



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2021

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J4525/W/21/3270321

Land at Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Houghton-le-Spring, Sunderland

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gentoo Group Limited against the decision of Sunderland City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01360/FUL, dated 30 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of 86 no. residential dwellings (Class C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of 86 no. residential dwellings (Class C3) at Land at Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Houghton-le-Spring, Sunderland in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01360/FUL, dated 30 July 2020, subject to the conditions set out in the Schedule at the end of this decision.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Gentoo Group Limited against Sunderland City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the appeal was lodged. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the Framework in reaching my decision.
4. On 14 January 2022 the Government published the 2021 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. However, the results do not materially change the Council's position, nor do they have any implications for the parties' respective arguments at appeal. Therefore, it has not been necessary to seek the parties' further views on this matter.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the provision of greenspace, with due regard to outdoor sport and recreation provision; and

- Other considerations relevant to the planning balance.

Reasons

Greenspace

6. The appeal site consists of an extent of fields which rises gently to the south, extending from an area of suburban housing towards a tree-line with an adjacent public right of way. The site contains extents of hedgerow and trees, with informal pedestrian routes running across the site to nearby greenspace including a children's play area as well as to the right of way.
7. Policy NE4 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan 2020 (CSDP) seeks to protect, conserve and enhance greenspace and wider green infrastructure. Although the site is not allocated within the CSDP, policy NE4 is relevant due to the contribution the site makes as greenspace to this area. Policy NE4-3(ii) requires major residential development to provide a financial contribution for the maintenance/upgrading of neighbouring greenspace as appropriate. Policy NE4-4(iii) also requires that where development would have an adverse effect on greenspace that the developer should make a contribution to the improvement of existing greenspace and other facilities within an appropriate distance of this site. The appellants have provided a Planning Obligation (the Obligation) which meets these requirements of Policy NE4, although I will return to this matter later in my decision.
8. The Council's Greenspace Audit and Reports 2018 and 2020 (the GAR) identify the ward in which the site is located as having a Very High quantity of greenspace. The GAR identifies the application site as being of Low Value, and that the wider ward has a Below Average quality of greenspace. The golf course area, to the south of the site, is identified as natural/semi-natural greenspace of Very High Quality, however this is of a different nature to the appeal site and does not fulfil the same role for residents in the area.
9. The Council emphasises that the appeal site is a valuable community asset, both in terms of its visual amenity and as informal recreational open space. This reflects my observations on my site visit, where I saw that the site was used for informal recreation purposes and provided a landscaped setting for nearby residential estates. Mindful that the evidence of the GAR suggests that its loss would not lead to a deficiency in the quantity of greenspace in the area, and furthermore the contention that this loss could be mitigated by improving the quality of greenspace in the vicinity, an assessment of the existing site is appropriate.
10. In respect of informal recreation, the proposal would lead to a reduction in the amount of greenspace in the area available for informal use. Whilst the proposal would include publicly accessible open areas, these would have the character and functionality of incidental landscaping around the estate or that associated with pedestrian routes, rather than greenspace of the nature that would be lost as a result of this development. The open space and landscaping within the site would therefore not compensate for the loss of greenspace arising from the proposal for existing residents in the area, and would not represent appropriately usable green space for future residents. However, I am mindful of the evidence in respect of the quantity and quality of greenspace in the area. On that basis, I consider that a financial contribution to improving the quality of greenspace in the vicinity would be more appropriate mitigation for

the loss arising from the proposal as well as the limited usability of the proposed landscaping for informal recreation.

11. The proposal would affect informal access routes running through the site. However, a direct pedestrian route to the right of way to the south would be provided, and the proposal would therefore not conflict with policy HA25 of the Unitary Development Plan 1998 (the UDP) in respect of the provision of multi-user routes. Pedestrian access to the open space and play area adjacent to the site would also be provided. Due to the proposed layout and footpaths within the development it would not act as a barrier to pedestrian movement through the site.
12. With regards to character and appearance, nearby residents as well as people passing through the area would see a significant change in their outlook, with the greenspace being replaced by housing. However, this would be mitigated to a significant degree through the use of appropriate separation distances from buildings, landscaping separating much of the proposed development from nearby housing, as well as tree planting and landscaping within the streetscape and open areas. An existing hedgeline would be retained which would provide a soft landscaped edge between the development and the adjacent open space and play area.
13. In respect of the wider character of the area, the proposal would not project beyond the tree line to the south, and would respect the extent of development established by housing to the west and further to the east of the site. When combined with the potential extents of landscaping and planting within the site, the estate would appear as a logical addition to this residential area. On that basis, the proposal would not lead to material harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the proposal would have an urbanising effect on the site, this is not out of character within the context of the area.
14. I conclude that the proposal would comply with policy NE4 of the CSDP in respect of the provision of attractive, accessible and functional greenspace in the area due to the quantity of existing provision in the area, and contributions to the upgrading and improvement of greenspace to address the quality of provision in the vicinity of the site. The proposal would also not conflict with policy HA25 of the UDP in respect of the provision of multi-user routes.
15. A significant area of the site is allocated for new outdoor sports facilities under policy HA11 of the UDP. However, this policy is of some age, and whilst that in itself does not indicate it should be given less weight, there is no substantive evidence that this allocation is likely to be delivered despite its longstanding nature. Moreover, the emerging Allocation and Designations Plan (ADP) does not include the allocation for outdoor sports facilities and instead allocates the site for housing. Given the stage of the ADP this carries very little weight as planning policy, but it is further evidence that the allocation of the site under policy HA11 of the UDP is unlikely to be implemented. I therefore give the conflict with policy HA11 of the UDP limited weight.

Other Considerations

16. All of the dwellings within the site would represent affordable homes, consisting of a mix of affordable rent and shared ownership which would be maintained in perpetuity. Evidence, including the Council's 2020 Strategic Housing Market Assessment, identifies a substantial annual shortfall in affordable housing

provision in the Council's area. The appeal proposal would represent a significant contribution to meeting the need for affordable housing, and subsequently this carries significant weight in favour of the proposal.

17. The proposal would add to the supply and mix of housing in the area. However, given the Council's general housing land supply position this carries no more than limited weight in favour of the proposal.
18. Residents of the proposal would support services and facilities in the area. However, given the size of settlements in this area this benefit would be proportionately of a very limited scale.
19. The proposal would support jobs on-site and through the supply chain during the construction period, although this would only be for a limited period of time even allowing for the scale of the proposal, and therefore carries limited weight as a benefit.
20. Other than the provision of affordable homes, there is no certainty that the wider social support for residents from the appellants would endure, and this is not a matter which weighs in favour of the planning balance.

Other Matters

21. Policy HA28 of the UDP identifies part of the site as being within the route of a potential bypass. However, part of this road scheme in another Council's area is no longer safeguarded and the Council has expressed concerns about its potential deliverability. This matter does not therefore weigh against the proposal.
22. Natural England have commented that the proposal could have potential significant effects on the Northumbria Coast Special Protection Area (SPA), Northumbria Coast Ramsar and the Moorsley Woods Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This may be presented through recreational disturbance, increased by the provision of dwellings at this location. In respect of relevant protected sites, I have been provided with documents which have identified a 6km¹ catchment area for visitor pressure and a 7.2km² zone of influence with regards to recreation pressure on the Durham Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the SPA. Based on the submitted evidence, the appeal proposal would not fall within the catchment area or the zone of influence. Having regard to that evidence, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not be likely to lead to a significant effect on the identified 'Natura 2000' sites either on its own or in combination with other plans and projects. Natural England has confirmed that it has no comments to make on this further evidence. There is therefore no requirement for me to undertake an appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations.
23. Further in respect of biodiversity, an ecological mitigation strategy for designated sites, including the SSSI, has been prepared and compliance with this can be ensured by condition. The appellant has also undertaken to provide a contribution towards ecological mitigation.

¹ Response to Natural England prepared by Biodiverse Consulting (25 September 2020)

² Sunderland City Council Core Strategy and Development Plan: Report to inform Habitat Regulations Assessment (19 December 2018); Initial Report to inform the Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Sunderland Allocations and Designations Plan (20 November 2020); and Sunderland Recreation Mitigation Strategy (to accompany the Allocations and Designations Plan) (27 November 2020).

24. The layout of the proposal is such that there would not be an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of nearby residents with regards to privacy or loss of light, even allowing for the topography of the area. Noise, disturbance and traffic generated during the construction period would be for a limited time and could be appropriately controlled through conditions.
25. I note the comments raised about access to the site and parking in the area. However, based on what I have seen and read, the local road network is capable of accommodating traffic generated by the proposal. The access, parking and layout of the development would also be acceptable in highway terms. The Council's Highways team have also not objected to the proposal.
26. Concerns have been expressed on the capacity of services in the area, such as doctor's surgeries, dentists and schools. However, this is of an anecdotal nature and there is no substantive evidence that existing services could not absorb the increase in demand arising from the proposal.
27. Issues arising from title deeds are a civil matter and do not fall within the remit of this planning appeal.

Planning Obligation and Conditions

28. The Obligation secures the provision of affordable housing as well as contributions regarding education, open space, off-site play and ecology.
29. The appellants contend that the financial contribution in respect of open space should be revised to remove the amount intended to address part 3 of Policy NE4. However, for the reasons stated previously, the open space and landscaping within the site would not compensate for the loss of greenspace arising from the proposal and would not represent usable greenspace for future residents. Therefore a contribution in respect of neighbouring existing greenspace is more appropriate. On that basis I consider that the full open space contribution is required, as indeed are the other covenants of the Obligation. These would make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development, and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. As such, the Obligation meets the requirements of paragraph 57 of the Framework and Regulation 122(2) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010.
30. The Council and consultees have suggested a number of planning conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. As a result, I have amended some of the conditions for clarity, accuracy and completeness.
31. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have included a condition specifying the approved plans and documents in the interests of certainty.
32. The Council has suggested amendments in respect of a construction management plan, and a condition to this effect is appropriate in the interests of the amenity of the area. This should be submitted and approved prior to the commencement of development as this relates to matters which need to be addressed before site works commence.
33. A condition in respect of unexpected contamination and remediation is required in the interests of public safety. A condition in respect of the provision and

retention of parking is required in the interests of highway safety and the living conditions of residents. A condition requiring compliance with an ecological mitigation strategy is necessary in the interests of conserving and enhancing the natural environment. A condition regarding landscaping is required in the interests of character, appearance and biodiversity.

34. Conditions in respect of a drainage scheme and sustainable surface water drainage are necessary in the interests of managing flood risk and to ensure that the site is properly drained. The provision of electric vehicle charging points and air source heat pumps are appropriate to promote sustainable travel and energy efficiency.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

35. I have concluded that the proposal would conflict with policy HA11 of the UDP, although for the reasons given this should carry limited weight against the proposal. I have also concluded that the proposal would comply with policy NE4 of the CSDP in respect of greenspace and, based on the evidence before me, policy HA25 of the UDP regarding multi user routes. Any conflict with Policy HA28 of the UDP does not weigh against the proposal for the reasons stated previously.
36. The limited weight given to the conflict with the development plan should be balanced against the significant weight given to the contribution that the proposal would make to the supply of affordable housing, as well as the limited weight given to other benefits arising from the development. On balance, and primarily due to the weight given to the provision of affordable housing, material considerations indicate that the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
37. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Housetype 01a – 2B3P Bungalow, Proposed elevations, drawing number GENHTRPHS-01a-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
 - Housetype 01a – 2B3P Bungalow, Proposed floor plans, drawing number GENHTRPHS-01a-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
 - Housetype 03b -2B3P Elevations, Proposed elevations, drawing number GENHTRPHS-03b-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
 - Housetype 03b -2B3P Floor Plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-03b-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
 - Housetype 05a -2B3P Elevations, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-05a-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
 - Housetype 05a -2B3P Floor Plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-05a-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;

- Housetype 05b – 2B4P Elevations, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-05b-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
- Housetype 05b – 2B4P Floor Plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-05b-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
- Housetype 09a – 3B6P Elevations, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-09a-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
- Housetype 09a – 3B6P Floor Plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-09a-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
- Housetype 10a – 3B6P Elevations, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-10a-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
- Housetype 10a – 3B6P Floor Plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-10a-XX-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
- Housetype 11a – 4B6P Elevations, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-11a-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
- Housetype 11a – 4B6P Floor Plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-11a-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
- Housetype 11b – 4B6P Elevations, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-11b-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
- Housetype 11b – 4B6P Floor Plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-11b-XX-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
- Housetype 13a – 2B6P Apartments elevations, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-13a-XX-DR-A-1001 rev P1;
- Housetype 13a – 2B6P Apartments floor plans, drawing number GENHTR-PHS-13a-ZZ-DR-A-2001 rev P1;
- Location Plan Drawing number RES790-BHA-V1-00-DR-A-0500 Rev P04
- Housetype 1A (Variant 1) Floor and roof plans, Plots 73 & 78 (Corner turner types), drawing number RES790-BHA-01a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1010, Revision P01;
- Housetype 1A (Variant 1) Elevations, Plots 73 & 78 (Corner turner types), drawing number RES790-BHA-01a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1011, Revision P01;
- Housetype 5A (Variant 1) Floor and roof plans, Plots 1, 12 & 26 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-05a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1012 Rev P01;
- Housetype 5A (Variant 1) Elevations, Plots 1, 12 & 26 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-05a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1013 Rev P01;
- Housetype 9A (Variant 1) Floor and roof plans, Plots 18, 21, 27 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-09a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1014 Rev P01;
- Housetype 9A (Variant 1) Elevations, Plots 18, 21, 27 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-09a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1015 Rev P01;
- Housetype 10A (Variant 1) Floor and roof plans, Plots 4, 11, 22, 38 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-10a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1016 Rev P01;
- Housetype 10A (Variant 1) Elevation, Plots 4, 11, 22, 38 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-10a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1016 Rev P01;
- Housetype 11A (Variant 1) Floor and roof plans, Plots 39, 59, 66 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-11a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1018 Rev P01;

- Housetype 11A (Variant 1) Elevation, Plots 39, 59, 66 (Corner turner type), drawing number RES790-BHA-11a(V1)-XX-DR-A-1018 Rev P01;
- Proposed Layout, drawing number RES790-BHA-V1-00DR-A-1201 Rev P13;
- Boundary Treatments and Hard Landscaping Plan, drawing number RES790-BHAV1-00-DR-A-1410 Rev P06;
- Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Soft Landscape Proposals 1 of 3, Drawing No.1105.01 Rev A;
- Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Soft Landscape Proposals 2 of 3, Drawing No.1105.02 Rev A;
- Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Soft Landscape Proposals 3 of 3, Drawing No.1105.02 Rev A;
- Ecology management plan – Cragdale Gardens, January 2021;
- Cragdale Gardens mitigation strategy for Gentoo Group BIOC19-043 V3.0;
- Sunderland residential sites: Cragdale, Report to inform SSSI impact assessment zone, for Gentoo Group, BIOC19-043 V1.1;
- Technical report: Analysis of environmental DNA in pond water for the detection of Great Crested Newts by SureScreen Scientifics;
- Planning position statement, 16.11.20, Site: P20-1433 – Land at Cragdale Gardens;
- Transport Statement, Cragdale Gardens, Reference number: SYS_GENTOO_02TS_001, dated 02.04.20, by Systra;
- Interim Travel Plan, Cragdale Gardens, Reference number: SYS_GENTOO_02ITP- 001, dated 02.04.20 by Systra;
- Cragdale Gardens Supplementary Information: Alternative Green Space Map for Gentoo Homes, BIOC10-043 V1.0;
- Gentoo Affordable Development Programme, Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Benefits Statement, October 2020, P20-1433;
- JNP Group Consulting Engineers SuDS Maintenance Report, Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, DH5 0EE, Gentoo Group, Ref RES790-JNP-92-XX-RP-C-1002, dated 30 September 2020;
- JNP Group Consulting Engineers S38-S278 Construction Details, Drawing Number
- RES790-JNP-90-XX-DR-C-3003, Rev P01;
- JNP Group Consulting Engineers Drainage Plan, Drawing Number RES790-JNP-92-XX-DR-C-2019, Rev P01;
- JNP Group Consulting Engineers Private Drainage Construction Details, Drawing Number RES790-JNP-92-XX-DR-C-3009, Rev P01;
- JNP Group Consulting Engineers, Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy, Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, DH5 0EE, Ref RES790-JNP-XX-XX-RP-C-1001;
- JNP Group Consulting Engineers, Phase I & Phase II Geo-Environmental Report, Cragdale Gardens, Ref H77109-JNP-XX-XX-RP-G-1001, dated July 2020.
- Archaeological Services Durham University on behalf of Gentoo, Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Tyne and Wear archaeological evaluation, report 5359 September 2020;
- Archaeological Services Durham University on behalf of Gentoo Homes, Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Tyne and Wear, archaeological desk-based assessment, report 5310, April 2020;

- Archaeological Services Durham University on behalf of Gentoo Homes, Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Tyne and Wear, geophysical survey, report 5329 July 2020;
 - Noise and Air Quality Screening Report reference: NJD20-0072-003L;
 - Sustainability Statement Land South of Cragdale Gardens, Hetton-le-Hole, Sunderland, July 2020.
- 3) No development shall commence until an amended Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority, which includes the following:
- i. Site layout including location of site compound, materials and waste storage
 - ii. Location of the site access
 - iii. Provision for workforce and visitor parking
 - iv. Traffic management measures – e.g. delivery times and avoidance of queuing and idling
 - v. Sheeting of wagons
 - vi. Dust – provision of vacuum extraction or wet arrestment to masonry cutting equipment
 - vii. Provision of mains water or suitable alternative supply
 - viii. Noise – use of mobile noise barriers where necessary, particularly around compressors and generators
 - ix. Site lighting – location, height, angle to ensure no spill or glare impacting off site occupiers
 - x. Use of solid perimeter hoardings to protect neighbouring properties.
 - xi. Given the location, working times should be 07.30 - 18.00 Mondays to Fridays, 0800 - 14.00 Sat. No Sundays or Bank Holidays. No working should take place outside these times without the prior agreement of the LPA and Environmental Health and this will only be in exceptional circumstances and subject to conditions.
- 4) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. A Risk Assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of DEFRA and the Environment Agency's "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CLR11" and where remediation is necessary a Remediation Scheme must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the requirements that the Remediation Scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.
- Once the Remediation Scheme has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority it shall be known as the Approved Remediation Scheme. Following completion of measures identified in the Approved Remediation Scheme a verification report must be prepared and submitted in accordance with the approved timetable of works. Within six months of the completion of measures identified in the Approved Remediation Scheme, a validation report (that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out) must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

- 5) No part of the development shall be occupied until the off-street parking provision has been constructed, surfaced, sealed, and made available in accordance with the approved plans. This parking area shall then be retained and permanently reserved for the parking of vehicles to ensure that adequate and satisfactory provision is made for the off-street parking of vehicles.
- 6) Development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted ecological mitigation strategy (Biodiverse Consulting ref. BIOC19-043 | V3.0).
- 7) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting season following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner, and any trees 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 a similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.
- 8) Development shall be implemented in line with the drainage scheme contained within the submitted document entitled "Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy" dated "July 2020" (the FRA). The drainage scheme shall ensure that foul flows discharge to the foul sewer at manhole 7608 and ensure that surface water discharges to the surface water sewer at manhole 9605. The surface water discharge rate shall not exceed the available capacity of 10l/sec that has been identified in this sewer. The final surface water discharge rate shall be agreed by the Lead Local Flood Authority.
- 9) Prior to the commencement of development above foundation level, details of any Electric Vehicle Charging points and Air Source Heat Pumps to be installed on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation of the development, or in accordance with a timescale agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 10) Prior to the first occupation of the development, or in accordance with a timescale agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, a verification report carried out by a suitably qualified person must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to demonstrate that all sustainable drainage systems have been constructed as per the agreed scheme. This verification report shall include:
 - As built drawings (in dwg/shapefile format) for all SuDS components - including dimensions (base levels, inlet/outlet elevations, areas, depths, lengths, diameters, gradients etc) and supported by photos of installation and completion.
 - Construction details (component drawings, materials, vegetation).
 - Health and Safety file.
 - Details of ownership organisation, adoption & maintenance.

End of Schedule