



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 5-9 and 12-15 November 2024

Site visit made on 15 November 2024

by J P Longmuir BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1780/W/24/3347358

Land to rear of former St Mary's College, Midanbury Lane, Southampton, Hampshire, SO18 4HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sovereign Network Group against the decision of Southampton City Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/01341/FUL.
 - The development proposed is re-development of the site to create 84 dwellings (8 x one bed apartments, 24 x 2 two apartments, 27 x two bed houses, 22 x three bed houses, 3 x four bed houses) with associated car and cycle parking, landscaped areas, play space and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for re-development of the site to create 84 dwellings (8 x one bed apartments, 24 x 2 two apartments, 27 x two bed houses, 22 x three bed houses, 3 x four bed houses) with associated car and cycle parking, landscaped areas, play space and associated works at land to rear of former St Mary's College, Southampton, SO18 4HE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01341/FUL, subject to the conditions in the conditions annexe below and Option A in the Unilateral Undertaking.

Preliminary Matters

2. An application for costs was made by the Appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.
3. A Unilateral Undertaking (UU) dated 2 December 2024 was submitted by the Appellant. This sought to address the absence of a completed section 106 Legal Agreement which was the basis for the fourth reason for refusal with obligations considered necessary for affordable housing, highway works, essential services and ecology.
4. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on the significance or otherwise of the revisions to the amended December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Housing supply and delivery. They duly responded.
5. The Framework was amended again in February 2025, but those changes are not significant to this appeal proposal.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are:

- the loss of the designated open space/ sports playing pitches in relation to the need in the area and the proposed mitigation/compensation;
- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
- the effect of the additional vehicle movements arising on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents.

Reasons

The loss of open space

7. Policy CS 21 of the Core Strategy Development Plan, Amended Version incorporating the Core Strategy Partial Review March 2015, is titled protecting and enhancing open space and has two limbs. The first limb states the Council will protect and enhance key open spaces including Southampton Common, central, district and local parks. The second limb allows replacing or reconfiguring 'other green spaces' in order to achieve wider community benefits such as improving the quality of open space or providing a more even distribution across the city.
8. The Council suggest the first limb is most pertinent. However, I find the appeal site is not a key open space, lacking public access, not being part of important views and not comparable with parks and the Common. Indeed, the Council's Green Space Strategy Technical Document¹ lists school playing fields and private open spaces as 'other green spaces'. I therefore conclude that the second limb is the more relevant.
9. Policy CLT3 of the City of Southampton Local Plan Review, adopted 2015 is also relevant although was not mentioned in the reason for refusal. It states development will not be permitted which would result in the loss of areas of public and private open space listed in the Plan's appendix 5 (which includes the appeal site).
10. Paragraph 104 of the Framework states the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quality and quantity in a suitable location.
11. Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and Guidance emphasises that all playing fields ought to be protected, whether they are used or not.
12. The Turner judgement² and the later Brommell judgement³ suggests that a combination of quantity and quality can be a correct approach in the consideration of the loss of open space and I find that is applicable here.
13. Sport England objected to the application, as 'it has not been demonstrated the benefits to sport outweigh the harm caused by the loss of playing field'. They did not appear at the Inquiry.

¹ Page 67

² Turner and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 375 (Admin)

³ R (Brommell) v Reading BC [2018] EWHC 3529 (Admin)

14. The school closed in March 2020 and with that the use of the appeal site as a playing field. Formerly it was used for youth 11x11 football and a smaller junior pitch, cricket, rounders, and long jump⁴. It is now an unmarked rough grassed field with the only discernible remnant to sport being the cricket wicket and a corrugated metal shed which was used as an equipment store. The site has no car park, toilets or changing facilities.
15. The appeal proposal would mean that there would be no future prospect of use as a playing field for formal sport. The Appellant submitted a detailed survey to consider its potential as a playing field. It is evident that there is water logging from the higher ground exacerbated by the lack of drainage and the grass surface is additionally prone to thatch and moss due to shading from the adjacent trees. These characteristics undermine the potential quality of a playing surface here as well as its robustness to accommodate matches and recover thereafter.
16. The uncontested costs to install drainage and remediate the surface is estimated at £205,000. Additionally, the lack of toilets would limit its use by some teams and a simple building with facilities including two changing rooms would be approximately £300,000⁵. These are significant costs for recreational use.
17. In any event the appeal site is not large enough to accommodate a full size adult football pitch or adult cricket pitch⁶ being partly constrained by the trees and grass banks around the edges of the site. This does limit the range of its potential users and therefore its recreational contribution to the city's needs.
18. The appeal site has never had any formal community or non-school use. The submissions to the Inquiry suggest some informal and occasional community events but these are not recent and have not been formalised or had regular commitment. The field is in private ownership and there is no certainty that it would be available for community use, which would require negotiations and/or potentially compulsory purchase, with acquisition costs as well as the above costs to remediate the playing surface, and more so, if rudimentary facilities were provided. These constrain the likely potential of recreational use but do not preclude the eventuality. In any event the appeal site could be used for private recreation space.
19. This proposal provides funding for off-site recreation provision close to the appeal site at Riverside Park, which both parties agree is approximately one kilometre away. £618,377.73 would be allocated to create one new football pitch, improve the playing surface of another and create a new cricket square, thus more matches could be accommodated. There is also funding for the upgrading of the existing changing rooms here.
20. Riverside Park is well suited to formal sport with good parking facilities and road access and is distanced from another main recreation area: the Southampton Outdoor Sports Centre. Whilst Sport England objected to the principle of development on the appeal site, they nonetheless favoured this location for the mitigation funding and I similarly concur.

⁴ Council closing paragraph 2

⁵ Appellant closing paragraph 120

⁶ Mr Grady appendix 4

21. The Council questioned the lack of a maintenance contribution in the UU funding package but did not quantify such requirements and similarly have no supplementary planning guidance to inform such a request. In any event, the contract for the construction of the pitches would be expected to include a 12 and 24 month maintenance period, for cricket and football surfaces respectively. In addition, there is no drainage at the Riverside Park pitches due to its former use as a landfill site and such drainage would be the most expensive element to maintain. Additionally, the Council's maintenance team have a depot at Riverside Park which would help cost effective maintenance. Moreover, the cricket and football teams would be paying match fees thereby potentially contributing to pitch maintenance. Given the above, I find that maintenance funding is not justifiable.
22. Relatedly, the Appellant suggests that the new pitches would accommodate the existing need; conversely the Council suggest that supply is inadequate and declining.
23. The Sport England guidance suggests as a 'guide', a three-year limit of reliability of a playing pitch strategy (PPS) to calculate need. The Council does not have an adopted PPS and even the draft refers to the 2021/ 2022 football season and has no clear picture on cricket. The associated survey of facilities is based on one in 2016. In addition, there is no mention of nine '3 G' pitches which typically enable 27 matches to take place within the city per week, but there is no clear evidence that these are wholly satisfying the peak need.
24. Both parties give the PPS limited weight⁷. Strategic Leisure (who manage the City Council facilities) provided written comments⁸ on capacity. Their monitoring, albeit dated, shows pressure at weekends although the Appellant highlights there is some capacity across the city. However, such capacity is very limited, and the Council depends on community use agreements which are not guaranteed in the future.
25. No other substantive survey of need was presented to the Inquiry, and I therefore find that the current balance of need/supply is not clear.
26. The future need is also relevant because that is when the implications of implementation of the proposal would be manifested. The need has both elements of demand and supply.
27. Demand for playing pitches would be reasonably expected to increase with population growth, and the national planning policies demonstrate that there will be new housing in Southampton. There is also a need to encourage formal sports for physical health and mental well-being, through the benefits of fresh air, exercise, and team spirit. The PPS⁹ indicates a substantial increase in need up to 2041 in football and cricket against all age groups. Even taken as a ballpark the likely increase in need would be significant. Strategic Leisure also note the growing participation in girls football. It also foresees demand increasing in the future.
28. The PPS focuses on the proposed improvements at the Outdoor Sports Centre to address future shortfalls. However, those works have not yet started, and

⁷ Mr Ramsay P of E of, paragraph 6.31, Mr Jackson-Hookins in cross examination and Council closing paragraph 14

⁸ E-mail 15 November, to which Appellant responded 20 November

⁹ PPS Stage D Table 1 page 12

whilst permission has been obtained that is not a guarantee of delivery. Nor is it clear that Government funding will cover the proposed works in full¹⁰.

29. The Appellant highlighted at the Inquiry the constrained Council boundary around the edge of the built up extent of Southampton area, which does not allow for outward expansion into green fields. Urban sites would be constrained in terms of availability of the sizeable space required and the potential proximity for nearby residential properties being subject to disturbance. As Mr Grady accepted in cross-examination¹¹, 'playing fields which are capable of accommodating grass playing pitches are not easy to come by'. They require a large, relatively flat area of open space. Therefore, it would be difficult to acquire playing space.
30. Indeed, for the Council to increase playing pitches they would have to look at existing outdoor space, particularly that under their control, which is scarce, and may not be possible. Indeed, the land at Riverside Park would be a possible location, but this proposal and its mitigation could impair that prospect.
31. At the Inquiry the Council suggested the availability of facilities is declining. However, this was based on 3 different surveys at different times and it was not demonstrated that the methodologies and interpretation of results were consistent. Consequently, a declining supply was not clearly demonstrated in the evidence before the Inquiry.
32. The other recreational element of the proposal is to provide some publicly accessible open space on the site. The current lack of access means the site has some very limited recreational value by providing a non-developed context to public footpaths around two sides of the appeal site, but a raised bank restricts views in some places.
33. The proposed open space on the site would be sufficiently large for some informal recreation and includes a play area¹² as well as new footpaths, which would support walking and running and contribute to wider connections in the green grid of open spaces in the vicinity. The open space on the appeal site would include a drainage pond and swales, which although would provide a sense of rurality and openness, I do not find would be conducive to recreation. Accordingly, I have discounted those areas in my assessment of recreational space.
34. The open space would be well placed and accessible to the extensive surrounding residential area although the area has a reasonable amount of existing spaces for informal recreation. Overall, I find that the benefit of the appeal proposal's on-site open space would be limited.
35. Policy CLT 3 refers to the loss of open space against which the proposal would not comply. Policy CS 21 is different in that it refers to replacing or reconfiguring other open spaces in order to achieve wider community benefits. The proposal makes some alternative provisions by intensification but not new open space, and whilst the quality of the pitch is mediocre, bearing in mind the likely pressure on facilities from increasing population, the constrained future opportunities and scarcity of land, the proposal would conflict with CS 21.

¹⁰ Mr Grady cross examination

¹¹ Council closing paragraph 26

¹² LEAP

The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area

36. Saved Policy SDP1 promotes good design. SPD7 requires proposals are compatible with existing landform, natural features, retain spaces and features and respect the existing streetscape. SDP9 requires high quality building design especially detailing and materials. Saved policy CS13 lists fundamental principles of design, including response to context, local distinctiveness, quality spaces, accessibility, appropriate density and respect for landscape qualities. The Residential Design Guide 2006 recommends approaches to evolving design and response to context.
37. The site is not within a conservation area nor any other designation. It is surrounded by 1920s/1930s housing, which is confirmed by the mapping of the area¹³. There are footpaths around the southern and eastern edges of the site, which allow some views, but the adjoining palisade fencing creates an unsettling experience of enclosure.
38. The appeal site is a former playing field having been created by earthworks and terracing, resulting in a slight slope and is fairly featureless except for surrounding mature trees. The adjacent school buildings are partially visible from the appeal site.
39. The proposal would be accessed off the existing cul-de-sac at the northwest end which is slightly elevated and would offer views across the site. The proposal would provide open space and landscaped parkland, at this point of arrival. This would create a discernible sense of place.
40. This open space would extend into areas of shared surface and then continue into another open space alongside a swale to the other side of the site. This too would create character.
41. The proposed buildings would be largely arranged in blocks of houses facing onto roads or open spaces. The Council were critical that this does not reflect the pattern of the surroundings wherein the houses face onto the streets with front and rear gardens.
42. However, the proposed layout prioritises the land for collective public open space rather than forming large front and rear gardens. Not only would such open space be attractive and seen by more people rather than the enclosed private nature of gardens, but in addition, this form of layout reduces the dominance of roads: the proposed houses would be perceived around open space rather than following and being part of the roadsides.
43. The submitted evidence shows that the density of the proposal would be similar to that of the surroundings.
44. The buildings would generally be seen to be facing the open spaces, which would be appropriate and empathising, whereas siting to the side has been generally avoided which would ignore such an outlook.
45. Some parking areas are shown to the sides of the main open space, to which the Council were critical. However, they would be well related and close to the dwellings and moreover parking needs to be provided somewhere particularly as the Council were requiring full parking provision. Tree planting is shown

¹³ Gail Stoten Proof of Evidence plates 6 and 7

amongst the parking in the proposal which would empathise with the soft textures of the open space and filter the views of cars. Whilst the Council questioned the space available, the submitted detail of the planting pits demonstrates reasonable opportunity for the roots to flourish. In addition, suitable species can be chosen.

46. The proposal would provide public access on a west-east axis as well as a route across the southern boundary. This would improve connectivity with the surrounding area. The proposal would also involve removal of the existing palisade fencing around the edge of the site, which would also be beneficial.
47. The Council were also critical that the elevations lacked the gable projections and bay windows as seen in the surrounding houses. However, the design concept here is for a simple and crisp contemporary elevational treatment. As such the design would be deferential to the open space: the houses being simple would not overly attract attention which would allow the specimen tree planting to be the focus of views.
48. The Council re-iterated the design review panel comments which had some criticisms about the development. However, that was on a pre-application scheme which was different to this appeal proposal and also led to amendments to the subsequently submitted design. Indeed, the submitted evidence clearly shows that the design evolved through a series of alternative layouts.
49. I therefore find that the design would be appropriate to the site and surroundings and would create a discernible sense of character. This parkland concept would appropriately form the backdrop to the large scale school buildings. The open space, new trees and the low height would ensure development does not dominate the site.
50. The proposal therefore accords with policies SDP1, SPD7 and CS13 and the Residential Design Guide.

The effect of the vehicle movements on the living conditions

51. Policy SDP1 seeks to protect the health and amenity of local residents and SDP7 requires development integrates with the local community. Paragraph 135, of the Framework requires new development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area and to create places that promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and do not undermine the quality of life.
52. The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area and the Council's Environmental Health Officer had no objection. The Council confirmed at the Inquiry that their objection related to noise/disturbance to existing residents.
53. The sole access for construction and the resulting 84 houses would be from Monastery Road, which is a residential cul-de-sac off a network of suburban through roads. The houses face directly towards Monastery Road and set back typically 4.9m¹⁴ at Nos. 13-21, behind parking hardstandings or a few simple gardens.

¹⁴ Jenna Turner Proof of Evidence page 37

54. The uncontested Transport Assessment foresees 35 vehicles/hour in the morning peak and 33 in the afternoon peak. Whilst this would be a proportionally high increase of the existing, it would nonetheless be less than the surrounding streets, which are through roads. As Monastery Road would continue to be a cul-de-sac and the access into the development is via a sharp turn, traffic speeds (and therefore resulting disturbance) would be expected to be low.
55. Noise modelling of the increased traffic has been undertaken. This found that the interior noise would only be less than ideal if windows are open, and even so, would still be within the upper limits in the 'necessary development category'. In any event open windows would only be expected during peak summer and would be unlikely to be during the morning peak. Consequently, the number of occurrences would be very limited. In addition, the noise would only be discernible during the passing of cars which would be 1-2 seconds duration.
56. The noise modelling shows that rear gardens of the Monastery Road houses would have some 'quiet spaces'.
57. The construction process would involve the machinery, supplies and workers using Monastery Road. However, conditions could be imposed to control working hours, temporary parking and deliveries.
58. I therefore find that the proposal would not jeopardise the reasonable living conditions of the existing residents. The proposal would not be contrary to policies SDP1 and SPD7 and Paragraph 135 of the Framework.

Other Matters

59. Nearby is the Grade II listed St. Mary's College¹⁵, which the list description dates from the 18th century. Their significance and special interest is derived from their architecture, notably its 4 storeys with its height emphasised by two overtly tall chimneys and sash windows in a symmetrical arrangement, mansard roof and curved bay wings. Its setting is the school grounds including the appeal site, which historically would have been parkland, and some such specimen trees are still evident.
60. This setting compliments the architecture as firstly the parkland emulates the grandeur of the buildings and secondly, the siting of the house and fenestration is orientated to the outward view, especially the bay windows. The hilltop position of the house also helps capitalise on the view and similarly the ancillary outbuildings are to the east and north so there is clear visibility.
61. The proposal retains some open space with parkland planting to reassert that context. In addition, the houses are sited away from the main outward aspect of the house which together with the retention of surrounding trees would lessen the impact. The housing would also be limited to two storey height.
62. Although the design and landscaping would minimise the impact of the new buildings, nonetheless there would be a loss of some open space, which would harm the setting. I find that less than substantial harm would result, which I return to latterly.

¹⁵ List entry number 1178928

63. The site is close to the Solent and Dorset Coast SPA, the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar Site and New Forest SAC/SPA/Ramsar site.
64. The above were designated in response to their scarce species and distinctive habitats, which are protected under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.
65. Disturbance by humans has been found to impair birds, in particular their feeding and breeding. In addition, the trampling of vegetation and compaction of soils can lead to changes to plant and invertebrate species. Having regard to the evidence provided I consider that the development could, in combination with other development in the area, have a significant adverse effect on the above designations through added recreational pressure.
66. The Council is committed to ring fencing 4% of receipts under the 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL) to improve footpaths within the city to ease pressures on the New Forest where some residents are currently travelling for recreation and 1% of CIL receipts to promote access management to sites and monitoring.
67. The Council in 2017 adopted a strategy for The Solent and Southampton SPA/Ramsar site to address recreational impacts in particular to birds, by promoting the awareness and responsibility of visitors. The submitted legal agreement has an obligation for a contribution of £60,278 towards these measures.
68. It is therefore necessary to assess whether the potential adverse impact could be adequately mitigated so as to avoid any significant adverse effect on the conservation objectives of the above designations.
69. The Solent Maritime SAC and the Solent and Southampton Water SPA/Ramsar are vulnerable to excess nutrients in the water leading to disproportionate plant growth. The nitrogen levels arising from developments can be mitigated by measures of nearby Eastleigh Borough Council and a Grampian style condition is warranted.
70. A condition requiring the submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan would also help groundwater.
71. The above would be directly related to the impacts of the proposal on the designations and necessary to make the development acceptable. Moreover, they would be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development, as they follow the methodology for calculating them in the established strategies.
72. In conclusion, with the mitigation secured, the scheme would not harm the designations. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with Policy CS22 which seeks to avoid harm to protected habitats and species.
73. Some of the local residents refer to drainage problems in the area and comment on the elevated position of the appeal site in relation to the Monastery Road houses. Whilst the proposal would lead to the creation of new hard surfaces on this greenfield, however, the proposal includes a drainage pond and swale to hold the resulting surface water run-off. These have been calculated to be equivalent capacity of the greenfield run off rate with an

allowance for climate change. The Council had no objection in this regard, and I concur.

74. Several residents raise parking problems in the area particularly due to the schools. However, the Highway Authority have considered the vehicle demand arising from the proposal and the requisite number of spaces, 162, have been designed. Therefore, the proposal should not exacerbate the current situation. One resident questioned parking restrictions arising from the development. However, such restrictions would be managed by the Council and would be expected to consider the availability of residents parking. Additionally, one resident commented on the hazardous road junctions in the vicinity, however, there is no objection from the Highway Authority, there are speed restrictions in place, and the proposal includes measures for traffic calming at the Mousehole Lane/Glenfield Avenue junction.
75. The potential for subsidence problems from lorries as well as the effects of piling and excavation are raised. However, the developer would be expected to be liable for any established faults that arise. It is also suggested that Japanese Knotweed is present on the appeal site, but this would require removal by formal and established procedures thereby preventing its spreading. There is also comment that the proposal would lead to anti-social behaviour and personal safety issues. However, the new public thoroughfares would be overlooked with natural surveillance and could be lit if the Council felt it necessary. There is clear division between private and public space too. Indeed, improved public connectivity can improve safety through surveillance. It is also suggested that an electrical substation would be likely which could cause disturbance, however that would be controlled by the safety standards incumbent on the relevant authorities. There is concern about harm to privacy however the new buildings would be distanced from the existing and the access lies to the side of the nearest dwelling where trees and shrubs provide screening to that rear garden.
76. One response suggested that the proposal would be an inappropriate mix of houses. However, it has a mix of tenures, sizes and types, and the Council confirm in the agreed Statement of Common Ground that the mix satisfies Policy CS16. There are also concerns about inadequate social/community facilities in the area. However, there are a range of local shops close by and schools and bus services. Other services, such as medical and leisure are at the behest of the providers and such a suburban area would be expected to have fair provision. Both main parties accepted the site is in a sustainable location.
77. There are concerns about the impact of the proposal on wildlife and particularly bats and badgers. However, the agreed Statement of Common Ground confirms that the appropriate surveys have been carried out and that protected species can be accommodated with appropriate conditions in place.
78. There is concern that this proposal if allowed would set a precedent for development of the Charlton House school site. However, I can only consider this appeal site and this proposal on its planning merits, and any other potential development elsewhere would similarly be considered on its own particular circumstances.

Planning Obligations

79. The CIL Regulations and paragraph 58 of the Framework provide the legal and policy tests for obligations. These tests require that planning obligations should only be sought where they are: a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
80. The Council's adopted Developer Contributions SPD April 2013 provides guidance following the above criteria. Policy CS25 states development will only be permitted if the necessary infrastructure, services, facilities, and amenities are available to meet the needs of the development.
81. The Appellant clearly indicated that their intention is for 100% of the units to be affordable, using Homes England grant funding. However, as this is not a firm requirement in the UU, I cannot afford this weight. The UU has A and B Options in a 'blue pencil clause'¹⁶ to vary the mix in the event of such grant funding. The Council state¹⁷ that the B option would contravene the CIL Regulations and paragraph 57 of the Framework. If I find that the development would be acceptable with policy compliant affordable housing (35%), then Option B would therefore fail the 'necessary' criterion of the above. I return to this latterly.
82. The UU makes provision for the submission and approval of a management plan for the open space, which would ensure that it is properly maintained and accessible for the community. Similarly, there is a requirement for the new footpath connections and improvements to the existing.
83. The UU includes provision of funding and opportunities for employment and skills training as part of the construction process, which would help deliver the benefits of the development for the community. There is also provision for carbon off-setting in the event that the buildings are not 'zero carbon' in terms of their emissions.

Housing Land Supply and Planning Benefits

84. The Council claimed at the Inquiry that it had 2.92 years supply whilst the Appellant stated 2.5 years. Both parties agree the required number of dwellings and the differences arise from 3 disputed elements: the Olleco site for co-living and the extent to which this accommodation constitutes dwellings, the deliverability of the Gas Works site and the amount of windfalls that should be assumed.
85. The above calculations were re-done using the revised approach following the recent changes to the Framework and PPG: the Council now suggests it has 3.55 years, whereas the Appellant 3.11 years¹⁸. Fundamentally the Council accepts that it does not have a five year supply of housing. In addition, even taking the Council's position, the shortfall is severe, and in such circumstances, I find that there is little difference between 3.11 and 3.55 years.

¹⁶ This enables an Inspector to determine which obligations are appropriate and to confirm that any obligation in the Section 106 Agreement that are not compliant with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended) or Paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

¹⁷ Council closing paragraphs 198, 204 and 205

¹⁸ E-mails 3 January

86. In terms of future prospects, the Council has a constrained boundary around an environment with little space for outward expansion. The submitted evidence shows that housing provision has been declining. It is also evident the Council has at least some reliance upon brownfield sites which are more likely to have constraints to their implementation.
87. The existing Local Plan dates back to 2015, and the Emerging Plan is not currently being formally timetabled due to uncertainties. It was accepted at the Inquiry that there is a need to allocate a substantial number of sites to meet land supply requirements.
88. I therefore find that the prospects of improving land supply are challenging.
89. The proposal has been submitted as a full application which together with being a greenfield should enable prompt implementation. Similarly, the Appellant being a housing association would be reasonably expected to be keen to begin building. Consequently, I would expect the proposal to contribute to the 5 year Housing Land Supply.
90. In addition, this proposal would provide 35% dwellings as affordable homes secured by the UU, in compliance with policy CS15.
91. Both parties agree that waiting lists are rising and there has been declining provision in the last few years. There is a pronounced shortfall in affordable provision and the need is chronic. The proposal would help towards a pressing need.
92. I therefore find the benefits of new housing would be very substantial.
93. The dwellings would be energy efficient which would help the occupants as well as the wider environment saving carbon emissions, albeit there is a fallback zero carbon off-set measure in the UU. The proposal would promote a biodiversity net gain which would be a benefit to the area. The employment and skills training provision in the UU would also benefit the community.

Heritage and Planning Balances

94. As I have found above the proposal would harm the designated heritage asset, contrary to section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
95. Whilst the harm arising would be less than substantial; however, Paragraph 212 of the Framework advocates great weight to the asset's conservation. I therefore give considerable importance and weight to the harm I have identified in my balancing judgment below. In addition, Paragraph 213 of the Framework emphasises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, should require clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 215 states where a development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of an asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits, including securing its optimum viable use.
96. Taking the public benefits together as a whole I conclude that they would be of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm identified to the significance and special interest of the designated heritage asset.
97. As I have found above the proposal would not comply with the open space policies CLT3 and CS21, which are the most important in this appeal, although

the proposal would comply with SDP1, SPD7, CS13, CS15, CS22 and CS25. Considering the above collectively, there is some accordance but also some conflict with the Development Plan policies. When taken as a whole, I find that the proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan.

98. As I found above there is a shortfall in housing land supply and in such circumstances paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is triggered. Paragraph 11(d) criterion ii requires consideration of whether any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Footnote 7 of the Framework does not apply due to the result of the heritage balance above.
99. Paragraph 7 of the Framework states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In order to achieve this paragraph 8 of the Framework provides three overarching objectives: economic, social and environmental.
100. In terms of the economic objective the proposal would provide up to 84 dwellings which would have benefits from their construction. The Housing Land Supply shortfall is significant with uncertain prospects for improvement and paragraph 61 of the Framework confirms the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes.
101. In terms of the social objective, the Framework refers to the need to provide sufficient number and range of homes to meet the needs for present and future generations. Bearing in mind the severe supply shortfall there is a pressing need to increase supply from deliverable sites. The proposal would provide a range of new homes, in terms of size and form.
102. The affordable housing would also contribute to the social objective, particularly as 35% of the dwellings would be affordable which is a significant proportion. This would help towards the pressing local need and support the well-being of the community as a whole. The proposal would provide an acceptable standard of everyday living for those currently waiting for suitable homes. Even with the revised Housing Land Supply position the Council agree¹⁹ that 'the provision of housing attracts very substantial weight in the planning balance'.
103. The UU also makes provision for employment training which would have both social and economic benefits.
104. The obligations for funding towards the recreation ground and the pavilion would benefit existing as well as new residents which would contribute to the social objective as well as the public access to open space on the site and improved connection. However, as these seek to mitigate the reduction in the open space and the loss of the hope of a playing pitch in the future, I therefore do not give these any weight in favour of the proposal.
105. In terms of the environmental objective the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The dwellings would be energy efficient, and the occupants of the dwellings would be close and accessible to facilities without being wholly reliant upon car use, thereby helping towards low carbon living as advocated within this criterion of paragraph 8. Additionally, the

¹⁹ Council closing paragraph 4 and the more recent 3 January e-mail paragraph 6.5

proposal has been demonstrated to potentially improve biodiversity, which would be a benefit.

106. In the light of the above I therefore conclude that the adverse impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. The proposal therefore benefits from the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The benefits of the proposed development and presumption in favour of sustainable development in the context of the paragraph 11(d) balance therefore lead me to conclude that the appeal should be approved not in accordance with the development plan as material considerations indicate a decision otherwise is appropriate.
107. The policies in the Emerging Plan do not lead me to a different decision. In any event, the Council stated²⁰ at the Inquiry that Plan 'has been paused'.
108. As I find that the development is acceptable with policy compliant affordable housing (35%), Option B in UU would therefore fail the 'necessary' criterion as considered earlier. Accordingly, I find that Option A in the UU is appropriate and not Option B.

Conditions

109. Paragraph 57 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance, Use of planning conditions, provide the tests for the imposition of conditions. The Framework is clear that planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning, and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects. I have assessed the suggested conditions accordingly. There was considerable agreement on the suggested wording of conditions.
110. Conditions on the timing of commencement and approved plans would provide clarity and certainty.
111. A condition requiring the approval of materials would ensure that the design is appropriate to the site's context. Similarly, a condition requiring the approval of the new planting and replacement of any failures is important to the design as I have found above. Tree protection measures are necessary to protect the significant specimens which contribute to the character of the site. The condition on floor levels would ensure the buildings would appear appropriate.
112. Whilst the PPG advises against routinely removing permitted development rights, this is warranted here due to the relationship of the public spaces and buildings and the need to protect the integrity of the design.
113. A condition on the provision of roads and footpaths is necessary to ensure these essential facilities are provided. Similarly, a condition is warranted on car parking, which also includes electric charging in the interest of the wider environment.
114. The condition requiring submission and approval of a Construction Method Plan would avoid unreasonable disturbance to those living nearby and using the surrounding roads. Conditions on working hours and compliance with the

²⁰ Council closing paragraph 4

Environmental Noise Survey would ensure that the construction process respects the living conditions of the neighbouring residents. A condition to investigate and potentially remedy land contamination is necessary to avoid risk to human health.

115. A condition requiring the provision of amenity spaces is necessary to safeguard living standards of the intended occupants. Similarly, a condition on the provision of balconies is necessary.
116. The conditions on drainage are necessary to ensure that surface water run-off is managed from this elevated greenfield site to avoid exacerbating potential problems off site.
117. Conditions on management of habitat for bats and badgers would support the biodiversity of the site. Similarly, conditions controlling external lighting and clearance of vegetation would avoid disturbance to wildlife. A condition requiring measures to limit nitrates would help wider biodiversity as I found earlier.
118. A Refuse Management Plan would ensure that provision is made for this essential service however the wording is simplified as the requirement for the refuse and recycling containers to be kept only within the approved storage areas with the exception of collection days is unrealistic to enforce.
119. As I have found above the energy efficiency/carbon offsetting is a benefit of the scheme and needs to be confirmed by conditions. Similarly, the condition on cycle storage would support low carbon living.

Conclusion

120. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions in the conditions annexe below and Option A in the UU.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR

Appearances

For the Appellant

Christopher Young, King's Counsel No.5 Chambers

Jessica Allen, Counsel No.5 Chambers

David Ramsay MTCP(Hons) MRTPI Partner, Vail Williams LLP

Richard Grady BA(Hons) Director, Consult QRD Ltd

James Stacey BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI Managing Director, Tetlow King Planning

Ben Pycroft BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI Director, Emery Planning

Lisa Sumner BA(Hons) PG Dip B.Arch MA ARB RIBA

Architect, William Lester Architects

Ian Roberts MCIHT Director, Bellamy Roberts

Gail Stoten BA(Hons), PG Cert Res MCIfA FSA Heritage Executive Director, Pegasus Group

Jenny Grote BA(Hons) Assistant Director of New Business, Sovereign Network Group

Jennifer Eng LLB LPC/LLM Principal Associate, Capsticks LLP

For the Council

Rebecca Sage, Counsel Landmark Chambers

Amber Trueman MSc Strategic Planning Manager

Jenna Turner MSc Regeneration Planning Manager

Warren Jackson-Hookins BSc(Hons) MRTPI Principal Planning Officer

Alex Russell Solicitor²¹

Interested parties

Kevin Leckey local resident, also representing other residents

Graham Linecar Southampton Commons and Parks Protection Society

²¹ for the Unilateral Undertaking session

Documents submitted during the Inquiry

1. Appellant opening
2. Council opening
3. Turner and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 375 (Admin)
4. Social and affordable rent comparison
5. Errata sheet for David Ramsay Proof of Evidence
6. Amended Affordable Housing Statement of Common Ground and additional data on housing net completions
7. Natural Turf for Sport. Updated guidance for 2011. Sport England
8. Prospect House scheme, Pear Tree Avenue
9. PPG17
10. Draft Playing Pitch Strategy Stage C
11. Draft Unilateral Undertaking (UU)
12. Playing Pitch Strategy Project Brief Stages A and B
13. E-mails between Sport England and the Council
14. Mr Jackson-Hookings Proof of Evidence corrections
15. PINS note on Statement of Case
16. Email from Mr Crawford to Council
17. Letter from Charlton House School
18. CIL Compliance Statement
19. Section 106 Note from Capsticks with UU changes
20. Note on 3G facilities (including Strategic Leisure note and Mr Gardy response)
21. Council closing
22. Appellant closing
23. Appellant cost claim
24. Council cost rebuttal
25. Appellant further comment on costs
26. Finalised and signed UU

Conditions annexe

1. The development works hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date on which this planning permission was granted.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in the schedule attached at the end of this conditions annexe.
3. Notwithstanding the information shown on the approved drawings and application form, with the exception of site clearance, demolition and preparation works no development works above ground level shall commence until a written schedule of external materials and finishes, including samples and sample panels where necessary, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall include full details of the manufacturer's composition, types and colours of the external materials to be used for external walls, windows, doors, rainwater goods, and the roof of the proposed buildings, and substations. Development shall be implemented only in accordance with the agreed details.
4. No development shall take place until details of finished floor levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) for the proposed finished ground levels across the site, building finished floor levels and building finished eaves and ridge height levels and shall be shown in relation to off-site AOD. The development shall be completed in accordance with these agreed details.
5. a) Notwithstanding the submitted details, no development works above ground level shall commence until a detailed landscaping scheme and implementation timetable shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing, which includes:
 - (i) proposed finished ground levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle pedestrian access and circulations areas, hard surfacing materials including permeable surfacing where appropriate, surfacing of the public open space, external lighting, structures and ancillary objects including refuse bins;
 - (ii) planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment), schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/planting densities where appropriate;
 - (iii) an accurate plot of all trees to be retained and to be lost;
 - (iv) details of any proposed boundary treatment, including retaining walls and around the public open space, attenuation basin and swale, and;
 - (v) a landscape management scheme.
- b) The approved hard and soft landscaping scheme for the whole site shall be carried out prior to occupation of the building or during the first planting season following the full completion of building works, whichever is sooner. The approved scheme implemented shall be maintained for a minimum period of 5 years following its complete provision, with the exception of boundary treatment, approved tree planting, bollards and external lighting which shall be retained as approved for c).
- c) Any approved trees, shrubs, seeded or turfed areas which die, fail to establish, are removed or become damaged or diseased, within a period of 5 years from the

date of planting shall be replaced by the Developer in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species. The Developer shall be responsible for any replacements for a period of 5 years from the date of planting.

6. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, the following details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

a. a specification of the type of construction proposed for the roads, cycle ways and footpaths including all relevant horizontal cross-sections and longitudinal sections showing existing and proposed levels together with details of street lighting, signing, white lining and the method of disposing of surface water;

b. a programme for the making up of the roads and footpaths to a standard suitable for adoption by the Highway Authority; and

c. details of a management process which will maintain these areas in the future. The road and footways shall be completed in accordance with the agreed details before the development first comes into occupation and thereafter retained as approved for the lifetime of the development.

7. Before any development works are commenced details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority making provision for a Construction Method Plan for the development. The Construction Management Plan shall include details of:

a) parking of vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors. No construction vehicles shall access the site from, or park on the private road located to the west of the proposed access;

b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;

c) details of cranes and other tall construction equipment (including the details of obstacle lighting) – Such schemes shall comply with Advice Note 4 'Cranes and Other Construction Issues'

d) details of temporary lighting associated with the construction of the road and the dwelling works taking place;

e) storage of plant and materials, including cement mixing and washings, used in constructing the development, including height of storage areas for materials or equipment;

f) treatment of all relevant pedestrian routes and highways within and around the site throughout the course of construction and their reinstatement where necessary;

g) measures to be used for the suppression of dust and dirt throughout the course of construction;

h) control and disposal of putrescible waste to prevent attraction of birds;

i) details of construction vehicles wheel cleaning; and,

j) details of how noise emanating from the site during construction will be mitigated.

k) details of temporary car parks and timescales for their removal and any reseeded prior to first use of the open space.

The approved Construction Management Plan shall be adhered to throughout the development process.

8. With the exception of the delivery and installation of tower cranes, all works relating to the demolition, clearance and construction of the development hereby granted shall only take place between the hours of; Monday to Friday 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours (8.00am to 6.00pm) Saturdays 09:00 hours to 13:00 hours (9.00am to 1.00pm) and at no time on Sundays or recognised public holidays. Alternative timings for delivery and installation of tower cranes will be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any works outside the permitted hours shall be confined to the internal preparations of the buildings without audible noise from outside the building.

9. Notwithstanding the Arboricultural Impact Assessment submitted by Broad Oak Tree Consultants, no development shall take place until a site specific Arboricultural Method Statement has been first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It will be written with contractors in mind and will be adhered to throughout the duration of the demolition and development works on site. The Method Statement will include the following:

- (i) a specification for the location and erection of protective fencing around all vegetation to be retained;
- (ii) specification for the installation of any additional root protection measures;
- (iii) specification for the removal of any built structures, including hard surfacing, within protective fencing areas;
- (iv) specification for the construction of hard surfaces where they impinge on tree roots;
- (v) the location of site compounds, storage areas, car parking, site offices, site access, heavy/large vehicles (including cranes and piling rigs);
- (vi) an arboriculture management strategy, to include details of any necessary tree surgery works, the timing and phasing of all arboricultural works and protection measures; and
- (vii) specification for soft landscaping practices within tree protection zones or the canopy of the tree, whichever is greatest.

The Arboricultural Method Statement shall be fully adhered to throughout the course of the development.

10. Prior to the commencement of development approved by this planning permission (or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority), a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. That scheme shall include all of the following phases, unless identified as unnecessary by the preceding phase and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- 1. A scheme of remediation detailing the remedial actions to be taken and how they will be implemented.

On completion of the works set out in (1) a verification report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority confirming the remediation actions that have been undertaken in accordance with the approved scene of remediation and setting out any measures for maintenance, further monitoring, reporting and arrangements for contingency action. The verification report shall be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation or operational use of any stage of the development. Any changes to these agreed elements require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority.

11. Before the development hereby approved first comes into occupation, secure and covered storage for bicycles shall be provided in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The storage shall be thereafter retained as approved for the lifetime of the development.

12. Before the development hereby approved first comes into occupation, storage for refuse and recycling shall be provided in accordance with the plans hereby approved and thereafter retained as approved.

13. Sustainable Drainage shall be implemented in accordance with the submitted details and plans, with runoff from the site shall be restricted to no greater than 2.3l/s for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 45% climate change allowance, and thereafter retained and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

14. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a Drainage Verification Report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must demonstrate that the drainage system has been constructed as per the agreed scheme (or detail any minor variations) providing the as built drawings and photographs showing that the key components have been installed (i.e. surface water attenuation devices/areas, flow restriction devices and outfalls etc). The full details of the appointed management company or person(s) who will be responsible for the ongoing management and maintenance of the drainage system should also be included, with appropriate evidence for example a letter or contract agreement showing that this arrangement is in place.

15. Finished Floor Levels for the proposed dwellings shall be set no lower than 100mm above ground level.

16. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied unless a Nitrate Mitigation Vesting Certificate confirming the purchase of sufficient nitrates credits from a suitable Nutrient Offset scheme serving the Itchen or Test river basin catchment for the development has been submitted to the Council.

17. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as amended or any Order amending, revoking or reenacting that Order, no building or structures within Schedule 2, Parts 1 and 2, Classes as listed below shall be erected or carried out to any dwelling house hereby permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority:

Part 1

Class A (enlargement of a dwelling house), including a garage or extensions,

Class B (roof alteration),

Class C (other alteration to the roof),

Class D (porch),

Class E (curtilage structures), including a garage, shed, greenhouse, etc.,

Class F (hard surface area) Class H (satellite antenna or dish)

Part 2

Class A (gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure)

18. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, external lighting shall be implemented in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The lighting shall be thereafter retained as approved.

19. No storage of goods including building materials, machinery and soil, shall take place within the root protection areas of the trees to be retained on the site. There will be no change in soil levels or routing of services through root protection zones. There will be no fires on site within any distance that may affect retained trees. There will be no discharge of chemical substances including petrol, diesel and cement mixings within or near the root protection areas.

20. Prior to development commencing, including site clearance, the developer shall submit a Biodiversity Enhancement and Mitigation Plan and a Site Management and Monitoring Plan for badgers, which shall be implemented in accordance with the programme before any demolition work or site clearance takes place. The agreed mitigation measures shall be thereafter retained as approved.

21. The bat mitigation and enhancement measures shall be provided in accordance with the details and programme outlined within Section 5 of the Phase II Bat Survey written by Aaron Domblides dated 19/09/2022 and shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development.

22. The balconies serving the development hereby approved shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the residential units to which they relate and shall be constructed in accordance with the approved plans and retained thereafter.

23. Confirmation of the energy strategy, including zero or low carbon energy technologies that will achieve a reduction in CO2 emissions of at least 15% must be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby granted consent. Technologies that meet the agreed specifications must be installed and rendered fully operational prior to the first occupation of the development hereby granted consent and retained thereafter.

24. Before the development commences, written documentary evidence demonstrating that the residential development will achieve at minimum 19% improvement over 2013 Dwelling Emission Rate (DER)/ Target Emission Rate (TER) (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for Energy) and 105 Litres/Person/Day internal water use (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3/4) in the form of a design stage SAP calculations and a water efficiency calculator shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval.

25. Within 6 months of any part of the residential development first becoming occupied, written documentary evidence proving that the residential development

has achieved at minimum 19% improvement over 2013 Dwelling Emission Rate (DER)/ Target Emission Rate (TER) (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for Energy) and 105 Litres/Person/Day internal water use (Equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3/4) in the form of final SAP calculations and water efficiency calculator and detailed documentary evidence confirming that the water appliances/fittings have been installed as specified shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its approval.

26. Notwithstanding the approved plans, no dwelling shall be occupied until final details of the attenuation pond/basin have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the submission of sectional drawings and plans showing the depth. The development shall be completed in accordance with these agreed details prior to occupation of the 80th dwelling.

27. A minimum of 162 parking spaces, shall be marked out in accordance with the approved plans, with a minimum of 1 space allocated to each dwelling, prior to the first occupation or operational use of the development hereby approved. These spaces shall be retained as approved in accordance with a car parking management plan that shall have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority ahead of first operational use of the development hereby approved with parking retained for the parking of occupants and their visitors only. A minimum of 25 (15%) parking spaces shall be fitted and retained with a fast charging electric car charging point for use by residents and their visitors. Provision for future 'passive' infrastructure should also be provided and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development.

28. Before the development hereby approved first comes into occupation, the external amenity space associated with each dwelling, and pedestrian access to it, shall be made available for use in accordance with the plans hereby approved. The amenity space and access to it shall be thereafter retained for the use of the dwellings.

29. No clearance of vegetation supporting nesting birds shall take place between 1 March and 31 August unless a method statement has been first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and works implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

30. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the measures outlined within the Environmental Noise Survey and dated 27/07/2022. The approved measures shall be adhered to throughout the development process.

31. Before the development hereby approved first comes into occupation, a Refuse Management Plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Refuse Management Plan shall provide details of a collection point for refuse and recycling.

List of approved plans:

6010-WLA-00-XX-DR-A-0015-A Location Plan 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-00-XX-DR-A-0020-D Proposed Site Plan 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-00-XX-DR-A-0400-A Site Sections 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-00-XX-DR-A-0401-B Street Scene 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-00-XX-DR-A-0500—CGI Artists Impression Public Open Space 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-00-XX-DR-A-0501—CGI Artists Impression Greenway 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-A1-XX-DR-A-0110-A Block Type A Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-B1-XX-DR-A-0111-B Blocks B P Q U Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-C1-XX-DR-A-0112-B Block C Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-D1-XX-DR-A-0113-B Block D E Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-F1-XX-DR-A-0114-B Block F H Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-G1-XX-DR-A-0115-B Block G Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-J1-XX-DR-A-0117-B Block J K Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-L1-XX-DR-A-0118-B Block L Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-M1-XX-DR-A-0119-B Block M Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-N1-XX-DR-A-0120-B Block N Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-O1-XX-DR-A-0121-B Block O R Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-C1-XX-DR-A-0112-B Block C Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-D1-XX-DR-A-0113-B Block D E Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-F1-XX-DR-A-0114-B Block F H Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-G1-XX-DR-A-0115-B Block G Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-J1-XX-DR-A-0117-B Block J K Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-L1-XX-DR-A-0118-B Block L Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-M1-XX-DR-A-0119-B Block M Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-N1-XX-DR-A-0120-B Block N Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-O1-XX-DR-A-0121-B Block O R Plans and Elevations 16 September 2022

6010-WLA-A1-XX-DR-A-0110-B- Block Type A Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-B1-XX-DR-A-0111-C- Block B Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-C1-XX-DR-A-0112-C- Block C Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-D1-XX-DR-A-0113-C-Block D E Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-F1-XX-DR-A-0114-C- Block Type F Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-G1-XX-DR-A-0115-C-Block Type G Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-H1-XX-DR-A-0116-Block Type H Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-J1-XX-DR-A-0117-C-Block J K Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-L1-XX-DR-A-0118-C-Block L Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-M1-XX-DR-A-0119-C- Block M Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-N1-XX-DR-A-0120-C-Block Type N Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-OR-XX-DR-A-0121-C-Block O R Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-PQ-XX-DR-A-0124-- Blocks P Q Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-S1-XX-DR-A-0122-C-Block S Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-T1-XX-DR-A-0123-B- Block T Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-U1-XX-DR-A-0123-Block U Plans and Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-V1-XX-DR-A-0131-E-Block V Flats Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-V1-XX-DR-A-0132-C- Block V Flats Plans 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-W1-XX-DR-A-0133-D-Block W Flats Elevations 10 February 2023

6010-WLA-W1-XX-DR-A-0134-C-Block W Flats Plans 10 February 2023

5530-016 Junction Improvements 5 May 2023

5530-017 Footpath 13 Improvements 5 May 2023

5530-008 Rev Q Drainage 4 January 2024

5530-011 Rev B Flow Exceedance 4 January 2024

5530-023 Rev A Drainage Sections 4 January 2024

End of conditions