The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 29 November 2022
Site visit made on 30 November 2022

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T2405/W/22/3302956
Land off Cork Lane, Glen Parva

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Glen Parva JV LLP against the decision of Blaby District Council.
- The application Ref: 19/0813/RM, dated 1 July 2019, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 2 of a planning permission Ref: 15/0176/OUT, granted on 2 August 2016.
- The application was refused by notice dated 25 May 2022.
- The development proposed is a residential development (max 165 dwellings) associated landscaping and public open space with vehicular access from Cork Lane (Outline) (Resubmission).
- The details for which approval is sought was originally described as 'Reserved matters for appearance of the appearance of the dwellings, layout of the scheme and scale of proposals.'

Richborough Estates

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the reserved matters are approved, namely appearance, landscaping, layout and scale details submitted in pursuance of condition No 2 attached to planning permission Ref: 15/0176/OUT dated 2 August 2016 subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Glen Parva JV LLP against Blaby District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of reserved matters for which approval is sought in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The appeal form states that the description has changed to a proposed residential development of 165 dwellings (Reserved Matters in relation to outline permission 15/0176/OUT). This same description is set out on the Council's decision notice. The reserved matters that are applied for are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal on this basis. It is reflected in my decision paragraph.

4. The appeal was submitted by Mrs Olivia Hewitt, Glen Parva JV LLP. While these details differ from those set out on the application form and in the banner

heading as there is a named individual, they concern the same company. In addition, the appellant has clarified that they are one and the same. I am therefore satisfied that the appellant has the authority in order for the appeal to proceed.

5. The proposal has been considered by the Secretary of State in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (SI 571/2017). A screening direction has been issued which states that the proposal is not Environmental Impact Assessment development.

6. The Council refused the application on the grounds that it had not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed layout could enable remediation and mitigation works to be undertaken to address the risk posed to the future occupants and the surrounding residents as a result of the site's previous use as a landfill site.

7. In reviewing the main parties' Statements of Case, it was evident that the dispute centred on 2 matters, namely whether land contamination is a relevant consideration for the reserved matters, in particular the layout; and if it is, the effect on the public health of the future occupiers of the proposal and on the occupiers of nearby residential properties by way of land contamination. Proofs of Evidence were subsequently submitted by the main parties that concerned these issues.

8. Shortly before the inquiry, the main parties agreed a Supplementary Statement of Common Ground (sSoCG). Included within it was an appendix between the respective land contamination witnesses which provided a joint statement and commentary on land contamination matters. On this basis, the main parties agreed that reserved matters may be approved, subject to conditions.

9. The sSoCG included an amended site layout drawing which showed a gas easement alongside the northern boundary of the site and which necessitated alterations to a number of the proposed plots. I was mindful that interested parties and consultees had not had the opportunity to comment on this drawing and so required the Council to carry out a consultation. In coming to this view, I had regard to the Wheatcroft principles[1] and consider it consistent with the Holborn judgment[2] that I was referred to at the inquiry.

10. The appellant was subsequently given the opportunity to provide a response to the representations that were received. Thus, I accepted the drawing and have also considered the associated representations and the appellant's response in my decision.

11. The main parties' agreed position makes the issue of whether land contamination is a relevant consideration for the reserved matters, in particular the layout, a redundant issue. However, interested parties continue to raise concerns over the effect on land contamination on residents. Relevant consultees have also raised related matters. Hence, this remains a main issue for my consideration.

[1] Bernard Wheatcroft Ltd v SSE [JPL 1982 P37])
[2] Regina (Holborn Studios Ltd and Brenner) v Hackney London Borough Council [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

Richborough Estates

Main Issue

12. Taking account of the above, the main issue is the effect on the public health of the future occupiers of the proposal and the occupiers of nearby residential properties by way of land contamination.

Reasons

13. The appeal site comprises an expansive area of land that was formerly in use as a landfill site and prior to that as a brickworks and claypit. It now largely has a grassed appearance. It does have a telecommunications installation close to its eastern boundary, and an electricity pylon and an associated transmission line in its south west corner. The site is raised, in particular in relation to land to the south. There is a secured access on Cork Lane in the north east corner of the site, as well as field accesses elsewhere.

14. The northern boundary of the site is formed by vegetation, beyond which is a Public Right of Way (PROW) and then residential properties on Westdale Avenue and Cork Lane. The eastern boundary is well vegetated and delineates the site from a well-used shared cycleway and footpath that forms part of the National Cycle Network, which itself separates commercial uses from the site. To the south are modern residential properties on Navigation Drive, where a steep slope on the adjoining part of the site is marked. The south west corner of the site is well vegetated and abuts the northern bank of the Grand Union Canal, which is a conservation area. To the west, past vegetation on the boundary, are open fields.

15. The outline planning permission (Council ref: 15/0176/OUT) was granted 2 August 2016 for a residential development of a maximum of 165 dwellings with associated landscaping and public open space, and vehicular access taken from Cork Lane. The permission included condition No 11 which concerned the land contamination on the site. No development is to take place until a number of matters have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority under this condition, including a preliminary risk assessment, a site investigations scheme, the associated results, an options appraisal and a verification plan. Condition No 12 deals with the finding of unexpected contamination and condition No 10 requires that development must not commence until conditions Nos 11 and 12 have been complied with, apart from that approved under the remediation scheme.

16. While information on land contamination was submitted during the course of the reserved matters application, condition No 11 has not been discharged. It is not worded to require the reserved matters to deal with condition No 11. What was submitted during the consideration of the reserved matters was, according to the appellant, comprehensive but to be treated as for information only. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that the Council at that time, as well as interested parties and consultees, took some notice of it as it was not unreasonable to consider that such information would have a potential bearing on a proposed layout.

17. The remediation of the site as is now envisaged differs from that which was indicated at the outline stage. The most notable difference is that the capping of the landfill is now proposed in places and that the top part of the landfill material would not be removed.

Richborough Estates

18. However, making comparisons with what was formerly indicated would be the remediation at the time of the outline application would not in itself protect public health. Rather, it is the indicated proposed measures which need to be subject to deliberation and whether they could satisfactorily deal with land contamination, in particular through the future discharge of condition No 11 when full details will need to be provided. Nor can it be reasonably said that the site is not suitable for residential development because of the former landfill use as it already benefits from the related outline planning permission.

19. The potential risk that arises concerns the emission of gases, in particular methane, from material that is the subject of biodegradable decomposition, as well as ground movements that may result from it. Due to the planning history of the site and work that has been commissioned by developer(s), as well as the Council, it seems to me that such issues on the site are already reasonably well understood. They form a sound basis for informing the mitigation that might be required to ensure that potential significant health risks are addressed. There is not substantive expert evidence to the contrary.

20. With regard to the future occupiers of the proposal, it is proposed to incorporate a number of measures into the construction, design and fabric of the dwellings, in line with BS8485[3]. Gas membranes will be provided in the floor construction and which will be sealed where a drainage pipe intersects. Sub floor ventilation is also proposed so that if gas does come out of the underlying ground conditions, it will be diluted to safe levels.

21. On this basis, I am satisfied that methane would not build up to a level within confined spaces within the proposed dwellings where ignition would occur. This would also necessitate the removal of Permitted Development rights for further building works that require below surface works, by way of a planning condition, so that future development does not heighten that risk.

22. A further form of the indicated mitigation would be the building up of the thickness of the existing capping level on the site to one metre (m) in places, where it is less than this. This would also reduce the potential for impacts on the future occupiers. Based on the current information, it would seem that any required levels changes would be fairly modest in nature and in the region of 0.5m.

23. Moving onto the occupiers of nearby residential properties, there is already an existing operational gas venting barrier alongside the southern boundary with Navigation Drive. It has been indicated that more gas monitoring wells are to be installed. Monitoring is to take place prior to and during the proposed development of the site to gauge if there is migration of landfill gas across this boundary. If it proves necessary, mitigation measures will be then undertaken. A passive system would be utilised and so would not be mechanical to avoid noise impacting on existing, and future, residents. Such an approach would ably protect the public health of these occupiers.

24. Ground movements related to landfill gas also need to be considered close to the southern boundary because of the steepness of the slope. If further assessment shows that stability measures will be required, these will need to be implemented in order that stability is maintained. However, there is no

[3] British Standard 8485:2015+A1: 2019 Code of Practice for the Design of Protective Measures for Methane and Carbon Dioxide Ground Gases for New Buildings

Richborough Estates

evidence at this stage that suggests that such measures to protect the occupiers of neighbouring properties would require the layout itself to be changed.

25. There is not a venting barrier along the northern boundary with Westdale Avenue and the end of Cork Lane. The amended site layout however now leaves an easement for one to be installed, if that proves necessary as mitigation following monitoring that will also be carried out along this boundary. This will also need to have regard to the vegetation and with the width of the easement, the barrier would have to be kept to a shallow depth. Such an approach would also ably protect the public health of those occupiers. The width of this easement is less than was originally envisaged in the evidence of the Council's expert witness, but as there is now agreement between the main parties on this matter there is no substantive evidence that it would not perform its function.

26. Settlement resulting from the underlying ground conditions would have the potential to impact on both the future occupiers of the proposal and nearby residents, if parts of the ground would be subject to collapse, in particular if it became saturated. It is proposed that testing would be undertaken to assess the potential for settlement in accordance with National House Building Council technical standards. If this proves to be the case, then piled foundations are likely to be required. This is in order that the proposal can be built out safely.

27. There is no other compelling evidence that the indicated approach and mitigation measures that have been put forward in agreement by the main parties would not be effective. While there remains a difference in opinion between the land contamination expert witnesses over what level of Characteristic Settlement (CS) should apply, what is now proposed would meet the higher CS level in any event. The same applies in relation to views on the content and scope of the EPG Report[4] (2022) that was submitted by the appellant around the time when the Council made its decision. This is in light of what is now intended to deal with the land contamination issue.

28. The Environment Agency (EA) confirmed during the course of the appeal, that whilst it had concerns, it did not object. The advice that it provided on gas mitigation and the quality of the installation of measures to be incorporated into the design of the development seems largely to have been reflected in what is now proposed and is in agreement with the main parties. It would adequately mitigate the level of risk that the EA identified.

29. The full details of the land contamination preliminary risk assessment, a site investigations scheme, the associated results, an options appraisal and a verification plan are not before me. These will be matters for the Council when an application is submitted to discharge condition No 11. However, the evidence that has been submitted on land contamination is not insignificant and satisfactorily demonstrates that remediation and mitigation works could be undertaken to address the risk posed to both the future occupants and the surrounding residents as a result of the site's previous use as a landfill site.

30. The potential for old aircraft to be buried on the site was raised at the inquiry. Photographic evidence was submitted of a maintenance unit, accessed off

[4] The Environmental Protection Group Limited, Review of Landfill Gas, Cork Lane, Glen Parva, Planning Ref(19/0813/RM), May 2022

Leicester Road, and which appears to extend into part of the site, or at least where the properties on Navigation Drive are found. In the event that parts of aircraft are discovered, I see no reason why this could also not be dealt with through the discharge of condition No 11. Matters in relation to exhumation are not for my consideration.

31. I have also been referred to the Huncote Leisure Centre in the area where landfill gas issues arose. While the full details of that case are not before me, with the evidence on the appeal site and the proposal that is for my consideration, I am satisfied, subject to conditions, that the land contamination issue would be capably addressed.

32. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the public health of the future occupiers of the proposal and the occupiers of nearby residential properties by way of land contamination. As a result, it would comply with Policy DM13 of the Council's Local Plan (Delivery) Development Plan Document (2019) (Delivery DPD) where it states that proposals will be required to clearly demonstrate that any unacceptable adverse impacts related to land contamination, landfill, land stability and pollution can be satisfactorily mitigated, and will be supported where they are accompanied by a detailed investigation of the issues and appropriate mitigation measures are identified to avoid any adverse impact upon the site or adjacent areas, including where land is (or has the potential to be) subject to land contamination or land stability issues, amongst other considerations.

33. The proposal would also comply with Policy CS2 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) Development Plan Document (2013) and Policy DM1 of the Delivery DPD in as far as addressing land contamination can be seen as a constituent of good design.

34. The proposal would also comply with paragraphs 183, 184 and 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) where they concern ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability and contamination, that responsibilities for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner, and that decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects, including health and living conditions.

Other Matters

35. The separation distances between the proposed and the existing dwellings beyond the northern boundary would ensure that overlooking and the visual impact would not be unacceptable for the occupiers of those nearby properties. The amended site layout plan has resulted in some of the proposed dwellings being sited further away from this boundary, while the PROW would provide a distinct sense of separation. The boundary vegetation would also provide some screening.

36. The separation between the proposal and the dwellings to the south of the site would be significant and negates the marked difference in land levels. In relation to the potential for levels changes, as I have set out, these would be modest. The outline permission is already subject to a finished ground levels condition and this would ably prevent levels changes causing unacceptable living conditions effects. This applies to both existing residents who live to the north and south of the site.

Richborough Estates

37. As piling may be required, this has the potential to cause some noise and vibration as regards living conditions. This can be ably controlled through a planning condition, to prevent undue levels of disturbance to local residents. In relation to other relevant on-site construction aspects, this would be dealt with through the construction method statement (CMS) condition on the outline permission.

38. In respect of ecological interests, the outline permission required an updated Phase 1 Habitat Survey to be submitted with the reserved matters and accordingly this was provided, along with a badger survey. The associated measures are to be implemented as part of the reserved matters approval, along with a biodiversity management plan to be submitted. There is not persuasive evidence of an undue impact on a nearby nature reserve. The effect on biodiversity interests arising from the reserved matters would not be unacceptable.

39. The outline permission already includes a number of planning conditions that deal with drainage and so also addresses flood risk. Drainage of the site is also of relevance to settlement but as I have already set out, this would be addressed through the details to be submitted in pursuance of condition No 11 on the outline permission.

40. The proposal provides for links to the PROW network and the outline permission imposes a travel plan condition to promote more sustainable transport, in relation to carbon footprint matters. The provision of a not insignificant amount of on-site public open space would also be of benefit to public recreation and there would not be an impact on nearby open land where access for public recreation is afforded.

41. The proposed housing would also lie a significant distance away from the Grand Union Canal, so that the historical significance of this heritage asset is maintained. Nor would the design of the proposal raise substantive matters in relation to crime prevention, based on the evidence before me. The Section 106 Agreement associated with the outline permission also provides for a police contribution.

42. A number of the concerns raised by interested parties relate more appropriately to the existing outline permission. This forms the planning permission for the proposal, not the reserved matters which are the subject of my appeal decision because they seek approval of details pursuance to condition No 2 of that outline permission. The reserved matters that are for my consideration are themselves consistent with the outline permission.

43. Accordingly, that some time has passed since the submission of the outline application and the granting of that permission does not change that the principle of that permission cannot be reopened at this stage. The consideration of alternative uses also falls outside the ambit of what this reserved matters application can consider.

44. The same applies as regards access because this is not a matter which is the subject of these reserved matters. Hence, traffic generation and the associated safety implications on the surrounding area have a limited bearing at this stage, as does the effect on PROW users. This is equally true for both footpath and bridleway users. The same applies with regard to the impact on local services and infrastructure. These would all have been issues for

Richborough Estates

consideration when the Council determined the outline application. Similarly, the arrangements for the use of Section 106 Agreement monies associated with the outline permission are not for my consideration. Air quality is also a matter dealt with by way of that Section 106 Agreement.

45. The outline permission also deals with construction traffic through the CMS condition in as far as it concerns parking, loading, the site compound location, and measures to control dust and dirt, amidst other matters. It does not deal with lorry routeing but as these vehicles cannot be prevented from using public roads and may not all be in the direct control of the developer of the site, such a condition would prove difficult to enforce.

Conditions

46. A condition is imposed concerning the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. This does not include noise and biodiversity related reports, as they are dealt with adequately through other conditions. I have also imposed a condition concerning the implementation of parking and turning related to the layout, in the interests of highway safety.

47. Conditions are also imposed which remove permitted development rights relating to enclosure and hard surfacing, in the interests of character and appearance. I was informed at the inquiry that a great deal of work had gone into the design of the proposal and so consider such conditions are reasonable and necessary in light of the emphasis that the Framework and the National Design Guide now place on good design.

48. A condition is imposed to obscurely glaze flank elevation windows on specified plots in the interests of protecting living conditions by way of privacy. Such windows are to be obscurely glazed prior to the occupation of the respective dwellings. A condition is also imposed for details contained in the submitted Noise Impact Assessment in the interests of protecting living conditions in this regard.

49. A condition is imposed which removes permitted development rights from future building works that require below surface works. This is due to land contamination and in the interests of public health. Conditions are also imposed in relation to ecology and biodiversity measures in order to protect these interests. An implementation schedule is required as regards the biodiversity management plan condition. A condition is also imposed in respect of a land contamination pack for occupiers, also in the interests of public health.

50. Conditions are also imposed regarding the implementation of the proposed landscaping, in the interests of character and appearance, and with regard to a proposed local area of play, in the interests of providing recreational facilities. A condition is also imposed controlling piling operations, in the interests of protecting living conditions by way of noise and vibration, and protecting groundwater and subsurface infrastructure.

51. A condition concerning access is not imposed as that is not a matter which is part of the reserved matters that are for my consideration. A condition is also not imposed in relation to drainage because there are already conditions on the outline planning permission which deal adequately with this matter. A condition requiring landscaping on individual plots to be retained, or else

Pilkington Estates

replaced on a like for like basis, is also not imposed as it would not be reasonable as regards the future occupiers. In addition, walls on relevant plots are already satisfactorily dealt with through the condition which removes such Permitted Development rights. 'Tailpiece' phrases have also been excluded from a number of the conditions as they introduce uncertainty over what is permitted, and so are not reasonable.

Conclusion

52. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Jonathan Easton	Of Counsel, instructed by the Legal Services Department, Blaby District Council
He called	
Kristy Ingles BA(Hons), MA, MRTPI	Development Services Manager, Blaby District Council
Dr Geoffrey B Card PhD, BSc, CEng, FICE, EurIng, CGeol, CSci, FGS	Managing Director, GB Card & Partners Limited

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Charles Banner	Of Kings Counsel, instructed by Chris May, Partner, Howes Percival LLP
He called	
Craig Alsbury BA(Hons), BTP, MRTPI	Principal, Avison Young
Steven A Wilson MSc, BEng, CEng MICE, CEnv, CSci, CWEM, MCIWEM, FGS	Technical Director, The Environmental Protection Group Ltd

INTERESTED PARTIES

Janet Martin	Chair, Glen Parva Parish Council
Cllr Geoff Welsh	Ward Councillor, Blaby District Council
R. Woolley	Local Resident

Richborough Estates

INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

1 Rebuttal Proof of Evidence of Craig Alsbury BA(Hons), BTP, MRTPI and the Appellant's Outline Legal Submissions (appended)
2 Supplementary Statement of Common Ground dated 23 November 2022
3 Document Reference: G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Proposed Site Layout dated 17.11.2022
4 Appellant's Application for Costs
5 Response to Costs Application on behalf of Blaby District Council, including The Queen on the application of Village Concerns v Wealden District Council and Swansea Enterprises Corporation and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities [2022] EWHC 2039 (Admin)
6 Appellant's reply to the Council's Cost Response
7 Appellant's Opening Statement
8 Representation dated 16 November 2022 from Mrs Victoria Maloy
9 Aerial Photograph submitted by Janet Martin
10 Regina (Holborn Studios Ltd and Brenner) v Hackney London Borough Council [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)
11 Piling condition submitted on behalf of Blaby District Council

DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FOLLOWING THE CLOSE OF THE INQUIRY

12 Council notification letter dated 30 November 2022 concerning the amended site layout plan and consultation lists
13 Representations received (bundle) after 14 Dec
14 Appellant response

Richborough Estates

Schedule of Conditions

1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in Annex 1.

2) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until space has been laid out within the site for the associated parking and turning facilities in accordance with Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022 and that space shall thereafter be kept available at all times for those purposes.

3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no further vehicular access gates, barriers, bollards, chains or other such obstructions or gates, fences or walls shall be erected within 6 metres of the highway boundary of any access serving individual dwellings.

4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional hard surfaces shall be laid out within 6 metres of the highway boundary of any individual dwelling.

5) The dwellings hereby permitted on plots 10, 11,12, 19, 20, 29, 43, 51, 53, 61, 64, 65, 68, 78, 84, 95, 103, 106, 125, 136, 141, 143, 150 and 152 shall not be occupied until the windows located in their flank elevations have been obscurely glazed and shall thereafter be retained as such.

6) The dwellings hereby permitted shall be constructed in strict accordance with the details specified in the Noise Impact Assessment, Revision 1, prepared by BWB dated June 2021 and shall thereafter be retained as such.

7) Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, AA, D and E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no extensions or additions to the dwellings hereby permitted, the provision of any additional building within their curtilage, or any other development that requires below surface works or works that obstruct, impact or alter the installed landfill gas protection measures shall be constructed or carried out.

8) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the precautionary measures, mitigation measures and timing of such as set out in the Phase 1 Preliminary Ecology Appraisal by Dr Stefan Bodnar prepared January 2020, revised November 2020 and the Badger Survey by Dr Stefan Bodnar dated 13th January 2020.

9) Within 6 months of the commencement of above ground construction, a biodiversity management plan for all retained and created habitats including an implementation schedule shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained as such.

Pinnacle Estates

10) Prior to the first occupation of each dwelling hereby approved, a pack detailing the contamination, remediation and ongoing monitoring and related liabilities shall be provided to the occupier. The pack shall also set out the contamination and controlled waters conditions within this permission which must be adhered to.

11) The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out within one year of completion of the development hereby approved and any trees, hedges, shrubs or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

12) The central local area of play shall be equipped in accordance with the approved landscaping scheme and shall be completed and made available for use within 2 years of the first occupation of the first dwelling hereby approved. The local area of play shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

13) No piling including impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to minimise the potential for impact on ground water, impact on living conditions through noise and vibration, damage to any subsurface water infrastructure and the implementation programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any piling shall be undertaken only in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Richborough Estates

Annex 1 – Approved Plans

- Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- House Type Pack P19-2940_07K Dated January 2021
- Materials plan Drawing No. P19_2940_15 Revision E Dated 14/01/21 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Building Heights Drawing No. P19-2940_08 Revision F Dated 14/01/21
- Parking Strategy Drawing No. P19-2940_09 Revision F Dated 14/01/21 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Adoption Plan Drawing No. P19-2940_10 Revision E Dated 14/01/21 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Movement Plan Drawing No. P19-2940_11 Revision E Dated 14/01/21 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Affordable Housing Drawing No. P19-2940_12 Revision E Dated 14/01/21 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Refuse Strategy Drawing No. P19-2940_13 Revision F Dated 14/01/21 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Boundaries and surfaces Drawing No. P19-294_14 Revision F Dated 14/01/21 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Landscape Masterplan Drawing No. C-1661-05 Revision H Dated Dec 2019 with the layout of plots 2, 65, 67, 80, 81, 82 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Detailed Landscape Proposals Sheet 1 of 4 Drawing No. c-1661-01 Revision F Dated Dec 2019
- Detailed Landscape Proposals Sheet 2 of 4 Drawing No. c-1661-02 Revision G Dated Dec 2019 with the layout of plots 2 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Detailed Landscape Proposals Sheet 3 of 4 Drawing No. c1661-03 Revision G Dated Dec 2019 with the layout of plots 65, 67, 80, 81 and 82 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Detailed Landscape Proposals Sheet 4 of 4 Drawing No. c1661-04 Revision G Dated Dec 2019 with the layout of plots 2 and 152 as amended by Site layout Drawing No. G128-BRP-00-00-DR-A-8002-P01 Dated 17.11.2022
- Tree Removal Plan Drawing No. C-1661-06 Dated Dec 2020

Richmond Estates