Appeal Decision

Park House
87/91 Great Victoria Street
BELFAST
BT2 7AG
T: 028 9024 4710
F: 028 9031 2536
E: info@pacni.gov.uk

Appeal Reference:	2013/A0183
Appeal by:	WGK Construction in default of a decision on an application for full planning permission
Development:	Proposed amendment of residential development permitted under refs S/2011/0383/F and S/2008/0714/F changing 39 no. dwellings (9 no. detached and 30 no. semi-detached dwellings, previously referenced as sites 387-413b) to 33 no. dwellings comprising of 14 no. detached, 16 no. semi-detached and 3 no. townhouse dwellings, with associated car parking, landscaping and relocation of bus gate to facilitate a two phased development
Location:	Lands immediately to the north of Mount Royal and to the east of Hollybrook Hill, Lisburn
Application Reference:	S/2013/0423/F
Procedure:	Informal hearing on 27th June 2014
Decision by:	Commissioner Julie de-Courcey, dated 4th September 2014

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and full planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out below.

Reasons

2. The Department was content that the proposal complies with planning policy and provided draft conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed.

3. Objectors raised a variety of concerns, the main issues being the proposal's impact on:

   - The local road network and road users' safety; and
   - Local character, environmental quality and residential amenity.

4. The majority of the appeal site is part of housing Zoning LD 3 Plantation/Hillhall Road in the adopted Lisburn Area Plan 2001 save for the dwelling and outbuildings at No. 34a Plantation Avenue at the site's western extent, which are designated whiteland. Zoning LD 3 is subject to three Key Design Considerations (KDCs) one of which states that: "*The site can be accessed via Hillhall Road which shall be upgraded to a satisfactory standard together with the provision of a*

right turning lane". This KDC is not prescriptive as regards access via Hillhall Road and does not preclude the possibility of acess via Saintfield Road/ Plantation Road and Mount Royal.

5. The majority of the appeal site comes within Zoning LC 05/08 Housing Land at Hillhall Road in the draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 (dBMAP). Again, the buildings at No. 34a Plantation Avenue are designated whiteland. The Zoning is subject of 14 Key Design Considerations (KDCs), one of which includes the statement that: "*No vehicular access to Plantation Road due to difficulties at Plantation Road/Saintfield junction"*. At the Public Local Inquiry into dBMAP, the Department conceded that the KDCs attached to the Zoning were no longer necessary on the basis that there was extant planning permission for housing thereon. In its report to the Department on the Inquiry, the Planning Appeals Commission agreed with the Department's approach and considered that it would address the concerns of objectors to the KDCs. Accordingly, it recommended that they be deleted from the plan. In this context, it is unlikely that the KDCs would be retained in the adopted Plan.

6. I cannot re-examine the Department's reasons for its concession and the Commissioners' recommendation in the context of this appeal or speculate on whether their respective positions would have differed had it been considered that a future proposal would seek to access part of the Zoning via Plantation Road. As such, the appeal proposal is not at odds with adopted or emergent development plan policy and the issue of prematurity does not arise.

7. 22 of the proposed dwellings would take access off Plantation Road via Mount Royal. An extended estate road leading from Hillhall Road would serve the remainder. Objectors have no issue with the principle of the dwellings that would take access from Hillhall Road; it is the additional loading of the junction of Plantation Road with Saintfield Road (A49) and the impact of additional traffic using Mount Royal that are the nub of their concerns. The fact that previous permissions for housing on this site and the wider housing zoning were, save for access for buses, to be served via Hillhall Road does not weigh against this proposal. It must be assessed on its own merits.

8. The appellants submitted a Transport Assessment Form (TAF) and Roads Service assessed the proposal's traffic implications on that basis together with supplementary survey evidence. Objectors contended that Roads Service failed to apply the Department's *"Transport Assessment, Guidelines for Development Proposals in Northern Ireland"* as it did not seek a detailed Transport Assessment (TA) for this development that they said is likely to have significant transport implications and raises significant concerns over road safety. Policy AMP 6 of Planning Policy Statement 3 "*Access, Movement and Parking*" (PPS 3) affords the Department discretion in deciding whether developers should be required to submit a TA. Paragraph 5.37 of the Justification & Amplification text refers to the associated guidelines that objectors cited. Section 3.5 of the latter sets out guidance for deciding whether a detailed TA is required. Considerations include the size threshold for residential development, set at 100 dwellings, and whether the site complies with development plan policy and any accessibility criteria therein. There are other qualitative considerations to be weighed into the decision as to whether or not a TA is required.

9. Roads Service explained that, having considered the submitted TAF and the guidelines, it decided that the proposal would not have significant transport implications or raise significant concerns for road safety and concluded that a TA was not necessary. Both policy and guidance allow discretion by the decision-maker and I am satisfied that both were considered by the roads authority.

10. Saintfield Road (A49) is a Protected Route. Some of the traffic generated by the proposed development would be ultimately join it, either via Plantation Road or Clogher Road. However, as the proposed dwellings would not take direct access off the A49, Policy AMP 3 *Access to Protected Routes* of Planning Policy Statement 3 *"Access, Movement and Parking"* (PPS 3), as amended, is not relevant.

11. Nonetheless the proposal would involve the increased of use of the junction of Plantation Road with the A49. Development Control Advice Note 15 states that intensification of an access is considered to occur when a proposed development would increase the flow using an access by 5% or more. Roads Service provided unchallenged quantitative evidence to show that the additional traffic associated with 22 houses would equate to less than 1% additional traffic accessing the A49. It advised that this value is below the Transport Assessment (TA) guidelines for identifying traffic impact of a development that would require the consideration of mitigation measures. Notwithstanding, the issue of the additional traffic using this junction and the attendant implications for road safety and whether it would significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic are still material considerations.

12. Not all of the traffic emanating from 22 houses to be served off Mount Royal would use the junction of Plantation Road with Saintfield Road. Clogher Road leads south-east off Plantation Road to join the A49 less than a mile and a half from the aforementioned junction. Whilst the minor road is narrow and undulating, it is relatively straight and has good visibility at the junction with the A49. If travelling to Saintfield, Ballynahinch, Carryduff and other destinations east and south-east of Lisburn, at times of peak flow, this alternate route might cater for some of the traffic associated with the proposed development. Plantation Road becomes Ballymullan Road that joins Pine Hill, then Braniel Road and Hillhall Road. Whilst relatively circuitous and involving a right turn onto Hillhall Road if Belfast-bound, some associated traffic going to south Belfast might opt to use this route at "rush hour" as opposed to negotiating the access onto the A49, the roundabout at junction 6 of the M1 and then Largymore Drive to reach Hillhall Road.

13. The appellant's Transport Assessment Form (TAF) used the National Standard for Trip Generation Analysis (TRICS), which is the industry standard database for the assessment of proposals' transport implications. This showed that the 22 houses taking access off Mount Royal would generate 57 daily additional car trips and 1 HGV movement. It identified the peak period for movements as 17.00-18.00 hours with a mean trip rate of 8 arrivals and 5 departures along Mount Royal. It indicated a morning peak of 08.00-09.00 hours with 3 arrivals and 9 departures along Mount Royal. Roads Service analysis of the TAF corroborated this evidence. The appellants advised that a traffic count on Saintfield Road in April 2012 identified the two-way flow during the AM and PM peak periods as 1315 and 1648 vehicles respectively. They added that if all the additional trips used Saintfield Road in one direction then the impact would be 0.9% in the AM peak

and 0.8% in the PM peak. However, as already considered not all additional traffic movements would necessarily be to/from the A49.

14. The objectors referred to previous Commission decisions that they consider to support their stance on this issue. However, each case has to be considered on its own merits in light of the prevailing material considerations. For example the scale of the development may differ, changes to the road network may have been effected and/or the advice of the statutory roads authority specific to individual proposals. In these respects, I am not persuaded that previous decisions are on all fours with the current proposal and consider that they are distinguishable on their facts.

15. The appellants are not required to improve existing issues with the road network. Policy only requires that road safety is not prejudiced and that existing traffic flows are not significantly inconvenienced. Account has been taken of objectors' concerns about difficulties negotiating the junction of Plantation Road with the A49, its proximity to the Junction 6 roundabout, the speed of county-bound traffic on the A49 is the traffic lights at J6 are green, the volume of traffic generated by Dobbie's Garden Centre and the Park and Share facility at Plantation Road and on-street overspill parking from the latter. However, the quantitative evidence is persuasive that peak hour flows associated with 22 additional houses are unlikely to cause any significant change in local travel patterns, waiting times to exit minor roads, accident rates or environmental conditions arising from traffic flow in the immediate area including the junction of Plantation Road with the A49.

16. Criterion (h) of Policy QD 1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 *"Quality Residential Developments"* (PPS 7) stipulates that the proposal's design and layout will not create conflict with adjacent land uses and there is no unacceptable adverse effect on existing properties in terms of noise and other disturbance. Objectors said that allowing access to 22 properties of Mount Royal would be inconsistent with this requirement. They also contended that the proposal would also be at odds with guidance on layout and access in residential developments as set out in "Creating Places".

17. In accordance with Table 3 of "Creating Places" the existing Mount Royal 5.5m carriageway with a footway on both sides would serve 0-200 dwellings. If approved, this proposal would bring the total units served off this route to 65. Accordingly, the capacity exists for Mount Royal to carry traffic associated with more dwellings than it currently serves. The footway rounds the corner at the T junction at the top of Mount Royal, off which the proposed dwellings would be served, and the road narrows to a 4.8m wide shared surface providing access to Nos. 20-23. The rumble strip marks the start of the shared surface. Where the shared surface widens out to form the existing turning head is approximately 20m from the rumble strip. Paragraph 16.06 of 'Creating Paces" states that, for a shared surface, the minimum width is 6.0m but its entrance should always be 4.8m wide. Paragraph 16.09 allows for carriageway narrowing to a 4.8m on shared surfaces but only for short lengths (around 20m). Whilst Paragraph 9.10 and Table 3 states that the minimum width for bus routes is 6.0m, in light of the provisions with paragraphs 16.09 and 16.10, the proposal is consistent with guidance in "Creating Places". The 4.8m carriageway would not allow 2 buses to pass. However, if the proposed bus service were to be two-directional, taking into account available visibility, the location of the turning head, one bus could stop to

allow the other to negotiate the narrow stretch without prejudice to road safety or the free-flow of traffic.

18. Service vehicles, including bin lorries, already have to negotiate the mini roundabout and left hand turn into the current cul-de-sac at Mount Royal off which 22 of the houses would take access. The 4 houses served by this cul-de-sac have 3 off-street parking spaces albeit that those for 2 of the houses are a nose-to-tail layout rather than side-by-side. However, their driveways take access of the turning head rather than the 20m extent where the carriageway narrow so, even if associated vehicles park on-street for the sake of convenience, even service vehicles could pass. One of two on-coming vehicles might have a stop briefly until the other passes before pulling round parked vehicles but does not rule against the proposal. Moreover, previous planning permissions have set a precedent for the suitability of the existing road layout to serve buses. Roads Service advised that the proposal is consistent with "Creating Places". In all, there is no persuasive evidence that the additional traffic using Mount Royal would prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic.

19. As the access route already has the capacity to carry service vehicles in accordance with guidance in "Creating Places", I am not persuaded that it could not cater for construction traffic if no alternate haul route is available during the site clearance and build phase. The size of vehicles involved would detrimentally impact on the ease of traffic flows within Mount Royal whilst they negotiate traffic calming features, parked vehicles and on-coming traffic. However, notwithstanding the amount of excavated material that might have to be exported from the site, taking into account the likely length of the construction phase, I am not convinced that the temporary inconvenience to the flow of traffic would be so significant as to warrant dismissing the appeal on this basis.

20. Mount Royal comprises 41 dwellings, 19 of which front the route of the access to 22 of the proposed houses. An additional 58 vehicle movements per day would represent a significant increase in activity on the main spine of the "estate road" and this proportionate increase would be most marked for the residents of dwellings on the cul-de-sac nearest the appeal site's southern end. The associated noise and activity would irrefutably change the residential environment that has been enjoyed by the occupants to date. However, the overriding policy test set out in PPS 7 is whether the proposed increase in the number of vehicles using Mount Royal would significantly erode the environmental quality, amenity and privacy that they enjoy. In the context of a housing estate within the city's Urban Area Boundary that is already served by street lighting, a maximum additional 13 vehicles movements at the peak period between 17.00-18.00 hours would not significantly harm these considerations in terms of noise, general disturbance, noise, light and/or air pollution. Whilst the proposal would change the residential environment of Mount Royal's occupants, the potential of the site's development is well-established. Despite that previous proposals opted for an alternate access, it was not unforeseeable that traffic associated with additional housing might use Mount Royal.

21. Whilst there is no communal play space within Mount Royal, the houses have private amenity space to the rear that children can use. However, if children are playing on the public road, it is reasonable to expect that they would be subject of adult supervision. Accordingly, determining weight is not attached to the

consideration that extension of the cul-de-sac to accommodate 22 new houses and associated traffic would prejudice the safety of children who are used to playing on the public road.

22. Objectors are concerned about the impact of construction traffic in terms of noise, dirt, dust and air pollution. The City Council's Environmental Health did not raise any issue with regard to these matters. During the site preparation and build phase, these considerations will undoubtedly detract from residents' amenity. However, given the likely duration of the construction phase, I am not persuaded this this disturbance will be so significant as to result in unacceptable damage to the area's environmental quality or residential amenity.

23. The proposal's impact on road safety, traffic flows and residential amenity has been considered on the basis of an additional 22 dwellings taking access off Mount Royal. It is therefore essential that a condition is attached to any forthcoming permission to ensure that the bus gate is erected in the position shown on the associated plans and becomes operational prior to first occupation of any of the houses ton Plots 23-33 inclusive to be erected at the site's northern end that are to take access via Hillhall Road. It would need to be retained thereafter.

24. Objectors fear that the developer may use Mount Royal for access for construction traffic for further development beyond the confines of the appeal site. Whilst this is a possibility, I have to consider whether it is a realistic one. The aforementioned condition on any forthcoming permission would require provision of the bus gate before 11 of the proposed 33 houses are occupied, which would physically bar access for further construction traffic. At any rate, in the current economic and financial climate, it is likely that the developer would want/need to sell houses as quickly as possible on completion and would not choose to deter potential buyers by continuing to use the access for construction traffic associated with further development. Accordingly, determining weight is not given to this concern.

25. The dwellings on Mount Royal are predominantly large, two storey, red brick houses. The proposed dwellings would be a mix of smaller detached, semi-detached and townhouses. Entering the proposed development from Mount Royal, the proposed houses on the left hand side would also be two storey, detached properties but with a markedly smaller footprint and frontage width than their existing neighbours. The first six on the opposite side would be semi-detached dwellings of two different designs. One pair would have one of the entrances on the gable end, designed to give the appearance of a large, detached house. The 3 proposed townhouses would be in a corner of the site and not seen in the context of Mount Royal. Objectors referred me to another of the appellants' developments where properties of similar scale, design and finishes were erected at the interface with the existing houses. However, the policy test that the proposal must satisfy is whether it would offend the overriding objective of PPS 7 by avoiding any significant erosion of local character and the environmental quality, amenity and privacy enjoyed by existing residents. Policy LC 1 of the Addendum to PPS 7 "*Safeguarding the Character of Established Residential Areas*" does not apply as the proposal involves development on a site zoned for housing in the adopted and draft Area Plan and not the redevelopment of existing buildings or the infilling of a vacant site (including extended garden areas).

26. Criterion (a) of Policy QD 1 of PPS 7 requires that the development respects the surrounding context and is appropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout scale, proportions, massing and appearance of buildings, structures and landscape and hard surfaced areas. Whilst a mix of houses types is acceptable in principle in an urban area, the proposed dwellings' scale, massing and appearance does not respect the surrounding context. In these terms, the stark contrast between the dwellings on Mount Royal and those proposed would be visually jarring and out of character especially where there are juxtaposed at the site's south-eastern corner. The density of the proposed development would be markedly higher than that on Mount Royal.

27. There is extant planning permission (S/2008/0714) for the erection of 39 no. 2 and 3 storey detached and semi-detached dwellings on the appeal site. In that scheme, it was proposed to erect a pair of semi-detached dwellings immediately north of No. 21 Mount Royal, with 2 no, detached houses on the opposite side. The approved semis have a frontage width of 11.9m and a hipped roof. The semis now proposed have a wider frontage (13.3m) and their design is more in keeping with properties on Mount Royal. The approved detached houses immediately north of No. 22 have a slightly wider frontage (0.4m) than that now proposed on the interface between the existing and proposed development. However, the proposed design is more in keeping with the area with a gabled front return as opposed to that approved that included a split eaves line and fenestration reminiscent of Art Deco style.

28. The appeal site is part of a larger one that is subject of a second extant planning permission (2011/A0263). The layout for the appeal site mirrored that of the 2008 permission with almost identical house types proposed on the plots at the interface between Mount Royal and the adjoining part of that appeal site.

29. Accordingly, whilst the marked contrast in the scale, massing and appearance of the existing and proposed houses at the site's interface with Mount Royal would significantly erode local character, what is now proposed represents a better visual transition. Overall, the proposed density is lower than that previously approved with more detached houses. The current scheme's design is more respectful of the challenge presented by the site's topography and includes an area of communal open space as the focus of the layout. Notwithstanding that the schemes subject of the extant planning permissions are to take access via Hillhall Road, their visual relationship with the adjoining houses on Mount Royal would be the same irrespective that the bus gate would be in a different position. As determining weight is attached to the precedent set by the two extant planning permissions on the appeal site, the proposal is not at odds with criterion (a) of Policy QD 1 of PPS 7.

30. The houses on Mount Royal are faced in red brick with concrete roof tiles in varying colours. Some have panels of smooth render on their façade. The proposed dwellings are also to be roofed with concrete tiles and a mixture of facing brick and smooth render used in the elevations. A condition would be necessary to ensure that the colour and texture of the proposed finished is consistent with their surroundings but, in principle, the proposed finishes are acceptable in this context.

31. The proposal is not at odds with the final paragraph of Policy QD 1 of PPS 7, which states that any proposal for residential development which fails to produce an appropriate quality of design will not be permitted, even on land identified for residential use in a development plan and objectors' concerns in these respects are not sustained.

32. In compliance with criterion (c) of Policy QD 1 of PPS 7, conditions are necessary to ensure retention of the majority of the existing boundary hedgerow, existing trees and the provision of additional landscaping together with provisions to secure their management.

33. The proposal would not significantly erode local character and the environmental quality, amenity and privacy enjoyed by existing residents. It is consistent with both the overriding objective of PPS 7 and with Policy QD 1 thereof. As such, and without convincing quantitative evidence to the contrary, I am not persuaded that the appeal proposal would cause significant diminution in property values.

34. Regarding the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Convention, both Article 1 of the First Protocol that provides for the protection of property and peaceful enjoyment of possessions and Article 8 of the Convention, which provides a right to respect for private and family life are engaged by the proposal. However, these are qualified rights and the legislation envisages that a balance be struck between the interests of individuals and those of society as a while. I have already concluded that the proposal is consistent with planning policy and regard it in the public interest that housing is provided within the urban footprint on a site zoned for that use. Accordingly, there is no unacceptable or disproportionate infringement of objectors' human rights.

35. Any subsequent proposals to increase the number of new dwellings that take access either from Mount Royal or via the Plantation Road/Saintfield Road junction would have to be considered on their own merits. Accordingly, allowing this appeal would not set a precedent for their approval.

36. As determining weight is not attached to objectors' concerns, the appeal is allowed. In reaching this decision, weight has not been attached to the parties' submissions on whether the site's planning history represents a realistic fall-back position.

37. Conditions to ensure the provision and retention of visibility splays and hard surfaced areas for parking and turning within the development are necessary in the interests of road safety. On account of the site's topography, conditions are also needed to restrict gradients of driveways and roads in pursuit of road users' safety.

Conditions

1. No building works shall start until a schedule of the facing brick and concrete tiles to be used within the development hereby approved have been submitted to the Department and the details, as finally approved, have received its written agreement.

2. Prior to occupation of any of the dwellings, the vehicular access including visibility splays and any forward sight distance shall be provided in accordance with Drawing No. 08-772-001 Rev A Mount Royal Extension Road Plans & Sections bearing the Roads Service Determination date stamp 25.11.13

3. Prior to occupation of any of the dwellings the area within the visibility splays and any forward sight line shall be cleared to provide a level surface no higher than 250mm above the level of the adjoining carriageway and such splays shall be retained and kept clear thereafter.

4. The access gradients for public roads and shared accesses shall not exceed 4% (1 in 25) over the first 10m outside the road boundary. Where the vehicular access crosses a footway or verge, the access gradient shall be between 4% (1 in 25) maximum and 2.5% (1 in 40) minimum and shall be formed so that there is no abrupt change of slope along the footway.

5. The access gradient for private driveways shall not exceed 8% (1 in 12.5) over the first 5m outside the road boundary. Where the vehicular access crosses a footway or verge, the access gradient shall be between 4% (1 in 25) maximum and 2.5% (1 in 40) minimum and shall be formed so that there is no abrupt change of slope along the footway.

6. The dwellings on Plot Nos. 23-33 inclusive shall not be occupied until the bus gate shown on Drawing No. 08-772-001 Rev A Mount Royal Extension Road Plans & Sections bearing the Roads Service Determination date stamp 25.11.13 is in place and fully operational. It shall be retained thereafter.

7. The dwellings hereby permitted shall not be occupied until hard surfaced areas have been constructed in accordance with Drawing No. 08-772-001 Rev A Mount Royal Extension Road Plans & Sections bearing the Roads Service Determination date stamp 25.11.13. No part of these hard surfaced areas shall be used for any purpose other than for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles.

8. Save for creation of the point of access to the dwellings on Plots 23-33 inclusive, existing hedgerows on the site boundary shall be retained together with existing trees identified on Drawing No. LO-01 Rev G Landscape Proposals.

9. During the first available planting season after work begins on the build phase of the 23rd dwelling within the site, the landscaping scheme shown on Drawing No. LO-01 Rev G Landscape Proposals shall be implemented in its entirety. Trees or shrubs dying, removed or becoming seriously damaged within five years of being planted shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species unless the Department gives written consent to any variation.

10. Before any dwellings are occupied, a landscape management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Department setting out the period of the plan, long-term objectives, management responsibilities, performance measures and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.

11. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Planning (General Development) Order (Northern Ireland) 1993, as amended, (or any legislation revoking that Order and

re-enacting those provisions) no buildings, walls or fences shall be erected, nor hedges nor formal rows of trees grown in verges/service strips determined for adoption.

12. The development shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

This decision relates to:

- Drawing No. 2602-050-01-001 Site Location Plan stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-050-04-03-002-Rev G Site Layout received from appellant at Hearing
- Drawing No. 2602-050-04-03-003 Rev G Parking Layout stamped received by Area Planning Office on 29.08.13
- Drawing No. LO-01 Rev G Landscape Proposals stamped received by Area Planning Office on 29.08.13
- Drawing No. 08-772-001 Rev A Mount Royal Extension Road Plans & Sections bearing the Roads Service Determination date stamp 25.11.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-05 House Type B6.2 (semi) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-08 House Type B6A & B6.2 stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-10 House Type B6.2, B12, B12A.2 (3 block) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-11 House Type B6.2, B12, B12A.2 (3 block) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-12 House Type B8 (semi) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-13 House Type B8 (semi) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-14 House Type B11.3 (semi) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-15 House Type B11.3 stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-16 House Type B14 stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-17 House Type B14 (handed) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-18 House Type P3 stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-19 House Type P3 stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-20 House Type P3 (handed) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-21 House Type P3 (handed) stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-22 Single Garages received from appellant at Hearing
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-23 Single Garages received from appellant at Hearing
- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-24 Twin Garages received from appellant at Hearing

- Drawing No. 2602-010-02-25 Wall & Fence Details stamped received by Area Planning Office on 25.07.13

COMMISSIONER JULIE DE-COURCEY