

Delegated Report

Planning Ref: 24/00540/FUL
Applicant: Mr. McCarthy & Mrs. A.S. McCarthy-Young

Ward: Barlestone Nailstone and Osbaston

Site: The Limes Wood Road Nailstone

Proposal: Proposed conversion of outbuilding to a single dwellinghouse with associated works



Hinckley & Bosworth
Borough Council

1. Recommendations

1.1. Refuse planning permission subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

2. Planning Application Description

- 2.1. This planning application seeks full planning permission for the conversion of two containers into a single storey two-bedroom dwellinghouse at The Limes, Wood Road, Nailstone. The proposal features a 24.3sqm extension on its northern side to accommodate a sitting room and dining area. The containers are painted grey and feature horizontal cedar cladding.

3. Description of the Site and the Surrounding Area

- 3.1. The application site is outside of any identified settlement boundary in the designated open countryside and the National Forest. The application site is wholly surrounded by woodlands, fields, and further areas of undeveloped rural land. Approximately 500 metres to the north of the site is Aldi Distribution Centre and some 220 metres to the northeast is a commercial vehicle sales site. The application site is approximately 1km northeast of Nailstone.
- 3.2. The wider site beyond the red line boundary comprises a two-storey dwellinghouse, and several outbuildings associated with the residential property. The containers that are the subject of this proposal lie to the north of the property within an area that is heavily wooded. The development proposal comprises two green steel containers that are a metre apart that feature a canopy that extends to the north of both structures. Both structures are 2m in height, 2m in width, and 4.4m in depth and appear to have no current use other than for storage purposes. The site is accessed via Wood Road, which is an adopted and classified 'B' road (B585) which is subject to the National Speed Limit.
- 3.3. The application is in close proximity to a Great Crested Newt Breeding Pond and is within a Risk Impact Zone of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 N/A.

5. Publicity

5.1 The application has been publicised by posting a site notice within the vicinity of the site. No responses have been received.

6. Consultation

6.1 Nailstone Parish Council have objected to the proposal for the following reasons:

- The application is in an unsustainable location for additional dwellings.
- The proposal shows no relationship to the existing architecture of the associated dwelling.
- The buildings have no foundations and are considered to be temporary buildings.

6.2 There have been no objections from the following consultants:

- Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (HBBC)'s Drainage Officer
- HBBC's Environmental Services' Pollution Officer
- HBBC's Waste Management Officer
- Local Highway Authority (LHA) (subject to conditions)

Ecology:

6.3 The County Council's Ecology Department confirmed that there are Great Crested Newt ponds within 100m of the site and that the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal that accompanied the planning application provided incorrect information and a lack of detail. Therefore, it is not clear whether the structures are suitable for bats, nor what habitats are impacted by this proposal, or whether mandatory biodiversity net gain applies to this development.

Waste:

6.4 The Council's Waste Management Officer highlighted that all waste services have a collection point at the boundary of the adopted public highway and the Waste and Refuse Department does not collect or travel along private or shared driveways. Therefore, bin collection points are required near to the roadside for the safe placement of the various containers on collection day.

6.5 Natural England did not respond to the planning application. No further responses have been received.

7. Policy

7.1 Core Strategy (2009):

- Policy 21: National Forest

7.2 Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP) (2016):

- Policy DM1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- Policy DM4: Safeguarding the Countryside and Settlement Separation
- Policy DM6: Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geological Interest
- Policy DM7: Preventing Pollution and Flooding
- Policy DM10: Development and Design
- Policy DM15: Redundant Rural Buildings
- Policy DM17: Highways and Transportation
- Policy DM18: Vehicle Parking Standards

7.3 National Planning Policies and Guidance:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2023)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)
- National Design Guide (2019)

7.4 Other Relevant Guidance:

- Good Design Guide (2020)
- Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) (2017)
- Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG) (2022)
- Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standards (2015)

8. Appraisal

8.1 The key issues in respect of this application are therefore:

- Principle of development
- Housing land supply
- Design and impact upon the character of the area
- Impact upon residential amenity
- Impact upon parking provision and highway safety
- Planning balance

Principle of Development

- 8.2 Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies that planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 8.3 The current Development Plan consists of the adopted Core Strategy and the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (SADMP). In accordance with Paragraph 225 of the NPPF, due weight should be given to existing policies according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 8.4 Section 9 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that developments provide appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes, given the type of development and its location, and a safe and suitable access to the site for all users. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.
- 8.5 This is reinforced by Policy DM17(b) of the SADMP, which requires development proposals to be located where the need to travel will be minimised, and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Policy DM17 of the SADMP also states that development proposals should seek to ensure that there is convenient and safe access for walking and cycling to services and facilities; and that scheme should make the best use of existing public transport services.
- 8.6 The application site is in an isolated location that is 1km outside of the rural village, Nailstone, in the designated open countryside. Nailstone can only be accessed from the site via an unlit, classified 'B' road that is subject to the National Speed Limit that does not feature any pedestrian or cycle paths. Nailstone does not benefit from a shop.
- 8.7 Given the above, the occupants of the scheme would be reliant on private motorised transport to meet their day-to-day needs, which is likely to cause environmental harm in principle that is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM17 of the SADMP, and the environmental aim within the definition of sustainable development within the NPPF.
- 8.8 Outside defined settlement boundaries, the countryside is not regarded as a sustainable location for new development and Section 15 of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF confirms that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside unless one or more of the following circumstances apply:

- (a) There is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control of a farm business, to live permanent at or near their place of work in the countryside; or
 - (b) The development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or would be appropriate enabling development to secure the future of heritage assets; or
 - (c) The development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and enhance its immediate setting; or
 - (d) The development would involve the subdivision of an existing residential building; or
 - (e) The design is of exceptional quality in that it is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas, and would significantly enhance its immediate setting and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.
- 8.9 To support this, Policy DM4 of the SADMP states that the Council will protect the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside from unsustainable development. Consequently, Policy DM4 of the SADMP only considers development in the countryside sustainable where:
- (a) It is for outdoor sport or recreation purposes (including ancillary buildings) and it can be demonstrated that the proposed scheme cannot be provided within or adjacent to settlement boundaries; or
 - (b) The proposal involves the change of use, re-use or extension of existing buildings which lead to the enhancement of the immediate setting; or
 - (c) It significantly contributes to economic growth, job creation and/or diversification of rural businesses; or
 - (d) It relates to the provision of stand-alone renewable energy developments in line with Policy DM2: Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Development; or
 - (e) It relates to the provision of accommodation for a rural worker in line with Policy DM5 - Enabling Rural Worker Accommodation.
- 8.10 The Applicant claims that the development involves the change of use and extension of an existing building, which leads to the enhancement of the immediate setting.
- 8.11 However, the existing 'building' is two steel containers that are separated by 1m. Therefore, the containers are considered to be temporary structures that can be relocated.

- 8.12 As a result, the proposal does not relate to, or comply with, any of the criteria above in Paragraph 84 of the NPPF, or in Policies DM4 or DM15 of the SADMP, but this does not mean that the development is not sustainable.
- 8.13 Importantly, Policy DM4 of the SADMP also requires that development meets five further requirements to be considered as sustainable development. These are discussed in detail further in the report.
- 8.14 Nevertheless and by virtue of these factors, the application does not accord with Development Plan Policy and is unacceptable in principle, subject to the assessment of all other material considerations. Other material considerations are set out within the next sections of the report.

Housing Land Supply

- 8.15 Using the standard method as outlined by the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG), Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council are able to demonstrate 5.6 years of deliverable housing on 29 July 2024.
- 8.16 However, due to the age of relevant housing policies within the adopted Core Strategy, the 'tilted' balance in Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF is triggered in accordance with Footnote 8 and Paragraph 11 of the NPPF.
- 8.17 Paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the NPPF requires planning permission to be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.
- 8.18 In light of the above, the provision of one residential dwelling is not considered to provide more than a limited benefit to the supply of housing within the Borough.

Design and Impact upon the Character of the Area

- 8.19 Section 12 of the NPPF confirms that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and the creation of high quality, beautiful, and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should ensure. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF details the six national policy requirements of development to ensure the creation of well-designed and beautiful places.
- 8.20 Paragraph 139 of the NPPF states that development is not well design should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.
- 8.21 Policy DM4(i) and (v) of the SADMP states that development in the countryside will be considered sustainable where it does not have a significant adverse effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside; and it contributes to the delivery of the National Forest Strategy in line with Core Strategy Policy 21.

8.22 Policy 21 of the adopted Core Strategy confirms that the National Forest Strategy includes:

- Increasing woodland cover
- Enhancing biodiversity
- Developing a new woodland economy for timber products and wood fuel energy
- Outdoor recreational and sports provision
- Tourism development such as quality overnight accommodation linked to tourism in the Forest.

Proposals that support the delivery of the National Forest Strategy will be supported provided that:

- The siting and scale of the proposed development is appropriately related to its setting within the Forest; and
- The development respects the character and appearance of the wider countryside; and
- The development does not adversely affect the existing facilities and working landscape of either the Forest or the wider countryside.

8.23 The proposal does not contribute to the delivery of the National Forest Strategy, nor has any additional justification been provided by the Applicant to suggest otherwise. This is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM4 of the SADMP and Policy 21 of the adopted Core Strategy.

8.24 Policy DM10(c) of the SADMP states that developments will be permitted where they complement or enhance the character of the surrounding area with regard to scale, layout, density, mass, design, materials and architectural features.

8.25 The development represents unjustified new residential development in an unsustainable location in the designate countryside. This fundamentally and detrimentally alters the character of the application site, which results in significant adverse environmental impacts and harm to the character of the area and the countryside. This is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM1, DM4, DM10, and DM17 of the SADMP and Sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

8.26 Furthermore, the development is located 39.2m from the host dwelling, The Limes, and consequently does not appear to be associated with this property. Therefore, the development of this site is likely to appear at odds with the layout of the wider site of The Limes and its associated outbuildings. This is considered to result in harm to the character of the area.

8.27 In addition, there are many trees within the application site and no details have been provided to demonstrate that the scheme will not result in harm to, or the loss of, the trees within the site. This is likely to result in further harm to the rural character of the site.

- 8.28 This harm is exacerbated by the 55m extension of the hard surfacing to provide a vehicular access into the site and the further 160sqm of hard surfacing for off-street vehicle parking.
- 8.29 Whilst the scheme is single storey in massing and is unlikely to be visually prominent from public vantage points, this does not suggest that the scheme has not resulted in any harm.
- 8.30 By virtue of its location, layout, design, size, and scale the proposal causes significant harm to the site, the surrounding area, the National Forest, and the intrinsic value, beauty, open character, and landscape character of the countryside. Therefore, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4 and DM10 of the SADMP, Policy 21 of the adopted Core Strategy, the Good Design Guide, and Sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework

Impact upon Residential Amenity

- 8.31 Policy DM10(a) and (b) of the SADMP states development will be permitted provided that it would not have a significant adverse effect on the privacy and amenity of nearby residents and occupiers of adjacent buildings, including matters of lighting and noise and that the amenity of occupiers would not be adversely affected by activities within the vicinity of the site.
- 8.32 The Good Design Guide requires the way buildings to relate to each other, and their orientation and separation distances, to provide and protect acceptable levels of amenity.
- 8.33 Paragraph 135 of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments create places with a high standard of amenity for future users.
- 8.34 There are no neighbouring dwellings in close proximity to the application site. Therefore, the scheme is not considered to result in any harm to existing neighbouring residential amenity.
- 8.35 To support the residential amenity of future occupiers of the scheme, one of the aims of Section 4 (New Residential Development) within The Good Design Guide is to ensure that new residential development exceeds the internal space standards set by the Technical Housing Standards (THS) (2015) wherever possible.
- 8.36 Proposals for two-bedroom, single storey dwellings should provide a minimum of 70sqm of floor space and 2sqm of built-in storage in accordance with the Technical Housing Standards (THS).
- 8.37 The scheme provides 61.8sqm of floor space, which is not compliant with the THS. Therefore, the scheme is not considered to provide a high level of amenity for its future occupants. This results in significant harm to the residential amenity of the future residents of the scheme, which is contrary to Policy DM10 of the SADMP and to the requirements of the NPPF.

- 8.38 In accordance with Paragraph 10(c) of the THS, to provide one bed space, a single bedroom should have a floor area of at least 7.5sqm, and a width of at least 2.15m. In order to provide two bed spaces, a double or twin bedroom should have a floor area of at least 11.5m, and a width of 2.75m for the master bedroom, and a width of 2.55m for every other bedroom in accordance with Paragraphs 10(d) and (e) of the THS.
- 8.39 Both bedrooms do not comply with the minimum double-bedroom floor space standards advised within the THS.
- 8.40 Given the fact that the scheme does not provide sufficient floor space for the entire proposed dwelling, the proposal is considered to cause significant harm to the residential amenity of the future residents of the scheme, which is contrary to Policy DM10 of the SADMP and to the requirements of the NPPF.
- 8.41 To comply with the Good Design Guide, two-bedroom houses must also provide a minimum of 60sqm of private outdoor amenity space with a minimum length of 7m.
- 8.42 It is likely that the scheme could provide sufficient outdoor private amenity for this form of dwelling in accordance with the Good Design Guide.
- 8.43 To summarise, the development results in significant harm to the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the scheme as a result of insufficient total floor space and bedroom floor space for the proposed dwelling. This is contrary to, and in conflict with, with Policy DM10 of the SADMP, Section 12 of the NPPF and the Good Design Guide.

Impact upon Parking Provision and Highway Safety

- 8.44 Policy DM17 of the SADMP states that development proposals need to demonstrate that there is not a significant adverse impact upon highway safety, and that the residual cumulative impacts of development on the transport network are not severe.
- 8.45 All proposals for new development and changes of use should reflect the highway design standards that are set out in the most up to date guidance adopted by the relevant highway authority (currently this is the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide (LHDG)).
- 8.46 Policy DM18 of the SADMP requires developments to demonstrate an adequate level of off-street parking provision.
- 8.47 The Local Highway Authority (LHA) consider that the existing outbuilding could generate a level of traffic in its own right. Therefore, it would be difficult to demonstrate that the proposal for a two-bedroom property in this location would result in a material or severe increase in traffic from the existing established access.

- 8.48 In light of this, whilst five Personal Injury Collisions (PICs) have occurred on Wood Road within 500m of either side of the site access within the last five years, the LHA consider the scheme to exacerbate any highway safety issues.
- 8.49 The development utilises, and makes no amendments to, an existing access into the site via Wood Road. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) have visited the site and considered that visibility splays of 2.4m by 215m in each direction could be achieved from the site access. As it would be difficult to demonstrate that the proposal results in a material or severe intensification of the use of the existing site access, the LHA would not seek to resist the proposal's use of the existing access on the grounds of Part 1 of Section IN5 of the LHDG.
- 8.50 Whilst no details of the off-street parking arrangements have been provided within this application, it is considered that the scheme can provide sufficient off-street parking.
- 8.51 To summarise, the Local Planning Authority are unable to demonstrate that the scheme shall result in any unacceptable impacts on highway safety or the road network. Therefore, the scheme is regarded as acceptable with Policies DM17 and DM18 of the SADMP, and the LHDG.

Planning Balance

- 8.52 The Council can demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply. However, the housing policies in the adopted Core Strategy are considered to be out of date. It is necessary therefore to consider that the 'tilted' balance in Paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF applies and planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
- 8.53 The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development will not result in any adverse impacts to protected species or habitats, nor that it can provide its statutory requirement 10% biodiversity net gain within the site. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM6 of the SADMP, and Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). This is considered to attract substantial weight in the planning balance.
- 8.54 Due to the location of the site, the development represents unjustified development in an area of poor transport sustainability and fails to promote sustainable transport, the best use of public transport, nor provide any safe walking and cycling access to services and facilities. Therefore, the future occupants of the scheme are highly likely to be dependent on private motorised transport to meet their day-to-day needs. Consequently, the proposal is in an unsustainable location for residential development and results in significant environmental harm due to the future occupants of the development's dependence on private motorised transport.

- 8.55 As a result, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4, DM15, and DM17 of the SADMP, as well as Paragraph 8 and Sections 9 and 15 of the NPPF. This is considered to attract significant weight in the planning balance.
- 8.56 By virtue of its location, layout, design, size, and scale the proposal results in a detrimental and irreversible urbanising and domesticating effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character of the countryside, the National Forest, and the surrounding area. Therefore, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4 and DM10 of the SADMP, Policy 21 of the adopted Core Strategy, the Good Design Guide, and Sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF. This is considered to attract significant weight in the planning balance.
- 8.57 Furthermore, the development results in significant harm to the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the scheme as a result of insufficient total floor space and bedroom floor space for the proposed dwelling. This is contrary to, and in conflict with, Paragraph 135 of the NPPF, Policy DM10 of the SADMP, and the Good Design Guide and is offered significant weight in the planning balance.
- 8.58 In spite of this, it is acknowledged that there are potential social benefits from the scheme such as providing housing for a range of occupants including families, and economic benefits associated with the construction of the dwelling and the future occupant's opportunity to act as new customers and employees for local businesses and services. Nevertheless, these benefits when associated with one dwelling are modest and are not considered to maintain or enhance the local community. In addition, there are no planning benefits such as affordable housing or essential infrastructure provision as identified within Paragraph 12.13 of the SADMP.
- 8.59 By virtue of these factors, the adverse impacts of the development are considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme. As a result, the development is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM1, DM4, DM6, DM10, and DM15 of the SADMP, Sections 2, 9, 12, and 15 of the NPPF, the Technical Housing Standards, and Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021).

9. Equality Implications

- 9.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states: -
- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

9.2 Officers have taken this into account and given due regard to this statutory duty, and the matters specified in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in the determination of this application.

9.3 There are no known equality implications arising directly from this development.

9.4 The decision has been taken having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including General Data Protection Regulations (2018) and The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).

10. Conclusion

10.1 Taking national and local planning policies into account, and regarding all relevant material considerations, it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

11. Recommendation

11.1 **Refuse planning permission** subject to:

- Planning reasons detailed at the end of this report.

11.2 Reasons

1. The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development will not result in any adverse impacts to protected species or habitats, nor that it can provide 10% biodiversity net gain within the site. Without this information, the development has the potential to result in significant harm to protected species and their habitats and is unable to comply with the mandatory requirements of Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021). The benefits of the development of one dwelling do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh this harm. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policy DM6 of the adopted Site Allocations Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016).
2. The development represents unjustified development in an area of poor transport sustainability and fails to promote sustainable transport, the best use of public transport, nor provide any safe walking and cycling access to services and facilities. Therefore, the future occupants of the scheme are highly likely to be dependent on private motorised transport to meet their day-to-day needs. Consequently, the proposal is in an unsustainable location for

residential development and results in significant environmental harm due to the future occupants of the development's dependence on private motorised transport. The benefits of the development of one dwelling do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh this harm. As a result, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Policies DM4 and DM17 of the adopted Site Allocations Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), as well as Paragraph 8 and Sections 9, 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

3. By virtue of its location, layout, design, size, and scale the proposal results in a detrimental and irreversible urbanising and domesticating effect on the intrinsic value, beauty, open character of the countryside, the National Forest, and the surrounding area. Ultimately, the benefits of the development of one dwelling do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh this harm. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023), Policies DM4 and DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), Policy 21 of the adopted Core Strategy (2009), and the Good Design Guide (2020).
4. The development does not provide a high level of amenity and results in significant harm to the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the scheme as a result of insufficient total floor space and bedroom floor space for the proposed dwelling. The benefits of the development of one dwelling do not significantly and demonstrably outweigh this harm. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to, and in conflict with, Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023), Policy DM10 of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Development Plan Document (2016), and the Good Design Guide (2020).

a. **Notes to Applicant**

1. This application was assessed by the documents submitted by the Applicant that were received by the Local Planning Authority, as follows:
 - Application Form (submitted: 23.05.2024)
 - Covering Letter (submitted: 23.05.2024)
 - Existing Floor Plan & Elevations / Design Section A/A – Drg No. HMD/SV/0546/02 (submitted: 23.05.2024)
 - Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (submitted: 23.05.2024)
 - Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations / Design Section A/A / Roof Plan 0 Drg No. HMD/PD/0546/01 (submitted: 29.05.2024)
 - Site Location Plan (submitted: 23.05.2024)