



---

# Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 13 November 2012

Site visit made on 13 November 2012

**by James Ellis LLB (Hons) Solicitor**

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

**Decision date: 11 January 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/A/12/2179203**

**Meldan Site, Marsh Lane, Barton-upon-Humber DN18 5HB**

- 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 planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Neal Dickinson against North Lincolnshire Council.
  - The application Ref PA/2005/1898, is dated 25 July 2007.
  - The development proposed is a new housing development of 108 dwellings to replace an existing engineering works.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a new housing development of 108 dwellings to replace an existing engineering works at the Meldon Site, Marsh Lane, Barton-upon-Humber DN18 5HB is refused.

## Procedural matters

2. The copy of planning application Ref PA/2005/1898 ("the application") submitted to the Planning Inspectorate was undated. However, at the hearing, both parties confirmed that the original was dated 25 July 2007.
3. In a representation made to the Planning Inspectorate dated 13 September 2012, the Environment Agency ("the EA") made clear its position with regard to the application and flood risk. The EA stated that it had originally objected to the scheme because: no evidence had been submitted to show that the flood risk sequential test had been passed; it had not been demonstrated that the flood risk exception test had been passed; and no evidence had been submitted to ensure that the scheme would not increase the risk of pollution to controlled waters.
4. The EA went on to say that its concerns over the exception test and controlled waters could be overcome by planning conditions, but that it had not received confirmation from the Council that the sequential test had been passed. The EA deferred to my judgement as to whether or not, based on up to date information, the sequential test has been passed. I shall therefore treat flood risk as a main issue, although it did not form the basis of one of the Council's reasons on which it would have refused the application had the appeal against non-determination been made.

## Main Issues

5. The main issues are, therefore: flood risk; the effect of the proposal on archaeology; the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future

occupiers in terms of private amenity space, and noise and possible disturbance; the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with reference to the Barton-upon-Humber Conservation Area ("the CA") and the setting of St Mary's Church, a listed building; whether the proposal would be acceptable in terms of pedestrian and vehicular connectivity and permeability; and the viability or otherwise of the proposal in relation to providing the community benefits sought by the Council.

## Reasons

6. The appeal site is a brownfield site within the Barton-upon-Humber settlement development boundary for the purposes of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan, adopted in 2003 ("the LP") of which a number of policies remain saved. The site, which I am told has an area of about 1.69 hectares, is located to the north-east of the town centre and has a number of somewhat dilapidated buildings which are no longer occupied, but were in use as industrial workshops and warehouses. A small part of the site (towards its south-eastern corner) lies within the CA.
7. The western boundary of the site is bounded by existing residential properties which include two-storey terraced houses and also a row of single-storey dwellings known as 'The Hoppers'. The main entrance to the site is just to the north of The Hoppers, beyond which there is a warehouse building that has planning permission to be converted to residential units. St Peter's Church of England Primary School lies to the north of the site, whilst the eastern boundary of the site is bounded by the rear gardens of residential properties, and also industrial and commercial premises. The southern boundary of the site adjoins Soutergate where there are residential properties. The CA wraps round the western, southern and eastern boundaries of the site and St Mary's Church is located to the south of the site.
8. The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings on the site and erect 108 new dwellings comprising houses, bungalows and flats to provide a range of accommodation. The flats and many of the houses would be set in terraces with a good number of the buildings being three storeys in height. An integral feature of the scheme would be a crescent of buildings facing a tree lined boulevard running through the centre of the site. The scheme would incorporate 'homezones' and, in addition to private amenity space, there would be a pocket park adjacent to the flatted accommodation.
9. The appeal site was allocated for residential development in the LP and it is a proposed housing site in the Council's Housing and Employment Land Allocations Development Plan Document Submission Draft, published in November 2010. I understand that the draft DPD has undergone some public consultation but I have not been provided with the details of any objections that have been made in respect of it. Also, as far as I am aware, the draft DPD has not been the subject of examination. I can, therefore, only give limited weight to it.

### *Flood Risk*

10. Paragraphs 99 to 104 of the of the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") together with guidance contained in Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework refer to flood risk. The Practice Guide to

Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk ("the Practice Guide") is still extant and relevant to the proposal.

11. Paragraph 99 of the Framework states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. In order to achieve this, a sequential approach is taken with the aim of the sequential test being to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding. Only where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zones 1 or 2 should the suitability of sites in Flood Zone 3 be considered taking into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and applying the exception test if required.
12. Policies CS1 and CS2 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy ("the CS"), adopted in 2011, are also relevant here. Policy CS1 sets out a spatial strategy for North Lincolnshire and includes reference to market towns (such as Barton). It says that an appropriate level of new housing will be provided to support the market towns as sustainable communities, and that over the plan period, to 2026, the market towns will provide 2171 new dwellings.
13. Policy CS2 states that a sequential approach will be taken to future development needs in North Lincolnshire, and that in the market towns development will be focused on previously developed land and buildings within the defined development limits, followed by other suitable infill opportunities then appropriate small scale greenfield extensions to meet identified local needs. The policy goes on to say that a sequential approach will be applied to ensure that development is, where possible, directed to those areas that have the lowest probability of flooding, taking account the vulnerability of the type of development proposed, its contribution to creating sustainable communities and achieving the sustainability objectives of the plan. The supporting text to the policy refers to the sequential test and states that only in exceptional circumstances can a deviation from this approach be permitted where there is a need to meet the wider aims of sustainable development.
14. A sizeable area of the appeal site is in Flood Zone 3a where there is a high probability of flooding. The evidence before me indicates that a sequential test has been carried out and it has been concluded that there are no reasonably available sites which are in Flood Zones 1 and 2. However, I understand that the search area was limited to sites within Barton to accord with a protocol adopted by the Council's Planning Committee. The Council explained that the reason behind the protocol was to ensure that new development takes place in sustainable locations.
15. However, there is clear guidance in the Practice Guide concerning the sequential test. Paragraph 4.19 states that in all cases the developer must justify with evidence to the local planning authority what area of search has been used when making the application. Following paragraph 4.27, the Practice Guide refers to a case study where a Planning Inspector found that a search limited to Caversham, rather than the whole of Reading Borough, would not suffice for the sequential test. This suggests to me that, on the face of it, the search applied in respect of the proposal is not sufficient, notwithstanding the Council's protocol, which does not have the weight of adopted policy.
16. Policy CS2 of the CS does refer to sustainable communities and the sustainability objectives of the plan. However, there is no evidence before me

to indicate that there are exceptional circumstances which would justify a 'narrow' search area limited to Barton, rather than across North Lincolnshire as a whole.

17. I note also that the appeal site itself is a brownfield site and close to town centre facilities. However, there is nothing to mark it out as being exceptional as many proposed development sites in built up areas are brownfield sites that are close to facilities.
18. From the evidence available to me, I therefore find that the sequential test that has been carried out in this case is inadequate in that it has failed to demonstrate that there are no alternative sites in North Lincolnshire that could accommodate the proposal. Having regard to this, I can only conclude that the scheme would fail to minimise the risk of flooding which would run contrary to the objectives of the Framework and the guidance identified in paragraph 10.
19. I appreciate that within recent years the Council has permitted residential development in Barton which is within Flood Zone 3a. However, I have not been provided with full details of the planning histories of the sites in question and I do not know if the sequential test was properly applied. I therefore give little weight to the other sites.

#### *Archaeology*

20. Paragraph 17 of the Framework sets out 12 core planning principles. One of these is that planning should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Paragraphs 128, 129 and 135 of the Framework are also relevant to archaeology in this case.
21. Amongst other matters, paragraph 128 refers to the need for developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation in respect of a development site which includes heritage assets with archaeological interest. Paragraph 129 says that the particular significance of any heritage asset should be assessed, and the assessment taken into account when considering the impact of the proposal on the asset, to minimise conflict between the asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal. Paragraph 135 goes on to say that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application, and that in weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset.
22. Here, the appellant's archaeological consultant has produced a desk-based assessment and a standing building appraisal. In addition, field evaluation (trial trenching) has taken place. The number and location of trial trenches that were dug were limited because commercial operations were then taking place on the appeal site. I am told that the trenches represent a less than 1% sample of the site. Trial trenches in the south-west corner of the site, along the Soutergate frontage have revealed well preserved remains of Saxon and Medieval date.
23. The appellant's consultant, in an outline mitigation strategy, considered that the identified remains were of limited archaeological potential and of local significance. The strategy went on to say that remains would require preservation by record where they cannot be voluntarily preserved in situ.

- A schedule of works was then suggested including further excavation and a watching brief in the north-east and south-west corners of the site.
24. This was not accepted by the Council whose Historic Environment Record Officer gave oral evidence at the hearing. The importance of Barton in Saxon and Medieval times was explained with reference to Soutergate being within the proto-urban core of the town. It was stated that the remains therefore had an important contribution to make to the heritage of Barton and that they were of regional significance for North Lincolnshire. Reference was made to indications of equally significant deposits across the rest of the site and the need for further trial trenching to be carried out before a mitigation strategy could be accepted. It was also stated that in-situ preservation was the preferred option in terms of mitigation. An e-mail dated 10 December 2007, from the Record Officer to the Council's Development Control Team, provides details of a possible alternative mitigation strategy.
  25. At the hearing, there was debate about whether or not the need to raise levels on the site in order to meet the exception test for flood risk would result in archaeology remaining in situ in any event. This might well apply to some of the site but would not be relevant to the higher parts of the site, for example adjacent to Soutergate where Saxon and Medieval remains have been found. Reference was also made by the appellant to a 'watching brief' by a suitably qualified archaeologist as work on the scheme progressed, but the Council's Record Officer explained that this would not be an effective way of dealing with archaeology on such an important and large site.
  26. Whilst noting the views of the appellant's consultant, I find the evidence of the Council's Record Officer to be compelling. I accept that the remains that have been found are of regional significance. Given the limited nature of trial trenching that has taken place, it is therefore right that further trenching should be undertaken. In my view, it would not be appropriate to accept a mitigation strategy until this work has been completed so that the work can fully inform the strategy. Also, the evidence suggests to me that an appropriate mitigation strategy should further explore physical or in situ preservation of remains. To achieve the latter, account could be taken of a sympathetic foundation design to sit above archaeological levels, though it is conceivable that the layout of the scheme would have to be looked at again.
  27. I have given consideration as to whether this matter can be dealt with by way of a planning condition. However, it seems to me that if the scheme was accepted in principle, and a condition imposed requiring a further mitigation scheme to be submitted and approved by the Council, this could impose a constraint on the requirements of a future mitigation strategy, say if for example the layout of the scheme needed alteration to preserve in situ remains. This would not afford the archaeology the degree of protection that it merits. I therefore find that this is a case where an appropriate mitigation strategy needs to be accepted by a decision maker prior to planning permission being granted.
  28. Until further archaeological investigation is carried out and an appropriate mitigation strategy is put in place following this, I cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to, or, indeed, loss of archaeology on the appeal site. I must therefore apply the precautionary principle and conclude that I am not convinced that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on archaeology. In this respect, the proposal

would be contrary to Policy HE9 of the LP, Policy CS6 of the CS, and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework.

29. The Council was also concerned that further photographic recording of the buildings currently on the site was needed, albeit that a record already submitted by the appellant has gone into considerable detail. At the time the record was made, not all the buildings on the site were accessible so I find that there is a need for further recording. However, after hearing evidence, I am satisfied that the additional recording could reasonably be carried out pursuant to an appropriately worded planning condition.

*Living conditions of future occupiers*

30. The scheme would provide future occupiers with amenity space through a number of means. Each unit of accommodation would have some private amenity space and a pocket park would be provided adjacent to the flatted development. In addition, the use of 'homezones' would also create a shared environment in streets where children's play and other social activities could take place in addition to the movement of vehicles.
31. There is no dispute that the scheme would be provided with sufficient private amenity space in terms of area. Nevertheless, the Council had concerns over the quality of some private amenity spaces to dwellings. A number of spaces would be limited in extent but this, in itself, is not problematical given the provision of the pocket park and the 'homezones'. However some of the dwellings, for example those in the terraces facing Soutergate, would have amenity spaces that would be open to public view. In my opinion, this would be a severe limitation on their value for private amenity purposes.
32. Moreover, some private amenity spaces, for example those at the rear of the terraces on the eastern side of the boulevard, would lie close to those parts of a 'homezone' which would be accessed by vehicular traffic. Whilst vehicles would be driven at low speeds, vehicle movements would nevertheless generate noise and result in possible disturbance which would have an effect on persons using the amenity spaces for quiet purposes such as reading. Given the proximity of the amenity areas to those parts of the 'homezones' where there would be vehicle movements, the resulting noise and possible disturbance would again have a material adverse impact on the enjoyment of private amenity areas. To my mind, this situation would be exacerbated by some elevations of dwellings, for example those to the rear of the terraces fronting Soutergate, being close to roads and shared spaces, where noise and possible disturbance would again have a considerable adverse impact on residential amenity.
33. The appellant claimed that the layout should be found to be acceptable because the scheme would be within in an urban area. It was also said that the environment to be provided by the scheme would prove attractive to future occupiers and that, after all, it was a matter of choice to be left to them to decide whether or not to live there. I note these arguments. However, to my mind, new development, wherever it situated, should provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. Such is not the case here. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of future occupiers in terms of private amenity space, and noise and possible disturbance. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to Policies

CS2 and CS5 of the CS and paragraph 58 of the Framework all of which, amongst other matters, seek to prevent such harm.

*Character and appearance of the area*

34. In terms of character and appearance, the Council has two concerns. The first is that the formal crescent of terraced properties along a tree lined boulevard is not representative of Barton's historic core, and the second is that the proposed use of three storey terraced dwellings in a uniform format is at odds with the more irregular and informal development pattern which is characteristic of most of Soutergate which is within the CA.
35. The crescent would not be readily apparent in terms of the street-scene when viewed from the historic core. However, when inside the scheme, it, together with the boulevard, would provide a sense of identity and distinctiveness which, to my mind, would be a positive attribute of the scheme. There are at present no crescents within the historic core of Barton, and trees are generally not a common feature. However, the historic core of Barton has a close urban grain and there are terraces of dwellings within the CA, a good number of which are three storeys in height. It is therefore clear to me that the scheme seeks to reflect existing development within the historic core, but it would do so within a modern context. To my mind, the scheme would work well in this regard and would not detract from the historic core as a whole.
36. I will now turn to the Soutergate frontage of the scheme. Here, there would be terraces of dwellings, most of which would be three storeys in height. However, one dwelling, towards the middle of the longest terrace would be two storey with accommodation in its roof space. Moreover, some of the dwellings would be set back from others, so as to follow the set back of certain elements of existing development on Soutergate. I do not therefore accept that the terraces would have a uniform format.
37. The existing development on Soutergate (within the CA) is mainly two storey, has differing forms, and has been built at different times. There are a few interesting and attractive buildings. However, the overall street scene, particularly on the southern side of the street, lacks cohesion and does little in the way of making a positive contribution to the CA. The Soutergate frontage of the scheme would echo terraces of dwellings elsewhere in the historic core of Barton and, in my view, its juxtaposition with existing development in Soutergate would not have a material adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Overall, I find that the scheme, insofar as it is outside the CA, would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the setting of the CA.
38. A small part of the appeal site lies within the CA. This is currently occupied by Workshop 10, a disused industrial building, which, as I saw on my site visit, has little architectural merit. In the scheme, this building would be demolished and a pedestrian access provided from the scheme (at the southern end of the boulevard) to Soutergate. This would open up views from the appeal site towards St Mary's Church. The scheme would, in my opinion, therefore preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, and also have a positive impact in terms of preserving the setting of the listed building.
39. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. In this respect, it would not be contrary to Policies

CS5 and CS6 of the CS and Policy HE2 of the LP which seek to prevent such harm.

*Pedestrian and vehicular connectivity and permeability*

40. The scheme does include pedestrian linkages from the appeal site to surrounding areas, but not to the school which lies to the north of the appeal site. The site's boundary with the school is marked by a wall which, I understand, is owned by the appellant's company. Following on from debate at the hearing, it seems to me that the Council's concern over the missing link to the school could be met by a suitably worded planning condition requiring that an access point be provided from the site to the school in accordance with details to have been submitted to and approved by the Council. Footpath linkages within the site and the 'homezones' would result in acceptable pedestrian permeability.
41. With regard to vehicular access, Manual for Streets (guidance published by the Departments of Communities and Local Government, and Transport in 2007) does say that internal permeability is important but the area also needs to be properly connected with adjacent networks. The proposal would have only one vehicular access (from Marsh Lane) and roads within the scheme would be cul-de-sacs which would have a negative impact on vehicular permeability. The Council suggested that the site would be better connected if there was a vehicular access to Soutergate at that point where there would be a pedestrian access at the southern end of the boulevard. I agree that this would be so. However, the appellant gave unchallenged evidence at the hearing that discussions had taken place with the Council's highway engineers and that a vehicular access at this point was not pursued for reasons of highway safety.
42. After considering the evidence before me, and noting guidance in Manual for Streets, I find that the scheme would not be ideal in terms of vehicular connectivity and permeability. However, having regard to the inherent constraints of designing a scheme to fit with the shape of the site, and despite it having only one vehicular access, I conclude that planning permission should not be withheld because of this.

*Community benefits and viability*

43. The Council has sought a number of community benefits in connection with the scheme. These are the provision of 22 units of affordable accommodation, and commuted sums for education provision and public open space. The appellant took no issue with the principle of the Council seeking the community benefits but explained that, in his view, they should be waived in this particular case because of the scheme not now being viable. From the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the benefits sought by the Council would meet the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended.
44. The appellant explained that when he lodged the application with the Council in 2007, the benefits sought by the Council at that time (including 11 units of affordable housing, as opposed to 22) were affordable given the viability of the scheme at that time. However, there had been major changes in circumstances relating to viability since that time. Amongst other matters, reference was made to a reduction in property values in the area of 18.8%, an increase in building costs, and an increase in demolition (abnormal) costs.



45. In support of this, the appellant produced a detailed set of figures relating to the sale price of units within the scheme and the costs of developing the scheme. The detailed evidence provided by the appellant was not challenged by the Council, though it maintained that community benefits should be provided in respect of all new housing schemes. Having regard to the lack of any evidence to the contrary, I shall accept the set of figures submitted by the appellant. The figures show that if the scheme were to be built out and the units put on the market in 2012 the scheme would not be viable, even without the community benefits sought by the Council being taken into account. The figures suggest that even if the housing market were to pick up during the lifetime of any permission which might be granted (and, here, the appellant requested a five year commencement period because of viability), it is likely that the scheme would not become viable for a number of years.
46. Against this background, I am satisfied that this is a case where the provision of the community benefits sought by the Council would have an unacceptable impact on the economic viability of the scheme and could therefore prevent new housing development on the appeal site, the principle of which has been accepted by the Council. This is therefore an exceptional case where those policies of the Development Plan which refer to the provision of community benefits (Policies C1 and H10 of the LP, and Policies CS9, CS13, CS23 and CS27 of the CS) are clearly outweighed by other material considerations. I therefore conclude that planning permission should not be withheld on the basis that the scheme would not provide the community benefits sought by the Council.

*Other issues*

47. Threaded through the Council's case were a number of concerns about crime prevention and community safety. Following debate at the hearing, where evidence was given by a Crime Prevention Design Advisor from Humberside Police, the Council accepted that its concerns could be overcome through imposition of a condition (requiring details of crime prevention measures, such as gates and lighting to be incorporated into the scheme) to be submitted to and approved by the Council before commencement of development. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of community safety and that it would not be contrary to Policy DS3 of the LP which requires that new development takes account of personal safety and the security of people and property.
48. Other points raised by third parties include: the height and scale of the proposal in relation to neighbouring properties and St Peter's school; possible overlooking of the school; surface water run-off to neighbouring properties and the school; the effect of the proposal on outdoor provision at the school; the effect of the proposal on highway safety and parking; and the effect of the proposal on a neighbouring property in terms of maintenance, and possible foundation damage caused by building works and tree roots.
49. I have already dealt with how the proposal would relate to Soutergate. Given the height and scale of the existing buildings on the appeal site which are to be demolished, the layout of the proposal and its relationship with other existing residential properties and the school, I do not consider that the proposal would be perceived as being out of keeping with existing development. Again, the submitted plans show that any overlooking of the school from the development would be limited and not such as to have a significant impact on the privacy of

children, staff and visitors to the school. There is no detailed evidence to indicate that surface water run-off would be any greater than that from existing development on the appeal site where hard surfacing surrounds buildings. The outdoor space around the school is limited but there is no evidence before me to show that the proposal would result in additional accommodation being built at the school, and even if it were, that the accommodation would have a material adverse impact on outdoor space at the school.

50. The proposal would utilise the existing access to the appeal site which has served an engineering works in the past. As I saw on my site visit, visibility at the junction of the access and Marsh Lane is acceptable and the nature of Marsh Lane is such that it should be able to cope with vehicle movements emanating from the proposal. The submitted plans indicate that parking provision for the scheme would be adequate. There has been no objection to the proposal from the local highway authority. The effect of the proposal on the maintenance of a neighbouring property and the effect of building work on foundations are not material planning considerations to which I can give weight. The location of trees to be planted as part of the scheme can be determined through a planning condition dealing with landscaping. I therefore only give little weight to the points raised by third parties.

### **Conclusion**

51. I have some sympathy with the appellant in this case because the scheme has undergone redesigns to try and meet the concerns of the Council and a Design Review Panel. Protracted negotiations have taken place between the appellant and the Council and it is now well over five years since the application was lodged with the Council, during which time there has been an economic downturn. The scheme has a number of commendable aspects, for example it would result in the redevelopment of a brownfield site which is in a sustainable location. It is allocated for housing development in the LP. I have also found in favour of the appellant in respect of a number of the Council's concerns. However, in my opinion, those points which are in favour of the scheme are heavily outweighed by the cogent harm to planning interests that I have found.
52. After taking account of all the evidence before me, and for the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*James Ellis*

Inspector

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Neal Dickinson MBA, CEng, BEng, MIMechE, AMIChemE	Planning Agent and Developer, Soutergate Properties Ltd
Mark Hodson	Director, Hodson Architects
Derek Dickinson	Soutergate Properties Ltd

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

David Wordsworth BSc (Hons), DipTP	Principal Officer, Regeneration and Planning, North Lincolnshire Council
Ian Goldthorpe MA, MRTPI	Environment Team, North Lincolnshire Council
Alison Williams	Historic Environment Record Officer, North Lincolnshire Council
Denise Wood	Crime Prevention Design Adviser, Humberside Police

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mrs K Robert	Local resident
John Swanson	Local resident
Wendy Witter	Local resident

## DOCUMENTS

- 1 Drawing issue sheet – November 2008
- 2 Extracts from North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Policies DS3, HE2 and HE3
- 3 Letter from Humberside Police dated 22 October 2012
- 4 Additional information on viability
- 5 Copy article from local newspaper

## PLANS

- A Drawings: 1998-300 Rev A, 1998-301 Rev A, 1998-302 Rev A, 1998-310 Rev A, 1998 -311 Rev A, and 1998 -312 Rev A – November 2008
- B Plan showing historic core of Barton-upon-Humber
- C Plan showing appeal site with trenches and identified zones of archaeological potential
- D Coloured Plan showing extent of the Barton-upon-Humber Conservation Area
- E Coloured Plan showing Flood Zone