

East Lothian Council Consultation

at

QMUC

A1

Edinburgh

Edinburgh

TABLED ITEM

**Development Quality Sub-Committee
of the Planning Committee**

25 February 2004

Proposal: Outline planning permission for the erection of educational campus including academic buildings and student residences, learning resource centre, training hotel, sport and leisure facilities, key worker housing, new road junction on the A1 trunk road, access roads, parking, associated landscaping and utilities.

Applicant: East Lothian Council.

Reference No: 03/04458/ELC

1 Purpose of report

To recommend that **RAISE NO OBJECTION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS** as noted below;

Conditions

1. Incorporation of the traffic and access issues outlined in section 2 of this **FURTHER ASSESSMENT**.
2. East Lothian Council to consult the City of Edinburgh Council on any application for reserved matters.

3. East Lothian Council to consult the City of Edinburgh Council on any proposed alteration to Green Belt boundaries in the context of the review of the East Lothian Local Plan.

Reasons

1. In order to safeguard the interests of road safety and to ensure the promotion of the use of public transport and sustainable development.
 2. In order to ensure that detailed plans are properly considered in terms of issues of concern to this Council.
 3. In order to ensure that any strategic implications to the Edinburgh Green Belt are given proper consideration.
-

2 Main report

Site description

This is a consultation on an outline application which has been lodged with East Lothian Council for development of a new university campus for Queen Margaret University College (QMUC) on greenfield, Green Belt land west of Musselburgh. It has been referred to this Council for its views in accordance with the agreed Code of Practice in that the application raises cross boundary interest, is contrary to the approved Lothian Structure Plan 1994 (LSP1994) and raises a new planning issue of strategic significance.

The application site extends to some 20 hectares of what is presently part of three agricultural fields (classed as "prime quality" agricultural land), including a 1.1 hectare "loop" on the southern side of the Musselburgh By-pass/A1 in order to create a new grade-separated junction which will form the site's vehicular access.

Site history

There is no relevant planning history for this site.

Development

QMUC- THE CASE FOR RELOCATION.

The application is designed to allow QMUC to relocate and rationalise/expand facilities by amalgamating its two main campuses within the urban area of Edinburgh (at Clerwood and the former Leith Academy) on a new greenfield site.

The Gateway theatre complex on Leith Walk will be retained to offer specialist drama and theatre arts provision. This would be the first new university campus in Scotland for over 30 years.

QMUC has, in the past, focused on healthcare and service industries and this will continue in broad terms, but it is planned to expand business, leisure and arts subjects to achieve a more equal balance and to adjust, over time, the ratio of undergraduate to post-graduate students from an 83:17 to a 70:30 ratio.

Supporting information emphasises that relocation must be self-financing and based on re-investment of funds obtained through disposal of current estate assets.

With assistance from the City of Edinburgh Council, QMUC attempted to secure sites at first Granton and then Gogarburn, but these were unsuccessful. During this process, however, the difficulties in accommodating an amalgamated/expanded campus within the urban area became apparent and it became clear that a greenfield, Green Belt site would be required to relocate the campus within the Edinburgh area.

A site search was undertaken by QMUC in 2001 with over 50 sites in/around Edinburgh assessed. By October 2001, this was reduced to four sites (plus a base case of remaining at Clerwood):

1. Dunfermline/Carnegie Campus
2. Riccarton
3. Craigoyston/Civil Service Sports Club
4. Craighall (the current application site)

The outcome of the final appraisal on financial and non-financial criteria was that this Craighall site was the one which most closely met QMUC's strategic requirements.

DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

According to the Supporting Documents 1, the application proposals envisage a 14.2 hectare university campus within a total development area of 20 hectares. This represents 71% of the total site area and will include:

1. Teaching facilities (including a "Learning Resource Centre" accessible over 24 hours, 7 days per week);
2. Sports facilities (with sports provision off-site);
3. 1,500 student residences;
4. 44 key worker residences for university staff/post-graduate students;
5. A 100-bed "training Hotel" (2,200 sq. metres) open to commercial visitors;
6. Ancillary facilities such as kitchens/Food Court, Student Union, crèche, chaplaincy centre etc.

It appears the car parking facilities (on the northern part of the site), the 1.1 hectare "loop" for the new access junction and landscaping are to be accommodated in the remaining 29% of the total site area.

The development is to be phased with the first phase to be completed by 2007 catering for 3,650 students and 500 staff (including residential accommodation for 950 students/staff and 414 car parking spaces). Completion is envisaged by 2020 when 4,492 students, a consequent increase in teaching/support staff and 644 car-parking spaces will be accommodated.

The main vehicular access to the site is proposed to be via a new junction on the A1, with "Queen Margaret Drive" replacing Muckletts Road as a pedestrian/cycle access and acting as a bus route.

Though this is an outline application, it is accompanied by a "Masterplan" indicating likely principles for development of the site and outlining potential building/storey heights.

Consultations

Transport

The Transport Function advise that it would like the application to be continued for further information as, although a transportation assessment was submitted in support of the application, clarification on a number of points is still required. The following comments are offered:

Accessibility

The current standard of accessibility by public transport is very poor and large areas of the city are not served even by a 70-minute bus isochrone. It is not clear whether this travel time includes walking and waiting time and whether the times are for moving in peak-hour traffic.

Discussions have taken place with Lothian Buses plc about increasing the level of service on existing routes although this has not been detailed in the transportation assessment. If several thousand staff and students will be attending the university the proposal to increase bus provision will have to be extended to provide new services. It is possible to identify gaps in provision from the post-code surveys that have already been carried out. Further discussion about bus provision is required.

LRT bus 30 currently serves Fort Kinnaird and Newcraighall Station and therefore, to allow this to continue, access to the QMUC site/area would have to come from Newcraighall Road. Current junctions from Newcraighall Road are substandard and will require to be upgraded to allow bus access:

The train service going to Musselburgh from Waverley is currently limited to a single train suitable for a morning start, arriving at 8.43am. The alternative of walking to and from Newcraighall station, which will take half an hour, allowing for waiting time, cannot seriously be regarded as an option unless a connecting bus service is made available for every train.

It is unlikely that further train services will be available via Waverley station. Further discussions about better utilisation of Newcraighall station are required.

Cycling is a good option for those living within a few kilometres of the campus. The cycling initiatives are welcome and should be expanded to provide better links to the nearby coastal towns and south Edinburgh areas. Proposed routes from the CEC cycle team are enclosed.

It is likely that the preferred route corridor for tram 3 will take it to Newcraighall Park and ride. With the number of students and staff being so high and the adjacent proposed business parks, the tram could be extended to the campus. This should be further pursued with CEC.

Trip rates

The trip rates used for the business proposals were very low and need to be discussed with CEC. It is also not clear how the number of person trips in the am peak is as little as 517, and vehicle trips of 211, when it is estimated that 3000 people will be travelling to QMUC in the morning and there are over 400 parking spaces proposed. This has obvious knock-on effects on the traffic generation and car-parking provision.

The assumption that the mode share target is 40% for car drivers requires further discussion and would like the work carried out on the location of staff and students origins to be used to establish the likely number of vehicle trips. This is obviously related to the success of the green travel plan (see below) which, if strongly implemented from the start, could achieve excellent results.

Green travel plan/parking

The single most important factor in successfully implementing a travel plan is limiting the available parking. Although this is proposed, the number of spaces has been set at 414 up to 644. The number of spaces should be linked to the actual number of vehicles requiring (rather than desiring) to park on campus. It is not accepted that the existing arrival/departure profile should be used to calculate parking requirement as the existing situation is an undesirable model based on an historically unrestricted planning consent.

Traffic impact

CEC is only concerned with the road network within its boundary although concerned about any effects generated beyond this. As stated above, the number of vehicle trips involved with this proposal requires further discussion as without severe parking restrictions it is believe the generated trips will be greatly exceed the 211 am inward trips.

Notwithstanding this, the base condition queues for the junctions on the A6095 (Newcraighall Road) corridor are observed to be far longer than modelled, particularly at the Wisp a.m. and at Kinnaird Park p.m. The Jewel roundabout also experiences longer queuing at peak times.

Where there are already capacity problems, or problems associated with background growth, it has been suggested that QMUC should not be liable for any mitigating measures. Whilst it is acknowledged that the percentage increase attributed to QMUC is minor it is not acceptable to CEC to continue to approve incremental developments, particularly ones within a masterplan area, without ameliorating proposals. Further development at a junction operating at capacity is grounds for refusal and doing nothing is not an option.

Given the range of issues needing further discussion, Transport recommend the following conditions and Section 75 requirements:

Conditions

1. Provision of a bus-only road link and associated improvements from Newcraighall Road into the site.
2. A financial contribution towards, and provision of any land required at no cost to CEC for Tram 3.
3. The performance of the A1 between Old Craighall and Newcraighall junctions to be no worse than at present.
4. Section 75 agreement. A section 75 agreement will be required for contributions to cover the extension of bus, train and tram services, the provision and extension of cycle routes and implementation of the travel plan. Infrastructure works outside the site boundary i.e. junction improvements, signals installation should also be included. This should comprise a legal agreement to:
 - a) guarantee or underwrite provision of a frequent bus service from Edinburgh to Newcraighall to Campus to Mussleburgh railway station to Mussleburgh,
 - b) either a half-hourly train service to Mussleburgh railway station or a bus link to meet every train arriving to/departing from Newcraighall station.
 - c) Upgrade and provide pedestrian/cycle links to SE Edinburgh as shown on attached drawing.
 - d) Produce and implement a travel plan.

Scottish Water

Unable to respond at the present time.

Representations

No representations undertaken

Policy

1. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY - CIRCULAR 24/1985
"DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE AND GREEN BELTS"

As designated Green Belt (the East Lothian Local Plan 2001), the provisions of this Circular with regard to the purposes for which Green Belts are established, justifications for alterations to them and developments which will be permitted within them, apply.

2. THE STATUTORY DEVELOPMENT PLAN - LOTHIAN STRUCTURE PLAN 1994.

The aim to maintain a continuous Green Belt around the city is an essential part of the strategy of the approved structure plan with Policy ENV8 expressing the purposes for which the Edinburgh Green Belt has been established and Policy ENV12 expressing what developments will be permitted within it.

In addressing strategic needs (and consistent with Circular 24/1985), the Structure Plan reviewed the Green Belt and its boundaries and justified certain Green Belt releases in order to meet these needs and to be consistent with other objectives. This resulted in the justifiable extraction of the South East Wedge development area. In this assessment, the current Green Belt boundary in this area of Musselburgh was considered to be a "firm, defensible boundary" and the area to be visually prominent.

The Lothian Structure Plan 1994 (LSP 1994) strategy is that, once modifications to the Green Belt to accommodate strategic development needs are made, "severe restraints on developments in the modified Green Belt will continue" (paragraph 2.72). The plan also says that "no further Green Belt releases, beyond those arising from this Structure Plan will be accommodated for the foreseeable future.....peripheral development should be controlled and concentrated so that in the long-term a continuous Green belt around the city is robust and enduring. The strategy envisages that the long-term form of the city as a whole will be limited by the Green Belt. This will result in a continuous Green Belt corridor around the city, with a green expanse on either side of the City and Musselburgh Bypasses" (paragraph 3.18). This acknowledges that the City Bypass forms a defensible Green Belt boundary from the Gyle to Fairmilehead but not elsewhere.

Structure Plan Policy ENV8A required a study of the defensibilities of the remaining Green Belt and this joint authority study is the Edinburgh Green Belt Study 1999, probably the most comprehensive consideration given to the boundaries of the Edinburgh Green Belt. For this site, the results of the defensibility analysis undertaken concluded that current Green Belt boundaries (with the exception of the "Parkway" abstraction) were "firm" and defensible.

3. EMERGING STRATEGIC POLICY - THE EDINBURGH AND LOTHIAN STRUCTURE PLAN 2015, MARCH 2003.

The new Structure Plan which will replace LSP1994 has been submitted to the Scottish Ministers for approval; it builds on the strategy contained in LSP1994 and rolls it forward to a new horizon of 2015.

The settlement structure will continue to give priority to re-use of brownfield land as far as possible and contain the outward spread of the city through maintenance of the Green Belt.

Growing pressures for development in Edinburgh and the Lothians as a result of its strong and growing economy are however recognised. Whilst further major Green Belt releases would be prejudicial to its stability and endurance, the strategy does allow for limited Green Belt releases to achieve the housing targets set and to allow better distribution of land for economic development. Relating such releases to transport corridors will help to attain a more sustainable pattern of development. Such land should be concentrated in areas where impact on Green Belt objectives is least, and elsewhere the Green Belt will be vigorously defended and the principle of a continuous Green Belt should not be undermined.

Policy ENV2A outlines the objectives for designation of the Edinburgh Green Belt and Policy ENV2B outlines what uses will be considered appropriate within it.

The structure plan strategy is to focus most new development in 15 core areas with the "A1/East Coast Main Line Corridor and North Berwick" as one. Paragraph 2.42 suggests that strategic housing land allocations and strategic employment/educational uses will be supported in Musselburgh subject to Policies HOU3, ECON2 and ECON3. These require, where Green Belt sites are necessary, that the aim should be to minimise impact on Green Belt objectives, the establishment of new long-term and defensible Green Belt boundaries and, for housing, ensure that development can be integrated into effective networks for walking, cycling and public transport.

Paragraph 4.10 recognises that opportunities for the required 40 hectares of strategic employment land in the west sector of East Lothian may only be available within the Green Belt. Releases consistent with Policies ECON2 and ECON 3 are to be justified through local plans.

3 Conclusions and Recommendations

ASSESSMENT

QMUC has an important and valued role in the city-region's economy. Its retention and investment in the Edinburgh City Region is supported in principle.

As potentially the first greenfield, campus development in the Edinburgh area for over 30 years, this is very much a "one-off" scenario which is difficult to anticipate through the normal development plan process. That being said, development of the campus anywhere in the Green Belt would be contrary to the policies contained in the approved LSP 1994 and would require to be justified as an exception.

The Supporting Information submitted by the applicant sets out to justify the development on two grounds; neither of these is accepted. Firstly, the applicant's Supporting Information states that the QMUC proposals

constitute an "institutional use" which may be supported within the Green Belt in terms of Circular 24/1985 or Policy ENV8 of LSP1994. The use is not considered to be consistent with the definition of an "institutional use" in the LSP1994 Glossary. Campus development will inevitably generate considerable amounts of traffic, the campus is not self-contained and it is questionable whether the balance of undeveloped area proposed constitutes "extensive grounds".

Secondly, it states that the site is suitable for release from the Green Belt for development on the grounds that it is of "low landscape quality". Conversely, "high landscape quality" is given as a reason for not selecting the Craigoyston Green Belt site. This is not consistent with Green Belt policy. Landscape quality assessments (on their own) must not be directly related to potential for release of Green Belt land. All Green Belt land contributing to Green Belt objectives should be defended as such, regardless of landscape quality.

The emerging Structure Plan, however, is a material consideration. It suggests that a site in the Musselburgh area would be supported for strategic educational uses. Such a site would ideally be identified through the local plan process, but this work has not yet been completed.

Given that the site search exercise indicates that QMUC will have to consider a Green Belt site, there are three main issues of interest to the City of Edinburgh Council:

- Its impact on the Edinburgh Green Belt and its objectives;
- Transport and accessibility issues;
- Infrastructure.

Green Belt

Although this is a discrete application, Planning Committee in June 2002 considered a report on a consultation document that indicated the intention of East Lothian Council to seek the release of approximately 57 hectares of land east of the Musselburgh By-pass (the "Craighall" area and including the QMUC site) for strategic employment uses envisaged in the new structure plan.

That Report concluded that the Craighall area (including the QMUC site) was of great value to the landscape setting of Edinburgh and Musselburgh, to their separate identity and their sense of containment. It also provided the expanse of green countryside on either side of the Musselburgh By-pass, as required in LSP 1994. An extensive development of the area would contribute to an apparent merging of the built-up areas of Musselburgh and Edinburgh in the Newcraighall area and could be detrimental to the attractiveness of the city's major approach from the east. The Report also noted that there could also be implications for the continuity of the Green Belt to the east of the city, as has been emphasised by objections recently debated at the South East Edinburgh Local Plan Public Local Inquiry.

In terms of Green Belt policy, it is therefore recommended that, should East Lothian Council be minded to grant consent to this application, that it be referred to the Edinburgh and Lothians Structure Plan Joint Liaison Committee (ELSPJLC) for discussion in the context of the emerging Structure Plan, where East Lothian Council would have the opportunity to demonstrate the material grounds for departure from development plan policies and, in particular, the potential impact of the development on:

- The objective of retaining a continuous Green Belt around the city;
- Any potential consequence by way of "urban sprawl" or coalescence;
- The landscape settings of Edinburgh and Musselburgh (including the requirement to retain a green expanse along the Musselburgh Bypass);
- How long-term defensible green belt boundaries might be achieved in this area;
- How any visual impact on this strategic approach to the city may be mitigated (including securing through design and/or a Masterplan, key green corridors).

Notwithstanding any eventual decision by the ELSPJLC/East Lothian Council, the City of Edinburgh Council would wish to comment on any detailed application for QMUC purposes in this area, by way of landscape setting and form, height and massing of any buildings. The Supporting Information acknowledges the sensitivity and visibility of this area and its "gateway" role on a principle approach route to the city. Any development of the area should pay careful consideration to such matters and the impact of development on significant views, landmarks and the areas of Green Belt to be retained.

Transport and Accessibility Issues

As outlined in the Consultations Section, Transport has reservations about certain aspects of this proposed development with regard to transport and accessibility and the information submitted in support of the application. Transport recommends that, should it be minded to grant consent, East Lothian Council attach a number of conditions to cover these. These are detailed in the Consultations Section.

Infrastructure Considerations

As a result of recent discussion with Scottish Water and its advice that it will operate on a "first come, first serve" basis for the provision of water and drainage infrastructure to developments, the approval of this application may prejudice other development plan-led proposals in the South East Edinburgh Local Plan area and the Shawfair and Midlothian Local Plan areas. Assurance should therefore be sought from Scottish Water and East Lothian Council that serving the QMUC proposals would not displace infrastructure to developments brought forward through the local plan process. East Lothian Council should therefore be requested to ensure that planning conditions and/or legal agreements are secured to require that this development (if permitted) should itself make adequate provision for water and drainage services without prejudice to other plan-led proposals in this area.

In summary, QMUC has an important role in the Edinburgh City Region. The emerging Structure Plan suggests that a site in the Musselburgh area would be supported for strategic educational users. A number of aspects of this specific proposal would benefit from joint discussion at the ELSPJLC.

Members should note that, given that the strategic issues involved, Scottish Ministers may chose to exercise their powers to "call-in" the application.

It is recommended that, subject to discussion of the key issues indicated above at the ELSPJLC and subject to the conditions stated in this Report, that Committee raises no objections to this proposal.

FURTHER ASSESSMENT

Introduction

1. At its meeting on 25 February 2004, Committee asked that this report be continued in order to request East Lothian Council to provide clarification on the issues of:

- Transport and accessibility;
- Implications for the Green Belt;
- Infrastructure.

Discussions relating to these matters have now taken place between officials of the City of Edinburgh Council and East Lothian Council and East Lothian Council has provided further information on issues of concern to this Council relating to transport and accessibility issues. As a result, it is proposed to modify the recommended response to East Lothian Council, as this FURTHER ASSESSMENT details.

2. Transport and Accessibility

2.1. The issue of public transport remains a concern. The site is served by the existing Musselburgh train station. Service path restrictions and occupancy limits the ability of the train service to provide an adequate level of service and it is likely that the bus will be required to provide the core public transport service, especially from suburban Edinburgh and East Lothian communities.

2.2. To provide bus access to the campus that will prove attractive to operators of commercial bus services it will be necessary to provide a bus link from Newcraighall village (and Park and Ride station) through the campus to Musselburgh Railway Station and beyond. To facilitate this route for through bus services a bus link road will be necessary from Newcraighall Road to the campus. This link would have the potential to serve the area of land north west of the campus that East Lothian Council proposes to release from the Green Belt for development.

It may have to cross-land, which this Council would wish to retain within the Green Belt. It would however be for buses, emergency vehicles and cycles/pedestrians only and therefore could be of a restricted width and detailed accordingly. It will require planning consent in due course. East Lothian Council is therefore requested to seek the realisation/funding of this in consultation with QMUC, owners of the wider site and other relevant parties.

2.3. Accordingly, this Council would have no objection to the application subject to the following:

1. The provision of a bus (and cycle/emergency vehicle) link road between the campus and Newcraighall Road prior to first occupation of the QMUC site. Limited sight distances at the entrance would require this junction to be controlled by signals.
2. The provision of bus services, whether through commercial provision or otherwise:
3. frequent services linking Edinburgh via the Campus to Musselburgh;
4. shuttle bus to meet every train arriving/departing from Newcraighall Station.
5. The provision of cycle/footway links between South East Edinburgh and
6. the Campus such as shown as indicative proposals on the Cycle Plan in
7. Supporting Information.
8. The submission and approval of a Travel Plan to include: The submission and approval of a Travel Plan to include:
 - a) A parking limit of 414 spaces with an agreed management plan setting out criteria for the issue of parking permits and the charges involved;
 - b) Annual monitoring of parking provision and use;
 - c) A "Travel co-ordinator" with an annual budget;
 - d) Information on sustainable travel modes to be available in prominent locations close to the main entrances, and on the college intranet, and kept up to date;
 - e) Real Time Information screens to be located at prominent positions in each building;
 - f) Cycle parking, lockers and shower facilities to be provided free of charge;
 - g) Car sharing schemes to be set up with priority parking.
5. The proposed initial A1 junction form (left in/left out half diamond) would be acceptable for the initial development phase (25,061-sqm teaching, 4776 sqm. sports, 100-bed hotel). Any further development to require a full junction.
5. That East Lothian Council considers:
 - a) requiring the applicant to include a route for Tram Line 3 through the site, the land to be made available at no cost, should Tram Line 3 extension proceed;

- b) requiring the applicant to commit to making a financial contribution to Tram Line 3 extension, should the proposal proceed.

3. Green Belt

3.1 Committee concerns related to impact on Green Belt objectives; continuity of the Green Belt and defensibility of boundaries.

East Lothian Council advises that, in its view, this application must be seen in the context of the wider abstraction from the Green Belt in this area of Musselburgh, which it has resolved to pursue through the local plan process. This abstraction/future local plan allocation responds to the strategic development requirements of the new Edinburgh and Lothians Structure Plan.

3.2 East Lothian Council advise that the issue of impact on Green Belt objectives will be dealt with through progression of reserved matters for the application by way of design, massing, location and height of proposed buildings and through the design and implementation of an appropriate landscape framework. Work is underway on a Masterplan for the development of the larger area (including this QMUC site) and the concept under consideration relies on the continuation of a "parkland" type development extending from Musselburgh Golf Course towards the city boundary. East Lothian Council has been in discussion with Scottish Natural Heritage specifically regarding SNH concerns on these matters. East Lothian Council contends that a landscape framework which is inherently more attractive and ecologically diverse can be created to replace the current rather "bland" agricultural area. East Lothian Council intends to consult this Council on any applications for reserved matters. This approach is considered satisfactory.

3.3. With regard to continuity of the Green Belt, East Lothian Council consider that this is also an issue which must be seen within the wider context, including Green Belt designation of adjoining land within the South East Wedge and the future of the "Newcraighall Field" which is within the City Council administrative boundary. At the recent South East Edinburgh Local Plan Public Local Inquiry, this Council sought to defend Green Belt designation for this field, in response to objections seeking its allocation for development. The Reporter's Report and recommendations on this is awaited. East Lothian Council is of the view that Green Belt continuity can be ensured through whatever this Council considers to be an appropriate landscape barrier or landscape framework between the Newcraighall Field and the wider area of abstraction. These matters will be addressed by East Lothian Council in its review of the East Lothian Local Plan and this Council will be consulted. This approach is considered satisfactory.

3.4 With regard to defensibility of Green Belt boundaries, East Lothian Council are of the view that those proposed through the wider abstraction are as firm and defensible as the present boundaries; this is accepted.

Infrastructure

The servicing of development foreseen through current development plans and the accommodation of future development to needs the

requirements of the new Structure Plan is an issue of concern not just to the City Council but to all of the Lothian authorities. As a result of discussions with Scottish Water, the ELSPJLC has begun a dialogue with the Scottish Executive to highlight this concern and attempt to resolve such issues.

5. Recommendation

It is therefore recommended that the Council advise East Lothian Council that, in response to this consultation, it will raise no objection subject to the conditions stated.

Alan Henderson

Alan Henderson
Head of Planning and Strategy

Contact/Tel Val Malone on 0131 469 3590

Ward affected 00 -No Ward Number

Local Plan

Statutory Development
Plan Provision

File

Date registered 9 December 2003

Drawing numbers/
Scheme