



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2025

by **M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/W/24/3357969

Land South of Kithill, Crewkerne, Somerset TA18 8HJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of an outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Tilia Homes Limited against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01295/REM sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 1 of planning permission Ref 18/01737/OUT, granted on 17 June 2020 (Appeal Ref APP/R3325/W/19/3240967).
 - The application was refused by notice dated 10 July 2024.
 - The development proposed is the residential development of up to 150 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and associated works with access from Lang Road.
 - The details for which approval is sought are: Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the reserved matters are approved, namely the Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale details submitted in pursuance of condition No 1 attached to planning permission Ref 18/01737/OUT dated 17 June 2020 (Appeal Ref APP/R3325/W/19/3240967), in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/01295/REM, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was amended multiple times while under the Council's consideration. A fourth version was presented to the Council before it made its decision, but it was not considered or consulted upon. Further adjustments were made in a fifth version presented with the appeal documents.
3. While there has been no formal consultation on the latest two revisions, the Council has confirmed in its appeal statement that there is not a great deal of difference between the third and fifth versions. The Council has commented on the fifth version as part of its appeal statement and members of the public have had the opportunity to comment to me. Therefore, I am satisfied that the amendments are not substantive, nor would there be any procedural injustice caused if I were to consider them. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the fifth version.
4. In addition to that, at my suggestion, further revisions were made to some of the detailed house-type drawings to correct some drafting errors identified by the Council at appeal statement stage. As these are largely technical, were noted by the Council as needing correcting for the avoidance of doubt, and do not alter the layout or positioning of the individual houses, no injustice would arise from this and it is those corrected plans that are listed in my decision.

Main Issues

5. Planning permission for this development has been granted by the outline planning permission. The appeal relates to an approval of the reserved matters only. Those matters are layout, scale, appearance and landscaping. Thus, while I note continuing concern of many local residents about matters such as effects on highway safety and the general local road network, off-site highway improvements, construction traffic management, access to and capacity of existing services and facilities, land stability and contamination, and the effects of construction activities on neighbouring property, these matters are of little relevance to the case before me.
6. I note several concerns about the adequacy of on-site ecological information provided with the outline application. Those details have been updated, alongside the detailed proposals before me now, and I have considered them insofar as they are relevant to the reserved matters. There were a number of conditions attached to the outline planning permission. Those will continue to apply.
7. Within the last few weeks, the Supreme Court has handed down a judgment in the case of *CG Fry & Son Ltd v SSHCLG* [2025] UKSC 35. This clarifies that the protection afforded to the habitats of the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site, that may be affected by this development, is a matter of national policy rather than law. While the potential for adverse impacts had arisen since the grant of outline planning permission, national policy could not automatically impose new requirements after outline permission has been granted.
8. Here, there are strong parallels to the current case. The condition seeking approval of the reserved matters does not concern issues associated with impacts on the Somerset Levels and Moors Ramsar Site. Those effects have nothing to do with its layout, appearance, scale or landscaping, and the condition was not imposed to control matters relating to effects on the Ramsar Site.
9. Thus, while the appellant has made arrangements to secure off-site mitigation, and was previously happy to provide on-site measures, these are not matters that can be legitimately considered or secured via conditions or planning obligations attached to this appeal decision.
10. With regard to the above, the main issues for this appeal are:
 - (a) Whether the proposal represents good design and placemaking that integrates with the character and appearance of the area;
 - (b) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of adjoining residents; and
 - (c) The effect of the development on off-site flood risk.

Reasons

Character, appearance and placemaking

11. The site spans a number of fields at the edge of Crewkerne. Vehicular access from Lang Road at one end of the site was approved at outline stage which would, of necessity, lead to a cul-de-sac layout. Pedestrian links are shown to the adjoining residential areas in the eastern parts of the site. A connection suggested on the outline masterplan to Henley Road, is not proposed, but I have no reason to find

that it would provide a significantly beneficial connection to surrounding services and facilities, above and beyond those that are proposed. While Kithill Lane might not be suitable for all users, these were the connection points suggested in the outline masterplan, and it is not possible, as part of this application to seek improvements to it. The proposal would, therefore, be sufficiently connected to the surrounding area.

12. The houses would be taller than those that currently form the edge of the settlement, with steeper pitched roofs. However, the boundary hedges and trees would be retained, as proposed at outline stage. This would help to assimilate the development into the surrounding landscape, so far as is possible. There is no reason to find that it would be significantly more present in views from outside Crewkerne and the North Dorset National Landscape than a similar quantum of development with roof forms more closely resembling the existing nearby dwellings.
13. A first version of the layout, submitted at the beginning of the application process, showed a significantly different landscape structure to that proposed on the outline masterplan. It related poorly to some existing landscape features and would have left the western part of the site distant from play areas.
14. There have, however, been significant revisions and overall, the layout determined by the Council, and slightly amended since, closely follows the suggested outline masterplan in terms of roads, nodes of open space and the relationship of buildings to these. The open spaces would have clear functions, such as an orchard, allotments, formal play, or to contain surface water infrastructure. These would be in locations broadly consistent with the outline masterplan.
15. A number of 'spur' cul-de-sacs are proposed from the main estate road, but other than in the narrowest western field, these would be connected pedestrian loops, providing visual and functional permeability. That also follows the principles of the outline masterplan, which the Council has indicated received a generally positive response from design specialists.
16. The proposed buildings would mostly follow and front the roads and footpaths. However, there are a lack of focal points, and key corners and junctions would not be well defined. While some buildings would be off-set to provide some visual termination, the so-called 'squares' and 'gateways' are little more than deviations in road alignment and would not be convincing, memorable townscape. There would not be a strong urban form and the use of raised tables in these locations could lead to some dominance of the roads over buildings. The open spaces and play areas are confined to the edges of the development, and not well related to the houses around them in a way that might encourage incidental, more lightly supervised play around peoples' homes, or encourage ad-hoc social interaction at a variety of levels.
17. That said, this is a rural fringe site, with a connection to the open countryside. The layout, while not giving a strong townscape, would provide connection with the existing landscape features, as well incidental and designed views towards new open spaces and landscaping. Even if the attenuation areas are not designed as usable public open space, and trees would take time to establish, they would provide relief from, and a landscape setting to, the built form. Further green infrastructure would be incorporated into the streets, through street trees and

amongst the parking areas, with additional planting around the open spaces and attenuation basins.

18. This development would not provide large gardens. Most would be smaller than the more generous ones in the existing, surrounding areas. The Council suggests that a greenfield site should be providing a more spacious layout, but doing so would result in a compromise over the amount of housing provision, open space, or landscape setting of the development. There is no local policy on garden sizes and no substantive evidence that those proposed would be inadequate to meet future residents' needs. Some of the gardens for flats would be separated from the building and its door. However, upper floor accommodation will seldom provide direct access to garden. As, other than the main block of flats, each unit is provided with its own private space, I find the arrangement acceptable.
19. It is clear that the detailed design has resulted in a greater amount of surface water drainage infrastructure to that suggested in the outline masterplan. This has compressed the residential development area, particularly in the central part of the site. The greatest consequence would be to reduce the garden sizes, but this is also alongside a reduction of 6 dwellings from that envisaged by the outline. I have already found the resulting gardens to be acceptable.
20. The need for more drainage infrastructure could also result in a more functional appearance to the incidental spaces around the edges of the development but, subject to final design, there is no obvious reason why these should appear to be overly engineered features that could not be well integrated into their open space contexts, or provide biodiversity benefits. Further landscaping details, required by condition, can clarify the proposals for these areas as well as the remainder of the development.
21. The final details presented include a mix of house-types finished in varying materials. While there may be little variation in fenestration, there would be sufficient design variation to avoid a monotonous townscape. A striking design could have been proposed for the prominently located block of apartments, but the Council has not identified that any harm would arise from the proposed design of this block, which would echo the style of the other proposed dwellings.
22. There would be a number of parking courts and areas of frontage parking. Some of these, particularly the most dominant examples towards the western end of the site and around the flats, were anticipated by the outline masterplan. There would be a long stretch of frontage parking between the flats and plot 80, but they would be broken up with street trees.
23. Overall, there would be a significant amount of parking within the public realm. This appears to be a product of a very high parking standard required by the Council in this location, that stipulates up to 3 spaces per dwelling. A number of the dwellings with 3 spaces include garages, which would reduce the dominance of hard surface. The resulting increase in built form would be largely set behind the dwelling frontages and would have a limited effect on the general appearance of the development.
24. While each site should create an identity in response to its own context, this is similar to a nearby development off Station Road where there is also extensive parking provision. At that site, while presenting a different urban form to that proposed here, I observed that the parking arrangements were not dissimilar, but

the overall result, as built so far, was providing a satisfactory balance between buildings and cars in the streetscape. There is no obvious reason why routes for electric vehicle charging cables cannot be carefully integrated into any footways they must cross. This solution is indicated on the drawings and can be secured by condition.

25. The provision of garages would further diminish garden sizes, but could avoid the need for additional sheds to store cycles, that would also diminish the available garden size. The parking layout at some plots might not be the most convenient layout for future users, but there is no objection from the Local Highway Authority, suggesting that there is sufficient parking provision to meet the future needs of the development, including for the allotment and community orchard areas.
26. The majority of bicycle parking would be provided in rear gardens. This is not so convenient as storage to the front and may reduce the incentive to cycle. However, the houses appear to have rear gardens that are accessible without passing through the building and it has not been shown that any disincentive would likely be a significant one.
27. Most dwellings would have space to store refuse bins within the gardens. Designated collection points would also be provided and, while it would be difficult to enforce bins being taken away from these locations after collection day, it would be preferable to providing no such spaces, that could result in bins being left on footways or verges. I have no reason to find that such arrangements would be more unsightly than a scenario where none were provided. Where communal storage facilities are shown, these appear to be gated, which would discourage fly-tipping and the like. However full details can be secured by condition.
28. With regard to the above, I find that the development would provide sufficient, purposeful green infrastructure to meet the aims of Policy EQ5 of the South Somerset Local Plan 2015 (LP) that seeks to deliver a network of connected and multifunctional open spaces.
29. As I have noted, there are areas, particularly around key junctions and open spaces, that could provide a more robust townscape. It would be desirable, for example, to provide a greater sense of place by framing these locations with buildings and reducing the presence of the highway. There is some tension here with the Council's placemaking principles which seek to deliver high quality environments.
30. Overall, I, therefore, find that the proposal would result in satisfactory placemaking that respects the rural-fringe context and integrates with the character and appearance of the existing area. However, the policy expects more than a lack of harm: While most criteria would be met, the noted shortcomings result in some conflict with LP Policy EQ2, which seeks to ensure that development is designed to achieve a high quality that promotes local distinctiveness, the creation of quality places with regard to the Council's published advice and guidance.

Living conditions

31. The small size of the proposed gardens means that the new dwellings would be close to existing ones. This is particularly apparent along the boundary with Henley View, where houses are located on the site boundary and there is also an

appreciable change in levels across the site boundary. Nos 36 and 37 have side windows facing towards the site.

32. The Council has confirmed in its appeal statement that the amended layout has satisfactorily addressed this. While there would be a significant and appreciable change for those closest residents, given the relationships now proposed, I am also content that there would be no significant adverse harm to living conditions, through effects on overlooking or outlook.
33. There is a sliver of land shown on the plans between some of the Henley View houses and the proposed new boundary fence. There is an existing area between the walls of the houses and boundary fence. In the event that the gap is not correctly shown, any intervening area is likely to become somewhat overgrown over time. However, there is no obvious reason that such should have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of those either side.
34. Therefore, I find no conflict with those aims of LP Policy EQ2 which seeks to ensure that development respects local context.

Flood Risk and drainage

35. The Lead Local Flood Authority (“LLFA”), having reviewed the appeal submissions are content that a satisfactory drainage solution can be provided for the proposed layout that will properly manage surface water at the site. It does not set out any objection to the development, including about land stability or the proximity of the proposed basins to the top of the steep slope just beyond the site boundary. There is no reason why the on-site solution should not also adequately prevent any increase in potential for surface water to discharge towards dwellings on Henley View. Nevertheless, Network Rail have objected to the proposal. Their concern has been about pond lining detail and the potential for exceedance flow to route towards the railway line, which is lower than the site.
36. In response to the appeal, Network Rail have confirmed that they still have concerns about the drainage strategy but have not said why. Given that the LLFA are content that the ponds would have sufficient capacity, I am satisfied that fine design details, such as lining methods, can be adequately dealt with through planning conditions and have little to do with the site layout or other reserved matters before me. In respect of overland flow, the drainage information clearly shows exceedance routes towards an area where the railway is elevated above intervening lower ground between it and the site. There is, therefore, no clear reason why Network Rail should still be concerned.
37. The Council have recommended a condition to secure the final details of the scheme. However, it is already a condition of the outline permission that drainage details are approved and implemented. Details pursuant to the approval of that condition are not before me in the context of this application, which is concerned only with the reserved matters. That is also the appropriate time to fully consider the relationship to of new drainage to existing Wessex Water infrastructure, and matters such as routes for connections to off-site infrastructure, that have little to do with the matters before me now. Where it is necessary to pass through hedgerows on the site, that can be managed through a condition dealing with a scheme for hedgerow protection. While future repairs to sewerage infrastructure might necessitate digging up estate roads and hindering access to dwellings at

that time, the frequency with which it might occur would not give rise to any material harm to the living conditions of future occupiers.

38. On the basis of the evidence before me, it has been shown that the proposed layout can be adequately drained without resulting in an increase in off-site flood risk. Finer engineering details can be agreed through the approval of conditions on the outline planning permission, and any practical or legal difficulties that the developer may face in connecting to existing infrastructure are for them to resolve outside the planning process. A pumping station is required to deal with foul water discharge, but as it is proposed to be sited closer to new dwellings than existing ones, there is no obvious reason why existing residents should be disturbed by any noise that it might generate. Accordingly, I find no conflict with those aims of LP Policy EQ1 that seek to ensure that development reduces and manages flood risk.

Planning balance

39. The proposal would integrate satisfactorily into the surrounding area, respecting its rural-fringe context and maintaining appropriate living conditions for adjoining occupiers. It would provide appropriately designed dwellings and communal areas to meet the needs of future residents. Nevertheless, there are design shortcomings that fall short of the expectations of the development plan and lead to some conflict with it. The development would not be unattractive, or unsympathetic to local character, but it would not, of itself, establish a strong sense of place.
40. Weighed against that, there are benefits associated with the delivery of new homes, including a significant number of affordable homes. This is of substantial weight in the context of the Council's inability to demonstrate a sufficient supply of deliverable housing land. As the development would facilitate the provision of much needed homes now, and the resulting environment would be an acceptable one, the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when considered against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole, with particular regard to policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes.
41. The proposal would, therefore, benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development outlined at paragraph 11 of the Framework. As Government policy, that is a weighty material consideration. There is only a small conflict with part of the development plan. Therefore, material considerations in this case indicate that a decision should be taken other than in complete accordance with it. The reserved matters should be approved.

Conditions

42. In addition to the conditions referred to within the main part of my decision, a plans condition is required in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the existing and future character and appearance of the area details of facing materials and landscaping should be agreed. The Council's suggested landscaping condition included some vague additional requirements, and it is not clear what details are envisaged to be necessary. Therefore, I have simply required the submission of a scheme, which will necessarily have to integrate with and be based upon the approved layout.

43. Boundary treatments to the various residential plots should be implemented prior to the occupation of the dwellings to which they relate in order to provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers and to protect existing ecological features. It is important that lighting is designed in order to avoid harm to biodiversity interests, so details should be submitted for approval. Measures to protect badger setts and nesting birds should be submitted and measures set out in the Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy and Landscape and Ecology Management Plan must be implemented. It is unnecessary to submit confirmation that a dormouse licence has been obtained or is not required as that duplicates other legislative controls.
44. The Council has suggested that the arboricultural surveys are updated, but it is not clear why this is required. However, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and biodiversity interests, a scheme for the protection of trees and hedgerows should be approved and implemented. While there were some ecological measures considered at outline stage and mitigated through planning obligations, updated information indicates that there is potential for other species and interests to be affected from the proposed layout and landscaping before me. It is, therefore, reasonable and necessary to impose additional conditions relating to these biodiversity matters.
45. To encourage travel by non-car means, a condition is required to ensure that the pedestrian and cycle links are delivered. Conditions were imposed on the outline planning permission to require certain highway works to be approved, with roads completed to base-course level. It is unreasonable to impose a further condition at this stage that introduces triggers for the completion of those works, as has been suggested by the Council. However, to ensure that sufficient parking is provided, I have imposed a condition that the approved parking spaces are delivered prior to the occupation of the dwelling to which they relate and that garages must remain in a parking-related use.
46. Cycle parking spaces should also be provided prior to the occupation of the plot that they serve. Like the Council's suggested condition, these details should be approved, so it is not necessary to set out circumstances in which garages may be used, or the relevant guidance documents, as that can be dealt with through the approval process.
47. The Council has recommended a condition removing permitted development rights for extensions and alterations to the buildings. However, it has not been shown why the existing controls, enshrined in the legislation, would not satisfactorily prevent harm to the area, or prevent overdevelopment of the various plots. Permitted development rights should only be removed in exceptional circumstances and a blanket removal has not been justified. Even if roof windows were to be included in the closest dwellings to Henley View, the distances to existing gardens and dwellings would be comparable to those frequently accepted, thereby avoiding any harmful overlooking impacts.
48. A further condition has been recommend requiring dwellings to comply with the nationally described space standards and for work areas to be provided for home working. However, the details of the individual dwellings are hereby approved and it is unreasonable to impose conditions that would result in deviation from that. Conditions relating to construction management and water efficiency are not related to the reserved matters before me.

49. I have made some revisions to the suggested conditions to ensure that they meet the tests for conditions and in the interests of clarity. I have removed a number of lists of requirements, the precise details of what is required can be agreed between the parties at the relevant time. I have also not included additional measures or conditions to submit confirmation of compliance, as that is not required in order to make the condition enforceable.

Conclusion

50. The appeal is allowed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR

Schedule

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the drawings listed in Annex A to this decision.
- 2) Before any above ground works commence, details including specifications and samples of the materials and finishes to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, windows and doors of the development hereby permitted, including the garages, boundary/enclosure walls, bin stores and cycle stores, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out and thereafter retained in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a scheme for the protection of existing trees and hedgerows during construction including a timetable for the erection and removal of any measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 4) Before any above ground works take place, details of a landscaping scheme, including a schedule for its implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including planting of native trees, shrubs, herbaceous plants and areas to be grassed.

The landscaping scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be maintained for a period of 10 years from its implementation. If any trees or shrubs which within that period die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, they must be replaced within the next planting season with trees/shrubs of the same approved specification, in the same location.

- 5) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a Lighting Strategy for Biodiversity shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No external lighting shall be installed other than in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the strategy and thereafter shall be maintained as such.
- 6) Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved, a 30 metre buffer exclusion zone starting from any active badger sett entrances shall be demarcated. No construction activities shall be undertaken within the exclusion zone. The exclusion zone shall be maintained throughout the development process unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 7) No building work or vegetation clearance shall take place between 1st March and 31st August inclusive, unless a competent ecologist has undertaken a careful, detailed check of the buildings, trees, shrubs and scrub and tall ruderal vegetation to be cleared for active birds' nests immediately before works proceed and written confirmation that no birds will be harmed and/or that there are appropriate measures in place to protect nesting birds on site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. In no circumstances should netting be used to exclude nesting birds.
- 8) The boundary treatments set out on the Enclosures Plans hereby approved shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the dwelling to which they relate and shall thereafter be maintained as such.

- 9) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, a timetable for the provision of the 2 no pedestrian/cycle paths on the northern boundary connecting to Kithill Lane shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The paths shall be constructed up to the boundary of the site and made available for public use in accordance with the approved timetable and thereafter maintained as such.
- 10) Prior to the occupation of each dwelling, the parking spaces serving that dwelling shall be provided in accordance with the details hereby approved and thereafter maintained as such. Visitor spaces shall be provided and made available for public use at the time that the highway from which they are accessed is provided and capable of use and shall thereafter be maintained as such.
- 11) Prior to the occupation of each dwelling, secure and weatherproof cycle parking for that dwelling at a minimum of 1 no. space per bedroom shall be provided in accordance with details which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle parking facilities shall thereafter be maintained as such.
- 12) Prior to the occupation of each dwelling, facilities for the storage (and placement for collection) of refuse and recycling receptacles, and electric vehicle charging, shall be provided for each dwelling in accordance with the approved plans. The communal bin stores shall be provided in accordance with further details that shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All vehicle charging, bin storage and collection facilities shall thereafter be maintained and kept clear of obstruction. Bins and recycling receptacles shall be kept in the specified locations at all times, except on the day of collection when they shall be placed out adjacent to the highway or at an identified muster point for collection.
- 13) All ecological measures and/or works shall be implemented in full as set out in the reports titled Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy and Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, both provided by GE consulting in May 2023.
- 14) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), the garages hereby permitted shall be used for parking purposes only and shall not be converted to any other use.

Annex A

Plan Ref	Plan Ref.	Revision
1644_P120	Site Location Plan	-
1644_P122	Proposed Site -Total Site	Rev N
1644_P123_1	Proposed Site Inc Roof Plan West	Rev M
1644_P123_2	Proposed Site Inc Roof Plan - East	Rev L
1644_P124_1	Proposed Materials Plan West	Rev L
1644_P124_2	Proposed Materials Plan - East	Rev L
1644_P125_1	Enclosures Plan - West	Rev M
1644_P125_2	Enclosures Plan - East	Rev L
1644_P126_1	Surfaces Plan - West	Rev L
1644_P126_2	Surfaces Plan - East	Rev K
1644_P127	Parking Plan	Rev L
1644_P128	Refuse Collection Plan	Rev L
1644_P221	Proposed Streetscenes 1	Rev E
1644_P222 Rev D	Proposed Streetscenes 2	Rev D
1644_P223	Proposed Streetscenes 3	Rev D
1644_P224	Proposed Sections 1	Rev A
1644_P225	Proposed Sections 2	
1644_PL500	Dalston - Plans	Rev A
1644_PL501	Dals 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL502	Dals 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL503	Dals 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL504	Dals 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL506	Dals 6 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL507	Dals 7 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL650	Dals 9 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL651	Dals 10 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL652	Dals 11 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL510	Tanton – Plans	Rev /
1644_PL511	Tant 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL512	Tant 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL520	Cornwood – Plans	Rev B
1644_PL521	Corn 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL522	Corn 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev C
1644_PL523	Corn 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL524	Corn 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL525	Corn 5 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL526	Corn 6 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL527	Corn 7 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL530	Scotswood – Plans	Rev C
1644_PL531	Scot 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev C
1644_PL532	Scot 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL533	Scot 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL534	Scot 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL535	Scot 5 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL536	Scot 6 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL537	Scot 7 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL538	Scot 8 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL539	Scot 9 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL540	Scot 10 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL541	Scot 11 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL542	Scot 12 – Elevations & Section	Rev /
1644_PL543	Scot 13 – Elevations & Section	Rev /

1644_PL550	Lingwood – Plans	Rev /
1644_PL551	Ling 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL552	Ling 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL553	Ling 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL560	Hartwood – Plans	Rev A
1644_PL561	Hart 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL562	Hart 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL563	Hart 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL564	Hart 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL570	Chelford – Plans	Rev A
1644_PL571	Chel 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL572	Chel 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL572	Chel 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL580	Fairford – Plans	Rev B
1644_PL581	Fair 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL582	Fair 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL583	Fair 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev C
1644_PL584	Fair 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL585	Fair 5 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL586	Fair 6 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL590	Bideford – Plans	Rev /
1644_PL591	Bide 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL592	Bide 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL593	Bide 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL594	Bide 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL600	2B3P – Plans	Rev A
1644_PL601	2B3P – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL610	2B4P – Plan	Rev /
1644_PL611	2B4P 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL612	2B4P 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL614	2B4P 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL615	2B4P 5 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL616	2B4P 6 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL654	2B4P 8 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL655	2B4P 9 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL620	3B6P – Plans	Rev A
1644_PL621	3B6P 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL622	3B6P 2 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL623	3B6P 3 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL624	3B6P 4 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL630	4B8P – Plans	Rev A
1644_PL631	4B8P 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev B
1644_PL632	4B8P 1 – Elevations & Section	Rev A
1644_PL640	1 Bed Apartment – Plans	Rev A
1644_PL641	1 Bed Apartment – Elevations & Section	Rev B