



Appeal Decision

Inquiry opened 18 November 2014

Site visit made on 19 November 2014

by D R Cullingford BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 January 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/A/14/2218286

Land beside The Gables, Peckforton Hall Lane, Spurstow, Tarporley, Cheshire, CW6 9TG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is by Mr J and Dr K Gaskell against the decision of the Chester East Council.
- The application (ref: 13/4631N and dated 1 November 2013) was refused by notice dated 12 February 2013.
- The development proposed is described as an 'outline planning application for housing development off Back Lane on land adjacent to The Gables, Spurstow with all matters reserved'.

Summary of Decision: ~ The appeal is dismissed

Reasons

The site and surroundings

1. Spurstow is little more than an isolated collection of 50-60 dwellings, most of which are in a triangle of roads consisting of the A49 (to the east), Peckforton Hall Lane (to the north) and Back Lane (to the west). There are sporadic groups of farmsteads and cottages along Peckforton Hall Lane, a cul-de-sac of what was once a small rural Council estate at South Croft and bits of ribbon development beside Long Lane and the A49. The place boasts of a post box and, oddly, a children's nursery and a restaurant (an old public house). Otherwise day-to-day facilities and services are in the village of Bunbury (about 1.5km distant) or they lie much further afield in the 'key service centre' of Nantwich. Bunbury is identified as a 'local service centre' (a 'third tier settlement') in the emerging Local Plan (policy PG2): Spurstow lies amongst the 'other settlements and rural areas', though it was previously identified as a 'sustainable village' at the 'Preferred Options' stage. A bus passes through the place on Thursdays and Saturdays twice in either direction on its route between Tiverton and Nantwich via Bunbury.
2. The site is carved from a couple of flat fields behind mature roadside hedgerows fronting both Peckforton Hall Lane and Back Lane. It extends to almost 1ha and it lies beyond the current 'settlement limit' of Spurstow, here aligned with Back Lane. It appears to have been last used for grazing, although it is actually classified as some of the 'best and most versatile' agricultural land (grade 2). Attractive trees adorn some of the field hedges, most of them being in the western hedgerow well beyond the appeal site. Back Lane is narrow (often less than 4m wide) with a wide grass verge beside

the field hedge: opposite, detached and largely suburban houses and bungalows shelter behind their front garden hedges.

The proposal

3. The application is made in outline with all matters reserved for subsequent approval. However, an illustrative plan shows how 18 detached and semi-detached 2-storey dwellings might be arranged along the frontages of Peckforten Hall Lane and Back Lane, each with individual driveways through the roadside hedgerows. The back gardens are shown as extending only to the middle of the southern field, the rest of the land being retained for 'light grazing and replanting'.
4. A line of 3 semi-detached dwellings, each containing 2 bedrooms, is shown at the southern end of the scheme (opposite the restaurant); these are to be secured through a submitted section 106 Undertaking as affordable homes. Of the 12 open market houses, 4 would be 3-bedroom semi-detached properties and 8 would be 4/5-bedroom detached dwellings.
5. Suggested conditions would ensure that the scheme would be implemented as intended: that the reserved matters would be submitted for approval: that foul and surface water drainage systems would be installed and controlled: that any contamination encountered would be addressed: that an Environmental Management Plan would be prepared and adhered to: that a Travel Plan would be devised and implemented: that an Ecological Mitigation Strategy would be devised and undertaken: that arrangements for the protection of the trees and additional landscaping would be secured: and, that other details would be controlled.

Planning policy and the main issues

6. The Development Plan currently encompasses the 'saved' policies of the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan, adopted in February 2005, and intended to provide for development up to 2011. The site is shown as lying within the 'open countryside', adjacent to, but just beyond, the settlement limits of Spurstow (policy NE2). There, residential development is to be strictly controlled: the scheme would fulfil none of prescribed purposes warranting houses in the countryside identified in policy RES5 nor would all the dwellings be 'affordable', as policy RES8 would allow. The proposal would also entail the loss of grade 2 agricultural land without explicitly complying with the requirements of policy NE12.
7. The emerging Local Plan is in the throes of an EiP. The Inspector issued his 'interim views' on the legal compliance and soundness of the submitted document on 6 November 2014. Those views of particular relevance to this appeal indicate that the minimum legal requirements associated with the 'duty to co-operate' have been met and that the proposed 'settlement hierarchy' (policy PG2) appears to be 'justified, effective and soundly based'. But, shortcomings in the objective assessment of housing needs, both in relation to market and affordable dwellings, are indicated and it is also suggested that the housing provision proposed is likely to be inadequate. The clear indication is that the emerging Plan is likely to be found unsound unless 'justified' by further work. The option of simply carrying on is discouraged: the opportunity of putting the EiP into 6 months of abeyance to allow the 'necessary' work to

be undertaken is suggested: and, the possibility of withdrawing the Plan and starting again with a fresh document is mooted.

8. At the inquiry into this appeal, the Council were (not unsurprisingly) undecided about how to proceed. I now read that the EiP is to be suspended (provisionally until June 2015) to allow additional work to be undertaken with the intention of addressing the identified shortcomings. Nevertheless, the Council no longer maintain that a 5-year supply of housing land can be demonstrated and the second reason for refusal is formally withdrawn. In those circumstances it follows, and indeed it is accepted, that paragraphs 47 and 14 of the Framework are engaged, so that the proposal is to be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and permission granted unless tests derived from specific policies in the Framework (or material considerations) indicate otherwise or any adverse impact of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme when assessed against the Framework taken as a whole. Those are the tests that I apply here.
9. In doing so, I bear in mind that whether or not paragraph 49 of the Framework is also engaged, not all policies that might influence the supply of housing deal solely with housing supply. 'Saved' policies NE2 and RES5 are examples. They demarcate land use distinctions between settlements and the countryside and they provide a way in which decision-taking might take account of other 'core principles', such as the 'intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside'. The absence of a 5-year supply of housing may require an urgent review of settlement boundaries and trigger a need for development on sites in the countryside, but it does not necessarily render the distinction between town and country irrelevant or the need to maintain and enhance the identity of settlements redundant. Moreover, a further 'core principle' is that decisions should be genuinely plan led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings. In this case the emerging 'vision for growth' entailed in the emerging Plan, includes the aim to focus development in accordance with a 'settlement hierarchy' where ordinary residential development in the 'other settlements and rural areas' (such as Spurstow) is to be restricted to small scale infilling or the change of use and conversion of existing buildings (policy PG2). This is an element of the Plan identified as 'justified, effective and soundly based' in the Inspector's 'interim views'. This is thus the context in which the tests, indicated above, are to be applied. And, in that way, the Framework establishes a new balance in providing the housing needed and protecting the countryside and the identity of towns and villages.
10. The Council acknowledge that the provision of market and affordable housing would constitute clear benefits of the scheme. But, their remaining objection is that the appeal site is an unsuitable location for housing development. They claim that little has changed since part of it was explicitly rejected as a suitable place to accommodate dwellings back in 2003 by the Inspector then considering objections to the Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan. Indeed, then it was held that an addition of up to 10 dwellings would be a 'relatively significant increase' in such a small settlement: now, the scheme entails some 18 additional homes. Then, the place was found to contain 'little in the way of social infrastructure': now, most facilities are located at least 1.5km distant (in Bunbury or even further afield) rendering the location an unsustainable one for new housing, given the paucity of bus services. Then,

the site was 'located in the open countryside': it still is. And, the site is classified as some of the 'best and most versatile' agricultural land (grade 2).

11. Local residents endorse those concerns. A petition with 48 signatures objects to the scheme on the basis that there is no need, that it would impinge on the countryside and that there is a lack of social and physical infrastructure (doctors, shops, public transport and pavements). Submissions raise concerns about traffic, congestion, disruption during construction, loss of privacy and prospect, the paucity of local facilities, the lack of employment, the lack of public transport and inadequate water pressure.
12. In those circumstances, and from all that I have heard, read and seen, I consider that this case turns on whether the presumption in favour and the benefits of this scheme would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by any adverse impact, as assessed against the Framework, with particular reference to:
 - i) the sustainability of the scheme, and
 - ii) the likely character and impact of the development intended.

The benefits of the scheme

13. A 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites cannot currently be identified. The proposal would thus contribute to the housing land required and address the implied shortfall that currently exists. This is an important benefit (as countless appeal decisions indicate) and an element of 'sustainability'. And, although the addition of 18 dwellings might not in itself be particularly 'significant', it would 'boost' the supply of housing and, perhaps, serve to encourage additional residential development elsewhere.
14. The scheme would deliver 6 dwellings (33%) as affordable homes, in accordance with an Interim Statement on Affordable Housing and emerging policy SC5, which would require a minimum 30% of affordable units here. The 2010 SHMA identified 66 households in need within the Peckforton sub-area, which extends over 11 parishes, including Spurstow. This was then the 5th highest level of need (8.3% of households) within 27 sub-areas. Moreover, the need is increasing, for some 70 households (9.3%) are identified as in need by the 2013 SHMA, the 2nd highest level of need identified. Indeed, an annual need for 13 affordable homes (amounting to 65 dwellings over the period 2013-2018) is estimated. But, the only provision identified at the Inquiry entailed the completion of 16 dwellings in Bunbury, which is part of a different sub-area with its own annual need for some 18 units. In any case, Cheshire Homechoice indicates that there are 36 applicants on its waiting list for Bunbury and the Bunbury Parish survey of 2013 identifies 68 potential new households in housing need. Clearly, the scheme would make a contribution to meeting the housing needs of those with a local connection to the area, a need with, as yet, no evident means of imminent fulfilment.
15. I accept that Spurstow would be a suitable place in which to provide for affordable homes and I agree that such provision is likely to require the use of the 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, though whether or not that would necessitate the use of grade 2 land cannot be determined on the basis of the evidence adduced. Even so, the Peckforton sub-area consists entirely of 'countryside' or settlements like Spurstow. And, the settlement has been previously identified as a 'sustainable village' with objections being lodged to the subsequent removal of that designation in the emerging Plan. Whether or

not that designation eventually remains, Spurstow is part of the Peckforton sub-area closest to Bunbury and thus 'within range' of being able to benefit from the services and facilities of that 'local service centre'.

16. These are important social and economic benefits of the scheme and key elements in the 'multi-faceted' concept of 'sustainability'. In addition, the proposal would help to contribute to a stable workforce in terms of ability and age and the construction of the dwellings would create jobs as well as generate a New Homes Bonus of approximately £166,642 over 6 years, so potentially stimulating further housing development. Once occupied, the residents of the scheme would spend money locally, so helping to maintain those local facilities and services that exist. The benefits of the scheme would thus be substantial. In those circumstances, as indicated above, planning permission should be granted unless significantly and demonstrably outweighed by any adverse impact, as assessed against the Framework. I consider those potential adverse impacts below.

Sustainability

17. The Framework advises that 'To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.' This reflects the vision outlined in the Taylor Report seeking to replace the question 'is this settlement sustainable?' with 'will this development enhance or decrease the sustainability of this community – balancing social, economic and environmental concerns?' The intention is to avoid the 'trap' of limiting decision making in rural areas solely to car-borne travel by treating 'sustainability' as a multi-faceted concept.
18. But, that does not mean that 'locational sustainability' is not an element in that 'multi-faceted concept'. The defects of this location and the dearth of facilities are matters of fact. A place that can boast of containing little more than a post box and a restaurant (transformed from an old public house beside the A49) can provide few of the day-to-day facilities that prospective occupants might need. Moreover, since there is barely a bus service to speak of, the means of reaching such facilities must mainly depend on using the private car. (Mr Augustine's ability to push his 2 children to Bunbury and back being the exception that proves the rule). True, there is a 'Bramble Hedge Nursery' amongst the 'farmsteads' a little way beyond the settlement, but everything else (a small Co-op, a butcher, a post office, a medical centre, the village hall, the primary school, 2 churches and 3 public houses) are at least 1.5km away in the village of Bunbury. No doubt prospective residents would make some use of those facilities, often travelling back and forth by car. But, the use of the car also presents immediate opportunities to travel further afield. And, the need to do so to reach facilities and services unavailable locally could well encourage such journeys. The contrary possibility that the appeal proposal might contribute to re-establishing the post office and shop, the police station, the primary school or the Methodist Chapel in Spurstow a quarter of a century or so since their demise is, I fear, little more than a 'pipe dream'.
19. Do the other elements of 'sustainability' redress the balance? The social and economic benefits of the scheme, outlined above, are positive facets. But, although the provision of a dozen market dwellings would contribute to the housing required, that would be a contribution to a District-wide requirement

potentially addressable elsewhere. The scheme would provide affordable housing. But it would provide for only the minimum level sought in relation to schemes actually within settlements. The site is not within the settlement of Spurstow, as currently defined. And, although the settlement limit identified in 'saved' policy NE2 must be regarded as 'flexible' in the absence of a 5-year supply of housing land, the fact remains that the site is part of the countryside surrounding the settlement. Nor would all the dwellings be 'affordable', in accordance with 'saved' policy RES8, which would allow 'affordable' dwellings on suitable 'exception' sites beyond settlements. I think that such considerations tend to undermine the 'sustainable' credentials of the scheme. However, the extent to which the proposal might chime with the emerging 'vision for growth', identified as 'justified, effective and soundly based' in the Inspector's 'interim views', might provide a further suitable test of 'sustainability'.

20. The Council claim that the findings of the Local Plan Inspector in 2003 remain pertinent. As he identified an addition of some 10 dwellings (roughly 20%) as a 'relatively significant increase', a proposal for 18 additional homes (a bit over 30%) must be 'significant'. Of course, those findings made in 2003 were made when circumstances, policies and Government advice were different. But, the emerging 'vision for growth' would appear (at first sight) to accommodate the scale of development now proposed in places like Spurstow. The emerging Plan indicates the need to cater for a further 882 dwellings in 'other settlements and rural areas' (such as Spurstow). Given that 21 'sustainable villages' were identified throughout the 'rural area' at the 'Preferred Options' stage, a notional average allocation within such a settlement, as currently envisaged, might amount to a further 42 homes over the Plan period. And, even if only half that 'allocation' were to be accommodated within the 'sustainable villages' (the rest being distributed across the 'rural areas'), some 20 dwellings might reasonably be envisaged as an appropriate average. The scale of such development would be commensurate with the appeal proposal.
21. The difficulty is that the emerging Plan indicates that residential development in 'other settlements and rural areas' (like Spurstow) is to be restricted to small scale infilling or the change of use and conversion of existing buildings (policy PG2). I do not consider this scheme to be 'small scale'. Nor do I think that it would entail 'infilling'. Indeed, such terms would not accurately describe a proposal for 18 dwellings strung along 2 road frontages, together extending over a distance of some 260m. It follows that the proposal would not accord with the form and character of development currently envisaged (in the emerging Plan) as appropriate for, and in character with, this settlement. In my view, this conflict undermines the sustainability of the scheme.
22. Whether or not it would be possible to accommodate the scale of development currently sought within the 'other settlements and rural areas' in the manner now deemed as appropriate is not a matter for me. Rather, that is an issue to be addressed in the context of the EiP and the progress of the emerging Local Plan. Nevertheless, the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of Spurstow is an appropriate matter for consideration in the context of this appeal. I turn to consider that matter below, bearing in mind that the 'settlement hierarchy' is an element of the Plan identified as 'justified, effective and soundly based' in the EiP Inspector's 'interim views'.

Character

23. The 'core principles' of the Framework set out aims requiring places in which people live their lives to be enhanced, high quality design to be secured and the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside to be recognised. The exhortation that schemes should properly reflect local character, reinforce local distinctiveness and provide a good standard of amenity for all chimes with some of the requirements set out in 'saved' policies NE2 and (as it happens) RES4 and emerging policies PG2 and SE1.
24. The appeal site is part of the countryside that envelopes Spurstow. It forms an evident rural element from several vantage points along Peckforton Hall Lane, it accentuates and contributes to the rural ambience and character of the narrow Back Lane and it offers a vista of the wider landscape towards the Peckforton Hills. The proposal would obliterate that segment of the surrounding countryside. The rural element evident along Peckforton Hall Lane would be replaced by a row of relatively closely spaced houses: the rural quality of Back Lane would be transformed into something more akin to a suburban street set between lines of dwellings on both sides behind hedges rendered intermittent by intervening driveways: and, perceptions of the wider landscape towards the Peckforton Hills would be curtailed by the walls, roofs and garages of the proposed development. Hence, I consider that the scheme would not only be seen as an intrusive encroachment into the enveloping countryside, but also as an intrusive and incongruous element within the settlement, radically altering the character and appearance of Back Lane. Such damage would be contrary to the aims of the 'saved' and emerging policies cited above and guidance offered by the Framework.
25. It seems to me that the submitted 'visual impact schedule' rather glosses over the damaging impact of the scheme. In only 2 cases (albeit indicated as representative of half a dozen) is the impact on residents assessed as 'significant' and the magnitude of change as 'substantial'. But the impact on several other classes of receptor normally deemed to be those most susceptible to change, such as pedestrians, walkers and, perhaps, communities, is ignored. Moreover, I do not see how the magnitude of change entailed in transforming field frontages into a row of houses, and evident from nearby properties, could be described accurately as a 'minor alteration in the street scene' or even as entailing no alteration at all. Indeed, it is not obvious to me that the assessment encompasses the natural perception of the scheme 'in the round', the evident impact of first floors and roofs above the front hedges or the full view of dwellings and garages through the numerous gates and driveways. And, although I appreciate that there would be some scope for additional planting, the illustrative layout would not be spacious enough to accommodate 'numerous new native trees' along Back Lane. On the contrary, the illustrative plan indicates that the front gardens would be fairly modest and suggests that 'replanting' would take place in the remaining area of the field behind the proposed development, so that it would not greatly influence the perception of the scheme from the road frontages.
26. I realise that the 'saved' policies are 'time-expired' and not 'up-to-date' and that the settlement boundaries are in 'urgent need of comprehensive review' to accommodate the housing likely to be required. But that does not mean that the severe restrictions designed to protect the character of the countryside should be wholly discarded, especially where the aims of that policy continue

to chime with the advice of the Framework. So, while an outdated policy might not of itself justify protection for this settlement boundary, the clear natural distinction between the character of the western and eastern sides of Back Lane, as well as the enveloping nature of the countryside around this small settlement and its contribution to the character of the place, might well be worth maintaining for sound planning reasons. The proposal would irrevocably alter those features and, for the reasons outlined above, be seen as an intrusive and incongruous element encroaching into the countryside that envelopes the settlement, contrary to several core planning principles set out in the Framework.

Conclusion

27. I have found that the need to make sufficient provision for housing, and to boost supply significantly, remains a primary consideration given the shortfall in the 5-year supply of housing land and the contribution the scheme would make to the provision of 'affordable housing' in this 'sub-area'. In addition, there would be financial and employment benefits commensurate with a scheme of this size and social benefits associated with the provision of additional market and affordable dwellings.
28. However, the scheme would not be in a 'sustainable location' (most facilities and services being absent and at least 1.5km distant). And, although the emerging Plan may eventually cater for development on the scale now proposed at Spurstow, it does not yet envisage schemes that would neither be 'small scale' nor 'infilling' as appropriate for a settlement like this one; this undermines the 'sustainable' credentials of the proposal. In any case, I consider that there are policies and impediments demonstrating clearly and convincingly that this scheme should be prevented. I find that it would result in obvious and irrevocable damage to the surrounding countryside and the character of this clear edge to the settlement, thereby constituting an intrusive and incongruous urban element entailing adverse visual impacts of 'major' significance. Such harmful effects would be contrary to aims of the 'saved' and emerging planning policies and fundamentally undermine several of the core planning principles outlined in the Framework.
29. In balancing that damage against the benefits identified, I find that the housing land shortfall is District-wide and that the damage due to the proposal would be irrevocable and irreversible. In the particular circumstances of this case, I consider such damage significantly and demonstrably outweighs the presumption in favour of sustainable development that might otherwise pertain. Hence, and in spite of considering all the other matters raised, I find nothing sufficiently compelling to alter my conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

Decision

30. I dismiss this appeal.

David Cullingford
INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES
FOR THE APPELLANTS:

Vincent Fraser QC		Instructed by: Stephen Harris, Emery Planning
He called: Stephen Harris	BSc MRTPI	Director, Emery Planning

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Anthony Crean QC		Instructed by: The Borough Solicitor, Cheshire East Council
He called Ben Haywood	BA MA MBA MRTPI MCIM	Major Applications Team Leader, Cheshire East Council

INTERESTED PERSONS:

John Henderson	Local resident
Eric Wallington	Local resident
Eileen Overy	Local resident
Mr Barry Bell	Local resident
Sean Augustine	Local resident
David Cox	Local resident
Reynold Finney	Parish Councillor and local resident

Richborough Estates

DOCUMENTS

Document	1	Lists of persons present at the Inquiry
Document	2	Summary proof ~ Stephen Harris
Document	3	Proof ~ Stephen Harris
Document	4	Appendices 1-30 ~ Stephen Harris
Document	5	Proof and appendices 1-13 ~ Ben Haywood
Document	6	<i>Summary, proof and appendices 1-14 ~ Graham Stock Evidence not given</i>
Document	7	<i>Appendices 15-30 ~ Graham Stock Evidence not given</i>
Document	8	Statement of Common Ground
Document	9	Draft section 106 Agreement
Document	10	Executed section 106 Undertaking
Document	11	Agreed list of conditions
Document	12	Inspector's interim views on the legal compliance and soundness of the submitted local plan strategy ~ Stephen Pratt, 6 November 2014
Document	13	Appeal decision, Wellingborough 2215925, November 2014
Document	14	Recent affordable housing schemes in Bunbury
Document	15	Proof ~ Michael Kitchen
Document	16	Letter from Mr and Mrs Bazeley
Document	17	Letter from Miss Christine Stubbs
Document	18	Schedule of representations submitted in relation to the appeal
Document	19	Numbered representations submitted in relation to the appeal
Document	20	Closing submissions on behalf of the Council
Document	21	Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant
Document	22	Schedule of Core Documents
Document	23	Planning Statement and appendices EP1-EP28

CORE DOCUMENTS

CD01	Crewe and Nantwich Local Plan 2011 (adopted 2005)
CD02	Committee Report February 2014
CD03	Minutes of 12 th February 2014 Southern Planning Committee
CD04	Decision Notice
CD05	Local Plan Strategy - Submission Version (March 2014)
CD06	Population Projections and Forecasts Background Paper (March 2014)
CD07	Strategic Housing Market Assessment (September 2010)
CD08	Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (September 2013)
CD09	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, February 2013)
CD10	Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Statement (February 2014)
CD11	Appeal: APP/R0660/A/13/2189733, Congleton Road, Sandbach
CD12	Appeal: APP/R0660/A/13/2195201, Sandbach Road North, Alsager
CD13	Appeal: APP/R0660/A/12/2188001, Hassall Road, Alsager
CD14	Appeal: APP/R0660/A/10/2141564, Abbey Road/Middlewich Road, Sandbach
CD15	Appeal: APP/R0660/A/13/2196044, Elworth Hall Farm, Sandbach
CD16	Appeal: APP/R0660/A/13/2198461, land at Dunnocksfold Road, Alsager
CD17	Blank
CD18	Appeal: APP/R0660/A/13/2204971, land at 144 Audlem Road, Nantwich

- CD19 Appeal: APP/R0660/A/13/2203282, west of Close Lane, Alsager
- CD20 Appeal: APP/R0660/A/14/2211721, land north of Moorfields, Willaston
- CD21 Appeal: APP/R0660/A/14/2212992, Hind Heath Road, Sandbach
- CD22 Appeal: APP/R0660/A/14/2213304, Crewe Road, Haslington
- CD23 Housing Land Supply Position Statement Update September 2014
- CD24 Determining the Settlement Hierarchy: LDF Background Report (11/2010)
- CD25 Appeal: APP/G2815/A/13/2209113 Oundle, Northamptonshire

PLANS

Plans	A	1	Site Plan	6463 03
		2	Site plan, location plan & elevations	6463 02 Rev A
Plan	B		Topographical survey	6463 01
Plan	C		Distance measurements in relation to the site and nearby development	
Plan	D		Outline plan	

Richborough Estates