. No development shall commence until a detailed foul water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include details of the arrangements for maintenance over the life of the development. The scheme shall be implemented and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved details.
5. No development shall take place until a scheme for the landscaping of the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscaping scheme shall include a method statement for the re-location and transplanting of hedgerows, and details of hard landscaping, soft landscaping, boundary treatments, planting plans, written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with tree, shrub, hedge or grass establishment), schedules of plants noting species, plant sizes, the proposed numbers and densities and an implementation programme.

All hard and soft landscaping works shall be completed in full accordance with the approved scheme, within the first planting season following completion of the development hereby approved, or in accordance with a programme agreed with the local planning authority. Any trees, shrubs or hedges planted in accordance with this condition which are removed, die, become severely damaged or become seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees, shrubs or hedging plants of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.

6. No development shall commence until a Written Scheme of Investigation for archaeological work has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority, and until any pre-start element of the approved scheme has been completed to the written satisfaction of the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:
- a) an assessment of significance and research questions;
 - b) a programme and methodology of site investigation and recording;
 - c) a programme for post-investigation assessment;
 - d) provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording;
 - e) provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - f) provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation;
 - g) nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation;
 - h) access at all reasonable times for the competent person/ organisation to observe excavations and record items of interest and finds.

No development shall take place other than in accordance with the archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation and the development shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post-investigation assessment have been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation, and the provision to be made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

7. Prior to the commencement of construction of the development hereby permitted, details or samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings, hard surfaces, boundary treatments and retaining walls shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
8. Prior to the commencement of construction of the development hereby permitted, details of the positions, design, and type of boundary treatment to be erected shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the boundary treatment pertaining to that plot has been implemented in accordance with the approved details.
9. The access road, footways, turning areas and parking areas shown on the approved site layout shall be implemented prior to first occupation of any dwelling on the site, and shall be retained for those purposes thereafter.
10. Visibility splays of 43m shall be provided in each direction from a point 2.4m from the carriageway edge on the centre line of the site access, measured along the nearside edge of the carriageway, in accordance with the approved

plan Ref 2015/1408/005 Rev B. Nothing shall be planted, erected or allowed to remain within the visibility splays that exceeds or would exceed 1m in height above the level of the adjacent carriageway.

11. The provision of a pedestrian refuge facility on Allithwaite Road and the alterations to Jack Hill and the junction of Jack Hill with Holme Lane shown on the approved plan Ref 2015/1408/005 Rev B shall be constructed to the current Cumbria County Council specification and shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the any dwellinghouse on the site.
12. Prior to the commencement of construction of the development hereby permitted, details of parking provision for vehicles associated with construction operations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved provision and the access thereto shall be used for and kept available for this purpose at all times until completion of construction works.

Richborough Estates